# Q

## Quade, Michael Friedrich[[@Headword:Quade, Michael Friedrich]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born July 28, 1682, at Zachau, Pomerania. He studied at Wittenberg and Greifswalde; was in 1716 rector of the gymnasium at Stettin, and died July 11, 1757. He wrote, De Dionysio Areopagita Scriptisque eidem Suppositis (Greifswalde, 1708): — De Apostasia a Lutheranismo ad Papismum AEternum Exitiosa (1711'): — De Vita Judae Apostoli (eod.): — De Ritu Veterum Vota Solvendi et Nuncupandi Variisque Votorum Generibus (1730). See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v. (B.P.)

## Quadragesima[[@Headword:Quadragesima]]

             (fortieth day) is a name sometimes applied to the Lenten season, or more properly to the first Sunday of Lent (q.v.). It is so called by analogy with the three Sundays which precede Lent, and which are called respectively Septuagesima, seventieth; Sexagesima, sixtieth; and Quinquagesima, fiftieth. The whole period of Quadragesima is in the Roman Catholic Church accounted as tempus clausum.

## Quadrangle[[@Headword:Quadrangle]]

             is an architectural term used to describe a square or court surrounded by buildings. The buildings of monasteries were generally arranged in quadrangles. SEE QUADRATUM.

## Quadrans[[@Headword:Quadrans]]

             SEE FARTHING.

## Quadratum[[@Headword:Quadratum]]

             (squared), a name which was given to the nave of a church because of its square form. SEE CHURCH; SEE NAVE; SEE QUADRANGLE.

## Quadratus[[@Headword:Quadratus]]

             bishop of Athens, flourished under the government of Antoninus Pius. Quadratus is reputed to have been a disciple of the apostles and a native of Athens. Under emperor Adrian, while Publius was bishop of Athens, the Christians were persecuted and the congregation scattered. When Quadratus later succeeded to the episcopate of Athens, he wrote, for the purpose of ending the persecution of his co-religionists, an Apology for the Christian Faith, and presented it to the emperor. This Apology, which had the desired effect, was extant in Eusebius's time, who tells us that it showed the genius of the man and the true doctrine of the apostles; but we have only a small fragment. preserved by Eusebius in the fourth book of his history, wherein the author declares that “none could doubt the truth of the  miracles of Jesus Christ. because the persons healed and raised from the dead by him had been seen, not only when he wrought his miracles. or while he was upon earth, but even a very great while after his death; so that there were many,” says he, “who were yet living in our time.” Valesius, and others upon his authority, make of this Quadratus a different person from Quadratus the bishop of Athens; but this assertion is generally rejected. Jerome affirms that the Quadratus of Athens and the one reputed to have lived at Magnesia were the same. Nothing certain can be collected concerning the death of Quadratus; but it is supposed that he was banished from Athens, and then put to a variety of torments, under the reign of Adrian. See Eusebius, Hist. Ecc 4:3; Cave, Hist. Lit.; Donaldson, Literature of the Early Centuries; Lardner, Works; Hook, Ecclesiastes Biog. 8:173; Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. s.v.

## Quadrio, Francesco Saverio[[@Headword:Quadrio, Francesco Saverio]]

             a learned Italian Jesuit, was born in Valtellina, Dec. 1, 1695. He was of an infirm and susceptible temper, which involved him in sundry broils and disappointments, in consequence of which he sought and obtained leave to quit the Order of the Jesuits and assume the garb of a secular priest or abbe. He died at Milan, Nov. 21, 1756. He is noted principally as a secular writer. His historical and descriptive work on his own country, which he dedicated to pope Benedict XIV- Dissertazioni Critico-storiche intorno allal Rezio, di qgua dalle Alpi oggi detta. Valtellina (Milan, 1755, 3 vols. 4to) — is the best account extant of that secluded region. But the principal work of Quadrio is his general history of poetry in all ages and countries; Storia e Ragione d' oquui i'oesiea (Bologna and Milan, 1741-52, 7 vols. 4to), a laborious work, containing a vast deal of information not found collected in any other compilation; and, notwithstanding several mistakes and imperfections, is a very useful library book. Its composition occupied the author a considerable part of his life. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Quadripartite[[@Headword:Quadripartite]]

             is the technical term for the divisions of a vault into four triangular spaces.

## Quadrisacramentarians[[@Headword:Quadrisacramentarians]]

             is a controversial name for some German reformers in Wittenberg and vicinity who maintained that there are four sacraments necessary to  salvation, viz., baptism, the Lord's supper, absolution, and holy orders. See Melancthon, Loci Comm. SEE SACRAMENTARIANS.

## Quadrivium[[@Headword:Quadrivium]]

             (quatuor, four, and via, a road), the name given, in the language of the schools of the West, to the higher course of the medieval studies. From its consisting of four branches, as the lower course, for an analogous reason, was called Trivium, or “Three Roads.” The quadrivium consisted of arithmetic, music, geometry, and astronomy. It would carry us beyond our limits to detail the nature and extent of each of these branches as pursued in the medieval schools. The reader will find much curious and new matter on all questions cf this nature in the volumes of the works of Roger Bacon, lately edited in the series issued under authority of the Master of the Rolls, as also in the Introduction prefixed to the volumes.

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

             Quagutl is the vernacular spoken by the Indians of Vancouver's Island. From the report of the British and Foreign Bible Society for 1882 we learn that, at the request of the Church Missionary Society, the gospel of Matthew, translated by the Reverend A.J. Hall, the only European who has studied the Quagutl, has been printed by the British and Foreign Bible Society. The same society also published, in 1884, the gospel of John, prepared likewise by Mr. Hall. (B.P.)

## Quail[[@Headword:Quail]]

             ( שְׂלָו[Keri, שְׂלָיו].selv; Sept. ὀρτυγομήτρα; Vulg. coturnix) occurs in Exo 14:13; Num 11:31-32; Psa 105:40, where it is mentioned as food of the Israelites while they were in the desert. According to Schultens (Orig. Heb. i, 231), the Hebrew שְׂלָוis derived from an Arabic root “to be fat.” The round, plump form of the quail is eminently suitable to this etymology; indeed, its fatness is proverbial. Josephus (Ant. 3, 1, 5), too, expressly names the bird referred to here ortyx, ὄρτυξ. In fact, the Hebrew word שְׂלָיוis unquestionably identical with the Arabic salwa, a “quail.” Nevertheless, various opinions have been held as to the nature of the food denoted by the Hebrew seldv, which on two distinct occasions was supplied to the Israelites in the wilderness (see Exo 16:13, on which occasion the people were between Sin and Sinai; and Num 11:31-32, when at the station named, in consequence of the ju(dgment which befell them, Kibroth-hattaavah). Ludolf, for instance, an author of high repute, has endeavored to show that the selav were locusts (see hi is Disse-tatio de Locustis, cum Diatribau, etc. [Franc. ad Moen. 1694]).

His opinion has been fully aldvocated and adopted by Patrick (Comment. on Num 11:31-32). The Jews in Arabia also, as we learn from Niebuhr (Beschreib. von Amab. p. 172), “are convinced that the birds which the Israelites ate in such numbers were only  clouds of locusts, and they laugh at those translators who suppose that they found quails where quails were never seen.” Rudbeck (Ichthyol. Bibl. Spec. i) has argued in favor of the selav meaning “flying-fish,” some species of the genus Exocetus. Michaelis at one time held the same opinion, but afterwards properly abandoned it (see Rosenmuller. Not. ad Bochart, Hieroz. ii, 649). A later writer, Ehrenberg (Geograph. Zeitschr. 9:85), from having observed a number of “flying-fish” (gurnards, of the genus Trigla of Oken, Dactylopterus of modern ichthyologists) lying dead on the shore near Elim, believed that this was the food of the Israelites in the wilderness, and named the fish Triglac Israelitarum. Hermann von der Hardt supposed that the locust bird (Patstor roseus) was intended by seladv; and recently Mr. Forster (Voice of Israel, p. 98) has advanced an opinion that “red geese” of the genus Casalrca are to be understood by the Hebrew term.

A similar explanation has been suggested by Stanley (S. and P. p. 82) and adopted by Tennent (Ceylon, i, 487, note): this is apparently an old conceit, for Patrick (on Num 11:31) alludes to such an expianation. Some writers, while they hold that the original word denotes “quails,” are of opinion that a species of sand-grouse (Pterncles alchata). frequent in the Bible lands, is also included under the term (see Rosenmuller [Not. ad -Hieroz. ii, 649], Faber [in Harmar, ii, 442], and Gesenius [Thesaur. s.v. שְׂלָו]). It is usual to refer to Hasselquist as the authority for believing that the Kata (sand-grouse) is denoted: this traveller, however, was rather inclined to believe, with some of the writers named above, that “locusts,” and not birds, are to be understood (p. 443); and it is difficult to make out what he means by Tetrao Israelitarum. Linnaeus supposed he intended by it the common “quail.” In one paragraph he states that the Arabians call a bird “of a grayish color and less than our partridge” by the name of Kattta. He adds “An Selaw?” This cannot be the Pterocles alchata. The view taken by Ludolf may be dismissed with a very few words. The expression in Psa 78:27, of “feathered fowl” (עו כנ), which is used in reference to the selav, clearly denotes some bird, and Ludolf quite fails to prove that it may include winged insects. Again, there is not a shadow of evidence to support the opinion that selav can ever signify any “locust,” this term being used in the Arabic and the cognate languages to denote a “quail.”

As to any species of “flying-fish,” whether belonging to the genus Dactylopterus or to that of Exocetus, being intended, it will be enough to state that “fling-fish” are quite unable to sustain their flight above a few hundred yards at the most, and never could  have been taken in the Red Sea in numbers sufficient to supply the Israelitish host. The interpretation of selav by “wild geese” or “wild cranes,” or any wild fowl,” is a gratuitous assumption without a particle of evidence in its favor. The Casorca, with which Mr. Forster identifies the selav, is the C. rutila, a bird of about the size of a mallard, which can by no means answer the supposed requisite of standing three feet high from the ground. “The large red-legged cranes” of which Prof. Stanley speaks are evidently white storks (Ciconia alba), and would fulfil the condition as to height; but the flesh is so nauseous that no Israelite could ever have done more than have tasted it. With respect to the Pterocles calchata, neither it, nor indeed any other species of the genus, agrees with the Scriptural account of the seldav. The sand-grouse is a bird of strong wing and of unwearied flight, and never could have been captured in any numbers by the Israelitish multitudes. It is at all times a tenant of the wilderness far from water, and, strictly taken, is perhaps not a clean bird, all the species subsisting, for the most part, on larvae, beetles, and insects. We much question. moreover, whether the people would have eaten to excess — for so much the expression translated “fully satisfied” (Psa 78:29) implies — of the flesh of this bird, for, according to the testimony of travellers, from Dr. Russell (History of Aleppo [2d ed.], ii, 194) down to observers of to-day, the flesh of the sand-grouse is hard and tasteless. The ὀρτυγομήτρα, or “quail-mother,” of the Sept. should not be passed over without a brief notice. It is not easy to determine what bird is intended by this term as used by Aristotle and Pliny (ortygometra). According to the account given of this bird bv the Greek and Latin writers on natural history just mentioned, the ortygometra precedes the quail in its migrations, and acts as a sort of leader to the flight. Some ornithologists, as Belon and Fleming (Brit. Anim. p. 98) have assigned this term to the “land-rail” (Crex pratensis), the Roi des Cailles of the French, Re di Quaglie of the Italians, and the Wachtelkonig of the Germans, but with what reason we are unable to say. Probably the Sept. uses the term as a synonym of ὄρτυξ, or to express the good condition in which the birds were, for Hesychius explains ὀρτυγομήτρα by ὄρτυξ ὑπερμεγέθης, i.e. “a quail of large size.” SEE PARTRIDGE.

The objections which have been urged by Patrick and others against “quails” being intended are very easily refuted. The expression “as it were two cubits [high] upon the face of the earth” (Num 11:31) is  explained by the Sept., by the Vulg., and by Josephus ( Ant. 3, 1, 5) to refer to the height at which the quails flew above the ground, in their exhausted condition from their long flight. As to the enormous quantities which the least successful Israelite is said to have taken (viz. “ten homers”) in the space of a night and two days, there is every reason for believing that the “homers” here spoken of do not denote strictly the measure of that name, but simply “a heap;” this is the explanation given by Onkelos and the Arabic versions of Saadias and Erpenius in Num 11:31. Indeed, the inspired historian has himself shown that a complete covering of the ground with a compact mass is out of the question. For he has informed us that the people “spread them all abroad for themselves round about the camp.” This was in order to dry them in the sun for keeping, and it would require to be performed before decormposition had begun to set in; therefore the ground about the camp was free and clean for the drying process, which could not have been if it had been covered a yard deep with birds, twenty bushels to the square yard.

As it was, however, the store they collected in thirty-six hours lasted them for a whole month. The bodies, after having been split and cleansed, may have been simply dried in the sun without any antiseptic; for desiccation having once taken place, which a few hours of sunshine would be sufficient to accomplish, the stock would be preserved in the arid climate of the desert for an indlefinite period. Thus the flesh of animals taken in hunting is simply sun-dried in South Africa, and thus the stock-fish of the Norwegians is prepared from the cod, without salt. It is possible that a portion of the preserved meat may have been salted. The Egyptians used a large quantity of salt provisions, particularly fish and fowl; and the processes of splitting and salting geese are well depicted in the paintings of the tombs. The Hebrews would thus be sufficiently familiar with the art; and we know, from the ordinances concerning sacrifice (Lev 2:13), that they carried salt with them. But that they had, or could on the spur of the occasion procure, salt enough for the curing of a hundred millions of bushels of quails (allowing twenty millions to have been consumed in the fresh state), is altogether improbable. A comparatively small quantity may have been so preserved, but the bulk was doubtless simply sun-dried. The Egyptians similarly prepared these birds (see Herodotus [ii, 77], and Maillet [Lettres sur L'Egypte, 9:21; 4:130]). SEE EXODE.

Quails form a subdivision of the Tetraonidae, or grouse family, being distinguished from partridges by their smaller size, finer bill. shorter tail,  and the want of a red naked eyebrow and of spurs on the legs. There are several species, whereof the common, now distinguished by the name of Coturnix dactylisonans, is abundant in all the temperate regions of Europe and Western Asia, migrating to and from Africa in the proper season. Thus it crosses the Mediterranean and Black seas twice a year in vast multitudes; but being by nature a bird of heavy flight, the passage is partially conducted by way of intermediate islands or through Spain, and inl the East. in still greater numbers, along the Syrian desert into Arabia, forming, especially at the spring season, innumerable flocks.

This quail, the only species of the genus known to migrate, has, in fact, a very wide geographical range, being found in China, India, the Cape of Good Hope, and England, and, according to Temminck, in Japan (see Col. Sykes's paper on The Quails and Hempodii of India [Trans. of Zool. Soc. vol. ii]). Enormous flights of this bird, after crossing( an immense surface of sea, are annually observed at the spring and fall to take a brief repose in the islands of Malta, Sicily, Sardinia, Crete, in the kingdom of Naples, and about Constantinople, where on those occasions there is a general shooting-match, which lasts two or three days. This always occurs in the autumn. The birds, starting from the Crimea about seven at night, and with a northerly wind, before dawn accomplish a passage of above sixty leagues in breadth, and alight on the southern shore to feed and repose. In the vernal season the direction of the flight is reversed, and thev arrive in similar condition on tIhe Russian coast. The same phenomena occur at Malta. etc.; and as gregarious birds of passage are known to guide their course by given landmarks, which they distinguish with unerring precision, and which, unless they have been driven out of their usual direction by storms of wind, they invariablv arrive at or over before they take a newv flight, sou also quails congregate in Arabia in numbers proportionate to the surface of Western Asia, whither they are proceeding. The providential nature of their arrival withiln and around the camp of the Israelites, in order that they might furnish meat to a murmuring people, appears from the fact of its taking place where it was not to be expected; the localities, we presume, being out of the direction of the ordinary passage; for, had this not been the case, the dwellers in that region, and the Israelites themselves, accustomed to tend their flocks at no great distance from the spot, would have regarded the phenomenon as a well-known periodical occurrence. Aristotle (Anima. 8:14) mentions the habit; and Pliny (Hist. Nat. 10:23) states that they sometimes alight on vessels in the Mediterranean and sink them! Belon found quails alight in autumn onn a vessel bound from Rhodes to Alexandria; they were passing  from the north to the south, and had wheat in their craws. In the preceding spring, sailing from Zante to the Morea, he saw flights of quails going from south northwards.

Buffon relates that M. le Commandant Godelun saw quails constantly passing Malta during certain winds in May, and repassing in September; and that they flew by night. Tornefort (Voyage, i, 329) says that all the islands of the Archipelago at certain seasons of the year are covered with these birds. Col. Syles states that such quantities wiere once caught in Capri, near Naples, as to have afforded the bishop no small share of his revenue, and that in consequence he has been called Bishop of Quails. The same writer mentions also (Trans. Zool. Soc. l. ii) that 160,000 quails have been netted in one season on this little island. M. Temminck says that in spring such prodigious numbers of quails alight on the western shores of the kingdom of Naples, about Nettuno. that one hundred thousand are taken in a day (Yarrell, Brit. Birds [2d ed.], ii, 404). It is interesting to note the time specified: “it was at even” that they began to arrive; and they, no doubt continued to come all the night. Many observers have recorded that the quail migrates by night, though this is denied by Col. Montagu (Ornithol. Dict. s.v.). “On two successive years I observed enormous flights of quails on the north coast of Algeria, which arrived from the south in the night, and were at daybreak in such numbers through the plains that scores of sportsmen had only to shoot as fast as they could reload” (H. B. Tristram). When the numbers, however, are very great, and the distance to be achieved remote, we can lwell imagine that both day and night would be spent on the wing, as on the second occasion recorded in the sacred text. The expression “quails from the sea” (Num 11:31) must not be restricted to denote that the birds came from the sea as their starting-point, but it must be taken to show the direction from which they were coming. The quails were, at the time of the event narrated in the sacred writings, on their spring journey of migration northwards, an interesting proof, as Col. Sykes has remarked, of the perpetuation of all instinct through some 3300 years; the flight which fed the multitudes at Kibrothhattaavah might have started from Southern Egypt and crossed the Red Sea near Ras Mohammed, and so up the gulf of Akabah into Arabia Petra. The Israelites would have had little difficulty in capturing large quantities of these birds, as they are known to arrive at places sometimes so completely exhausted by their flight as to be readily taken, not in nets only, but by the hand. See Diod. Sic. (i, 82 [ed. Dindorf]), Prosper Alpinus (Rerum Egypt. 4:1), and Josephus (Ant. iii, 5). Sykes (l.c.) says “they arrive in spring on the shores of Provence so fatigued that for the first few  days they allow themselves to be taken by the hand.” Diodorus tells us (i, 60) that the inhabitants of Rhinocolura, a town on the border of Palestine and Egypt, placecd long nets made of split reeds along the shore a length of many furlongs, in which the quails were arrested thatLhad crossed the sea in flocks; and that they then preserved them for future subsistence. In the northern parts of Persia and Armenia, according to Morier, quails are taken in great abundance, and with great ease, with the simplest possible machinery.

The men stick two poles in their girdles, on which poles they so stretch a coat or a pair of trousers that the sleeves or the legs shall project like the horns of a beast. Thus disguised, they prowl about the fields with a hand-net, and the quails, simply supposing the strange object to be a horned beast, and therefore harmless to them, allow him to approach, till he throws the net over them. Rude as such a contrivance seems, the Persians catch quails thus with astonishing rapidity (Second Journey, p. 343). The flesh of the quail, though of an agreeable quality, is said by some writers to be heating, and it has been supposed by some that the deaths that occurred from eating the food in the wilderness resulted partly from these birds feeding on hellebore (Pliny, Hist. Nat. 10:23) and other poisonous plants; but this is exceedingly improbable, although the immoderate gratification of the appetite for the space of a whole month (Num 11:20) on such food, in a hot climate, and in the case of a people who at the time of the wanderings rarely tasted flesh, might have induced dangerous symptoms. “The plague” seems to have been directly sent upon the people by God as a punishment for their murmurings, and perhaps is not even in a subordinate sense to be attributed to natural causes. See, in general, Bochart, lieroz. ii, 648 sq.; Bartlett, Forty Days in the Desert, p. 40; Tristram, Nat. Hist. of the Bible, p. 229; Wood, Bible Animals, p. 430 sq.; Bible Educator; i, 157, 250; iii, 88.

## Quaini, Luigi[[@Headword:Quaini, Luigi]]

             an Italian painter, the son of Francesco, was born at Bologna in 1643. After having acquired the rudiments of the art and a knowledge of perspective from his father, he became a disciple first of Guercino, and afterwards of his relation Carlo Cignani, in whose school he wmas contemporary with Marc Antonio Franceschini. His improvement was so great that in a few years he was employed, as well as Franceschini, to assist Cignani in the execution of some of his great works. Their method of handling and coloring was so similar that it was difficult to determine what part of any work was executed by either of them. In Cignanii's principal  works, however, it seems that Quaini painted the landscape, the architecture, and other ornaments, and Franceschini the figures. After Cignani's death the two artists continued to work together. They were employed at Bologna, Modena, Piacenza, Genoa, and Rome, where they painted the cartoons for a cupola in St. Peter's, which has since been executed in mosaic. Quaini also painted many historical subjects from his own compositions, which were entirely finished by himself. In the church of St. Joseph at Bologna there is a picture of the Visitcation; in La Carith, the dead Christ Supported by the Virgin; and in the church of St. Nicholas tihe principal altar-piece is by Quaini — it represents St. Nicholas in Prison Visited by the Virgin and an Angel, and is favorably spoken of by Lanzi. Quaini died in 1717.

## Quakers[[@Headword:Quakers]]

             SEE FRIENDS.

## Quam despectus[[@Headword:Quam despectus]]

             QUAM DEJECTUS, is the beginning of a passion-hymn, written by the doctor seraphicus, St. Bonaventura (q.v.), of which the first stanza runs thus:

“Quam despectus, quam dejectus,

Rex coelorum est effectus,

Ut salvaret saeculum;

Esnrivit et sitivit,

Pauper et egenius ivit

Usque ad patibulum.”

This beautiful hymn has been translated into English by P. S. Worsley, and

from the Lyra Messianica, p. 277, we subjoin the first stanza:

“Oh, what shame and desolation,

Working out the world’s salvation,

Deigned the King of Heaven to bear!

See him bowed with sorrows endless,

Hungry, thirsty, poor, and friendless,

Even to the cross repair.”

For the original, see Trench, Sacred Latin Poetry (Lond. 1864), p. 143 sq. (B. P.)

## Quam dilecta Tabernacula[[@Headword:Quam dilecta Tabernacula]]

             is the beginning of a prose of Adam of St.Victor (d. about 1192) for the dedication of a church. “This hymn,” says Mr. Trench, “of which the theme is, the dignities and glories of the Church, as prefigured in the Old Testament and fulfilled in the New, is the very extravagance of typical application, and were it only as a study in mediaeval typology, would be worthy of insertion; but it has other and higher merits, even though it must be owned rather that the poet's learned stuff masters him, than that he is able effectually to master it. Its title indicates that it was composed for the occasion of a church's dedication, the services of which time were ever laid out for the carrying of men's thoughts from the temple made with hands to that spiritual temple, on earth or in heaven, ‘ whose builder and maker is God.”' We subjoin the first verse:

“Quam dilecta tabernacula

Domini virtutum et atria!

Quam electi architecti,

Tuta aedificia,

Quae non movent, immo fovent,

Venius, flumen, pluvia!”

There are two English translations of this prose, one by W. B. Flower, in

Lyra Mystica (, p. 211 sq. — “How loved thy halls and dwelling-place” —

and the other by Neale, in his Mediaeval Hymns, p. 146 sq., with

explanatory notes. A third translation, but only of the last stanzas, is given

by Mr. Bonar in the Sunday at Home (Jan. 1878), which, for their beauty,

we subjoin:

“Future things in figure shadowed

This our day of grace displays!

on the couch with our beloved

here we rest, and sing, and praise,

Now the bridal day has come!

“Days of which the silver trumpets

Of the ancient feasts first told;

Day of days, whose promised glory

Israel’s holy psalms unfold,

Giving voice to solemn sound.

“Thousand, thousand are the praises

To the Bridegroom which they raise;

With one voice in triumph singing

Through the everlasting days,

Hallelujah, without end.”

See Trench, Sacred Latin Poetry, p. 227 sq.; Mone, Hymni Latini, i, 316; Koch, Geschichte des deutschen Kirchenliedes, i, 109. (B. P.)

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

             a Lutheran theologian, doctor and professor of theology, was born March 27, 1686, at Koniigsberg, in Prussia, where he also died Jan. 17, 1772, as church-counsellor and general superintendent. Of his writings we mention, Jude'nprediyt (Konigsberg, 1710): — De Atramento Hebrorum, ex Pandectis Talmudicis (ibid. 1713): — De Cultris Circumcisoriis et Secespitis Hebraeorunm (ibid. 1713): — De Cornibus Al taris Exterioris (ibid. 1713): — De Cinere in Sacris Hebrceorum (ibid. 1713): — Dissertatio de Sagtan (סנו) sire Pontifics Maximi Suffrasqaneo (Lips. 1708). reprinted in Ugolino, Thesaurus Antiquitatunm Sacrru'm, etc. 12:No. 16: — De Christo Veio Ecclesice 1F;'damento in Nomine Sethi typice adumbrato Gen 4:25 (Kinigsberg, 1726). See Furst, Bibl. Judaica, iii, 124; Winer, landbuch der theolog. Literatur, i, 637; ii, 718 (Leips. 1838). (B. P.)

## Quanian Version[[@Headword:Quanian Version]]

             The Quines, a wandering people, for whom this version is made, inhabit that most northerly portion of Lapland which is called Finmark or Norwegian Lapland. This dreary region, having for its northern boundary the Arctic or Frozen Ocean, is the habitation of about 6000 people, called the QuAines, who till within the last half century were left without any version of the Scriptures in their vernacular dialect. The Bible Society of Finland sent to them copies of the Finnish Testament, but this version was unintelligible to them, and even so the Lappish Testament, although they speak a dialect of Laplandish. In 1822 the British and Foreign Bible Society voted £200 to promote a version in Quinian, and it was not till the year 1828 that arrangements for the immediate translation of the New Testament were made by the Norwegian Society. The execution of the translation was committed to Mr. Stockfleth, a missionary of eminent devotedness, who in 1828 was laboring as a pastor among the uncivilized  tribes of Laplanders under the seventy-first degree of north latitude, where, during two months of the year, the sun never rises. In 1840 the translation of the New Testament was completed, and an edition was published at Christiania, under the superintendence of the Norwegian Bible Society. See The Bible of Every Land, p. 324. (B. P.)

## Quanwon[[@Headword:Quanwon]]

             is, in Japanese mythology, an embodiment of the goddess Amida. She is represented with a multitude of hands, each holding a different object, probably things useful to men, whom she has undertaken to make happy. Her temples are splendid, of extraordinary dimensions, and filled with idols: 33,333 are said to be contained in the temple of Miako; hence its name, San mun San Tsin, which signifies the temple of the 33,333 images. A large number of children are represented around her in her pictures: they are the gods themselves looking up to her with love and veneration.

## Quarantana[[@Headword:Quarantana]]

             In the mountainous wilderness between Jerusalem and Jericho, in which, according to tradition, our Lord's temptation took place, there is a very high mountain, one of the highest in Judaea, called Quarantana (by the Arabs Kuruntul), in allusion to the forty days' fasting of Jesus, and which is supposed to be the mount alluded to in Mat 4:8 (see Thomson, Land and Book, 2, 450; Wilson, Bible Lands, 2, 12); but by some it is identified with the Rock of Rimmon, where the defeated Benjamites took refuge (Jdg 20:47). “The mountain rises precipitously, an almost perpendicular wall of rock, twelve or fifteen hundred feet above the plain, crowned with a chapel on its highest point. The eastern front is full of grots and caverns, where hermits are said once to have dwelt in great numbers. At the present day, some three or four Abyssinians are said to come hither annually to pass the time of Lent upon the mountain, living only upon herbs. There is nothing else remarkable about this naked cliff to distinguish it from the other similar ones along the Ghor and the Dead Sea farther south. The tradition which regards the mountain as the place of our Lord's temptation, as well as the name Quarantana, appears not to be older than the age of the Crusades” (Robinson, Bib. Res. ii, 303).

## Quare impedit[[@Headword:Quare impedit]]

             (i.e. why he hinders) is the title of an English action whereby a person who has purchased an advowson, or iight of presentation to an ecclesiastical benefice, sues any one who disturbs or hinders him in the exercise of his legal right.

## Quare incumbravit[[@Headword:Quare incumbravit]]

             (why he has cumbered or taken possession). During a plea between two persons for the possession of an advowson [SEE QUARE IMPEDIT], if the bishop admits the presentee of one of them within six months, the other can have a writ of this form against the bishop.

## Quare non admisit[[@Headword:Quare non admisit]]

             (why he has not admitted). When one has recovered an advowson, and the bishop refuses to admit his presentee, such a writ may be employed.

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

             an eminent author and poet, was born at Stewards, near Rumford, Essex, England, in 1592. He was educated at Christ's College, Cambridge, and Lincoln's Inn. He occupied various civil. office until the rebellion of 1641 in Ireland, and he died September 8, 1644. Quarles was a man of learniig and ability, and the writer of many books in prose and verse, which are admirable for their moral and religious character. The following are a few of his works: Emblems, in five books: — A Feast for Worms, in a Poem on the History of Jonah: — Hadassah, or History of Queen Esther: — The History of Samson: — Job Militant, with Meditations Divine and Moral: — Sion's Sonnets Sung by Solomon the King: — Sion's Elegies Sung by Jeremy the Prophet: — Pantceologia, or the Quintessence of Meditation: — Divine Fancies, Digested into Epigramns, Meditations, and Observations: — Midnight Meditations on Death: — Manual of Devotion: — Heroglyphics of the Life of Man: — The Enchiridion,  containing Institutions Divine and Moral. See Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Quarrel[[@Headword:Quarrel]]

             (Fr. carre, square) is a technical term employed in architecture to describe a diamond-shaped pane of glass, or a square one placed diagonally. It is also the name of a small piercing in the tracery of a window. A wax taper (q.v.) used in churches is also called “quarrel.”

## Quarry[[@Headword:Quarry]]

             (פְּסַיל, pesil, but only in the plur.; Sept. γλυπτά', Vullg. idoll). In the account of the exploit of Ehud in Jdg 3:19; Jdg 3:26, for the “quarries that were by Gilgal” of our version, or, as the Syriac and the Chal dee read, stone-pits or quarries, the primary signification of images of false gods may be intended, as in Deu 7:25; Isa 42:8; Jer 8:19; Jer 51:52; Hos 11:12. etc.; and it is so understood by the Sept. and the Vulg. in the above text. We have no knowledge of any quarries at Gilgal, in the plain of Jericho; and Boothroyd conjectures that idols might have been erected at Gilgal by Eglon, and that the sight of them there inspired Elhud with new ardor to execute his purpose. Rosenmuller, after Rashi, adheres to the above interpretation of quarries, and in this Furst and Keil agree. The last-named interpreter remarks that the Gilgal intended cannot  be the one near the Jordan, but that in the hills of Ephraim. SEE GILGAL. Gesenius regards Pesilim as the name of a place. Cassel, in Lange's Commentary, understands by it boundary-stones, i.e. “termini,” of an idolatrous form. That the ancient Canaanites had extensive quarries is evinced by the cyclopean blocks at the foundation of the temple at Baalbek (q.v.).

## Quarterly Fast[[@Headword:Quarterly Fast]]

             SEE FASTING.

## Quarterly Meeting[[@Headword:Quarterly Meeting]]

             SEE MEETING, QUARTERLY.

## Quartodecimani[[@Headword:Quartodecimani]]

             a name in ecclesiastical history for those Christians of Asia Minor who, in the first ages of the Church, annually commemorated the death of Christ at the 14th of Nisan, the time when the Jews celebrated the Passover, SEE PASCHAL CONTROVERSY, and three days after the resurrection of Jesus, totally ignoring the regard for the day of the week usually taken as the one on which this event is believed to have occurred. This difference it was determined to adjust at the Council of Nice in A.D. 325, when it was decreed that the practice of observing Friday as the day of crucifixion (q.v.), and the following Sunday as the day of ascension (q.v.), should prevail. Those who refused to accept this decision of the council were denominated Quartodecimani, because of their contending for the fourteenth day of the first Hebrew month as the proper time for observing Easter, quartadecima lunae, on the fourteenth day of the moon. They are sometimes called Paschites. The Audaeans, Montanists, Novatians, and other sects were Quartodecimani. See Schaff, Ch. Hist. vol. ii; Riddle, Christian Antiquities; Waterland, Works, vol. vi.

## Quartus[[@Headword:Quartus]]

             (Graecized Κούαρτος, for the Latin quartus, fourth), a Christian resident at Corinth, and, from his name, apparently a Roman, whose salutations Paul communicated to the Church of Rome in his epistle thereto (Rom 16:23). A.D. cir. 50. There is the usual tradition that he was one of the seventy disciples; and it is also said that he ultimately became bishop of Berytus (Tillemont, 1, 334).

## Quas Laudes[[@Headword:Quas Laudes]]

             TIBI NOS, PATER, CANEMUS, is the beginning of one of the hymns written by the “prceceptor Germanise,” Philip Melancthon (q.v.). It was composed in the year 1527, and is based on Psalms 111. It is found with his other poems, of which he composed aItogether about 400, in Bretschneider's Corpus Reformatorum (Hal. Sax. 1842), vol. 10. A selection of about fifty- one, together with a German metrical translation, was published by Oberhey, Melancthon's Gedichte, Musgewihlt und ubersetzt (Halle, bei Muhlmann, 1862). See Koch, Geschichte des deutschen Kirchenliedes, i, 259. (B. P.)

## Quaser[[@Headword:Quaser]]

             The Scandinavian Edda tells us that the divine families of the Asas and Vanas, having warred against each other for many years, felt tired at last of these never-ceasing disputes, tand determinedh to create a being on whose wisdom they might safely rely, and whom they would take for their umpire. The Asas and Vanas spat into a common vessel, and formed Quaser. He was so wise that no one could ask him a question which he was not able to answer. Therefore, having pronounced his sentence in the. quarrel of the gods, he travelled about in the world to impart his wisdom to men. But two gnomes, Fialar and Galar, killed him, mingled his blood with honey, and thus prepared a delicious mead, which made poets of all those who tasted it. The gods having shown some anxiety as to what had become of the great sage, the gnomes managed to spread the rumor that Quaser had been choked by his own wisdom (a phrase which has become proverbial in the north), as nobody could relieve him of it by his questions. Shortly afterwards the same dwarfs killed the giant Gilling and his wife by crushing them with a mill-stone while sleeping. The giant Suttung, Gilling's son, avenged his father by exposing the murderers on a deserted island, to die there of starvation. In this extremity they offered him, to ransom their lives, their poetical mead. Suttung listened to their proposition, set them free, and had the precious liquid carefully guarded by his beautiful daughter Gunloda in the interior of a mountain. Odin, by a stratagem, penetrated into the mountain, gained the favor of the yotung giantess, and drank the mead to the last drop.

## Quasimodogeniti[[@Headword:Quasimodogeniti]]

             is a term sometimes used to denote the first Sunday after Easter. It is of comparatively late origin, and is derived from the Latin version of 1Pe 2:2 : Quasi modo geniti infantes, etc. — “As new-born babes,” etc. SEE EASTER

.

## Quatember[[@Headword:Quatember]]

             are fasts observed in the Church of Rome, and by other ecclesiastical bodies, among them the Church of England. According to Jewish custom, the four seasons of the year were observed as occasions for fasting. These were the four fast-weeks: one after Ash-Wednesday, Pentecost, the Crucifixion (Sept. 14), and after Lucia (Dec. 13). The fast-days were Wednesday, Friday, and Saturday. Wednesday was the day on which the quarterly offerings were brought, and it was principally called Quatember- day. In the German Protestant Church these fasts were for a long time observed also.

## Quaternion[[@Headword:Quaternion]]

             (τετράδιον, a body of fl.bur). “A quaternion of soldiers” (Act 12:4) was a detachment of four men, which was the usual number of a Roman night-watch (Veget. De Re de Milit. iii, 8; Philo, 2 In Flacc. p. 98; Polyb. 6:33, 37). SEE SOLDIER. Peter, therefore, was guarded by four soldiers, two within the prison, probably attached to his person, and two outside the doors; and, as the watch was usually changed every three hours, it was necessary that the “four quaternions” mentioned in the text should be appointed for the purpose. SEE PRISON. Or one set of sentinels may have been posted at the door of the cell (which was probably thought to be so secure as not to require a guard within), and another at the outer or street gate (Walch, De Vinclis Petri, in his Dissert. ad loc.). SEE PETER.

## Quatremere, Etienne Marie[[@Headword:Quatremere, Etienne Marie]]

             a celebrated French Orientalist, was born at Paris, July 12, 1782. He began his studies at a very early age, and as a youth was noted for his remarkable attainments. In 1807 he was employed in the Imperial Library. and in 1809 was called to the professor's chair at Rouen. In 1815 he was appointed to the Academy of Inscriptions, and in 1819 instructor of Hebrew, Chaldee, and Syriac at the College of France. In 1827 he became professor of  Persian. He was now known as one of the greatest Orientalists in the world, and was especially noted as an Egyptologist, and how well he deserved this distinction appears from his publications in this line of study. In his religious proclivities he was Gallican and Jansenist. He used his pen freely against the innovations of the papists and against their assumptions. We have not room here to mention his severe satires against the Ultramontanes, but refer the reader who desires to study them to Renan's Essays. Quatremire died Sept. 18, 1857.

## Quaw, James E[[@Headword:Quaw, James E]]

             a minister of the Reformed (Dutch) Church. He graduated at the New Brunswici Theological Seminary in 1828, and was engaged during his ministerial life chiefly in missionary work among feeble churches in New York and Michigan. He was the author of two remarkable books — The Cold Water Man, a powerful plea for total abstinence, and Bible Baptism, or the Immerser Instructed from Various Sources. T'he latter has passed through a number of editions. and is a real thesaurus of information, and of learned, acute, andl valuable discussion of the mode of baptism. The object is to place before its readers the results of learned investigation, and to prove that immersioul is not the only scriptural mode of baptism; that sprinkling is scriptural, and that infants are proper subjects of that ordinance. The individuality of the author's character, life, and ministry, and his independence of thought and treatment of his subject, may be gathered from his prefatory statement: “Many of the materials for the following work were collected while the author was travelling in primitive apostolic style in different parts of the great American valley. In these, his ministerial journeyings, he usually preached six or eight times a week, while he often travelled on foot without purse or scrip or two coats, sometimes with scarcely one, often for day's without bread and occasionally without water. But the mighty God of Jacob was always with him... This book was written in a Western log-cabin, in a room which at one and the same time answered for a study, a parlor, a sitting-room, a dining-hall, bedroom, and kitchen. The hours which for six or eight months the author could spare from the discharge of the duties of a New- Testament bishop, he has, in this rather romantic study, devoted to this work.” Mr. Quaw was lost on Lake Erie in the dreadful wreck of the steamer Erie in 1845. He was a godly and self-denying man, peculiar in appearance and manner, a faithful missionary to the needy, and an able writer. (W. J. R. T.)

## Quedara Wardon[[@Headword:Quedara Wardon]]

             is a Hindu festival in honor of the goddess Parwati (q.v.). It imposes on him who has once celebrated it the obligation of celebrating it every year. The participants in this solemnity are distinguished by a yellow string, which they carry around their arm. They fast the whole day of the feast.

## Quedil[[@Headword:Quedil]]

             is a Hindu feast in honor of the goddess Mariatale. The performances are the same as those of the goddess Mariyammai. Mariatale is probably identical with the latter.

## Quedlinburg, Synods Of[[@Headword:Quedlinburg, Synods Of]]

             Several ecclesiastical coulncils were held in this German city in mediaeval times. The first took place in 1085. The bishops who sided with pope Gregory VII assembled it immediately after Easter, and it was presided over by the papal legate Otto di Ostia. Among those who attended were archbishops Gebhard of Salzburg and Hartwick of Magdeburg; the bishops Adalbere of Wtirzburg, Altmann of Passau, Bernard of Merseburg, Gunther of Zeiz, St. Benno of Meissen, Albert of Worms. Burchard of Halberstadt, Herrmann of Metz, Reginhard of Minden, Wigold of Augsburg, Gebhard of Constance, Heinrich of Bamberg. The council recognised, first, the primacy of the pope, whose decisions it was allowed to no one to alter or to criticise. In conformity with the decrees of former popes, the consecration of the bishops unlawfully established by Henry IV, Wenzel of Mentz, Siegfried of Augsburg, Norbert of Chur, etc., was declared null, and likewise all other ordinations and consecrations of the same kind. The synod rejected the erroneous assertions of Wenzel of Mentz in regard to excommunication. Excommunications are only valuable when they are pronounced according to the forms adopted by the Church. The six following resolutions are of a general kind: The sixth canon recommends to the priests, deacons, and subdeacons perpetual continence; the seventh canon prohibits the lays from touching the altar-palls and holy vessels; according to the eighth canon, the lays shall not take hold of the dimes without having the consent of the legitimate owners; the ninth canon directs that the spring fast of Quatember shall be held in the first week of Lent, the summer fast in the week of Pentecost; the tenth canon decrees no one shall eat eggs or cheese during the forty days of Lent; the eleventh canon declares that the choice made by the legate Otto of Gebhard as  bishop of Constance, and everything done by the legate in that city, is approved by the council. At the close of the council the anathema was pronounced, with burning tapers, against the anti-pope Wibert (pseudo- Clemens III), the heresiarch; against the apostate Hugo of Albano, who had presided at the Council of Worms in 1076; against Johannes (Petrus), archbishop of Parto, and against Petrus, late chancellor of the pope; against archbishop Liemar of Bremen, Udo of Hildesheim, Otto of Constance, Burchard of Basle, Huzmann of Spire, deposed bishops; finally, against the usurping bishops aWenzel, archbishop of Mentz; Siegfried, bishop of Augsburg; Norbert, bishop of Chur, and all their followers. See Labbe, Concil. x; Hardouin, Concil. vi; Hartzheim, Cone. Germ.; Binterim, Deutsche Conc. vol. iii; Flotho, Konig Heinrich IV (Stuttg. 1855). Two other synods were held at Quedlinburg — one in 1105, for the reformation of manners; a third in 1121, about the situation of the empire and the investitures. See Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lex. s.v.

## Quedu[[@Headword:Quedu]]

             was, in Hindu mythology, the son of Kassiaba and Siugfriede. He and his brother Rahu were redoubtable giants and wicked daemmns. They tried to prevent the gods from preparing the beverage of immortality, the amrita. The gods having succeeded in their enterprise, by causing the Mandar Mountain to rotate in the middle of the milk sea, the two giants robbed the vessel which contained the amrita. The sun and moon had been witnesses to the robbery: they denounced it to Vishnu, who cut off the heads of the giants at the very moment when they carried the immortalizing liquid to their lips. A drop of the amrita had already made the two heads immortal; they flew towards the sky, and there became planets. They are only visible at the time of eclipses. They are fierce enemies of the sun and moon, which they pursue and try to swallow.

## Queen[[@Headword:Queen]]

             The Hebrews had no word properly answmering to our term queen in the sense of a female sovereign, neither had they the dignity which that word denotes. Of the three Hebrew terms used as the equivalents of “queen” in the A. V. (גְּבַירָה שֵׁגָל מִלְכָּה), the first (malkah) alone is applied to a queen reygnant; the first and second (shegal) equally to a queen consort; without, however, implying the dignity which in European nations attaches to that position; and the third (gebirah) to the queen mother, to whom that  dignity is transferred in Oriental courts. The etymological force of the words accords with their application. Malkah is the feminine of mlek, “king;” it is applied in its first sense to the queen of Sheba (1Ki 10:1), and in its second to the chief wife, as distinguished from all other females in a royal harem (Est 1:9 sq.; Est 7:1 sq.; Son 6:8): the term “princesses” is similarly used in 1Ki 11:3. Shegal simply means “wife,” i.e. of the first rank, as distinguished from mere concubines; it is applied to Solomon's bride or perhaps mother (Psa 45:9), and to the wives of the first rank in the harems of the Chaldee and Persian monarchs (Dan 5:2-3; Neh 2:6). Gebirdh, on the other hand, is expressive of authority; it means “powerful” or “mistress,” being the feminine of גְּבַיר, gebir, “master,” or “lord.” The feminine is to be understood by its relation to the masculine, which is not applied to kingly power or to kings, but to general authority and dominion.

It is, in fact, the word which occurs twice with reference to Isaac's blessing of Jacob: “Be lord over thy brethren;” and “I have made him thy load” (Gen 27:29; Gen 27:37). It would therefore be applied to the female who exercised the highest authority, and this, in an Oriental household, is not the wife, but the mother, of the master. Strange as such an arrangement at first sight appears, it is one of the inevitable results of polygamy: the number of the wives, their social position previous to marriage, and the precariousness of their hold on the affections of their lord combine to annihilate their influence, which is transferred to the mother, as being the only female who occupies a fixed and dignified position. Hence the application of the term gebirah to the queen mother, the extent of whose influence is well illustrated by the narrative of the interview of Solomon and Bathsheba, as given in 1Ki 2:19 sq. The term is applied to Maachah, Asa's mother, who was deposed from her dignity in consequence of her idolatry (1Ki 15:13; 2Ch 15:16); to Jezebel as contrasted with Joram (2Ki 10:13, “the children of the king and the children of the queen”); and to the mother of Jehoiachin or Jeconiah (Jer 13:18; comp. 2Ki 24:12; Jer 29:2). In 1Ki 11:19, the text perhaps requires emendation, the reading followed in the Sept., הִגְּדוֹלָח “the elder,” according better ith the context. The limited use which is made even of the restricted term gebiraih is somewhat remarkable. It is only employed twice with reference to the wife of a king: in one of these two cases it is applied to the wife of the king of Egypt, where the condition of the royal consort was more queenly than in Palestine (1Ki 11:19; comp. Willkinson, Anc. Egypt. ii, 59; iii, 64; v, 28); and in the other to  Jezebel, the wife of Ahab, who, as the daughter of a powerful king, appears to have enjoyed peculiar privileges in her matrimonial state (2Ki 10:13). In two other places it is not clear whether the king's wife or mother is intended (Jer 13:18; Jer 29:2); and in the remaining passages it is pointedly referred to the king's mother in such terms as clearly show that the state which she held was one of positive dignity and rank (1Ki 15:13; 2Ch 15:16). SEE WIFE.

The result of all inquiry into the subject seems to show that among the Jewish kings the usages bearing on this point were not different from those which are still exhibited in Western Asiatic courts. Where woman never becomes the head of the State, there can be no queen regnant; and where polygamy is allowed or practiced, there can be no queen consort. There will, however, be a chief wife in the harem; and this is no doubt the rank indicated in the Bible bv the words which we render “queen.” This rank may be variously acquired. The first wife of the king, or the first whom he took after his accession, usually obtained it; and if she is both of high birth and becomes the mother of the first son, her position is tolerably secure; but if she possesses neither of these advantages, she may be superseded in her position as head of the harem by a wife of higher birth and connections subsequently espoused, or by one who becomes the mother of the heir apparent.

The king, however, will sometimes act according to his own pleasure in this matter, promote any favorite lady to this dignity, and also remove her from it at his pleasure; but more generally he finds it convenient to follow the established routine. The daughter of the king of Egypt was, doubtless, from her high rank, the chief wife of Solomon; as was Jezebel, for the same reason, the chief wife of Ahab. In like manner the high-born mother of Absalom was probably the chief wife of David, although it is possible that the mother of the eldest son, Amnon, at first enjoyed that distinction, which, we may safely presume, eventually devolved on Bathsheba, after her son Solomon had been recognised as the heir. In one of Mr. Morier's amusing books (Hajii Baba in England) there is a passage which strikingly illustrates this matter. The court of Persia is there represented as being perplexed how to answer a letter which, in ignorance of Eastern customs, had been addressed by the queen consort of England “to the queen of Persia.” The cause of the dilemma thus created was that — “Although the shah's principal wife is called the banou harem, or head of the seraglio, yet her situation in the State bears as little affinity  to that of the queen of England as one may say the she buffalo kept in the enclosure for food and milk has to the cow fed and worshipped by the Hindu as his god. Our shah can kill and create banous at pleasure, whereas the queen of England maintains her post till the hand of fate lays her in the grave” (comp. Chardin, Voyages [ed. Langles], vol. 6 ch. xii; Thornton's Turkey, ii, 264-286).

Very different was, and is to this day, in Western Asia, the position of the king's mother, whose state is much the nearest to that of a European queen of any with which the East is acquainted. It is founded on that essential principle of Oriental manners whichl in all cases considers the mother of the husband as a far superior person to his wife, and as entitled to more re. spect and attention. This principle should be clearly understood; for it extends throughout the Bible, and is yet entirely different from our own social arrangementsi under which the mother, as soon as she becomes widowed, abandons her place as head of the familv to the daughter-in-law. Mr. Urquhart has admirably illustrated and developed this principle in his Spirit of the East (ii, 387 sq.); and his remarks, although primarily illustrative of Turkish manners, are, with some unessential limitations, applicable to the ancient and modern East. In p. 389 there is an anecdote of the late Ibrahim Pasha, who is represented as staying a whole week in the harem of his mother, waiting to find a favorable opportunity of pressing a request upon her; and when admitted, kissing her feet, refusing to be seated, and standing an hour and a half before her with his arms crossed, without, after all, succeeding in the suit which he — the conqueror of Syria and the victor of Konieh — preferred to an aged woman.

The arrangement in the seraglios of the more magnificent Hebrew monarchs was probably similar to that of Turkey, with this difference, that the chief women in the harems of the Jewish sovereigns entered it as wives, and not as slaves. The grand signior, from an indeterminate number of female slaves, selects his favorites, who are distinguished by the title of cadun, which, as it means “lady of the house,” seems nearly equivalent to the Hebrew gebirah. The number of these is said to be limited to seven, and their rank seems to correspond to that of the “wives” of the Hebrew seraglio, whose number was unlimited. The mother of a boy is called hasseky, unless the boy die, in which case she descends to her former rank. The caduns, or wives, of a deceased or deposed sultan are all removed from the imperial harem to a separate palace, with the single exception of the valide sultan, the mother of the reigning sultan, who has her liberty, a palace, and revenues to support a suitable establishment. But the hassekies, or those who have a son living,  are treated with marked respect, as in the natural course of events they may become valide. The title of sultan (for the Turkish has no distinction of gender), though from courtesy it may be given to the hassekies, is, strictly speaking, appropriate only to the sovereign's mother, and to the sons and daughters of the imperial family (Thornton, 2, 276; Urquhart, 2, 433).

This statement, especially the last point of it, strikingly illustrates the view we have taken as to the more queenly position of the king's mother than of his wife in the Jewish and other Asiatic courts. It must be clearly understood that this position is by no means peculiar to the modern East, or to the Jews among the ancient Orientals. Heeren, indeed, thinks that the power of “the queen mother” was even more considerable among the ancient Persians than among the modern Turks (Hist. Researches, i, 400); and the narratives of Herodotus and Ctesias respecting the tyrannical influence exercised by Parysatis, Amestris, and others bear ample testimony to this fact. The careful reader of Scripture will easily be able to trace the same ideas respecting the position of the king's mother among the Israelites. In how marked a manner does the mother of Solomon come forward at the end of her husband's and the beginning of her son's reign! She takes an active part in securisng her son's succession; it is in the conviction of her commanding influence that Adonijah engages her to promote his suit, alleging “he will not say thee nay;” and then, when Bathsheba appears before her son, the monarch rises from his place, advances to meet her, bows himself before her, and seats her on the right hand of his throne (1Ki 1:2). That the king's mother possessed high dignity is further evinced by the fact that Asa found it necessary to remove his mother, Maachah, “from being queen,” on account of her abuse of the power which that character conferred (1Ki 15:13). Jezebel was, as already stated, very powerful in the lifetime of her husband; but it is only under her son that she is called “the queen” (gebiraih); and the whole history of his reign evinces the important part lwhich she took in public affairs (2Ki 9:22; 2Ki 9:30; 2Ki 9:37; 2Ki 10:13). Still more marked was the influence which ler daughter Athaliah exercised in Judah during the reign of her son Ahaziah, which was, indeed, such as enabled her at his death to set the crown on her own head, and to present the anomaly in Jewish history of a regnant queen (2 Kings 11). SEE WOMAN.

## Queen Annes Bounty[[@Headword:Queen Annes Bounty]]

             is the name given in England to a fund appropriated to increase the income of the poorer clergy. It was created out of the firstfruits and tenths which before the Reformation were exacted by the pope from the clergy. These were funded by a statute in queen Anne's time; hence the name. See Chambers's Encyclop. s.v. SEE ANNATES.

## Queen Of Heaven[[@Headword:Queen Of Heaven]]

             In Jer 7:18; Jer 44:17-19; Jer 44:25, the Heb. מְלֶכֶת הִשָּׁמִיַם, meleketh hash-shamayim, is thus rendered in the A. V. In the margin is given “frame or workmanship of heaven,” for in twenty of Kennicott's MSS. the reading is מְלֶאכֶת, of which this is the translation, and the same is the case in fourteen MSS. of Jer 44:18, and in thirteen of Jer 44:19. The latter reading is followed by the Sept. and Peshito Syriac in Jer 7:18, but in all the other passages the received text is adopted, as by the Vulg. in every instance. Kimchi says א is wanting, and it is as if מלאכת— ‘workmanship of heaven,' i.e. the stars; and some interpret ‘the queen of heaven,' i.e. a great star which is in the heavens.” Rashi is in favor of the latter; and the Targum renders throughout “the star of heaven.” Kircher was in favor of some constellation, the Pleiades or Hyades. It is generally believed that the “queen of heaven” is the moon (comp. “siderum regina,” Horace, Carm. Sec. 35, and “regina coeli,” Apul. Met. 11:657), worshipped as Ashtaroth or Astarte, to whom the Hebrew women offered cakes in the streets of Jerusalem. Hitzig (Der Proph. Jeremia, p. 64) says the Hebrews gave this title to the Egyptian Neith, whose name in the form Ta-nith, with the Egyptian article, appears with that of Baai Hamman, on four Carthaginian inscriptions. It is little to the purpose to inquire by what other names this goddess was known among the Phoenician colonists; the Hebrews, in the time of Jeremiah, appear not to have given her any special title. The Babylonian Venus. according to Harpocration (quoted by Selden, De Dis Syris [ed. 1617], synt. 2, cap. 6, p. 220), was also styled “the queen of heaven.” Mr. Layard identifies Hera, “the second deity mentioned by Diodorus, with Astarte, Mylitta, or Venus,” and with the “queen of heaven,' frequently mentioned in the sacred volumes...

The planet which bore her name was sacred to her, and in the Assyrian sculptures a star is placed upon her head. She was called Beltis, because she was the female form of the great divinity, or Baal; the two, there is reason to conjecture, having been originally but one, and androgyne. Her worship penetrated from Assvria into Asia Minor, where its Assyrian origin was recognised. In the rock tablets of Pterium she is represented; as in those of Assyria, standing erect on a lion, and crowned with a tower or mural coronet, which, we learn from Lucian, was peculiar to the Shemitic figure of the goddess. This may have been a modification of the high cap of the Assyrian  bas-reliefs. A figure of Astarte found in Etruria represents her as winged (Rawlinson, Herod. ii, 404). To the Shemites she was known under the names of Astarte, Ashtaroth, Mylitta, and Alitta, according to the various dialects of the nations among which her worship prevailed” (Nineveh, ii, 454, 456, 457). It is so difficult to separate the worship of the moon- goddess from that of the planet Venus in the Assyrian mythology when introduced among the Western nations that the two are frequently confused. Movers believes that Ashtoreth was originally the moon- goddess, while according to Rawlinson (Herod. i, 521) Ishtar is the Babylonian Venus, one of whose titles in the Sardanapalus inscriptions is “the mistress of heaven and earth” (see Onias, De מלכת השמים[Alt. 1666]). SEE ASHTORETH.

With the cakes (כִּוָּנַים, carvvanmi; Sept. χαυῶνες which were offered in her honor, with incense and libations, Selden compares the πίτυρα (A. V. bran”) of Ep. of Jeremiah 43, which were burned by the women who sat by the wayside near the idolatrous temples for the purposes of prostitution. These πίτυρα were offered in sacrifice to Hecate while invoking her aid for success in love (Theocr. ii, 33). The Targum gives כִּרְדּוּטַין, kanrdutin, which elsewhere appears to be the Greek χειριδωτὸς, a sleeved tunic. Rashi says the cakes had the image of the god stamped upon them, and Theodoret that they contained pine-cones and raisins. SEE CAKE.

## Queen Of The South[[@Headword:Queen Of The South]]

             SEE SHEBA.

## Queensferry Declaration[[@Headword:Queensferry Declaration]]

             After the defeat at Bothwell Bridge, the stricter and more violent portion of the Covenanters drew off from the main body, and adhered exclusively to the ministers Cameron and Cargill. An outline of their opinion had been composed, and the document was found in possession of Hall of  Haughheaid on his apprehension at Queensferry on June 3, 1680. Hall was mortally wounded as he was defending himself, and Cargill, his companion, escaped. This document, unsigned and unfinished, and named after the place where it was seized, after affirming adherence to the Scriptures and the covenanted work of reformation. goes on, however, to say: “We do declare that we shall set up over ourselves, and over what God shall give us power of, government and governors according to the Word of God; that we shall no more commit the government of ourselves, and the making of laws for us, to any one single person, this kind of government being most liable to inconveniences, and aptest to degenerate into tyranny.” This bold avowal of revolution was soon charged against the entire Presbyterian body, and increased persecutions was the result. SEE COVENANTERS; SEE RUTHERGLEN DECLARATION; SEE SANQUHAR DELCLARATION.

## Queiss, Eberhard Von[[@Headword:Queiss, Eberhard Von]]

             a German prelate of the Reformation period, flourished near the opening of the 16th century. In 1523 he was made bishop of Pomerania, but in the following year he felt constrained to announce his abandonment of the old faith and became Protestant. In 1527 he resigned his worldly power (the episcopates of Germany then holding secular as well as ecclesiastical sway) into the hands of the duke of Pomerania. He also abandoned the celibate, and in every way he identified himself with the Protestant cause. He was overshadowed by the greatness of his predecessor in the see, George von Polentz (q.v.), and little is known of Queiss after 1527. Probably his decease only two years later was the reason for this obscured page in his life's history.

## Quelen, Hyacinthe Louis De[[@Headword:Quelen, Hyacinthe Louis De]]

             a French Roman Catholic prelate of note, was born at Paris, Oct. 8, 1778, and was educated at the seminary in St. Sulpice. In 1807 he was ordained to the priesthood, and made shortly after secretary of cardinal Fesch. When this noted dignitary fell out with Napoleon, Quelen accompanied his eminence to Lyons. Under the Restoration he became general vicar of Talleyrand, took an active part in the establishment of the concordat, and was rewarded for his valuable services by the bishopric in partibus of Samosata in 1819. When Talleyrand was elevated to the archbishopric of Paris, Quelen was made his coadjutor cum spe succedendi, and on Oct. 20,  1821, succeeded Talleyrand in the primacy of France. He made many journeys and busied himself greatly with relique controversies (Francis de Sales, Vincent de Paul); but his stout advocacy of Ultramontanism and the Jesuits, whose expulsion from France in 1828 he vainly endeavored to prevent, made him very unpopular, and he was subjected to repeated attacks in his palace by the mobs of Paris in 1830 and 1831. He lived on, however, until 1839, when sudden death ended the ignominious life of this great ecclesiastic. See Henrion, Vie et Travaux Apostoliques de oM. de Quelen; D'Exauvillez, Vie Abrgee; Clavel, Hist. Chret. des Dioceses de France, s.v.

## Quenstedt, Johan Andreas[[@Headword:Quenstedt, Johan Andreas]]

             a German theologian, was born at Quedlinburg in 1617, studied at Helmstbidt under Calixtus and Hornejus, and in Wittenberg under Leyser. Won to the theology of the latter highschool, he became in 1646 theological adjunct, in 1649 extraordinary, and in 1660 ordinary professor of theology at Wittenberg, and always distinguished himself as a most ardent Lutheran. He died in 1688. His most celebrated work, Theologia Didactico-polemica, s. Systema Theologicum (Wittenb. 1685), is a most elaborate treatise of Lutheran scholasticism, and constitutes one of the best polemics of its distinguishing dogmas. Other works of his of note are, De Sepultura Veterum (ibid. 1648, 8vo, and later): — Dialogus de Patriis Illustrium Doctrina et Scriptis Viroruem (ibid. 1654, 4to): — Disputationes Exeqeticce in Epistolm ad Colossenses (ibid. 1664, 4to): — Ethica Pastoralis (ibid. 1678, 8vo, and later): — Antiquitates Biblicce et Ecclesiasticce (ibid. 1688, 4to, and later). Personally Quenstedt was a mild, unpretentious character, and even his polemics is nothing less than zealotical. He appeared on the stage when the period of dissolution had touched Lutheranism and rejuvenated the old orthodox spirit, and gave it new and attractive form. His power was not only with his pen, but in the university. See Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctr. (see Index); Jocher, Allgem. Gelehrten Lexikon, s.v.; Tholuck, Wittenberger Theologen, p, 214 sq.; Gass, Geschichte der protest. Dogmatik, i, 357 sq. (J. H.W.)

## Quental, Bartholomieu Do[[@Headword:Quental, Bartholomieu Do]]

             a Portuguese theologian, was born of noble parentage, Aug. 22, 1626, in the isle of St. Michael, Azores. In 1643 he was sent to Portugal to study at Evora and other Portuguese highschools, and after taking holy orders  became one of the confessors of the king. He greatly served papal interests, and was distinguished by pope Clement XI with the title of “the venerable.” Quental introduced the “Congregation of the Oratory,” and in other ways strengthened Romanism. He died at Lisbon, Dec. 20, 1698. His principal works are, Meditacoes (Lisb. 166695, 6 vols. 8vo): — Sermoes (ibid. 1692, 4to). See Kiceron, Memoires, vol. xlii. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, xli, 300.

## Queras, Mathurin[[@Headword:Queras, Mathurin]]

             a French controversialist, was born at Sens, Aug. 1, 1614, studied theology at Paris, where he obtained the doctorate, and was attached to the Sorbonne. He was a Jansenist in proclivity, and in 1656 refused to abandon the Port-Royalists even on the threat of being ousted from his professorship. He was rewarded for his consistency by the archbishop of Sens, who made Queras one of his grand vicars and placed him at the head of his theological seminary. In 1674, upon the death of his protector, Queras was obliged to retire to Troyes, and became prior of St. Quentin. He spent the remainder of his life, like the Port-Royalists, in retirement and penitence. He died April 9, 1695. His most important works is Eclarcissement de cette Celebre et importante Question, referring to the decisions of the Council of Trent on the dogmas of justification and grace (Paris, 1683, 8vo), in which he takes ground against the council. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Quercus, Synod Of[[@Headword:Quercus, Synod Of]]

             In the year 403 a council was held at a place in the neighborhood of Chalcedon. The spot is designated ἐπὶ δρῦν (to the oak), and the council is therefore known as the Concilium cad Quercum. It was presided over by Paul, bishop of Heraclea. Theophilus of Alexandria here succeeded in effecting the deposition of his archenemy St. John Chrysostom, which was decreed by the thirty-six bishops present, among whom were Acacius of Berea, Severianus of Gabala. in Syria, Antiochus of Ptolemais, and Cyprian of Chaicedon. St. Chrvsostom was cited. but refused to appear, unless Theoplilhis, Acacius. Antiochns, and others of his declared foes withdrew. The emperor Arcadius, yielding to the wish of his wife Eudoxia, who had determined thie ruin of Chrysostom, confirmed the judgment of the council, and banished him to Bithynia However, an earthquake, which occurred on the very day of his departure, terrified the empress to such a  degree that he was instantly brought back, and re-entered Constantinople in triumph. SEE CHRYSOSTOM.

## Querini, Angelo Maria[[@Headword:Querini, Angelo Maria]]

             an illustrious Italian prelate of the Church of Rorne, was born at Venice. of noble parentage, in 1680. He first studied under the Jesuits, and at the age of seventeen entered the Benedictine order. Having become well acquainted with the Greek, Hebrew, and Biblical learning, he was made instructor of the novices, for whom he wrote a dissertation, De Mosaicoe Historia Praeftantia. He afterwards travelled four years in France, England, Holland, and Germany, and enjoyed the society of some of the most distinguished men of those countries. In his Comment arii de Rebus aid se Pertinentibus, he gives some account of what he saw and the conversations he had with many learned men. On his return to Italy he published several works on liturgic antiquities: Vetus Officinum Quadrayesimale Grcecice Orthodoxce: — Diatribcs ad Priosrem Partemr Veteris Officii: — De Ecclesiasticorumn Officioerum tpud Grcecos Antiquitate: — De Hymnis Quadragesimalibus Graecoreum: — De Alis Ccanticis Quadra oesimalibus. In 1721 Querini was made archbishop of Corfu, and he wrote on the antiquities and history of that island. In 1728 he was transferred to the see of Brescia, and soon after he was made a cardinal and librarian of the Vatican. It was after his promotion to the see of Brescia that he wrote his literary history of Brescia. He also published the Lives of Paul II (q.v.) and Paul III (q.v.), in the former of which he endeavored to clear the memory of that pope from the charges of Platina and other historians; and he edited a collection of the epistles of cardinal Reginald Pole. His other works consist of dissertations upon literary subjects, both sacred and profane, and of numerous epistles, chiefly in Latin. Cardinal Querini was in every respect one of the most distinguished prelates of the Roman Church in the 18th century. Spotless in his morals, modest and simple in his habits, generous, meek, and charitable, he conciliated the esteem of men of all countries and opinions. Frederick the Great wrote to him in the most flattering terms. Voltaire dedicated to him his tragedy of Semiramis and other works. Querini labored particularly to improve the town of Brescia, of which he was bishop. He completed the structure of its handsome cathedral, founded a clerical college, a house for female instruction in the Val Camonica, and, lastly, he established the public library of Brescia. He died in 1755.

## Quesnel, Pasquier[[@Headword:Quesnel, Pasquier]]

             a celebrated French priest or the Oratory, was born of Scottish descent, at Paris, in 1634. He studied at the Sorbonne, and in 1657 entered the Congregation, to which his two brothers belonged also. Those were times that tried men's souls. All France was agitated by the controversy which threatened the exodus of Holland from the domain of Romanism. The heresy of Jansen had found warm advocates in France also, and Quesnel was himself one of the most ardent of these. In 1671 he brought out his Abrege de la Morale de l'Evangile, which constitutes only the opening of the now celebrated work of his, Le Nouveau Testament en Francais, avec des Reflexions Morales (first complete ed. Paris, 1687, and often since). This work most unequivocally condemned much in the papacy, and advocated pretty boldly many features of Jansenism. Voltaire says that thirty pages of this book, properly qualified and softened, would have prevented much of the disturbance which Jansenism created in France. In 1675, Quesnel made the breach wider by his publication of the works of Leo I and of St. Hilary of Aries, greatly enriched by marginal notes, in the interest and defence of the rights of the Gallican Church. Of course, the book was placed on the Index, and its author proscribed at Rome. The superior of the Oratorians, pere Abel de Sainte-Marthe, was himself an enthusiastic Jansenist, and positively endorsed Quesnel. But when the archbishop of Paris, De Harlay, exiled Sainte-Marthe, Quesnel found France a very undesirable home, and he determined to go beyond its borders. In 1681 he was not even left to make his choice, for he was in that year driven from Paris. At first he went to Orleans.

His persistent refusal to abandon Jansenism made him uncomfortable here also. In 1684, finally, his order promulgated an anti-Jansenistic formula and demanded the signature of all its members. Quesnel refused to comply, and, feeling insecure, retired to Brussels, where he found the great Arnauld living, also in exile, on account of his Jansenistic proclivities. The two theologians became intimate companions and wrought much together, until the death of Arnauld, in 1694, terminated their relations. One of the most telling labors in defence of Jansenism brought out at Brussels by Quesnel was his Reflexions Morales. Notwithstanding its favorable treatment of Jansenism, the work, by its spirit of devotion and fervor, attracted many readers and warm admirers. Its beauties made even the moderate Ultramontanes forget the Jansenistic proclivities of the pen that wrote it, and all bestowed high encomiums on it. Several bishops were loud in its praises. Even the ultra-  Jesuits would read it to catch its holy influences; and Voltaire (Siecle de Louis XIV, vol. ii) asserts that it was freely read at Rome.

He tells the story that the abbd Renaudot, one of the most learned men in France, being at Rome the first year of Clement Xi's pontificate, went one day to wait upon this pope, who loved men of letters, and was himself a man of learning, and found him reading Quesnel's book. “This,” said his holiness, “is an excellent performance; we have no one at Rome capable of writing in this manner. I wish I could have the author near me.” Yet this very pope in 1708 published a decree against it, and afterwards, in 1713, issued the famous bull Unigenitus, in which were condemned a hundred and one propositions extracted from it. We must not, however, look upon this condemnation of Clement XI as a contradiction to the encomium he had before given; it proceeded entirely from reasons of state. The warmest advocate of the Reflexions was cardinal de Noailles (q.v.). While still bishop of Chalons he had defended Quesnel's works. Later, in the archiepiscopal see of Paris, he again espoused the cause of the PortRoyalists, and, of course, of Quesnel. In 1696 he even brought out an edition of the Reflexions at Paris. But the Jesuits were at work, and they finally succeeded in securing the pope's disapproval of the work, and in blackening the character of its author. They accused him of plotting against the authorities and as a dangerous and seditious person.

In 1703 Quesnel was arrested by order of king Philip V, at the instigation of the archbishop of Malines, and put in prison. He was rescued, however, by Jansenistic friends, and made good his escape to Amsterdam, where he spent the remainder of his days building up Jansenism in Holland and strengthening it in France and Belgium also. He died in 1719. The titles of all his writings fill in Moreri several columns. We have room here to mention only, L'Idee du Sacerdoce et du Sacrifice de Jesus-Christ (Par. 1688, 12mo): — Causa Arnaldina (ibid. 1697, 8vo): — La Paix de Clement IX, ou Demonstration des deux Faussetes Capitales avancees dans l'Histoire de cinq Propositions contre la Foi des Disciples de Saint-Augustin, etc. (ibid. 1701, 2 vols. 12mo): — Consultation sur le Famneux Cas de Conscience (ibid. 1704, 12mo): — La Discipline de ‘Eglise (ibid. 1698, 2 vols. 4to): — Tradition de I'Eglise Romaine sur la Predestination des Saints et stur la Grace Efficace (ibid. 1687. 4 vols. 12mo). See Guettei, Hist. de l'Eglis e de France, vols. x and xi; Ceillier, Dict. Hist. des Aut. Ecclesiastes; Jervis, Hist. of the Church of France (see Index); Reuchlin, Gesch. v. Port- Royal, vol. ii; Neander, Christian Dogmas; Hagenbach, Hist. of  Rationalism, p. 381; Princeton Review, 1856, p. 132; Moreri, Dict. Historique, s.v. (J. H. W.)

## Question, Modern[[@Headword:Question, Modern]]

             is, in Scotland, “Whether it be the duty of all to whom the Gospel is preached to repent andl believe in Christ?” and it is called modern because it is supposed never to have been agitated before the early part of the last century. It originated in Northamptonshire, in the churches in which Mr. Davis of Rothwell preached, though it does not appear that he took an active part in it. The question thus started was pursued by a variety of inferior writers down to the time of Andrew Fuller, who very ably supported the positive side of the question, namely, that faith is the duty of all men, although, through the depravity of human nature, men will not believe till regenerated by the Holy Spirit. On the other side it was contended “that faith was not a duty, but a grace,” the exercise of which was not required till it was bestowed. On this subject Mr. Fuller published The Gospel Worthy of All Acceptation; or, The Duty of All Men to Believe in Jesus Christ. Thereupon Fuller was attacked by Mr. Hutton, a Supralapsarian, on the one hand, and by Mr. Daniel Taylor, an Arminian, on the other, to whom he replied by A Defence of his former tract.

## Questmen[[@Headword:Questmen]]

             are parish officers whose duty it is to assist church-wardens.

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

             a French Dominican, was born in Paris Aug. 6, 1618. At a very early age he entered the order, and in 1635 was sent to Bordeaux to study theology. In 1642 he was ordained to the priesthood at Paris. After filling several positions of trust in houses of his order in provincial towns, he was recalled to Paris, in 1652, and placed in charge of the library of the Jacobin convent. Thereafter. he became noted for his bibliographical attainments and his intimate knowledge of the canon law. He died March 2,1698. We have from him: Hieronymi de Medicis Formalis Explicatio Summae Theol. D. Thomae Aquinatis (Paris, 1657, fol.): — Concilii Trid. Canones (ibid. 1666, 12mo): — Vita Hier. Savonarolce (ibid. 1674, 3 vols. 12mo): — Petri Morini Opuscula et Epistolce (ibid. 1675, 12mo): — Scriptores OrdinisPraedicatorum Recensiti (ibid. 1719 sq. 2 vols. fol.), left incomplete and continued by Echard. See Scriptores Ordinis  Praedicatorum, ii, 746; Niceron, Memoires, xxiv; Moreri, Dict. Hist. s.v. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Quetzalcoatl[[@Headword:Quetzalcoatl]]

             a Mexican divinity, represented by the green-feathered serpent, is the god of the air. He was, while on earth, a high-priest in the city of Tuta, and was so immensely rich that his houses were built with nothing but gold and precious stones. He was, at the same time, a legislator of incredible wisdom; his commands were published from the top of a mountain by a herald whose voice could be heard at a distance of three hundred miles. It was to him that useful inventions were due; he was, besides, a favorite of the gods, who, for his sake, loaded the land with blessings of all kinds. In that time an ear of corn was of such a size that it was no light burden for a strong man. But as the country, thlough him, grew happy to excess, and as the gods were well aware that such unmixed felicity was not to the advantage of the people, they advised him to emigrate. He did so; went to Cholula, where the people chose him for their ruler. His reign was as prosperous as could be expected. After his death he was worshipped as god of the air. Almost all peoples, even those hostile to Cholula, recognised his divinity and built temples in his honor.

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

             an idol or god of the Mexicans, particularly worshipped by all persons concerned in traffic. Forty days, before the feast of this god, the merchants purchased a well-shaved slave, who during that time represented the deity, spending his time in dancing and rejoicing, andlon the day of the festival was sacrificed to the deity at midnight, his heart being first offered to the moon, and then laid before the idol. This deity was, worshipped under another name at Cholula, where he was looked upon as the god of the air, the founder of the city, the institutor of penance, and the author of sacrifices. He was represented sitting on a kind of pedestal, habited in a cloak ornamented with red crosses. His devotees drew blood from their tongues and ears to procure his favor and before going to war sacrificed to him five boys and as many girls of three years of age.

## Quevedo y Villegas, Francisco Gomez De[[@Headword:Quevedo y Villegas, Francisco Gomez De]]

             a Spanish author of note, was born in Madrid, Sept. 26, 1580; was educated at the university at Alcala, and when only fifteen years of age took his degree in theology. He would probably have risen to great distinction in the Church had not his hot temper involved him in strife and controversy, which ended in a duel and exile. He removed to Italy and there also led a restless and eventful life. He died at Villanueva de los Infantes in 1645. Many of his writings were confiscated by the government, but among those that reached the public we are interested in the treatises On the Providence of God: — God's Politics and Christ's Government, in which he attempts a complete body of political philosophy based upon the example of the Saviour: — On a Holy Life: — The Militant Life of a Christian, etc. There is a complete edition of his works by Sancho (Madrid, 1790-94, 11 vols. 8vo), and a more recent one by Guerra y Orbe (ibid. 1852).

## Qui procedis, Ab Utroque[[@Headword:Qui procedis, Ab Utroque]]

             (who proceedest from both, i.e. from the Father and the Son) is the beginning of a sequence of Adam of St. Victor to the Holy Spirit, omitted entirely by the compilers of Songs of the Spirit. The first verse runs thus in the original:

“Qi procedis ab utroque,

Genitore, Genitoque,

Pariter, Paraclite,

Redde linguas eloquentes,

Fac ferventes in te mentes

Flamma tua divite.”

There is an English translation, by P. S. Worsley, in the Lyra Mystica, p. 170 sq., and by Caswall, in Hymns and Poems, Original and Translated, p. 136 sq. German translations are given, together with the original, in Konigsfeld, Lateinische Hymnen, ii, 181 sq.; Simrock, Lauda Sion, p. 209 sq.; Bissler, Auswahl altchristlicher Lieder, p. 111, 221. See Trench, Sacred Latin Poetry, p. 187; Daniel, Thesaurus Hymnol. ii, 73; Gautier, A dam de S. Victor, i, 115; Rambach, Anthologie christlicher Gesange, p. 293; Fortlage, Gesange christlicher Vorzeit, p. 401. (B. P.)

## Quiatri[[@Headword:Quiatri]]

             is, in the mythology of the Hindus, the conceiving force resting (therefore sterile, ineffectual) in Brahma. It is called his wife, and as such is opposed to the prolific goddess, Saraswati. The latter is the feminine element of Brahma in its exterior appearance; Quiatri is the same resting in himself.

## Quiches, Kiches, Or Utlatecas[[@Headword:Quiches, Kiches, Or Utlatecas]]

             a semi-civilized nation of Guatemala, occupying, at the time of the conquest, the greater part of what is now called Los Altos, or the highlands, of Guatemala, including the districts of Quiche, Totonicapam, and Quesaltenango. their traditions indicate that they sprang from the Toltec stock. Their records, as written out by members of the royal house immediately after the conquest, give a long array of kings, and imply a high antiquity. It seems that the Kachiquels and Zutugils were once embraced in the Quiche kingdom, and that their separation was the act of the king Acxopil, who divided his power with his two sons, retaining to himself the capital and surrounding regions, which preserved the name of Quiche. These three divisions, subsequently becoming hostile, were easily conquered by the Spaniards. Alvarado encountered his most vigorous resistance in Quiche, where the king, Tecum-Umam, went out to meet him, according to the chroniclers, with 232,000 men.

They fought with great bravery; but musketry and cannon, and, above all, the terror inspired by the Spanish horse, proved too powerful for the rude means of resistance at their command. The battle lasted six days, the Indians fighting desperately as they fell back. The king at last was slain by Alvarado, and the subjugation of the Quiches was completed. The ruins of the city of Quiche, described by Mr. Stephens, attest the grandeur and power of this people, and give a fair support to the early accounts of their numbers. The district which they occupied is the best-populated portion of Guatemala, and is almost purely Indian, the ancient language being still in general use. The people are described by Arthur Morelet as “an active, courageous race, whose heads never grow gray, persevering in their industry, skilful in almost every department of art, good workers in iron and the precious metals, generally welldressed, neat in person, with a firm step and independent bearing, and altogether constituting a class of citizens who only require to be better educated to rise equal to the best.” Their language is regarded as a purer dialect than either the Kachiquel or Zutugil, with which it is compared by Fray Ildefonso Flores, in his Arte de la Lengua  Kachiquel (Guatemala, 1753). Much has recently been done for a better knowledge of this people by Brasseur de Bourbourg, especially in his Grammaire de la Langue Quichee itise en Parallele avec ses Deux Dialectes Cakchiquel et Tzutuhil, avec un Vocabulaire, servant d'Introduction au Rabinal Achi, Drame Indigne (Paris, 1862); and Popul Voh, le Livre Sacrs et les Mythes de l'Antiquite Americaine, avec les Livres Heroiques et Historiques de Quiche (1861). — The Amer. Cyclop. s.v.

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

             Quichua was the predominant language of Peru during the sovereignty of the ancient Incas. It still prevails on the plateau of the Andes, from Quito to Santiago del Estero, and in some districts it is exclusively spoken. Before the year 1880 the Quichuans were entirely without the word of God in their vernacular. At the request of the Reverend F.N. Lett, the British and Foreign Bible Society's agent for Buenos Ayres, the gospel of John. was translated by the Reverend J. H. Gibbon-Spilsbury, of the South American Missionary Society, and an edition of one thousand copies was published at the expense of the British and Foreign Bible Society. This is the first portion of the word of God translated and published in the Quichuan. (B.P.)

## Quichuas[[@Headword:Quichuas]]

             the dominant people in the empire of Peru under the incas, who made their language the general one of their territory. The Quichuas extended from Lake Titicaca to Quito, and towards the coast to the territory of the Chinchas and Yuncas. The Aymaras, extending from Lake Titicaca to what is now the southern limit of Bolivia, were first reduced by the Quichuas under the incas. The Quichuas are gay, cheerful, energetic, and, under the wise sway of the incas, seem to have risen rapidly in many arts. They were assiduous cultivators of the soil; maize and other grains raised in Titicaca were sent to all parts of the empire as sacred presents, and the inca himself gave an example of the honor of agriculture. They wove and spun the wool of the llama, vicufia, and alpaca; they worked mines of gold, silver, and copper; built suspension-bridges; erected adobe houses with gables, niches, and arches, and temples of the same material or stone, cutting and fitting the blocks with an accuracy and finish that cannot be excelled; made sterile tracts productive by a wise and extended system of azequias and aqueducts, and also by excavating till moisture was reached. In astronomy they had not reached as high a degree as the Mexicans; and in literature, though preserving records mainly by quipus, or knotted cords, they cultivated poetry, and had dramas, as well as touching songs, that won the admiration of the Spaniards. The incas claimed to descend from the sun, and introduced the worship of that luminary.

They reduced the Chancas and Huancas, apparently intrusive eastern tribes. and then attacked the Yuncas, the people of the coast, whose capital was at Chimu, near Trujillo, and who worshipped Pachacamac, creator of the world (of whom there were a famous idol and temple at the place that still bears the name), the god Rimac (who had a famous oracle near Lima), and other deities. After a long and bloody war, the inca Capac Yupanqui overthrew Chuqui Manca, king of Chimu, and reduced the Yuncas. They were compelled to accept the sun-worship; but the inca allowed the temple of Pachacamac to stand,  as its fame was spread through most of South America. There are remnants of the Yuncas still retaining their language at Moche, Eten, etc.; it is entirely different from the Quichua. The priests of the sun dressed in white, and practiced celibacy and fasts. Near each temple was also a convent of virgins of the sun. The men wore woollen tunics and leggins, the women long skirts and short cloaks, joined by gold, silver, or copper clasps. The incas were distinguished by the llautu, a fillet with a ball descending between the eyes. After the Spanish conquest, the Indians lost much of the arts they had gained, and retrograded generally. A desperate effort was made by the Quichuas in the last century to recover their freedom; but their leader, Tupac Amaru, a descendant of the incas, was taken and torn in pieces by horses in the plaza of Cuzco in 1780. There is a series of grammars of the Quichua, beginning with that of Fray Domingo de San Tomas (Valladolid, 1560), and coming down to Markham, Contributions towards a Grammar and Dictionary of Quichua (London, 1864). Ollulttoy, a Quichua drama, and several songs of the haravecs, or bards, have been published.

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

             an English Presbyterian divine, was born at Plymouth in 1636. Having determined to enter the ministry, he was ordained in 1658. When the Nonconformity bill of 1662 was passed, he joined the conforming party, and was subjected to imprisonment. After his release, he went to London, and became the pastor of a Presbyterian congregation. He also interested himself in the French Protestants, and cared for those of the Huguenots who touched London on their way to a refuge from the intolerant measures of their own countrymen. He even wrote in their defence Synodicon in Gallia Reformata (Lond. 1692, 2 vols. fol.), being a history of the Reformed Church in France; and Icones Sacrae Gallicanoe, a biography of fifty Reformed French preachers, interrupted, however, by the death of Quick, which occurred in 1706. He left in manuscript several sermons and treatises, which all evince a superior mind. See Allibone, Dict. Brit. and Amer. Auth. s.v.; Hook, Ecclesiastes Biog. 8:183.

## Quicksands, The[[@Headword:Quicksands, The]]

             (ἡ Σύρτις, Vulg. Syrtis), more properly, The Syrtis (Act 27:17), the broad and deep bight on the North African coast between Carthage and Cyrene. In the above passage it is stated that when the ship in which Paul  was embarked was driven past the isle of Clauda on the south, the mariners, as would now be said, struck the sails, and scudded under bare poles, lest they “should fall into the quicksands.” The original word syrtis denotes a sand-bank, or shoal, dangerous to navigation, drawn, or supposed to be drawn (from σύρω, “to draw”), together by the currents of the sea. According to others, the name is derived from sert, an Arabic word for “desert.” For two reasons this region was an object of peculiar dread to the ancient navigators of the Mediterranean — partly because of the drifting sands and the heat along the shore itself, but chiefly because of the shallows and the uncertain currents of water in the bay. Josephus, who was himself once wrecked in this part of the Mediterranean, makes Agrippa say (War, ii, 16,4), φοβεραὶ καὶ τοῖς ἀκούουσι Σύρτεις. So notorious were these dangers that they became a commonplace with the poets (see Horace, Odes, i, 22, 5; Ovid, Fast. 4:499; Virgil, AEn. 1, 111; Tibul. 3, 4,91; Lucan, Phars. 9:431). It is most to our purpose here, however, to refer to Apollonius Rhodius, who was familiar with all the notions of the Alexandrian sailors. In the fourth book of his Aronaut. 1232-1237, he supplies illustrations of the passage before us in more respects than one — in the sudden violence (ἀναρπάγδην) of the terrible north wind (ὀλοὴ Βορέαο θύελλα), in its long duration (ἐννέα πάσας Νύκτας ὁμῶς καὶ τόσσα φέῤ ἤματα), and in the terror which the sailors felt of being driven into the Svrtis (Προπρὸ μάλ᾿ ἔνδοθι Σύρτιν, ὅθ᾿, οὐκέτι νόστος ὀπίσσω Νη• σι πέλει). SEE CLAUDA; SEE EUROCLYDON.

There were properly two Syrtes — the eastern, or larger, now called the Gulf of Sidra. and the western, or smaller, now the Gulf of Cabes. It is the former to which our attention is directed in this passage of the Acts. The ship was caught by a north-easterly gale onl the south coast of Crete, near Mount Ida, and was driven to the island of Clauda. This line of drift, continued, would strike the greater Syrtis, whence the natural apprehension of the sailors. SEE SHIP.

The danger was not so imaginary in this case, we apprehend, as Dr. Falconer (Dissert. on St. Paul's Voyage, p. 13) conceives; for the apprehension does not appear to have been entertained till the ship had been driven past the isle of Clauda, which, as we take it, is mentioned merely as the last point of land which had been seen till the ship was wrecked on the isle of Melita. The position of that island must be regarded as indicating the course in which they were driven; ani if that were Malta, it is clear that, had that course not been arrested by the intermediate shipwreck, they would, in all probability, have been driven upon the Syrtis Minor, which we may therefore conclude to have been the  subject of their apprehension. That apprehension only becomes “imaginary” when Meleda in the Adriatic is taken, as Dr. Falconer himself takes it, for the Melita of Scripture. It may, therefore, be added to the arguments in favor of Malta that its identification with Melita gives reality to the fear entertained by the mariners, which, uinder the other alternative, must be supposed to have been imaginary. SEE MALTA. The best modern account of this part of the African coast is that which is given by Admiral Smyth (in his Memoir on the Mediterraneean, p. 87-91, 186-190), who was himself the first to survey this bay thoroughly, and to divest it of many of its terrors. SEE SHIPWRECK.

## Quicunque vult[[@Headword:Quicunque vult]]

             These are the initial words of the symbol known as the Athanasian Creed. The real composer of this ancient formulary being unknown, its origin is a mere matter of conjecture. A cursory notice of its history in ancient and modern times is all that can be here attempted. It probably had its origin in the Gallican Church. It was first used in that Church. Gallican councils and bishops have always treated it with especial deference. Churches which received the Gallican Psalter received with it this “expositio fidei.” The oldest known translation into the vernacular was Gallican, as prescribed by Hincmar of Rheims to his priests. The first writers who cite its words were Avitus of Vienne and Caesarius of Aries; the oldest commentator upon its text was Venantius Fortunatus, bishop of Poitiers; and MSS. were nowhere so abundant or so ancient as in Gaul (Waterland).

This “Creed,” to use its scholastic title, first appeared in Latin, the Greek copies that exist being independent versions from that language. The age also of the oldest Latin MSS. exceeds that of the Greek exemplars by several centuries. The oldest Latin copy is referred by archbishop Usher to the beginning of the 7th century, and was in the Cottonian collection (De Symb. Praef. ii, 3). The Treves MS., acephalous, is of nearly equal antiquity. Five MSS. of the 8th century are known: the Ambrosian of Milan; the Cottonian in king Athelstan's Psalter, referable with certainty to A.D. 703, and professing to be “Fides St. Athanasii Alexandrini;” the Colbertine, copied in Saxon character from the Treves MS. shortly after the middle of the century, and, like the original, imperfect at the beginning; the Paris MS. of equal date, also in Saxon character; and the copy written in letters of gold which was presented by Charlemagne, while only king of France, to Adrian I on his accession to the pontificate, A.D. 772. It is still  preserved at Vienna. The Greek copies are of much later date, and Montfaucon had never seen one that was more than three hundred years old (Diatribe, p. 727).

The earliest form in which this “expositio fidei” is found is the commentary of Venantius Fortunatus in the middle of the 6th century, showing that it was then of popular use. The fourth Council of Toledo also (A.D. 633) adopted many of its more striking expressions. lome, distrustful of novelties, only admitted it after long delay, as Waterland says, about A.D. 930. Thus it was accepted by the churches of the West “as soon as, or sooner than, the Nicene Creed.”

This dogmatic composition has a direct bearing on the Apollinarian error, which was condemned by pope Damasus, A.D. 375. This heresy had much in common with the Eutychian error of the middle of the 5th century; but the latter had certain distinguishing features of which no notice is taken in the Creed, and for this reason the clauses that contravene both errors may be safely applied to Apollinarian notions: we need not look for its origin therefore so low as the Eutychian period (Harvey, Hist. and Theol. of Creeds, p. 549-557), in which the dying embers of Apollinarianism kindled up again. Neither can its production range later than the Nestorian controversy, which commenced with the first year of the patriarchate of Nestorius (A.D. 428), and led to the Council of Ephesus (A.D. 431); otherwise the crucial term θεοτόκος must as certainly have found its way into it as that the term ὁμοούσιος was made the “lapis Lydius” of orthodoxy by the Nicene fathers; hence this “expositio fidei” must have been written before the year A.D. 428 (Waterland, Harvey). But by how many years did it anticipate the council? There are undeniable points of resemblance between many of its expressions and the terms used by Augustine in his work De Trinitate (A.D. 416; Harvey, p. 562-564); which furnished the copy, the father or the Creed? Waterland affirms the former, but reasons quite as cogent point to the latter conclusion. Augustine says that the phrases used by him in defining the three Persons of the Godhead were adopted also by catholic writers his predecessors; and, in fact, the writer of the Creed may have borrowed the corresponding terms, in some few cases, from Tertullian, but abut ndantly from Ambrose. The Creed, then, so far as its phraseology is concerned, is quite as likely to have been written between A.D. 381, when Ambrose completed his work De Spiritu Sancto, and A.D. 416, when Augustine put forth his work De Trinitette, as after this latter date.  Further, the rudimental statements of the Creed are more fully developed in the work of Augustine. The Creed simply says, “The Holy Ghost is of the Father and the Son; neither made, nor created, nor begotten, but proceeding.”

The most unbending Greek theologian would have allowed the statement to pass unchallenged. e.g. Cyril of Alexandria says of the Holy Spirit, “For he is termed the Spirit of Truth, and Christ is truth; and he proceeds (προχεῖται) from him, as in fact he does from God and the Father” (Ep. Synod.; comp. Harvey, Vindex Cathol. i, 188). Thus also Basil says “the Spirit proceeds from God, not by generation as the Son, but as the Spirit of his mouth;” where it is manifestly intended that as the Spirit proceeds from God the Father, so also he proceeds from God the Word. Ambrose makes the matter more plain: “Dei Spiritus et Spiritus Christi et in Patre est et in Filio, quia oris est Spiritus” (Ambrose, De Spir. Sanct. i, 11, 37, 114; iii, 6). There is an Augustinian definiteness also in those other words of Ambrose: “Et si Spiritum dicas, et Deum Patrem, a quo procedit Spiritus, et Filium, quia Filii quoque est Spiritus, nuncupasti” (ibid.). The third Person was universally acknowledged to be of the Father and of the Son, and his origination was allowed to be by procession; that which was denied was his procession from the Son as well as the Father, instead of from the Father by the Son. But the work De Trinitate originated all the discussion that followed, and in fact led to that schism between the churches of the East and of the West which has never again been healed. Augustine expresses himself with his usual roundness and perspicuity upon a point that was a result of scriptural reasonings collected into one focus of light (De Trin. 4:29; 15:47). The concluding chapters of his work are filled with statements of the procession of the Holy Spirit, and a comparison of these with the more shadowy lines of the Creed satisfies the judgment that Augustine was indebted to the Creed, and not the Creed to Augustine. Then again the Creed instances by way of illustration the union of a spiritual and a material nature in the individual man: “As the reasonable soul and flesh is one man, so God and Man is one Christ.” The illustration is exactly to the point; but Augustine follows out the idea in a strain of subtle argumentationl that runs through six books of his work; finding points of analogy between the doctrine of a Trinity in Unity and the unity of the mind existing in different states; and falling into modes of expression that are exactly square with others in the Creed: “Hac igitur tria, memoria intelligentia voluntas, quoniam non sunt tres vitae sed una vita; nec tres mentes sed una mens; consequenter utique nec tres substantiae sunt sed una substantia” (De Trin. 10:18). Both the Creed and Augustine argue  from man's bodily and mental constitution, but the convincing simplicity of the former and the strained scholastic reasoning of the latter convince the mind that here again the Creed was the archetype. Diverging, therefore, at this point from Waterland, who dates the Creed A.D. 420, four years after the publication of the work De Trinitate, we may now see whether we can assign a prior date for its composition.

It should be borne in mind once more that the Apollinarian heresy is the latest form of error of which the Creed takes cognizance. But that heresy never took root in the churches of the West; therefore no newly appointed Gallican bishop would have gone out of his way to condemn it, as Waterland supposes Hilary to have done on his appointment to the see of Aries. “It is hardly in keeping with the mild ‘credo' of a newly installed prelate. But in the year A.D. 401 we can point to a most popular and zealous bishop of Western Gaul, apostolical in his labors among the benighted population of the Nervii and Morini (Pas de Calais) as well as in his self-inflicted poverty (Paulin. Nol. Ep. 18 ad Victric.), who was accused publicly of teaching heresy, and that evidently of Apollinaris; who also gave account of his faith in a confession that, without any great degree of improbability, may be identified with this exposition of the catholic faith. This eminent son of the Church was Victricius, confessor and bishop of Rouen, who at the close of the 4th centurv was considerably advanced in years” (Harvey, Hist. and Theol. of Creeds, p. 578). The terms of this confession are sketched out by Paulinus of Nola (Ep. 37 ad Victric. 3, 4), and they harmonize remarkably with those of the Creed (ibid. p. 5, 6). There are historical reasons for believing that this confession was presented at Rome between A.D. 399 and 402 when Anastasius was pope (Harvey, Hist. and Theol. of Creeds). But the name of Victricius was in time expunged, and it then stood as the production of Anastasius. Hence, since one commentator terms it “Fides Anastasii,” and a codex ascribes it to Anasthasius, it is highly probable that this name was connected with the Creed at an earlier date than that of Athanasius, into which it easily passed. The name of Athanasius is first placed at the head in a copy of the 8th century, which leaves a wide margin of three hundred years for the change of title. The earliest MS. (Cottonian. now lost) assigned no name to the Creed, but simply styled it “Fides Catholica,” as does also Venantius Fortunatus in his commentary. The reasons for assigning it to Victricius have been thus summed up:  “

(1.) Its careful, well-considered terms are more consistent with the mature age of Victricius, who had attained the honor of confessor forty years before the date now assigned to the Creed, in 401, than with the youth of Hilary, who was only eight-and-twenty years of age when he is supposed by Waterland to have composed the hymn on his advancement to the episcopate.

(2.) Its style, though not that of an apology in vindication of the writer's faith, agrees well with the supposition that he was accused of the errors that he anathematizes.

(3.) Its matter is exactly parallel with the subjects upon which Victricius, if we may judge from the expressions of Paulinus, was called to defend himself. With respect to both of these particulars, the supposition that Hilary should have been the author is singularly unsatisfactory to the judgment. His exposition of faith on entering upon his episcopal office would scarcely have been pointed with anathemas which the history of his time persuades us were not required. Indeed, the Creed can only be assigned to Hilary upon the supposition that Apollinarianism infested the Gallican Church at the date of his appointment to the see of Aries — a supposition wholly contrary to fact. But since we know that Pelagian tenets had then taken a firm root in the south of France, we know also the direction that any inaugural exposition by Hilary must have taken. (4.) Again, if Hilary had been the author of the Creed, his name must have commanded respect, and he would scarcely have met with such hard words from pope Leo I as may be found in his epistle to the French bishops, A.D. 445: e.g. “Non est hoc... salubritatem impendere diligentiae pastoralis, sed vim inferre latronis et firis ... Potest forsitan ad depravandos vestrae sanctitatis animos Hilarius pro suo more mentiri” (Leo, Ep. 10). On the other hand, the highly probable communication between Victricius and Anastasius, and the preparation of a confession of faith bv the Gallican confessor, indicate the process whereby the name of Athanasius may have been placed at length. by assimilation, at the head of the Creed. For these reasons, therefore, it is considered that the authorship of the Creed may be referred to the confessor Victricius, bishop of Rouen; and that the date of the production may be assigned to the year 401” (Harvey, On the Three Creeds, p. 583). See Waterland, On the Athanasian Creed; Harvey, Hist. and Theol. of the Three Creeds; Blunt, Annotated Prayer-book, which latter work should be consulted with reference to its liturgical use. SEE CREED.

## Quiddity, Or Quidity[[@Headword:Quiddity, Or Quidity]]

             (quidditas, from quid, mwhat), a term employed in scholastic philosophy as equivalent to the τὸ τί ῆν εἴναι of Aristotle, and denotes what was subsequently called the substantit form. It is the answer to the question, What is it? — quid est? It is that which distinguishes a thing from other things, and makes it what it is, and not another. It is synonymous with essence, and comprehends both the substance and qualities; for qualities belong to substance, and by qualities substance manifests itself. It is the known essence of a thing, or the complement of all that makes us conceive of anything as we conceive of it as different from ally or every other thing. — Krauth's Fleming, Vocab. of Philosophy, s.v.

## Quien, Le[[@Headword:Quien, Le]]

             SEE LE QUIEN.

## Quiercy, Council Of[[@Headword:Quiercy, Council Of]]

             (Concilium Carisiacense). An ecclesiastical council was there held in 849 by Hincmar and thirteen other bishops, who condemned Gottschalk, a Predestinarian, and sentenced him to be flogged and imprisoned at Hautvilliers, where he wrote a profession of faith similar to that which he had presented at the Council of Mayence in 848. See Labbe, Concil. 8:55.

Another council was held at the same place in 858. From this body the bishops of the provinces of Rheims and Rouen wrote a long letter, full of reproaches, to Louis, king of Germany, blaming him for invading France upon the invitation of the disaffected nobles of Charles, and declaring that it had come to their ears that, in the course of his march through the various dioceses, cruelties and abominations had been committed surpassing those of the heathen themselves. See Labbi, Concil. 8. 654.

## Quietism[[@Headword:Quietism]]

             is the doctrine that the highest character of virtue consists in the perpetual contemplation and love of supreme excellence. It recognises this excellence only in God, and maintains that perfect union with God must be effected, and that it is best attainable by a state of passive rest or quiet, more or less absolute. The quietude aimed at, begiinning with an act of so-called resignation of self, is a state of mental inactivity, without thought, reflection, hope, or wish. In this state it is supposed that the soul is brought  so immediately into the divine presence as to be merged in it by an essential union. Quietism, accordingly, is not peculiar, for it requires no basis of Christology. It results from every philosophical system by an excess or perversion of contemplation, when the ethical tendency of the mind is too weak to preserve a just balance with the contemplative. Vaughan (Hours with the Mystics, vol. 1, ch. 2, p. 43) observes that “the same round of notions, occurring to minds of similar make under similar circumstances, is common to mystics in ancient India and in modern Christendom.” He gives a summary of Hindf mysticism, that it

(1) lays claim to disinterested love, as opposed to a mercenary religion;

(2) reacts against the ceremonial, prescriptive, and pedantic literalism of the Vedas;

(3) identifies in its pantheism subject and object, worshipper and worshipped;

(4) aims at ultimate absorption into the Infinite;

(5) inculcates, as the way to this dissolution, absolute passivity, withdrawal into the inmost self, cessation of all the powers — giving recipes for procuring this beatific torpor or trance;

(6) believes that eternity may thus be realized in time;

(7) has its mythical, miraculous pretensions, i.e. its theurgic department;

(8) and, finally, advises the learner in this kind of religion to submit himself implicitly to a spiritual guide — his yaru.

Of these articles, the third, fourth, fifth, and sixth give quietism, properly so called; and it is a question whether the manifestation of this doctrine in Christianity adds anything essential to the definition of article five, so as to save Christian quietism from the pantheistic conclusions of articles three and four.

In the Christian Church this mystical theology is defined by its professors to be that doctrine which reveals to man the hidden essence of God's Being. The way to this wisdom is in three stages, the purgative, the illuminative, the unitive; the first purging the will from low affections, the  second communicating to the intellect the knowledge of God, and the third leading the soul thus prepared to union and deification.

It is evident that this. scheme, if at all carried out to its legitimate consequences, leads directly to the error of those enthusiasts who supposed the kingdom of Christ to be an earlier and inferior dispensation, the reign of the Spirit the later and perfect dispensation. Men aretaught by it, not the superiority of love to knowledgein St. Paul's sense, but that they may become more perfect by disregarding the knowledge of an earlier state, by becoming again children in understanding. To that earlier state are referred the power of Christ'sresurrection and the sacrament of the holy eucharist. What the higher sacrament of unction is does not appear. In working out this scheme, Molinos taught as follows:

1. The perfection of men, even in this life, consists in an uninterrupted act of contemplation and love, which contains virtually all righteousness; that this act once effected lasts always, even during sleep, provided that it be not expressly recalled; whence it follows that the perfect have no need to repeat it.

2. In this state of perfection the soul ought not to reflect either on God or on itself, but its powers ought to be annihilated, in order to abandon itself wholly and passively to God.

3. Perfect prayer is this state of quietude, in which there should be absolutely no thought or wish or hope. Vocal prayer, confession, all external things, are but hindrances.

4. In prayer the first act of faith, the first intention of resignation, prevails to constitute the whole an act of worship. “One may persevere in prayer though the imagination be carried about with various and involuntary thoughts.” These are not to be actively resisted, but merely neglected.

5. The violent and painful suggestions of impatience, pride, gluttony, luxury, rage, blasphemy, cursing, despair, and an infinite number of others,  are God's means for purifying those whom he calls. The soul ought not to be disquieted on account of them.

An example of pure quietism may be quoted in illustration of these principles: “Gregory Lopez having for the space of three years continued that ejaculation, Thy will be done in time and in eternity, repeating it as often as he breathed, God Almighty discovered to him that infinite treasure of the pure and continued act of faith and love, with silence and resignation; so that he came to say that, during the thirty-six years he lived afterwards, he always continued in his inward man that pure act of love, without ever uttering the least petition, ejaculation, or anything that was sensible or sprung from nature” (Spiritual Guide [transl. 1699], p. 75).

Molinos is charged by Romanist writers with teaching antinomianism. The charge does not appear to be well founded, but that his teaching regarding evil thoughts is most dangerous there can be no doubt. At the same time, the truth of which it is a perversion is very discernible.

Molinos proceeds to his doctrine of self-annihilation through what he calls infused contemplation. The means whereby the soul ascends to infused contemplation are two — the pleasure and the desire of it. The steps of it are three-satiety when the soul is filled with God; intoxication, an excess of mind and elevation of soul arising from satiety of divine love: security, when the soul is so drenched with love that it loses all fear, and would willingly go to hell if it knew such to be the will of God. Six other steps there are — fire, union, elevation, illumination, pleasure, and repose. But there are many other steps besides, as ecstasies, raptures, meltings, deliquiums, glee, kisses, embraces, exaltation, union, transformation, espousing, and matrimony; “which,” Molinos says, “I omit to explain, to give no occasion to speculation.” Madame Guyon, however, does explain: “The essential union is the spiritual marriage, where there is a communication of substance, when God takes the soul for his spouse, unites it to himself, not personally, nor by any act or means, but immediately reducing all to a unity. The soul ought not, nor can, any more make any distinction between God and itself. God is the soul, and the soul is God” (Explicat. du Cant. des Cant.).

Molinos passes through annihilation to the same result of deification. The soul that would be perfect passes, with the divine aid, into the state of nothingness: from the spiritual death the true and perfect annihilation derives its original; insomuch that when the soul is once dead to its will and  understanding, it is properly said to have arrived at the perfect and happy state of annihilation, which is the last disposition for transformation and union. The soul no longer lives in itself, because God lives in it. The soul being in that manner the nothing, the Lord will be the whole in the soul.

Quietism aims at an entire abstraction from all externals, and seeks to put the spirit of man into direct and immediate union with the very nature of the Godhead. From this there inevitably results, instead of the Christian doctrine of the communion of saints, the doctrine of a pantheistic identification of the creature with the Creator, and an ultimate absorption of the soul into the substance of God. The Quietists call it indeed a vulgar error to say that in the prayer of rest the faculties operate not, and the soul is idle and inactive; but they assert at the same time that the soul operates neither by means of the memory nor by the intellect, nor by ratiocination, but by simple apprehension (Molinos, Spiritual Guide, 1, 12). What an active apprehension is when none of the powers of the mind are exerted is not explained. The Quietists think to attain that repose of the mind which is the result of exertion, and that quiet rest in God which follows from the earnestness of meditative prayer, by altogether surceasing from the exertion and superseding the earnestness. Consequently, the mind being reduced to inactivity, the body has sway; and the state of perfect quietude, supposed to be a waiting for the divine access, becomes that state (which may be produced by “mesmeric” process) in which the body suffers or simulates catalepsy, and the mind apes a divine trance. Quietism becomes mental sleep.

There is a remarkable similarity between the mysticism of the Quietists and of the Plotinian school of philosophy. The aim of Plotinus was to enter into the immediate vision of Deity. “Unconditioned Being, or the Godhead, cannot be grasped by thinking or science, only by intuition. In this pure intuition, the good, or the absolute being, gazes upon itself through the medium of our own spirits. To close the eve against all things transient and variable, to raise ourselves to this simple essence, to take refuge in the absolute, this must be regarded as the highest aim of all our spiritual efforts” (Prof. C. A. Brandis, in Smith's Biog. Dict. art. Plotinus, p. 427). Plotinian contemplation may find a place in the system of John Smith and Henry More, but it may also pass as readily into the reveries of Molinos. It is to be considered whether the tendency of such contemplation is not to reduce the Father manifested in the Son to the cold abstraction of the Plotinian Deity.  In the Church there have been two kinds of mysticisml, one a churchly mysticism, which allies itself with the ordinances and rites of the Gospel; the other subjective or inward, which gradually rejects more and more all that is external, and even at last passes beyond the contemplation of the humanity of our Lord, and the sacraments which make men partakers of his body, to “seek a resting-place beyond all that is created in the Logos as he existed prior to the incarnation and creation” (Dorner, On the Person of Christ, II, i, 233).

This unchristianizing of Christianity, this presentation of the great drama without its central figure, this removal of God Incarnate from the mystery of godliness, as the result of a perverted or depraved mysticism; is exhibited more than once in the history of the Church. The words quoted from Dorner on the subject were used regarding Maximus Confessor. We may resume and continue them. “True love and knowledge unite to seek a resting-point beyond all that is created, beyond even the humanity of Christ: their final goal is the pure and bare (γυμνός) Logos, as he existed prior to the incarnation and the creation. It is clear that in the last instance Christ is hereby reduced to the position of a mere theophany, and that the historical significance of his person is destroyed. The same thing appears also from his application to the professedly highest stage of the words. Even though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now know we him no longer. So far was Maximus Confessor from attributing eternal significance to the God-man that he regarded the humanity of Christ rather in the light of a hindrance to the full knowledge and love of the pure God — a hindrance which must be surmounted by those who aim to reach the highest stage” (Dorner, l.c., and see note 48 there referred to). So in Italy, Marsilius Ficinus and John Pico of Mirandola turned Christianity in many respects into a Neo-Platonic theosophy.

In the article Mysticism (q.v.) this subject is more opened, and the schools of mysticism of the Greek and Latin churches classified. In the article Hesychasts (q.v.) is related the quietism of the Greek Church. The directions of the abbot Simon for producing the visions of quietism (supposed to have been written in the 11th century) are still in existence: “Alone in thy cell, shut thy door, and seat thyself in a corner; raise thy mind above all things vain and transitory; recline thy beard and chin on thy breast; turn thy eyes and thy thoughts towards the middle of thy belly, the region of the navel; and search the place of the heart, the seat of the soul. At first all will be dark and comfortless; but if you persevere day and night, you will feel an ineffable joy; and no sooner has the soul discovered the  place of the heart than it is involved in a mystic and ethereal light.” At present it is only necessary to point out that these Hesychasts had the same rule as the Hindlt Quietists, viz. that to produce the state of abstraction the eves must be steadily fixed on some particular object. The Hindus presented the tip of the nose, the Hesychasts the navel.

In German mediaeval mysticism a quietistic element is met with. It, however, borders on pantheism, very much as the pantheism of Dionysius the Areopagite borders on quietism.

The real founder of quietism in the Church is thus reputed to be Molinos (q.v.), a Spanish priest, whose opinions, published at Rome towards the end of the 17th century, called forth violent opposition from the authorities of the Church, but met with many supporters in Italy, Spain, France, and the Netherlands. He seems to have held “that religion consists in the perfect tranquillity of a mind removed from all external and finite things, and centred in God, and in such a pure love of the Supreme Being as is independent of all prospect of interest or reward.” In more modern times Fenelon and Madame Guyon have taught quietism. They are, however, usually called Semi-Quietists. The two following propositions from Fenelon's Maxims of the Saints were condemned bv Innocent XII in 1699:

1. There is attainable in this life a state of perfection in which the expectation of reward and the fear of punishment have no place.

2. Souls may be so inflamed with love to God, and so resigned to his will, that if they believed that God had condemned them to eternal pain, they would absolutely sacrifice their salvation. Madame Guyon thought she had learned a method by which souls might be carried to such a state of perfection that a continual act of contemplation and love might be substituted for all other acts of religion. She came forward as one of the chief promoters of quietism in France, and hence arose a celebrated controversy between Bossuet and Fenelon — the former of whom attacked and the latter defended several of that pious lady's opinions. See the dissertation by M. Bonnel, De la Controverse dle Bossuet et Fenelon sur le Quietisme (Nevers, 1850, 8vo); Dr. Burnet, Tracts (1689, 12mo), vol. i; Recueil des Diverses Pieces concernant le Quietisme et les Quietistes (1688); Weisman, Hist. Ecclesiastes § xvii.

## Quinby, Hosea, D.D[[@Headword:Quinby, Hosea, D.D]]

             a Free-will Baptist minister, was born at Sandwich, N.H., August 25, 1804. He was converted in 1824, and graduated from Waterville College, now Colby University, in 1832. He became principal of the Parsonsfield Seminary, Maine, and having been ordained June 2, 1833, preached habitually during his nearly seven years' connection with the institution. He was one of the editors of the Morning Star, and began to write a history of the Free Baptist denomination, which was published in part in the  Quarterly Magazine. For a few years he was pastor and teacher at Meredith village, N.H. Upon the establishment of the Smithville Seminary, afterwards Lapham Institute, in North Scituate, R.I., in 1846, he was appointed its principal, and was very successful in the management ofits affairs. Subsequently, as the seminary was greatly embarrassed financially, it was sold to Mr. Quinby, and carried on by him as a private enterprise for several years. For thirty years he did double work as preacher and teacher, and may be said to have been the father of the educational interests of his denomination. In January 1855, he became, a second time, pastor of the church in Meredith, and resumed his work as a teacher. On February 28, 1857, he entered upon his duties as pastor of the church in Pittsfield, N.H. at the same time having charge of a high-school in the village. His next settlements were at Lebanon, Maine, in 1861, and Lake Village, N.H., in 1864. In 1868 he removed to Concord, and devoted himself to literary work, an to his duties as chaplain of the New Hampshire state prison, for several years. His last pastorates were at Nottingham, October, 1872; Pittsfield, January 1875, and Mellon Mills, in May 1876, where he died, October 11, 1878. (J.C.S.)

## Quinet, Edgar[[@Headword:Quinet, Edgar]]

             a French philosophical writer, was born at Bourg, Bresse, February 17, 1803. He studied at Paris and Heidelberg, was for some time professor at Lyons and Paris, and died at Versailles, March 27, 1875. He published, De la Grece Moderne dans ses Rapports avec Antiqaite (1830): — De l'Avenis' es Religions: — De la Revolution et de la Philosophie: — Des la Vie de, Jeus par Strauss (essays written for the Rue des Deux Mondes and Revue de Paris. His treatise on the life of Jesus was translated into German. by Kleine, 1839): — Genie des Religions (1842): — l'Ultramontanisme ou la Societe Moderne et l'Eglise (1843; Germ. transl., Leipsic, 1845): — Le Christianisme et la Recolution Francaise (1846): — Philosophie de l'Histoire de France (1855): — Question Romaine devant Histoire (1867): — La Creation (1870, 2 volumes). His works were published in 11 vols. (1856-1870).. See Chassin, Edg. Quinet, sa Vie et son OEuvre (Paris, 1859); Vinet, Literature Franc. au Dix-Neuvieme Siecle; Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Quinisextum, Concilium[[@Headword:Quinisextum, Concilium]]

             (Σύνοδος πενδεκτή', as a complement of the fifth and sixth, so-called, cecumenical councils, A.D. 555 and 680), was held at Constantinople in 692, and intended to complete the disciplinary measures proposed, but not completed, at the previous councils. The meetings of this council were held in a hall in the imperial palace called Trullus, and hence it received, also, the name of the Trullan Council. It was composed chiefly of Oriental bishops, and its canons were publicly received in all the churches within the territories of the Greek emperors. Although the Roman legates subscribed to the acts of this council, it was never recognised by the Romish Church nor bv its then ruling pope, Sergius I. This is due to the decisions of the council regarding the number of the apostolical canons, against enforced clerical celibacy, the rank of patriarchs, the fasting on Sabbath eves, the partaking of blood, etc. See Schaff, Ch. History; Milman, Hist. of Christianity; Butler, Ch. History, i, 359; Riddle, Hist. of the Papacy; Mosheim, Ecclesiastes Hist. vol. i; Lea, Celibacy.

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

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born June 20, 1790. He was converted in his sixteenth year, and about four years after began to preach. In 1817 he joined the Philadelphia Conference. His various fields of labor, as indicated in the Conference Minutes, were: Talbot Circuit, 1817; Caroline, 1818; Daluphin, 1819; Lewiston, 1820; Dorchester, 1821-22; Accomac, 1823-24; and Annamessex, 1825. He then took a supernumerary relation until 1838, when, entering again the active workl, he served the Church on Salisbury Circuit, 1839-40; Kent, 184142; Milford, 1843-44; and Berlin, 1845. Declining health then obliged him to take rest, and he settled at Newtown, Pa., where he died Dec. 13, 1867. Ile was a well- cultured man and did honor to his Church and generation as a student and a Christian. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1868.

## Quinquageslma[[@Headword:Quinquageslma]]

             is the name by which the Sunday before Lent (q.v.) is designated. The first Sunday in Lent being called Quadragesima, this being further from Easter was called Quinquagesima (or fiftieth Sunday), reckoning the distance from Easter in round numbers. It was sometimes called Quinquagesima, poenitentioe, in order to distinguish it from the other Quinquagesima, or interval between Easter and Whitsuntide, called Quinquagesima paschalis,  or loetitioe. It is also called Shrove-Sunday (q.v.). In ordinary years Quinquagesima is the forty-ninth day before Easter; in leap-year it is the fiftieth.

## Quinquarboreus, Joannes (Or Jean Cinqarbre)[[@Headword:Quinquarboreus, Joannes (Or Jean Cinqarbre)]]

             a learned Frenchman, was a native of Aurillac, in Auvergne. In 1554 he was made regius professor of the Hebrew language at Paris; in 1575 he was made dean of the faculty, and occupied this position until the year 1587, when he died. He wrote, Institutio Linguae Ebraicoe, cum Notis, etc. (Paris, 1610): — De Re Grammnatica Hebraica Opus (ibid. 1549, 1556, 1582; Accessit etiam Liber de Notis, i.e. Abbreviaturis Hebroeorumn [Venice, 1588, and Paris, 1609, cum Notis P. Vignolii]): — Notoe in Clenardi Grammaitica Hebraica (Paris, 1549, 1564). He also translated into Latin the Chaldee of Jonathan on Hosea, Joel, Amos (ibid. 1556 and 1563). See First. Bibliotheca Judaica, ii, 106; iii, 124; Steinschneider, Bibliographisches Handbuch, p. 113; Wolf, Bibliotheca Hebr. 4:250, 298; Jocher, Allem. Gelehrten- Lexikon, s.v. (B. P.)

## Quinquarticular Controversy[[@Headword:Quinquarticular Controversy]]

             is a dispute which arose at Cambridge in 1594 between the Arminians and Calvinists respecting the following five points: predestination, free will, effectual grace, perseverance, and the extent of redemption. In 1626 two fruitless conferences were held on these same points; and in 1630 bishop Davenant preached at court on these disputed matters, and thereby gave great offence to Charles I. The next year the controversy was revived at Oxford, and in Ireland, of which archbishop Usher was then primate. The king issued certain injunctions concerning the bounds within which these points might be discussed; but these limits having been exceeded by Thomas Cooke, a fellow of Brazenose College, Oxford, in a Latin sermon preached before the university in 1634, he was compelled to make a public recantation. See Collier, Ecclesiastes Hist.; Mosheim, Ecclesiastes Hist. vol. iii. SEE DORT, SYNOD OF; SEE FIVE POINTS.

## Quinquatria[[@Headword:Quinquatria]]

             an ancient Roman festival celebrated in honor of Minerva on March 19. Some writers allege that its observance was limited to one day; others, however, say that it lasted for five days. This last is the opinion of Ovid, who considers it to have been a festival held in commemoration of the  birthday of Minerva; and hence it was customary for women on that day to consult diviners and fortunetellers.

## Quinquennalia[[@Headword:Quinquennalia]]

             games celebrated among the ancient Romans in imitation of the Greek festivals at the end of every four years. On these occasions keen competitions were carried on in music, gymnastics, and horse-racing. Quinquennalia were observed in honor of Julius Caesar, and also of Augustus; but they seem to have been celebrated with peculiar splendor under Nero, from whose time they were discontinued, until at length they were revived by Domitian in honor of Jupiter Capitolinus.

## Quintillani[[@Headword:Quintillani]]

             were a sect of Montanists who appeared in Phrygia about 189. They were so called from their prophetess, Quintilla of Carthage. One of the peculiar tenets of this strange sect was that women are by the Scriptures entitled to perform episcopal and other ministerial duties. They attributed extraordinary gifts to Eve, in consequence of her having eaten of the forbidden tree, and quoted the history of Miriam, and the four daughters of Philip, who were prophetesses, in vindication of their proceedings. In their assemblies virgins appeared in white robes, personating prophetesses. The errors of this sect were condemned in the Council of Laodicea in 320. Tertullian charges the Quintillani with having opposed baptism, and wrote a work on that subject.

## Quintillians[[@Headword:Quintillians]]

             SEE QUINTILLANI.

## Quintin Matsys[[@Headword:Quintin Matsys]]

             sometimes called the Farrier of Antwerp, was famous for having been transformed from a blacksmith to a painter by the force of love. He had followed the trade of a blacksmith and farrier near twenty years, when, falling in love with a painter's daughter, who was very handsome, and disliked nothing in him but his profession, he quitted his trade and betook himself to painting, in which art, assisted by a good natural taste, a master, and the power of love into the bargain, he made a very uncommon and surprising progress. He was a painstaking, diligent imitator of ordinary life, and much better at representing the defects than the beauties of nature.  One of his best pieces is a Descent from the Cross, in the chapel at the Cathedral of Antwerp, for which, and a multitude of other histories and portraits, he gained many admirers, especially for his laborious neatness, which, in truth, was the principal part of his character. He died in 1529. His works are dispersed throughout Europe.

## Quintus Memmius[[@Headword:Quintus Memmius]]

             (2Ma 11:34). SEE MEMMIUS.

## Quirenus [[@Headword:Quirenus ]]

             SEE CYRENIUS.

## Quirinalia[[@Headword:Quirinalia]]

             a festival celebrated among the ancient Romans in honor of Quirinus. It was kept on Feb. 17, being the day on which Romulus, who was called Quirinus, was said to have been carried up to heaven.

## Quirini [[@Headword:Quirini ]]

             SEE QUERINI.

## Quirk [[@Headword:Quirk ]]

             is an architectural term for a small acute channel or recess much used in mouldings.

## Quiroga, Joseph[[@Headword:Quiroga, Joseph]]

             a Spanish Jesuit, was born at Lugo, in Galicia, and distinguished himself as a missionary in America. During his residence here he collected much information respecting the territories he visited. and on his return to Europe published his travels. He died in 1784.

## Quisqueja[[@Headword:Quisqueja]]

             This island, one of the Great Antilles, now called St. Domingo or Hayti, was, at the time of the discovery of this part of the world, inhabited by a peaceable and harmless population, who were soon annihilated by Spanish cruelty. They adored the sun (Tonatiks) and the moon (Tona). Both luminaries resided at first on the earth, in the island of Quisqueja, of course, where a splendid cave was their mansion. Finally, they went to Turii (the heavens), thence to diffuse their light over the world. The cave is still shown; it has a diameter of 200 feet, and is 130 feet high. The purity of its form betokens the interference of human art. The figures of gods, genii, guardian spirits, are engraved in the mwalls. In a large number of places idols must have stood in ancient times. This supposition is in accordance with the scanty traditions that have reached us. More than a thousand idols were distributed at intervals in the interior (says the tradition), and the two largest, representing the sun and moon, stood at the entrance. This seems to have been the only temple of Quisqueja, for multitudes of worshippers flocked to it every day from all parts of the island. They believed that their country was the cradle of the human race. The first men were shut up in two caves of the Kauta mountain, and there watched by a giant. The jailer, having once ventured out of this recess, was changed into stone by the sun, whose rays were too powerful for him. The captive men, thus liberated, came forth in their turn. Many were those who shared the giant's fate, being transformed into animals, stones, or plants. Little by little those denizens of darkness became used to the light of day. The souls of men  repair to the mountains which cover the middle part of the island, and there, in a cool country, rich in springs, they feed on the savory fruit of the memmey-tree, called by the Spaniards apricots of St. Domingo. The living men piously abstain from touching those fruits, so as not to deprive the souls of their subsistence.

Their country was, primitively, much larger, and was not an island; but a terrible flood inundated the land, leaving only discovered the tops of the mountains. This happened under the following circumstances: A rich man, called Toja, lost by a sudden death his youngest son, whose mother had died in giving him birth. Not to part from the dear remains, he lout them into a large pumpkin. After some time he took off the lid, and saw, to his dismay, that the pumpkin was filled with greenish water, in which a multitude of fishes and aquatic monsters were swimming about. In his terror he had recourse to his friends, and deliberated with them what was to be dlone. Meanwhile his other children took the pumpkin in their midst to have a look at the sea which, they had heard, was hidden in it. When they saw their father returning from his call, conscious of punishable inquisitiveness, they put the pumpkin roughly on the ground and ran away. The funereal vessel, thus carelessly handled, got a rent, and hence the waters of the sea flowed, without intermission, night and day, until all lower parts of the earth were covered, and the mountain-tops alone protruded from the universal ocean. Those tops became islands and the abode of the surviving few. The sun and moon sent to Quisqueja as their representatives two other gods, Tokahuna and Temno, the supreme rulers. Other superior beings followed, and were all, more or less, solemnly worshipped. Images of stone and of clay were made of them, and decorated the great temple and the interior of the huts. These gods were thankful for the worship they received. and in return granted the pious people successful fishing and hunting, victory in battle (their images were fastened in battle with a string to the forehead of the combatants), plentiful crops, rain or sunshine, as circumstances required. The women were blessed with happy childbeds and the girls with pleasant husbands. A great festival was solemnized every year in honor of all these gods. The cacique on that occasion appeared with a drum made of the trunk of a hollow tree, which he beat unremittingly. The whole township followed him to the temple, where the priests received every coming crowd with tremendous shouts, and took possession of the offerings. The latter consisted of thin flour cakes which were broken in the presence of the god, and small  portions of them given back to the heads of the families. Those little slices were carefully preserved through the whole year. A general dance followed. It was at this solemn occasion that most of the matrimonial offers and arrangements took place. All traces of this ancient pagan worship were destroyed by the fanatical Spaniards, and the small Indian people was exterminated.

## Quisshion[[@Headword:Quisshion]]

             (pulvinar, cussinus, culcitrum), a cushion, usually of velvet, and stuffed with wool or horsehair, for the service-book on the south side of the altar, appears in Henry's VI's Book of the Hours, and was used by bishop Alndrewes. In the former it is on the south side, in the latter on the north. Albertis mentions the wooden desk, plated (legile), as a modern substitute. The book was first set on the right side and afterwards moved to the left side of the altar at mass.

## Quistorp[[@Headword:Quistorp]]

             a family of Christian theologians, of whom we mention the following:

1. BERNHARD FR., was born at Rostock, April 11, 1718. In 1753 he was made superintendent, in 1766 doctor and professor of theology, in 1779 general superintendent, and afterwards chancellor and curator of the University of Greifswalde, where he died, Jan. 4, 1788. He wrote, Dissertatio pist. de Atheismo Benedicti de Spiunoza (Rostock, 1743): — Diss. Epist. de Collationle Librorum n Scripturoe Sacrce in Interpretatione S. S. haud Injusta (ibid. 1736): — Disp. Exegetico — dogmatic eaque Intug. de Judfeis Corde Compunctis (ibid. 1749): — Ob die Altviter vor und nach der Siindfuth haben schreiben kwlunnena? Disp. de Notione Filioruml et Filiarumz Dei (ibid. 1751): — Hist. de Adoptione Ecclesiastica V. T. (ibid. 1755): )Ob, ehe de sogenannte griechische Uebersetzung der siebzi£g Dolmefscher von der Bibel des A. T. zu Standae gekommlen, schon eine griechische Uebersetzung der Biicher Moses vorhanden gewesen sei? (ibid. 1756): Num Michcelis Archangeli cumn Diaboli de Coupore Moosis Disceptatio Fubula sit? (Greifswalde, 1770): — De Agelis Dei in Legislatione Sinaitica Ministris, Galatians iii, 19 (ibid. 1771): — Disp. de ס תורה ביד משה בבית ייalbs. חלקרהו — reperto Chronicles 34:14, 15, et 2Ki 12:8 (ibid. 1771): — De Triplici Christi Officio (ibid. 1784). See Furst, Bibl. Judaica, iii, 124 sq.; Winer, Theol. Handbuch, p. 436, 719.  2. JOHANN (1), was born at Rostock, Aug. 18, 1584. Having completed his studies at his native place and at Frankfort-on-the-Oder, he travelled through Holland, Brabant, and Flanders, and after his return, in 1615, he became professor in his native city. In 1616 he was made doctor of theology, in 1645 he was called as pastor and superintendent of St. Jacobi, and died at Dobran, May 2, 1648. He wrote, Annotationes in Omnes Libros Biblicos (Frankfort, 1698): — Comment. in Onmnes Epp. Pauli: — Castigatio Hebroeormn , etc. See Furst, Bibl. Judaica, iii, 125; Jocher, Allyemn. Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v.

3. JOHANN (2), son of the preceding, was born at Roostock, Feb. 5, 1624. He studied at Greifswvalde, Konigsberg, Copenhagen, and Leyden, was made ldoctor of theology, and died as rector magnificus Dec. 24, 1689. He wrote, Catechesis Antipapistica: — Pia Desideria, etc. See Jocher, Allqem. Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v.

4. JOHANN NIKOLAUS, son of the foregoing, was born at Rostock, Jan. 6, 1651, studied at his native place and KIonigsberg, travelled through Germany, Holland, and Denmark, and after his return, in 1676, he was made deacon of St. Nicolai, afterwards pastor and superintendent, and finally professor of theology. He died Aug. 9, 1715. His writings, which are very numerous, touch upon almost every department of theology, and are enumerated by Jocher in his Allqem. Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. See, also, Diestel, Geschichte des Alen Testaments in der chrisil. Kirche (Jena, 1869), p. 372. (B. P.)

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

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Rostock, March 19, 1717. He pursued his theological studies at the university of his native place, was in 1743 professor at Kiel, in 1747 court-preacher at Euitin, in 1754 professor at Rostock, and died December 26, 1766. Besides several. volumes of sermons, Quistorp published, De Christo Legem et Prophetas non Solvente, sed Implente (Rostock, 1759): — De Sacris Poenitentiae Victimis Jansenistarum (1760): — De Recentissima Loci de Angelis Bonis ex Theologia Dogmatica Proscriptione Telleriana (1764). See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v. (B.P.)

R

## Quitaztli[[@Headword:Quitaztli]]

             is, according to Mexican mythology, the serpent woman who, at the begiining of the fourth age of the world, populated the earth by the successive birth of a number of twins. The latter are represented on monuments holding in their hands the shells of the eggs from which they have crept.

## Quitman, Frederick Henry, D.D[[@Headword:Quitman, Frederick Henry, D.D]]

             an eminent American divine of the Lutheran Church, was born in 1760, and after studying theology at home and abroad became pastor at Rhinebeck, on the Hudson, and greatly distinguished himself in the pulpit and the press. He died in 1832. Among his noteworthy publications are a Treatise on Magic (1810): — Evangelical Catechism (1814): — Hymn-book of the  Synod of New York (1817). See Evangel. Rev. Oct. 1858, p. 186; Sprague, Annals of the American Pulpit, 9:115 sq.

## Quiver[[@Headword:Quiver]]

             is the rendering in the A. V. of two very different Hebrew words. The English word “quiver” is a variation of “cover” (from the French couvrir), and therefore answers to the second of the two Hebrew words. SEE ARMOR

.

1. תְּלַי, tell. This occurs only in Gen 27:3 — “take thy weapons (literally “thy things”), thy quiver and thy bow.” It is derived (by Gesenius, Thesaur. p. 1504, and Furst, Handworterb. ii, 528) from a root which has the force of hanging. The passage itself affords no clue to its meaning. It may therefore signify either a quiver or a suspended weapon-for instance, such a sword as in our own language. was formerly called a “hanger.” Between these two significations the interpreters are divided. The Sept., Vulg., and Targum Pseudo-Jon. adhere to the former; Onkelos, the Peshito and Arabic versions, to the latter.

2. אִשְׁפָּה, acshpah. The root of this word is uncertain (Gesenius, Thesaur. p. 161). From two of its occurrences, its force would seem to be that of containing or concealing (Psa 127:5; Isa 49:2). It is connected with arrows only in Lam 3:13. Its other occurrences are Job 39:23; Isa 22:6; and Jer 5:16. In each of these the Sept. translates it by “quiver” (φαρέτρα), with two exceptions, Job 39:23, and Psa 127:5, in the former of which they render it by “bow,” in the latter by ἐπιθυμία.

The quiver is a case or box for arrows, which was slung over the shoulder in such a position that a soldier could with ease draw out the arrows when he wanted them (Isa 49:2; Jer 5:16). There is nothing in the Bible to indicate either its form or material, or in what way it was carried. The quivers of the Assyrians warriors, on the other hand, wore them slung  nearly horizonltal. drawing out the arrows from beneath the arm (Wilkinson, Anc. Egypt. abridgm. i. 354). The quiver was about four inches in diameter, supported by a belt passing over the shoulder and across the breast to the opposite side. When not in actual use, it was shifted behind, or hung at the side of the chariot, like that of the Assyrians. SEE CHARIOT. Among the ancient Greeks, the quiver was principally made of hide or leather, and was adorned with gold, painting, and braiding. It had a lid (πῶμα), and was suspended from the right shoulder by a belt passing over the breast and behind the back. Its most common position was on the left hip, and is so seen in the annexed figures, the right-hand one representing an Amazon, and the left-hand an Asiatic archer.

“Quiver” is also used figuratively for house, and arrows for children (Psa 127:5). SEE ARCHER.

## Quobdas[[@Headword:Quobdas]]

             is the magic drum used by physicians and sorcerers among the Laplanders to chase the evil spirits which are supposed to be the cause of the diseases. It is covered with figures of animals and mysterious characters, and embellished with divers ornamental appendages.

## Quod permittat[[@Headword:Quod permittat]]

             is, in the Church of England, a writ granted to the successor of a minister for the recovery of pasture by the statute of Edward I, c. 24.

## Quoin[[@Headword:Quoin]]

             the outer angle of a wall.

## Quotations Of The Old Testament In The Talmud[[@Headword:Quotations Of The Old Testament In The Talmud]]

             In order to understand many quotations which are cited in the Talmud from the Scriptures, we must remember that the ancient rabbins, in their colloquies and disputations, did not use a MS., but cited from memory — a mode of citation often found in the New Test. Dr. M. Steinschneider, in his essay Jewish Literature, in Ersch and Gruber's Allgem. Encycl. § 2, vol. 27:p. 375, makes the following statement: “The influence of the Bible on gnomonics in particular is shown in the following steps —

(1.) Biblical precepts were used unchanged in meaning and expression, as sentiments or favorite sayings of particular persons. \*

(2.) Biblical sentences, unchanged in form, were made by extending or contracting their contents into new expressions of various truths, uhich had elsewhere been clothed in known proverbs, so that these last were in some sense deduced from the Bible. A wide field was thus opened for the Midrash; and, finally, the words of the Bible were made into proverbs with an entirely different sense. †

(3.) Lastly, Biblical phrases and ideas were used more or less intentionally in newly formed sententiae,‡ and passed into proverbial forms, as they are to be found in the old Halachah (e.g. Peah, ii, 2).

\* To illustrate Steinschneider's statement, we give the following example. In the Talmud (Nidda, fol. 51, Colossians 2) it was said in the school of R. Ishmnael, “He will magnify the law and make it honorable” (Isaiah 42:41).

† In the Talmud (Sabbath, fol. 10, Colossians 1) the question was raised, how long the judges were oblinged to sit at court. R. Sheshel answerled, “Until mid-day.” To which R. Chama said, “Where do you find this in the Scriptire?” The answer was, “It is said, ‘Woe to thee, O land, when thy king is a child, and thy princes eat in the morning' (Ecc 10:16).” R. Jeremiah once engaged himself with R. Sera in the law. When the time for the evening prayer had already advanced, R. Jeremiah betook himself quickly to read it. To this R. Sera applied the passage (Pro 28:9), “He that turneth away his ear from hearing the law, even his prayer shall be abomination” (Sabbath, fol. 19, Colossians 1). Of R. Tarphon it is said that when some one told him something intellectual, he used to say כפתור ופרח, “A knop and a flower in one branch” (Exo 25:33); but when the tale was not according to his taste, he (Bereshith Rabba, ch. 91).

‡ E.g. כבר שתה עליכִוס תנחגומין, i.e. “He already drank for thee the cup of consolation” (Bereshith Rabba, fol. 20, etc.); i.e. to be comforted over something. The phrase “cup of consolation” is found in Jer 16:7.

1. As the ancient rabbins made the Bible their study for years, we must not wonder when, in their colloquies, they were able to quote a correct Biblical text. And yet we must bear three things in mind, in order not to have a misconception of the matter. To make this intelligible, we will quote the following examples:

(a.) The Talmudists sometimes erroneously attribute a Biblical verse to another context. Thus we read in the Talmud (Pesachim, fol. 109, Colossians 1), “It is every man's duty to rejoice with his household on the feast, for itis written, ‘And thou shalt rejoice in thy feast,' בְחִגֶּךָ וְשָׂמִחְתּ(Deu 16:14, where reference is made to the Feast of Tabernacles). The Tosaphoth on this passage, however, reads, “And thou shalt rejoice, thou and thine household” (וְשָׂמִחְתָ אִתָּה וּבֵיתֶךָ). Now the original reading was that as in the Tosaphoth, which is found in Deu 14:26, where the second tithe is spoken of. The rabbins, however, thought that the reading alluded to in the Tosaphoth is found in the section which treats of the Feast of Tabernacles; hence, when the editors of the Talmud found out the mistake, they substituted for the reading ושמחת אתה וביתthat of בחגוִשמחת

(b.) Sometimes sentences are quoted in the Talmud as Biblical which are not found in the Bible. In Berakoth, fol. 61, Colossians 1, in fine, we read: Rab Nachman said Manioah was an ignorant manl (עִם הארוֹ), for it is written, “He went after his wife” (Jdg 13:11). B. Nachman, the son of Isaac, asked, should this not also apply to Elkanah, for it is written, “And Elkanah went after his wife;” and to Elisha, of whom the Scripture says, “And he arose and followed her” (2Ki 4:30)? He followed her, indeed! Yes, but he followed her words and advice, and so here likewise he (Manoah) went after her words and counsel. The Tosaphoth correctly remarks on what the Talmud says concerning Elkanah: שבוש הוא שאין פסוק זה בכל המקרא; i.e. “It is an error, for this verse is not found in the whole Scripture.” once I had a dream, and I vwent to all [interpreters of dreams — the passage having reference to the twenty-four interpreters of dreams said to have been at Jerusalem], and the interpretation of the one was different from that of the other, but all were fulfilled, to fulfil what is said: All dreams go after the interpretation. But is this a verse of the Scripture? Yes, and according to R. Eliezer, who said, Whence do we know that all dreams go after the interpretation? For it is said, ‘And it came to pass as he interpreted' (Gen 41:13).”

In the Talmud (Pesachim, fol. 56, Colossians 1) it is said that Jacob, before his death, cited the words כבוד מלכותו לעולם ועד ברושִם; i.e. “blessed be the glorious name of his kingdom for ever and ever.” But such a quotation is nowhere found in the Scriptures.

In Yoma, fol. 85, Colossians 2, and Berakoth, fol. 62, Colossians 2, we read that the Scripture says, “If any one wants to kill you, kill him first” (להרגו בא להרגהִשכם), but such a passage is nowhere found. Oftentimes quotations are made from Ecclesiasticus, and are introduced by the phrases generally applied to scriptural passages, as in Niddah, fol. 16, Colossians 2 (לדכתיב); Berakoth, fol. 48, Colossians 1 (דכתיב); Erubin, fol. 65, Colossians 1 (שנאמר); Baba Kama, fol. 92, Colossians 2 (שנאמר בנביאים, Jdg 11:3; דבר זה כתיב בתורה, Gen 28:9; בכתובימ ומשולש, Sir 13:20). As these passages are al. ready enumerated in this Cycloopedia, we can only refer to the art. ECCLESIASTICUS SEE ECCLESIASTICUS.

(c.) Biblical phrases are here and there changed for the sake of brevity. In Erubin, fol. 31, Colossians 2 (Berakoth, fol. 27, Colossians 2; Kiddushin, fol. 54, Colossians 1), those things are mentioned which may be used for the Erub (i.e. the ceremony of extending the Sabbath boundary). But to prove those things which may not be used, the phrase is ונתן הכס וקם לו. But these four words are nowhere found in this connection together.

Sometimes some verses are contracted into one, as Deu 11:5-6, in Rosh ha-Shana, fol. 4, Colossians 2; Pro 19:17 and Pro 14:31, in Berackoth, fol. 18, Colossians 1; Eze 15:4, and Jer 36:22, in Sabbath, fol. 20, Colossians 1; Lev 14:39; Lev 14:44, in Maccoth, fol. 13, Colossians 2; Lev 19:13; ibid. fol. 16, Colossians 1. The same is often  the case in the New Test., e.g. Mat 21:5, where Isa 42:2 and Zec 9:9 are connected; Isa 6:9-10 in Mar 1:11; Isa 40:6-7; Isa 52:10, in Luk 3:4-6; Exo 16:14-15; Num 11:7; Psa 78:24 in Joh 6:31; Joh 6:49, etc.

2. Having thus shown the mode of quotations, we will now give a list of passages which are read otherwise in the Talmud than in our Bible:

A. Passages quoted in the Mishna.

1. Lev 25:36, אלאּתקח מאתו; Baba Metsia, ch. v, § 11, ממנו.

2. Num 28:2, ואמרת אלהם; Taanith, ch. 4:§ 2, אליהם

3. Num 32:22, והייתם נקים; Shekalim, ch. iii, § 2, נקיים [thus likewise in two MSS.].

4. Deu 24:19, לאאּתשוב; Peah, ch.vi, § 4, בלאּתשוכ [three times].

5. Jos 8:33, the words וכלאּישראלto לארוןare quoted Sotah, ch. 7:§ 5, but instead of ושוטריםthe reading is ושוטריו[probably on account of the antecedent וזקניוand following ושופטיו; the reading in the Mishna is also marked by Michaelis, Bibl. Hebr. 1720, ad loc., and so likewise in the Syriac, Chaldee, and Arabic versions].

6. Isa 10:13, שושתי; Yadaim, ch. 4:§ 4, שוסתי[in the Bible (with the exception of our passage) שסהis always read with the Samnech].

7. Eze 46:21, ארבעת מקצועי; Middoth, ch. ii, § 5, ארבע מקצעות[probably on account of the following מקצעתin v, 22; ארבעis the reading also of one MSS.].

8. Amo 9:14, ושבתי את שבות עמי ישראל; Yadain, ch. 4:§ 4, reads after ישראל ויהודה.

9. Mal 3:16, ספר; Aboth, ch. iii, § 3, בספר[which is supported by seven MSS. and the Syr.].

10. Malachi 3:23, הנה אנכי שלח לכם אליה הנביא; Eduyoth, ch. 8:§7, הנני שלח לכם את אליהו הנביא.

11. Psa 68:27, אלהים אדני; Berakoth, ch. 7:§ 3, יהוה אלהים יהוהis the reading of eleven MSS.].

12. Job 1:1, אלהים והיה האיש ההוא תם וישר וירא; Sotah, ch. v, § 5, אישתם וישר ירא אלהים.

13. Pro 22:28, עוים; Peah, ch. v, § 6, עולים[but ch. 7:§ 3, the reading is, as in the Bible, עולם].

14. 2Ch 28:15, הלבישי; Sotah, ch. 8:§ 1, הלבישים

B. Passages quoted in the Gemara.

15. Gen 7:8, אֵינֶנָּה טְחֹרָה; Pesachim, fol. 3, Colossians 1, איננה טהורה

16. Gen 7:23, מֵאָדָם עִדאּבְּהֵמָה; Berakoth, fol. 61, Colossians 1, ועד

17. Gen 15:2, in Berakoth, fol. 7, Colossians 2, we read: “R. Jochanan said, in the name of R. Sineon beni-Yochai, from the day wlien God created the world, no one called him Lord (אדון) until Abraham came and called him Lord, f)r it is written (Gen 15:8), ‘And he said, Lord God (יהֵוהֹ אֲדֹנָי), whereby shall I know that 1 shall inherit it?'“ [But in 15:2, we already read ויאמר אברם אדני יהוה.]

18. Gen 25:6, ולבני הפילגשים אשר לאברהם; in the Bereshith Rabba, sect. 61, fol. 67, Colossians 4 (where the question is whether Abraham had one or more concubines), it is stated that the reading is פילגשם[one concubine. This reading of the Midrash is followed by Rashi, who, in his commentary on Gen 25:6, remarks, “The textual reading is פילגשם, defective, because Abraham had only one concubine, namely, Hagar, who was identical with Keturah.” But this reading is contrary to the Masorah, which distinctly remarks that the word פילגשיםoccurs twice entirely plene, that is, with the two Yods after the two Chireks. The one instance is in Gen 26:6, and the other in Est 2:14].

19. Gen 35:18, בנימיןplene; in Sotah, fol. 36, Colossians 2, where the passage in Gen 49:27, בנימין זאב יטר, is treated, we read that, with the exception of 49:27, the word בנימיןis written בנימן, defective. [From this statement, it seems that at that time Gen 35:18; Gen 42:4; Gen 43:14; Gen 43:16; Gen 43:29; Gen 45:12 was written בנימן.]

20. Exo 12:3, עֲדִת יַשְֹרָאֵל; in Pesachim, fol. 6, Colossians 2, עדת בני ישראל[so Samuel, Sept., Syr., Vulg., Targumn; comp. our Horce Samaritance on Exodus, in Bibliotheca Sacra, July, 1876, loc. cit.; in the Talmud editions of Prague, Vienna, and Warsaw, the word בני is omitted].

21. Exo 12:6, לִחֹדֶשׁ הִזֶּה; Erakin, fol. 13, Col 2:22 לחדש הראשון. Exo 13:16, טוֹטָפֹת; Deu 6:8, טֹטָפֹת; Deu 11:18, טֹוטָפֹת; iln Menachothl fol. 34, Colossians 2, we read, “The sages propound, Rabbi Ishmael said in לָטוטפת לטטפֹת לטטפת, the four compartments [in the phylactery] are indicated.” [To understand this, we will remark that the word טטפתoccurs only three times, as indicated above; in two instances it has no ו (Deu 6:8; Deu 11:18), and in the third (Exo 13:16) there is a ו after the first ט, i.e. טוטפת; hence R. Ishmael regards it as a dual, and makes of the three words four, to obtain the four compartments in the phylacteries. But Chayim, in his Introduction to the Rabbinic Bible, tells us that “in the correct codices, as well as in the Book of Crowns,\* the reading is לטטפת (Deu 6:8; Deu 11:18) and ולטוטפת (Exo 13:16), but there is no ו between the פ and the ת; yet I myself have seen that in the ancient Book of the Crowns, even לטוטפתin Deu 11:18 is written with a, וafter the first ט“ The latter statement proves that our present reading is correct.]

\*The Book of Crowns (ספר תגין) is an ancient treatise, containing Masoretical rules on the ornamental letters. It has lately been published, for the first time, by Burges (Paris, 1866).

23. Exo 31:1, וִיְדִבֵּר; in Berakoth, fol. 55, Colossians 1, ויאמר

24. Lev 4:25; Lev 4:30; Lev 4:34, קִרְנֹת, defective; in Sanhedrin, fol. 4, Colossians 1, we read that the school of Shammai read קרנות קרנות קרנות, while that of Hillel, קרנות קרנת קרנת[i.e. once plene written; the same is also said in Zebachim, fol. 37, Colossians 2; comp. also the note in Michaelis, Biblia Hebr. ad loc.].

25. Lev 10:12, וִיְדִבֵּר; Berakoth, fol. 61, Colossians 1, ויאמר

26. Lev 15:10, וְהִנּוֹשֵׂא; Nidda, fol. 33, Colossians 1, כתיב והנשא

27. Lev 18:18, וְאַשָּׁה אֶלאּאֲחֹתָה לאֹ תַקָּח; Kiddushin, fol. 50, Colossians 2, תקח דאמר קרא אשה אל אחותה לא.

28. Num 5:19, אַם לאֹ שָׁכִב; Gittin, fol. 60, Yoma, fol. 37, Colossians 2, אם שכב אם לא שכב.

29. Num 18:16, וּפְדוּיָו מַבֶּןאּחֹדֶשׁ תַפְדֶּה; in the Talmud seems once to have stood ומעלהafter חדש, at least this is intimated in the Tosaphoth, or additional commentary to the Talmud; Erakin, fol. 18, Colossians 2, where it is stated וחפשנו אחר מקרא הזךְ ולא מצאנוהו, i.e. “We sought for this reading, but could not find it.”

30. Deu 6:7, וּבְשָׁכְבְּךָ; Berakoth, fol. 2, col.!בשכב, [thus likewise the Samar. and Vulg.].

31. Deu 6:9, מְזֻזוֹת; Menachoth, fol. 34, Colossians 1, R. Meir seems to have read מזוזת.

32. Deu 6:20, מָהto אתכם; Jerusalem Talmud, Pesachim, ch. 10:§ 4, אותנו.

33. Deu 23:1, כְּנִ אָבַיו; Berakoth, fol. 21, Colossians 2, את כנ

34. Deu 25:7, לאֹ אָבָה יִבְמַי; Yebamoth, fol. 106, Colossians 2, R. Ashai found R. Kahana, who, being perplexed about it, read ולא אבה יבמי(with וconjunctive). In correct codices, as is also evident from the Masorah, it is read לא אבה[some Hebr. MSS., 1 Samuel, the Syr., Ar., and Vulg. have ולא].

35. Jos 3:17 is quoted in Berakoth, fol. 54, Colossians 1, but instead of הארון ברית יההוהit reads ארון יהוה, and עד אשר תמו כל הגוי רtֵhe reading is כל הים עד תום

36. Jos 10:11, מַפְנֵי יַשְׂרָאֵל; Berakoth, fol. 54, Colossians 2, מפני בני ישראל:'

37. Jos 14:7; Jos 14:10. These two verses for the sake of brevity are thus contracted (see No. 1, c, above), Erakin, fol. 13, Colossians 1, שנה ד קאמר כלב בן ארבעים(?)עבד ה מקדש ברנע לרגל את מנלן הארוֹ ועתה אנכי היום בן חמש ושמונים בשלח אותי משה עבד, i.e. “It is said of Caleb, forty years old was I when Moses the servant of the Lord sent me from Kadesh-barnea to espy ont the land, and now I am this day fourscore and five years old.”

38. Jos 16:6, תִּאִנִת שַׁלה; Zebachim, fol. 118, Colossians 2, Rabbi Abdini bar-Chasa said, the Scripture says, תאנת שילה ולו, to which the commentary remarks, חיפשתיו ולא מצאתיו במקרא, i.e. “I have sought but not found it in the Scripture, but I found in Joshua 16 :, אבל מצאתיו תאנת שילה,

39. Jdg 15:20; Jdg 16:31, where Samson is said to have judged Israel twenty years (Jdg 16:31). The Talm. Hieros. Sotah, fol. 17, “One passage reads, and he judged Israel forty years, and another that he judged Israel twenty years. R. Acha answered, From this we see that the Philistines feared him twenty years after his death, just as they did twenty years before it.” [On this passage R. Chayim, in his preface to the Rabbinic Bible, makes the following interpretation: “To me it appears, however, that there is no difficulty in it; for what the Talmud speaks about Samson refers to the Midrashic interpretation, viz. ‘Why is the verse, that he judged Israel twenty years, repeated twice? R. Acha answered, From this we see that the Philistines feared him (viz. Samson) twenty years after his death, just as they did twenty years before it, and this makes forty years.' Hence the Talmnd does not say, Why is it written in the text, The judged Israel forty years?' but simply, The judged forty years,' that is, according to the Midrash. And now everything comes out right when thou lookest into it.” We may well subscribe what Claudius Capellanus, in his Mare Rabbinicum Infidum, 1p. 350, note, says, “Tam insigne mendacinum quod decepit  doctissimum Buxtorfium facile corruet vel sola adductiole loci Talmudici.” This much is certain, that in the time of the Talmud, one codex at least had the reading, Judges 15 : ארבעים שנה]

40. 1Sa 2:24, מִעֲבַרַים; in Sabbath, fol. 55, Colossians 2, “is not the reading מִעֲבַרַים? Whereupon R. Hunnah ben R. Joshua said the reading is מעברם[Rashi remarks that the reading of the most trustworthy codices is מעברים: plene, i.e. with a Yod after the Resh.]

41. 2Sa 3:35, להברות; Sanhedrin, fol. 20, Colossians 1, it is written להכרות, but is read להברות[a number of MSS. read להכרות; comp. also the Diets. of Kimchi, Lib. Rad. s.v. כרה, and Menachen ben-Sarug, Lex. Rad. ברand כר(ed. Filipowski, Lond. 1854, p. 48, 109)].

42. 2Sa 24:15, וְעִדאּעֵת מוֹעֵד וִיַּתֵּן יְהוהֹ דֶבֶר בְּיַשְׂרָאֵל מֵהִבֹּקֶר; Yoena, fol. 2, Colossians 2 , מן הבקר ועד עת מועד ויתן ה דבר בעם

43. 2Ki 17:31, נַבְחִז; Sanhedrin, fol. 63, Colossians 2, נבחן [D. Kimchi also asserts to have seen the Nun (“) final, instead of the ן majuscular, as written now].

44. 2Ki 23:17; in Erakin, fol. 33, Colossians 1, the whole verse is quoted with the exception of האלה אשר עשתה.

45. Isa 38:16, וְהֲחֲיֵינַי;ַ eerakoth, fol. 55, Colossians 1, ותחייני

46. Isa 42:5, וְנוֹטֵיהֶם; Bereshith Rabba, sect. 12, fol. 15, 3, ונווטיהם[i.e. leaders].

47. Isa 58:7, לאֹ תַתְעִלָּם; Jerusalem Talmud, Kethuboth, ch. 11:§ 3, אל תתעלם.

48. Eze 40:48; Eze 47:1; Erubin, fol. 2, Colossians 1, הבית דכאיב אל פתח אולם; but such a passage is not to be found in the Scriptures. [Tosaphoth remarks on this passage, “Such a passage is nowhere to be found, but we find written (Eze 40:48) אוּלָם הִבִּיַתand פֶתִח הִבִּיַת (Eze 47:1).”]

49. Eze 44:9, is quoted Moed Katon, fol. 5, Colossians 1, but with the addition לשרתני after מקדשי.

50. Hos 4:11, וְתַרוֹשׁpleine; Yoma, fol. 76, Colossians 2, it is written תירש and read תירוש.

51. Amo 4:6, וְגִם אֲנַי נָתִתַּי; lidda, fol. 65, Colossians 1, גם אנכי נתתי

52. Amo 8:11, אֵת דַּבְרֵי יְהוהֹ; Sabbath, fol. 138, Colossians 2, דברי את דבר יהוה is found in the ed. princeps, but later editions, Kimchi, Aben-Ezra, Sept., Syriac,Vulg., Targum, read דבר].

53. Amo 9:11, . וְשִׁבְתַּי אֶת שְׁבוּת; Berakoth, fol. 28, Colossians 1 (ed. princeps), הנני משיב את שבית[Later ed. reads as in our text of the Bible.]

54. Mic 4:2, גּוֹיַם; Berakoth, fol. 55, col. 2, עִמים. 55. Zec 12:10, אלי; Sukka, fol. 52, Colossians 1, אליו [forty codices have אליו, and so many Jewish commentators].

56. Mal 1:2, מֵאָהָלֵי יִעֲקֹב; many editions of the Talnud have מאלקיfor מאהלי, but this is of no importance, since the ed. princeps, Sanhedron, fol. 82, Colossians 1, only quotes the first part of the verse till ער ועונה.

57. Psa 5:5, רָע כַּי לאֹ אֵלאּחָפֵוֹ רֶשִׁע אִתָּה לאֹ יְגֻרְךָ; Chagiga, fol. 12, Colossians 2, יָגוּר בַּמְגּוּרְךָ רָע לאֹ אֵלאּחָפֵוֹ רֶשִׁע אִתָּה לאBut this does not stand in the Bible as Tosaphoth already remarked, אין זה מקרֹא.

58. Psa 16:10, חֲסַידְיךָ; Erubin, fol. 19, Colossians 1; Yomna, fol. 87, Colossians 1 (in five eds. of the Talmud) read! חסיד[so likewise Sept., Syriac, Vulg. Jerome].

59. Psa 56:11, דָּבָר בֵּאלֹהַים אֲהִלֵּל דָּבָר בִּיהוהֹ אֲהִלֵּל; Berakoth, fol. 60, Colossians 1, באלהים בוהוה אהלל דבר

60. Psa 68:21, לִמָּוֶת תּוֹצָאוֹת; Berakoth, fol. S, Colossians 1, ולמות

61. Psa 95:5, וְיִבֶּשֶׁת יָדָיו יָצָרוּ; Kethuboth, fol. 5, Colossians 1, ידו כתיב והכתיב יצרו‘.

62. Psa 97:7, תַשְׁתִּחֲווּ; Jerusalem Talmud, Edulyoth, fol. 44, Colossians 1, ישתחוו[comp. Epistle to the Heb 1:6, προσκυνησάτωσαν, κ. τ. λ.].

63. Psa 127:5, אֶתאּאִשְׁפָּתו; Kiddushin, fol. 30, Colossians 2, without את.

64. Psa 139:5, כִּפֶּכָה; Chagiga, fol. 12, Colossians 1,!כפ.

65. Pro 8:13, שׂנאֹת רָע; Pesachim, fol. 113, Colossians 2, שונאי רע

66. Pro 11:17, איש חָסֵד; Taanlith, fol. 11, Colossians 2, חסיד איש

67. Pro 15:1, יָשַׁיב; Berakoth, fol. 17, Colossians 2, משיב.

68. Job 2:8, לְהַתְגָּשׁד; Midrash Bereshith Iabba, sect. 64 (towards the end), להתגיר.

69. Job 13:4, אֵַּלל; Chullin., fol. 121, Colossians 1, אֵַליל.

70. Job 14:6, כַּיאּעִתָּה; Jerusalem Talmud, Berakoth, ch. v, § 1, כי אתה.

71. Job 36:5, הֶןאּאֵל כִּבַּיר וְלאֹ יַמְאָס; Bel rakoth, fol. 8, Colossians 2, הן אל כביר לא ימאס תם, without the Vav before לא[It may be that the Talmud confoun ds this passage with Job 8:20, הֵןאּאֵל לאֹ יַמְאִסאּתָּם.]

72. Job 36:11, יְכִלּוּ; Sanhedrin, fol. 108, Colossians 1, יבלו.

73. Rth 3:15, הָבַי; Midrash Ruth, ad loc. כתיב הבה.

74. Ecc 9:14, מְצוֹדַים גְּדוֹלַים; Nedarim, fol. 32, Colossians 2, מצודים וחרמים.

75. Ecc 9:15, חכם; Vedarimn, fol. 32, Colossians 2, וחכם.

76. Ecc 10:5, שֶׁיֹּצָא; Kethtuboth, f(l. 62, Colossians 2; Moed Katon, fol. 18, Colossians 1; Baba Mezia, fol. 68, Colossians 1, שיוצא.

77. Dan 2:29, Berakoth, fol. 55, Colossians 2, where for סלקו רעיוניאִנתהis written!אנת סליקו רעיונ.

78. Dan 4:14, וּמֵאמִר קִדַּישַׁין; Pesachim, fol. 33, Colossians 1; Sanhedrin, fol. 38, Colossians 2, ובמאמר קדישין[some codices have also ובמאמר].

79. Dan 6:18, וְהֵיתָיַת; Nidda, fol. 69, Colossians 2, והיתאית

80. Dan 10:13, אִָהִד הִשָּׂרַיםBerakoth, fol. 4, Colossians 2, אחד מן השרים.

81. Ezr 4:3, לַבְנוֹת בִּיַת לֵאלֹהֵינוּ; Erakin, fol. 5, Colossians 2, לבנות את בית אלהינו.

82. Neh 4:16, הִלִּיְלָה מַשְׁמָר וְהִיּוֹם מְלָאכָה; Mregil הלילה למשמר והיום למלאכהbut in Berakoth, fol. 2, Colossians 2, מלאכהand משמרare extant.

83. Neh 8:8, בִּסֵּפֶר בְּתוֹרִת הָאֶלֹהַים; Nedarim, fo]. 37, Colossians 2, תורת בספר תורת האלהים, so likewise the Sept., Vulg., Syr.].

84. Neh 8:8, האלהים, ibid. אלהים; but in Megillah, fol. 3, Colossians 1, האלהים.

85. Neh 8:15, לִעֲשׂת; Sukka, fol. 37, Colossians 1, וִעֲשׂוּ)'.

86. Neh 8:17, וִיִּעֲשּׁוּ כָלאּהִקָּהָל; Erakin, fol. 32, Colossians 2, ויעשו בני הגולח; for יֵשׁוּעread יהושע, ibid.

87. 1Ch 3:17, וּבְנֵי יַכָנְיָה אִסַּר שְׁאִלְתַּיאֵל בְּנוֹ,; Sanhedrin, fol. 37, Colossians 2, בנו בני יכניה אסיר בנו שלתיאל

88. 1Ch 4:10, וְהָיְתָה יָדְךָ עַמַי וְעָשַׂיתָ מֵרָעָה: Temutrah, fol. 16, Colossians 1, ידעִמדי ועשה מרעתי.

89. 1Ch 5:24, וְעֵפֶר וְיַשְׁעַי; Baba Bathra, fol. 123, Colossians 2, חפר וישעי‘ .

90. 1Ch 16:5, . מִשְׁמַיע; Erakin, fol. 13, Colossians 2, להשמיע.

91. 1Ch 17:9, לְבִלֹּתוֹ; Berakoth, fol. 7, Colossians 2, לכלותו

92. 1Ch 26:8, כָּלאּאֵלֶּה מַבְּנֵי עֹבֵר אֶדוֹם; ibid. fol. 64, Colossians 1, כל אלה עובד אדום. ‘

93. 1Ch 26:24, בֶּןאּמשֶׁה.; Babd Bathra, fol. 110, Colossians 1, בן מנשה.

94. 1Ch 27:34, יְהוֹיָדָע בֶּןאּבְּנָיָהוּ; Berakoth, fol. 3, Colossians 2, בניהו בן יהוידע

95. 2Ch 31:13, וִיֵעָתֶראּלוֹ; Sanhedrin, fol. 103, col. l, מאי דכתיב וישמע אליו ויחתר לו.

96. In fine, we will quote the following interesting passage. In the Jerusalem Talmud, Taanith, fol. 68, Colossians 1, we read the following: “Three codices [of the Pentatemuch] Were found in the court of the Temple, one of which had the reading מְעוֹו., the other זִעֲטוּטֵי, and the third differed in the number of passages whereiin היאis read with a Yod; thus in the one codex it was written מְעוֹן, dwelliing [Deu 33:27], while the other two codices had מְעוֹנָה; the reading of the two was therefore declared valid, whereas that of the one was invalid. In the second codex, again, זִעֲטוּטֵי. was found [in Exo 24:11], while the other two codices had אֶתאּנִעִרֵי; the reading in which the two codices agreed was declared valid, and that of the one invalid. In the third codex, again, there were only nine passages which had היאwritten with a Yod [as it is generally written הוא, with a Vav], whereas the other two had eleven passagces; the readilgs of the two were declared valid, and those of the one invalid.”

3. The different passages which we have presented here, and which might be yet increased to a great extent, do not justify us in presuming that the readings found in the Talmud were those of the Old-Testament codices of that time, and much less in the presumption that the readings of the Talmud  are to be preferred to those of our text, for the following reasons: 1. We have not as yet a critical edition of the Talmud; 2. The formulas ‘!אל תקרא כאִלא כ, i.e. “read not so, but so,” and יש אם למקרא ויש אם למסורת, i.e. “there is a solid root for the reading of the text, and there is a solid root for the traditional pronunciation,” already indicate that these variations arose partly for the sake of allegory, partly for exegetical purposes. Thus Richard Simon, Disquisit. Crit. de Variis Bibl. Edit. cap. 3, p. 17, remarks on the formula!אל תקרא כאִלא כ, Cavendum est, ne ista loquendi formula quam frequenter in Talmude usurpant ne legas sic sedsic ad lectionum varietatem trahatur. Lusus enim est allegoricus illis doctoribus admodum familiaris qui servata dictionum ut ita loquar substantia diversos unius ejusdemque vocis legendae modos pueriliter comminiscuntur.” To illustrate this, the following may suffice. Isa 54:13, we read, “thy son,” בָּנִיַךְ, but in Berakoth, fol. 64, we read, “Do not read בָּנִיַךְ‘thy sons, but בֹּנִיַךְ‘thy builders, thy wise, whereby it should be proved that ‘the wise build the peace in the world.'“ Sanhedrin, fol. 37, Colossians 1, the word בְּגָדָיו, “his raiment,” in Gen 27:27, is read בֹּגְדָיו, “his perfidious,” to prove thereby the perfidy of Jose ben-Joeser's nephew. (For more such examples the reader is referred to G. Surenhusius Βίβλος καταλλαγῆς, p; 59 sq. [Amst. 1713].)

As to the second formula, יש אם כוBuxtorf (De Punct. Antiq. p. 96, 103-110) makes the following correct remark: “Usus vero hujus axiomatis Talmudici hic est. Cum de re seu quaestione aliqua disputant ac in diversas sententias abeunt, saepe accidit ut uterque dissentientium fundamentum suum in uno eodemque Scripturse loco, imo et in eadem voce ponat: unus sc. in communi et recepta lectione, alter in lectione mystica et allegorica, eadem illa voce sed allis vocalibus animata vel aliter explicata. Prior dicit: est mater lectionis, q. d.: mea sententia innititur communi et receptae lectioni, cum punctis et vocalibus propriis, sensui literali. Alter dicit: est zmater lectionis, h. e. ego meam sententiam elicio et educo ex sensu mystico et lectione vel expositione aliqua per traditionem accepta, qua didici, hanc vocem pro infinita fecunditate legis sic quoque posse legi et explicari.” ‘To illustrate this, the following may suffice: In Exo 12:46 we read concerning the Passover, “In one house shall it be eaten,” יֵאָכֵל. But in the Talmud, Pesachim, fol. 86, Colossians 2, two inferences are deduced from this passage. R. Jehudah maintains that the man who partakes of the Passover, he must eat it (יֹאכִל) in one place (בבית אחד), but that the Passover itself may be  divided, and a part of it may be eaten by another company in another place; basing his argument upon the מסורות, viz.: יֹאכִלhe must eat it at one place. Whereas R. Simeon maintains that the Passover itself must be eaten (יֵאָכֵל) in one place (בבית אחד), and cannot be divided between two different companies in different places, though the man himself, after having eaten his Passover at home, may go to another place and partake of another company's Passover; basing his argument upon the מקראviz. יֵאָכֵל, it must be eaten in one place. To the same category belongs the rule that שבעים(Lev 12:5) is to be read שְׁבֻעִיַםtwo weeks, and not שַׁבְעַיםseventy days; and that בחלב(Lev 23:19) is to be pronounced בִּחֲלֵבin the milk, and not בְּחֵלֶב, in the fat.

4. Literature. — Compare Pesaro, Aaron di, ביתאהרן אהרן תולדות(Frankf. ad Viadr. fol.), which also gives all the passages found in the Midrashim and Sohar; Surenhusius Βίβλος καταλλαγῆς (Amsterd. 1713); Weisse, in Bechinath ha-Olsam (ed. Stern, Vienna, 1847), praef. p. xix adn.; Fromman, Oputscula Philologica, i, 146; Schorr, in He-chaluz (Lemberg), i, 97-116; ii, 56; Geiger, in Judische Zeitschrift, iv (1866), p. 43, 99 sq., 165-171; S. Rosenfeld, ספר חקת התורה(Vilnae, 1866); Buxtorf filius, Anti-critica, pt. ii, cap. 21:p. 808; Strack, Prolegomena Critica (Lips. 1873), p. 59 sq. (B. P.)

## Quotations, Biblical[[@Headword:Quotations, Biblical]]

             The verbal citations contained in Scripture are of three classes:

(a) Those which the later writers of the Old Test. make from the earlier.

(b) The quotations made by Paul from heathen authors — viz. Act 17:28 from Aratus, Phoenom, 5, or Cleanthes, Hymn. ad Jov. 5; 1Co 15:33 from Menander's ‘Thais; and Tit 1:12 from Callimachus, Hymn. ad lov. 8, according to Theodoret, or Epimenides  according to Jerome, Chrysostom, Epiphanius, and others. To these may be added Gal 5:23, where the words κατὰ τῶν τοιοῦτων οὐκ ἔστι νόμος are identical with the words of Aristotle, Pol. iii, 8 (Gill, Notes and Queries, v, 175). Perhaps also Act 14:17 and Jam 1:17, from their rhythmical form, may be quotations.

(c) Those which the New Test. contains from the Old Test. The first and third of these classes are the most important, and the only ones demanding special notice here. The following treatment as to both is compiled from the various aulthorities on Biblical introduction and interpretation, with additions from other sources.

I. Parallel passages of the Old-Testament Scriptures. — The principal of these are the following: Many sections of the books of Chronicles seem to be quoted fiomn the earlier Scriptures. The historical chapters of the book of Isaiah (36-39) are repeated in 2 Kings 18-20. The last chapter of Jeremiah reappears in 2 Kings 24:25. Of Psalms 18 we have two copies, one in 2 Samuel 22. Compare also Genesis 46 with Numbers 26 and Ezra 2 with Nehemiah 7. Other instances are cited: Hab 2:14 from Isa 11:9; Jon 2:3 from Psa 42:8; Psa 2:5 from Isa 49:2; Oba 1:8 from Jeremiah 49; and several passages in the later Psalms, which are found also in the earlier. The reader will find a list of the variations discovered by a comparison of most of the foregoing passages in the notes to Cappelli, Cuit. Sac. (i, 30-44 [ed. 1775]). See also Kennicott, Biblia Hebraica (ii, 727, etc.), and State of Printed Hebrew Text (pt. i).

The question to be determined is, Are we to regard each of the textual variations thus brought to light as a blunder to be corrected in one or other of the parallel Scriptures, or as a deviation (intentional or otherwise) on the part of the later writer from the language of the earlier? In considering this question a distinction must be made between two classes of parallel passages-the one class consisting of those in which the same story is told, or the same sentiments expressed, by two different writers, and the later writer avails himself of the language of the earlier, though it may be without any very exact or servile adherence in every word and clause; the other consisting of those in which a public or other document is inserted in two separate records. It would seem that such variations as are met with in passages of the former description are more likely to be designed and original, being probably traceable to the free use which the later writer made of the materials furnished by the earlier; and that variations met with  in passages of the latter description are more likely to be blunders arising from the negligence of transcribers and similar causes. But this anticipation is only partially realized, inasmuch as errors of transcription are found in the former class of passages, and alterations obviously designed are found in the latter. Let us illustrate this by four examples, two of each class.

1. The very remarkable prophecy contained in Isa 2:1-4 is found also in Mic 4:1-3. The variations are few and of no great importance. But, such as they are, there is no reason to suppose that the text of either of these passages ever differed from what it is now. It is of no consequence in the present inquiry whether Micah borrowed from Isaiah or Isaiah from Micah, or both from an older prophet. There is no evidence whatever that the later writer made it a matter of conscience to reproduce in every minute particular the language of his predecessor. His heart was too full of the great thought embodied in the language to permit him to be minutely attentive to every fold of the dress in which it had been presented. Possibly, also, the quotation was made from memory; and, if so, the wonder is not that any varieties of expression are found in it, but that they are so few and so trivial. In such a case as this, therefore, it would be quite unwarrantable to correct the one passage from the other. The text in both passages is accurate and genuine, and any attempted emendations with the view of bringing the two passages into rigid harmony would certainly be alterations for the worse, not for the better.

2. The prophecy of Nathan in 2 Samuel 7 occupies a very conspicuous position in the Old Test., and, as we might expect, the whole narrative is repeated in 1 Chronicles (17), not, however, without a very considerable number of alterations. In this case, also, it is quite evident that most of the alterations are to be traced to the author of Chronicles, and cannot be regarded as various readings. As is usual, the later writer makes a free use of the earlier narrative, adapting it and the language in which it is conveyed to the circumstances of his own time. Thus he writes דויד for דור, prefers, אֵֹלהים to יְהֹוָהor אֲדניֹ, sometimes substitutes מִלְכוּת for מִמְלָכָה, kingdom, and alters or omits words or clauses which appear to him obscure or unessential. The most remarkable omission is in 2Sa 7:13 as compared with 2Sa 7:14 of the narrative in Samuel. Compare also 2Sa 7:17 with 2Sa 7:19 of Samuel. Still, though it is evident that most of the variations between the two narratives are to be traced to the design of the later author, and cannot be regarded as errors of transcription, we do not think  that all of them can be accounted for in this way. Two instances may be given, in the one of which the text in Chronicles may fittingly be corrected by that in Samuel; in the other the text in Samuel may be corrected by that in Chronicles.

(1.) In 1Ch 17:18-19 we read, “What can David speak more to thee for the honor of thy servant, לְכָבוֹד אֶתאּעִבְדּךָ…For thy servant's sake, and according to thine own heart hast thou done all this greatness.” Not to mention the difficulty in the construction of the Hebrew in 1Ch 17:18, it is evident that the spirit of the whole passage is quite out of harmony with the context. Accorlingly, on turning to the corresponding verses in Samuel, we are not surprised to find the sentiment expressed very different indleed, the words being “And what can David say more unto thee... for thy word's sake, and according to thine own heart,” etc. (1Ch 17:20-21). It is not improbable that what we cannot but regard as the erroneous readings in Chronicles are to be traced to the similarity between לדבר and לכבד in the former of the two verses, and דבר and עבד in the latter. It may be added that in the Septuagint translation of Chronicles the objectionable words are omitted.

(2.) The other instance is in 2Sa 7:23, compared with 1Ch 17:21. In the former we read, according to the authorized translation, “What one nation in the earth is like thy people, even like Israel, whom God went to redeem for a people to himself, and to make him a name, and to do for you great things and terrible. For thy land, before thy people (מַפְּנֵי from before), which thou redeemedst to thee from Egypt, [from] the nations and their gods?” The text of this verse is obviously very confused; and in order to extract from it some tolerable sense, our translators have rendered מַפְּנֵי as if it were לַפְנֵי and have inserted from, without any authority, towards the close. Now, without venturing to affirm that the text in Chronicles is to be received as in every particular the true and genuine one, we have no hesitation in borrowing from it what we believe to be an important emendation of the text in Samuel — viz. the substitution of לגרש, to drive out, for! לארצ (the words are very similar),for thy land. This will allow us to give מַפְּנֵי. its proper force, and render unnecessary the insertion of the unauthorized/ionm; the meaning of the latter half of the verse when thus  corrected being as follows: “To drive out from before thy people, whom thou redeemedst to thee from Egypt, nations and their gods.”

3. The two remaining examples are of a different description, consisting not of historical or prophetical passages freely made use of by a later writer, but of documents of which we have, so to speak, two editions. The first is David's noble song of thanksgiving, of which two copies have come down to us — the one incorporated with the history in 2 Samuel 22; the other with the psalm-book as Psalms 18. Now, on comparing these two copies of the same song, we find scarcely a single line of the one exactly identical with the corresponding line of the other; some of the variations being of extremely little importance, others of greater moment. The question here again arises: How are these variations to be accounted for? How comes it that two copies of the same song, handed down to us in the same volume, should, though identical in the general sentiments expressed, in the train of thought, and in the order of the verses, present so many minute differences in the details of the composition? On first thought, we are disposed to conclude, somewhat rashly, that all the variations must be regarded as errors of transcription, and that in this case there is no room for the hypothesis of design on the part of the author or editor, inasmuch as we have here the case not of an independent author adapting to his own purpose the materials furnished by previous writers, but of a collector giving insertion to a document which, one would suppose, it is his duty to present as nearly as possible in the words of the original author. On comparing, however, the psalm with the history, it is evident that all the variations cannot be accounted for in this way. For example, the very first words of the psalm, “I will love thee, O Lord, my strength,” do not appear in the other copy; and of this the only admissible explanation plainly is that- the words in question constitute an authorized addition to the song in its original form, the addition being made probably for the purpose of adapting it more perfectly to liturgical use. If this explanation be admitted, it follows that of this song there have been transmitted to us two authorized editions — the one, which is inserted in the history, presenting the song in its original form; the other presenting it in the slightly altered form which was given to it when incorporated with the authorized hymn- book of the Hebrew nation. In this way a considerable number of the variations may be accounted for, but not, by anl means, all of them; for, with regard to many of them, it is impossible to discover any useful purpose which could be served by their introduction; and several of them  are just the sort of alterations which most usually arise from the mistake of transcribers-as, for example, the interchange of letters of similar form, the transposition of letters, etc. (thus for וירא, and he was seen, in 2Sa 22:11, we find in Psa 18:11 [10] וידא, and he did fly; and for ויחגרו in 2Sa 22:46 we find ויחרגו in Psa 18:46 [45]). The text in Samuel is the more antique in form-as, for example, in the more sparing insertion of vowel letters; but that of the Psalm appears to have been more carefilly preserved. Thus, there is little doubt that for גַּבּוֹר, in 2Sa 22:26, we ought to read גְּבִר, as in the Psalm; and in 2Sa 22:28, וַאֶת of Samuel ought to be read וְאִתָּה or כּי אתָּה, as in the Psalm; and in the second clause also the reading in the Psalm is much to be preferred. So in 2Sa 22:33; 2Sa 22:44; 2Sa 22:47; 2Sa 22:49. On the other hand, in 2Sa 22:5; 2Sa 22:43, the reading in Samuel may be preferred to that of the Psalm.

4. Our last example is the Decalogue, of which we have two editions, in Exodus 20 and Deuteronomy 5, between which there are not a few differences, some of considerable importance. But it is very doubtful whether any of these differences can be laid to the charge of the copyist; certainly the more important of them must be traced to the author. They are principally to be found in the fourth and tenth commandments: in the latter, the two first clauses are transposed in Deuteronomy, and a slight addition and alteration made; and in the former, the remember of Exodus is exchanged for observe in Deuteronomy; thy cattle is expanded into thine ox and thine ass and all thy cattle; and the “reason annexed” in Exodus — “For in six days,” etc. — is entirely omitted in Deuteronomy, and another statement substituted for it — “That thy man-servant and maid-servant may rest as well as thou; and remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt,” etc. The other alterations are of less importance. In each of the fourth and fifth commandments. the clause “As the Lord thy God hath commanded thee” is inserted in Deuteronomy, the promise in the latter being also expanded by the addition of the clause “that it may be well with thee;” and in the ninth, עֵד שָׁוְא(false witness) is substituted for עֵד שֶׁקֶר. Now, there is not one of these variations which can be certainly traced to the oversight of a transcriber. It is, indeed, on first thought, surprising that any writer, however conscious of the guidance of the Divine Spirit, should have ventured to depart, even in the minutest particular, from the ipsissima verba of a document which had been stamped in so special a manner with the impress of Heaven. It is, perhaps, the most remarkable example of that  complete mastery of the essential over the accidental, of the spirit over the letter, which distinguishes the entire revelation at once of the Old Testament and of the New. But to explain this phenomenon does not fall within our present purpose. It is sufficient to remark that most of the variations are evidently to be traced to the first composition of the book of Deuteronomy, and that none of them can with any degree of certainty be place in the category of various readings. SEE DECALOGUE.

From the four examples of parallel passages which have been under review, the following conclusions have been elicited: (a.) That most of the variations are to be traced to the author or editor, and not to the copyist; and. in all such cases, both forms of the passage must be preserved as belonging equally to the sacred text. (b.) That, notwithstanding, a considerable number of variations still remain which cannot be accounted for in this way, but probably arose through oversight in transcription. In such cases it is allowable to correct the more faulty text by the more accurate; but, in the absence of ally external testimony to the accuracy of the reading which we prefer, such corrections must be introduced with caution, and might, perhaps, with greater propriety be placed in the margin (as was the practice with the ancient Jewish critics) than incorporated with the text. The variations of this class would have appeared still more numerous had we selected our examples of parallel passages from those which are occupied with lists of names or numbers. See Kennicott, Dissertation on the State of the Printed Hebrew Text, pt. i.

II. Quotations from the Old Testament in the New. These form one of the outward bonds of connection between the two parts of the Bible. They are manifold in kind; but all that we need here to say respecting them may be summed tup under the following heads:

1. Sources whence the Quotations are made. — These are two-the Iebrew original and the Septuagint translation. On comparing the passages, in order to apportion the quotations between these two sources, we find that by far the larger number are taken, either wholly or chiefly, from the Sept., while a very few materially differ from both the Sept. and the Hebrew. The latter were probably quoted from memory, the occasion not requiring punctilious accuracy in the citation. For the most part, the deviations from the text of the Hebrew or the Sept. are not material. They may be classed as follows:

(1.) Changes of person, number, or tense in particular words. Thus, in Mat 26:31, we read, πατάξω τὸνποιμένα, καὶ διασκορπισθήσεται τὰ πρόβατα τῆς ποίμνης; while the Sept. gives it, πάταξον τὸν ποιμένα, καὶ διασκορπισθήσονται, κ. τ. λ. (Zec 13:7) (this is the reading of the Alexandrine Codex; that of the Vatican differs considerably: πατάξατε τοὺς ποιμένας καὶ ἐκσπάσατε τἁ πρόβατα); Joh 19:36, Ο᾿στοῦν οὐ συντριβήσεται αὐτοῦ, for Ο᾿στοῦν οὐ συντρίψετε ἀπ᾿ αὐτοῦ, Exo 12:46; 1Pe 2:24, Οῦ τῷ μώλωπι αὐτοῦ ἰάθητε, for μώλωπι αὐτοῦ ἰάθημεν, Isa 53:5, etc. Comp. also Mat 11:10 with Mal 3:1; and Joh 19:37 with Zec 12:4.

(2.) Substitution of synonymous words or phrases for those used in the Sept. or Hebrew: e.g. Joh 13:18, ῾Ο τρώγων μετ᾿ ἐμοῦ τὸν ἄρτον, ἐπῇρεν ἐπ᾿ ἐμὲ τὴν πτέρναν αὐτοῦ, for ῾Ο ἐσθίων ἄρτους μου ἐμεγάλμνεν ἐπ᾿ ἐμὲ πτερνισμόν, Psalms 40 (41), 9. Comp. Heb 8:8 sq. Mat 12:20, where לאֶמֶת יוֹצַיא מַשְׁפָּט(Isa 42:3) is rendered by ἕως ¨ν ἐκβάλη εἰς νῖκος τὴν κρίσιν. Sometimes the words thus substituted are synonymous with those for which they are used only historically; as when Paul (Gal 4:30) calls Isaac ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἐλευθέρας, in a passage quoted from Gen 21:10, where, in the words of Abraham, he is mentioned by name as ὁ υἱός μου Ι᾿σαάκ. Occasionally, also, this kind of substitution is effected by the use of a word describing a species for one designating the genus to which it belongs; as when Paul, in 1Co 3:20, substitutes the words τῶν σοφῶν for the more general expression, τῶν ἀνθρώπων, used in the passage (Psa 19:11) which he quotes; or as in Mat 22:37. where διανοία is put for מְאֹד, the special kind of strength intended being that of the mind.

(3.) Words and phrases transposed: e.g. Rom 10:20, Εὑρέθην τοῖς ἐμὲ μὴ ζητοῦσιν, ἐμφανὴς ἐγενόμην τοῖς έμὲ μὴ ἐπερωτῶσιν, for Ε᾿μφανὴς ἐγενήθην τοῖς ἐμὲμὴ ἐπερωτῶσιν, εὑρέθην τοῖς ἐμὲ μὴ ζητοῦσιν, Isa 65:1, etc. The Codex Alex. gives this passage exactly as cited by Paul.

(4.) Words and clauses interpolated or added: e.g. Joh 6:31, ἄρτον ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς φαγεῖν, where the words ἐκ τοῦ and φαγεῖν are an ad(lition (comp. Psa 78:24); 1Co 15:45,  Ε᾿γένετο ὁ πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος Α᾿δὰμ εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν, where the words πρῶτος and Α᾿δάμ are added by the apostle (comp. Gen 2:7). These additions are made sometimes from parallel passages, and sometimes of the writer's own device, for the purpose of rendering the mean ing of the passage clearer, or connecting it more readily with the preceding or subsequent context.

(5.) Words omitted and passages abridged: e.g. Mat 4:6, τοῖς ἀγγέλοις αύτοῦ ἐντελεῖται περὶ σου, καὶ ἐπὶ χειρῶν ἀροῦσί σε, μήποτε προσκόψῃς πρὸς λίθον τὸν πόδα σοῦ for τοῖς ἀγγέλοις αὐτοῦ ἐντελεῖται περὶ σοῦ, τοῦ διαφυλάξαι σε ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ὁδοῖς σοῦ· ἐπὶ χειρῶν ἀροῦσί σε, μήποτε προσκόψῃς πρὸς λίθον τ.π.σ., Psa 90:11-12. Comp. also Mat 22:24 with Deu 25:5; Rom 9:27-28 with Isa 10:22-23; Heb 4:4 with Gen 2:3, etc.

(6.) Passages paraphrastically rendered, or the general sense only given: e.g. Rom 9:25, where we leave a paraphrastic rendering of Hos 2:23; Rom 10:6 sq., a free rendering of Deu 30:12 sq.; 1Co 1:31, where the general sense of Jer 9:24 is given; comp. also 1Pe 2:22 with Isa 59:9.

(7.) Several passages quoted together, so as to form one connected sense: e.g. in 2Co 6:16-18 we have a passage made up of no less than three different passages — Lev 26:11; Isa 3:11; Jer 31:1. Comp. also Mar 1:2-3, where Mal 3:1 and Isa 40:3 are combined; also Rom 11:8, where Isa 29:10 and Deu 29:4 are strangely mixed together.

(8.) Several of these species of deviations combined together: e.g. Rom 2:24, τὸ γὰρ ὄνομα τοῦ Θεοῦ δἰ ὑμᾶς βλασφημεῖται ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσι, for δἰ ὑμᾶς διὰ παντὸς τὸ ὄνομά ῾μου βλασφημεῖται ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσι. Here we have the substitution of τοῦ Θεοῦ for μοῦ, and the omission of διὰ παντός Comp. also Rom 11:3 with 1Ki 19:14, for an instance of the combination of omission, substitution, and transposition.

(9.) Passages rather indicated, or hinted at, than formally quoted: e.g. Eph 5:14, ῎Εγειραι ὁ καθεύδων, καὶ ἀνάστα ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, καὶ ἐπιφαύσει σοι ὁ Χριστός. The difficulty of assigning this quotation to any passage in the Old Test. has been felt by all interpreters,  and various theories have been proposed for the sake of removing it. The most probable, however, seems that which regards these words as formed upon Isa 60:1-3, and the passage as rather hinted at than quoted. Comp. also Heb 13:15 with Hos 14:2. To this head may be also referred Joh 7:38, where no particular passage is quoted, but such passages as Isa 44:3; Isa 4:1; Isa 8:11; Zec 14:8; Zec 13:1, are alluded to.

In the quotations of all kinds from the Old Test. in the New we find a continual variation from the letter of the older Scriptures. To this variation four causes may be specified as having contributed:

First. All the New-Test. writers quoted from the Sept. — correcting it, indeed, more or less, by the Hebrew, especially when it was needful for their purpose; occasionally deserting it altogether; still abiding by it to so large an extent as to show that it was the primary source whence their quotations were drawn. Their use of it may be best illustrated by the corresponding use of our liturgical version of the Psalms-a use founded on love as well as on habit, but which, nevertheless, we forego when it becomes important that we should follow the more accurate rendering. Consequently, when the errors involved in the Sept. version do not interfere with the purpose which the New-Test. writer had in view, they are frequently allowed to remain in his quotation (see Mat 15:9 [a record of our Lord's words]; Luk 4:18; Act 13:41; Act 15:17; Rom 15:10; 2Co 4:13; Heb 8:9; Heb 10:5; Heb 11:21). The current of apostolic thought, too, is frequently dictated by words of the Sept., which differ much from the Hebrew (see Rom 2:24; 1Co 15:55; 2Co 9:7; Heb 13:15). Or even an absolute interpolation of the Sept. is quoted (Heb 1:6 [Deu 32:43]). On the other hand, in Mat 21:5; 1Co 3:19, the Sept. is corrected by the Hebrew; so, too, in Mat 9:13; Luk 22:37, there is an effort to preserve an expressiveness of the Hebrew which the Sept. had lost: and in Mat 4:15-16; Joh 19:37; 1Co 15:54, the Sept. disappears altogether. In Rom 9:33 we have a quotation from the Sept. combined with another from the Hebrew. In Mar 12:30; Luk 10:27; Rom 12:19, the Sept. and Hebrew are superadded the one upon the other. In the Epistle to the Hebrews, which in this respect stands alone, the Sept. is uniformly followed; except in the one remarkable quotation (Heb 10:30), which, according neither with the Hebrew  nor the Sept., was probably derived from the last-named passage (Rom 12:19), wherewith it exactly coincides. The quotation in 1Co 2:9 seems to have been derived, not directly from the Old Test., but rather from a Christian liturgy or other document into which the language of Isa 64:4 had been transferred.

Secondly. The New-Test. writers must have frequently quoted from memory. The Old Test. had been deeply instilled into their minds, ready for service whenever needed; and the fulfilment of its predictions, which they witnessed, made its utterances rise up in life before them (comp. Joh 2:17; Joh 2:22). It was of the very essence of such a living use of Old-Test. Scripture that their quotations of it should not of necessity be verbally exact.

Thirdly. Combined with this there was an alteration of conscious or unconscious design. Sometimes the object of this was to obtain increased force; hence the variation from the original in the form of the divine oath (Rom 14:11); or the result “I quake” substituted for the cause (Heb 12:21); or the insertion of rhetorical words to bring out the emphasis (Heb 12:26); or the change of person to show that what men perpetrated had its root in God's determinate counsel (Mat 26:31). Sometimes an Old-Test. passage is abridged, and in the abridgment so adjusted, by a little alteration, as to present an aspect of completeness and yet omit what is foreign to the immediate purpose (Act 1:20; 1Co 1:31). At other times a passage is enlarged by the incorporation of a passage from another source. Thus in Luk 4:18-19, although the contents are professedly those read by our Lord from Isaiah 61, we have the words “to set at liberty them that are bruised,” introduced from Isa 58:6 (Sept.); similarly in Rom 11:8, Deu 29:4 is combined with Isa 29:10. In some cases still greater liberty of alteration is assumed. In Rom 10:11 the word πᾶς is introduced into Isa 28:16, to show that that is uttered of Jew and Gentile alike. In Rom 11:26-27, the “to Zion” of Isa 59:20 (Sept. ἕνεκεν Σιών) is replaced by “out of Sion” (suggested by Isa 2:3); to Zion the Redeemer had already come; from Zion, the Christian Church, his law was to go forth; or even from the literal Jerusalem (comp. Luk 24:47; Rom 15:19), for till she was destroyed the type was still in a measure kept up. In Mat 8:17 the words of Isa 53:4 are adapted to the divine removal of disease, the outward token and witness of that sin which Christ was eventually to remove by his death, thereby  fulfilling the prophecy more completely. For other, though less striking, instances of variation see 1Co 14:21; 1Pe 3:15. In some places, again, the actual words of the original are taken up, but employed with a new meaning; thus the ἐρχόμενος, which in Hab 2:3 merely qualified the verb, is in Heb 10:37 made the subject to it.

Fourthly. Still more remarkable than any alteration in the quotation itself is the circumstance that in Mat 27:9 Jeremiah should be named as the author of a prophecy really delivered by Zechariah; the reason being, as has been well shown by Hengstenberg in his Christology, that the prophecy is based upon that in Jer 18:19 :and that without a reference to this original source the most essential features of the fulfilment of Zechariah's prophecy would be misunderstood. The case is, indeed, not entirely unique; for in the Greek of Mar 1:2-3, where Malachi 3, 1 is combined with Isa 40:3, the name of Isaiah alone is mentioned; it was on his prophecy that that of Malachi partly depended. On the other hand, in Mat 2:23; Joh 6:45, the comprehensive mention of the prophets indicates a reference not only to the passages more particularly contemplated, Isa 11:1; liv, 13, but also to the general tenor of what had been elsewhere prophetically uttered. SEE NAZARENE.

On Joh 7:38 it may suffice here to remark that perhaps the best solution of the difficulty is to regard our Lord as not making any direct quotation from any part of the Old Test., but as only referring in metaphorical language, suited to the strain of his previous address (comp. Joh 7:37), to a fact which in plainer style is unquestionably announced in the ancient prophecies, viz. the abundant possession of divine knowledge by those who should live under the Messiah's reign. The passage Jam 4:5 is beset with difficulty. Not only is there doubt as to what” Scripture” is cited, but much obscurity hangs over the meaning of the words themselves so adduced. We cannot enter into the details of the investigation. Referring for these to Huther's note on the passage in Meyer's Commentar, pt. 15, the substance of which is given by dean Alford in his notes, we content ourselves here with saving that some interpreters understand πνευμα of the human spirit, and translate, “the spirit [temper, feeling of mind] which dwells in us lusts to envy [covetousness];” while others understand it of the Holy Spirit, or the Spirit implanted in the soul by God, and translate, either, “The Spirit which dwelleth in us lusts [desires, inclines] against envy;” or, “The Spirit which he [God] hath placed in us jealously desireth [us for himself].” In neither case can the statement be referred to any single passage in the Old  Test.; but if the last rendering be adopted, the writer may be supposed to refer generally to those parts of the Old Test. in which God is represented as dwelling in his people (Num 35:34; Eze 36:27), and as desiring them with a jealous affection (Deu 32:10 sq.). This is far from satisfactory, but it seems the best solution that has been offered.

2. Mode in which Quotations from the Old Test. in the New Test. are introduced. — For this purpose certain formulhe are employed, of which the following is a list: Καθώς or Οὑτω γέγραπται, Πῶς γέγραπται, ῎Εστι γεγραμμένον, ῾Ο λόγος ὁ γέγραμμένος, Κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον, Ε᾿ῤῥέθη, Καθώς εἴρηται, Κατὰ τὸ είρήμενον, ᾿Ηγραφὴ εῖπε or λέγει, or simply Λέγει (sup. Θεός vel. προφήτης), Περιέχει ἐν τῇ γραφῇ, ῾Ο νόμος ἔλεγεν, Εἴρηκε δέ τις, Βλέπετε τὸ είεημένον, Οὐδέποτε ἀνέγνωτε, Καθὼς ἐλάλησε, Τότε ἐπληρώθη ἡ γραφή, ῞Ινα (ὅπως) πληρωθῇ (τελειωθῇ) τὸ ῥηθέν (ἡ γραφή). Surenhusius is of opinion, and labors to prove, that by attending to the force of these different formulee we may ascertain with what intent the waords they respectively introduce are quoted, as each formula, he asserts, involves a different meaning (Proef: in Bib. Catall.). A fatal objection, however, to this opinion is that we find the very same quotations, expressed in the same words and brought to prove the very same points, introduced by different formulae in different Gospels (Horne, Intr od. ii, 339). At the same time, there are obviously two classes of these formulae, the difference between which is distinctly marked by the circumstance that, while some of them merely express the fact that what follows is a quotation, others of them intimate the existence of a material relation between the passage quoted and the subject of which the writer quoting it is treating. Thus, when it is simply said, “The Scripture saith,” nothing more is necessarily implied than that what follows is taken from the Old Test.; but when it is said, “Then was the Scripture fulfilled which saith,” or “This was done that the Scriptures might be fulfilled,” we immediately perceive that the writer would intimate a real connection of some sort between the event he is recording and the statement with which he compares it in the passage quoted. We may therefore so far adopt the hypothesis of Surenhusius as to admit a distinction between these two classes, and expect to find in the passages introduced by the latter of them something more than a mere verbal quotation. SEE FULFIL.

Besides the quotations introduced by these formulae there are a considerable number scattered through the writings of the apostles which  are inserted in the trair of their own remarks without any announcement whatever of their being cited from others. To the cursory reader the passages thus quoted appear to form a part of the apostle's own words. and it is only by intimate acquaintance with the Old-Test. Scriptures, and a careful comparison of these with those of the New Test.. that the fact of their being quotations can be detected. In the common version every trace of quotation is in many of these passages lost, from the circumstance that the writer has closely followed the Sept., while our version of the Old Test. is made from the Hebrew. Thus for instance, in 2Co 8:21, Paul says, προνοούμενοι καλὰ οὐ μόνον ἐνώπιον Κυρίου, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐνωπιον ἀνθρώπων, which, with a change in the mood of the verb, is a verbatim citation of the Sept. version of Pro 3:4. Hardly any trace of this, however, appears in the common version, where the one passage reads, Providing for honest things not only in the sight of the Lord. but also in the sight of men;” and the other, “So shalt thou find favor and good understanding in the sight of God and man.” So, also, in 1Pe 4:18, the apostle quotes word for word from the Sept. version of Pro 11:31 the clause εἰ ὁ δίκαιος μόλις σώζεται, ὁ ἀσενὴς καὶ ἁμαρτωλὸς ποῦ φανεῖαι a quotation which we should in vain endeavor to trace in the common version of the Proverbs, where the passage in question is rendered, “Behold, the righteous shall be recompensed in the earth; much more the wicked and the sinner.” Such quotations evidently show how much the minds of the New-Test. writers were imbued with the sentiments and expressions of the Old Test. as exhibited in the Alexandrine version.

3. Purposes for which these Quotations are introduced. — These, as appears from an examination of the passages, are as follows:

(1.) For the explanation or proof of some doctrinal position. Thus Paul, for the sake of explaining and confirming his doctrine of the efficacy of faith, quotes repeatedly from Hab 2:4 the sentence “The just shall live by faith.” So, also, in order to prove that mere natural descent from Abraham did not of itself entitle any one to the divine favor, the same apostle quotes the terms of God's promise to Abraham, in which he expressly declares that in Isaac alone, of all Abraham's family, was the seed of Abraham — i.e. the spiritual Israel — to be called or chosen. Comp. also Rom 4:7-8; Rom 9:12-13; Rom 9:15; Rom 9:17; Rom 9:20-21; Rom 12:19-20; Rom 14:10-11, etc. It is to be observed that the passages thus adduced are almost always found in writings addressed to Jews, and are therefore to be regarded as  containing argumenta e concessis. They are always applied, if not in the words, at least in the sense, of the original from which they are taken.

(2.) For the purpose of pointing out the application of the passage quoted to some statement or description in the context into which it is introduced. From the circumstance that several of the passages thus adduced are, in the phraseology of the New Test., as well as in that of the Rabbinical writings, said to be “fulfilled,” it has been hastily inferred by some that they are all to be regarded as designed prophecies of the events to which they are applied. For this opinion, however, no adequate support seems to be afforded by the phrase in question. The general idea attached to the verb πληρόω is that of filling up to its full capacity anything of which it is predicated. Thus the Jews are said by Christ to have filled up the measure (πληρώσατε τὸ μέτρον) of their fathers (Mat 23:32). The phrase in question consequently is susceptible of application to whatever is thought of as supplying the complement of any given capacity, and that whether it is used in a literal or tropical sense. Hence it is appropriately used in the New Test. with respect to passages quoted from the Old Test. in the following cases:

First. When it announces the accomplishment of a a prophecy contained in the words quoted. As the prediction is a mere empty declaration, as it were, until the fact predicted has occurred; so that fact, by giving meanting and force to the prediction, is viewed as its complement or filling up. Thus, the New-Test. writers, in recording the facts of our Lord's history, when they come to any which formed the subject of ancient prophecy, whether explicit or typical, direct the attention of their readers to the circumstance by adducing the prediction and intimating its fulfilment in the fact they have recorded.

Secondly. When it introduces some description or statement which affords a parallel to what the writer has been saying. Such a description being regarded as involving a fact of general applicability to the human race, or to certain portions of it, is thought of as being, so to speak. in a state of deficiency until the measure of its applicability has been filled up. Each new case, therefore, which affords a parallel to that to which the description was originally applied goes so far to supply this deficiency by affording another instance in which the description holds; and hence the New-Test. writers are in the habit of quoting such descriptions as having been fulfilled in the cases to which they are applied by them. Thus a passage from the  prophecies of Jeremiah, in which a description is given of the desolation caused by the divine judgments upon the Jews, under the beautiful personification of Rachel rising from the dead looking in vain for her children, and refusing to be comforted because they are not, is adduced by Mat 2:17-18 as fulfilled in the sorrow which was produced by the massacre of the babes in Bethlehem by order of Herod. No person who studies the context of the passage as it occurs in the Old Test. can suppose for a moment that it contains a prediction of the cruelties which were perpetrated on the occasion related by the evangelist. The sole purport of the quotation seems to be to intimate, as bishop Kidder remarks, that “such another scene of sorrow appeared then (upon the murder of the innocents) as was that which Jeremy mentions upon another sad occasion” (Demonstration of the Messias, pt. ii, p. 215). See, also, Sykes, Essay on the Truth of the Christian Religion, etc., p. 217, 218; Blaney, ad loc.; Henderson, ad loc., and On Hos. ii, 1; De Wette, On Mat 2:17-18; and Marsh's Notes to Michcelis, i, 473. Comp. Mat 15:7-8, with Isa 29:13; Mat 13:14 with Act 28:25 and Isa 6:9, etc.

It appears, then, that even when a quotation is introduced by a part of the verb πληρόω, it does not necessarily follow that it is to be regarded as containing a prophecy. This is true as well of the conditional formula ἵνα (ὅπως) πληρωθῆ, as of the more direct τότε ἐπληρώθη , for these particles, as used in the New Test., frequently express nothing more than that occasion is given for a particular action or remark.

Besides the passages introduced as fulfilled, there are others referable to the same general head, which are introduced by others of the formulae above mentioned. Of these, some belong to both the classes just described — prophecies of which the New Test. announces the fulfilment, and general descriptions to which something parallel is brought forward. Another class consists of moral and religious maxims, which are adduced as applicable to the state of things of which the writer or speaker is discoursing, and which. though not said to be fulfilled thereby, are quoted under essentially the sanme idea. Such sentences embody, as it were, certain laws of human nature and conduct, certain general facts in the human economy, of which we are to expect the verification wherever the necessary conditions are exemplified. Like the laws of physical science, therefore, they are dependent for their verification upon the examination of the phenomena appropriate to that region to which they belong; and as no  law of science can be said to lie absolutely beyond the possibility of refutation until every one of the phenomena which it embraces has been examined and been found to support it, every experiment or occurrence that favors it mav be said to fill up what is wanting to its perfect and undeniable certainty. Hence the New-Test. writers, in recording events or describing characters which accord with and so exemplify the truth of the moral maxims of the Old Test., speak of these as if they had contained actual pre-intimations of the occurrence to which thev are applied. They contain, in fact, the norm, or rule, according to which the matter in question has occurred.

The usage of the New-Test. writers in the cases we have been considering is illustrated by that of the Rabbinical writers in their quotations from the Old Test., as Surenhusius has largely shown in his work upon this subject (Βίβλος Καταλλαῆς, etc., lib. i; see, also, Wihiner, Antiquitates Hebroeorum, i, 527 sq.). Instances have also been adduced of a similar usage by the classical and ecclesiastical writers. Tlhus, iElian introduces Diogenes Sinopensis as saying that “he fulfilled and endured the curses out of the tragedy” (ὅτι αὐτὸς ἐκπλήροι καὶ ὑπομέυει τὰς ἐκ τῆς τραγωδίας ἀράς). Olympiodorus says of Plato that “a swarm of bees made honey on his lips, that it might become true concerning him, ‘And from his tonlgue flowed a strain sweeter than honey,”' which is what Homer says of Nestor. Epiphanius says of Ebion, “But in him is fulfilled that which is written; I had nearly been in all mischief, between the Church and the Synagogue” (ἀλλ᾿ ἐν αὐτῷ πληροῦται τὸ γεγραμμένον, κ. τ. λ. Hoeresis Ebion. c. i]). So, also, the Latin implere is used by Jerome: “Coeterum Socraticum illud i nmpletur in nobis, Hoc tantullumm scio, quod nescio” (Ep. 103 ad Paulin.). Comp. Clem. Rom. Ephesians 1 ad Cor. sec. 3.

Thirdly. The New-Test. writers make quotations from the Old, for the purpose of clothing their own ideas in language already familiar to their readers, or attractive from its beauty, force, or dignity. The writings of the Old Test. were the great classics of the Jewish nation, venerable at once for their literary value and their divine authority. In these the youth of Judaea were carefully instructed from their earliest years, and with their words all their religious thoughlts and feelings were identified. Hence it was natural, and nearly unavoidable, that in discoursing of religious subjects they should express their thoughts in language borrowed from the books which had formed the almost exclusive objects of their study. Such quotations are  made for merely literary purposes — for ornament of style, for vigor of expression, for felicity of allusion, or for impressiveness of statement. The passages thus incorporated with the writer's own thoughts and words are not appealed to as proving what he says or as applying to any circumstance to which he refers; their sole use appears to be to express in appropriate language his own thoughts. Thus when Paul, after dissuading the Roman Christians from the indulgence of vindictiveness, adds, in the words of Solomon (Pro 25:21-22), “Therefore, if thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink, for in so doing thou shalt heap coals of fire upon his head,” the quotation evidently serves no other purpose than to express, in language of an appropriate and impressive kind, the duty which the apostle would enjoin, and which would have been equally intelligible and equally binding if expressed in his own words as when uttered in those of the inspired author of the Proverbs. On what other principle, moreover, are we to account for the quotation made by Paul, in Rom 10:18, from the 19th Psalm, where, in speaking of the diffusion of the Gospel among the Jews, he says, “But I say, have they not heard? Yes. verily, their sound went into all the earth, and their words into the end of the world” — a passage originally applied by the Psalmist to the heavenly bodies? To insist upon regarding this as a prediction of the diffusion of the Gospel, or as furnishing even a parallel to it, is surely to sacrifice reason and common- sense to prejudice or some favorite theory.

It has appeared to some that the hypothesis of an accomodation of words originally used of one thing to designate another is inconsistent with due reverence to the divine Word. But wherein does the alleged irreverence of such a practice lie? To employ the words of Scripture to express low and unworthy ideas, or for the sake of giving point to mere worldly reasonings, is to use them irreverently; but to use them to convey ideas as elevated as those originally attached to them, if not more so (which is the case, e.g., in Rom 10:18), has but little appearance of treating them with irreverence. The only ground on which such a charge could be maintained is, that words once employed by an inspired writer in a peculiar combination become thenceforward sacred to the expression in that combination of the one idea they were first used to designate, whatever others they may be susceptible of expressing. But who is there that could seriously attempt to defend such a position as this? If this were the case, every quotation not made expressly as authority would be liable to censure; and, as the number of such in the New Test. is indisputably considerable,  hardly any of its writers would stand clear of blame. SEE ACCOMMODATION.

The truth is, the practice of making use, in this way, of previous and popular writers is one which was common not only in the days of the apostles, but which can hardly fail to be common wherever an established national literature exists. In proof of this we have only to examine the writings of the later classics of Greece and Rome, which abound in quotations direct and accommodated from their earlier authors. We see the same course pursued by the Rabbinical writers towards the Old Test. and by the Christian fathers towards both the Old Test. and the New Test., as well as towards the profane classics. Indeed, such quotations form so apt and natural an ornament of style that writers of all ages and countries, where the means of doing so exist, have availed themselves of it. Why. then, should we wonder that such a practice should have been followed by the sacred writers, who, in other respects, appear to have obeyed in the preparation of their works the ordinary rules and usages, both grammatical and rhetorical, of literary composition?

Literature. — Surenhusius, Βίβλος Καταλλαγῆς, in quo secundusn Vet. Theol. Hebrceorum Formulas allegandi et Modos interpretandi conciliantur Loca ex V. in N.T. allegata (Amst. 1713, 4to); Drusius, Parallela Sacra: h. e. Locorum V. 7'. cum iis quce in r. citantur conjuncta Connmemoratio, Ebraice et Greece, cum Notis (1616, 4to; published also in vol. viii of the Critici Sacri); Hoffmann, Demonstratio Evangnelica per ipsum Scriptur/arumn Consensum ex Oraculis V. T. in N. allegatis declanrafa, edidit T. G. Ie.elmnaier (1773-79-81, 3 vols. 4to); Michaelis, Einleitung in die gqttlichen Schriften des N. B. Erster Theil, p. 223-265 (Eng. transl. by Marsh, i, 200246); Owen, Modes of Quotation used by the Evangelical Writers Explained and Vindicated (1789, 4to); Randolph, Prophecies and other Texts cited in the New Test. compared with the Iebrew Original and with the Sept. Version (1782, 4to); Koppe, Excursus I inl Ep. ad Ronanos, N.T. Koppianum (1806), 4:346; Horme, Introduction, ii, 281 (8th ed.); Davidson, Hermeneutics, ch. xi; Gough, New Test. Quotations Collated with the Ol Test. (Lond. 1853); Alexander, Connection and Harmony of the Old and New Test. (ibid. 1853, 2d ed.); Stier, Words of the Lord Jesus (Amer. ed.), i, 432 sq.

## Quotidian[[@Headword:Quotidian]]

             (secta chori), payment for duties performed in choir and personal attendance at divine service. The praesentiarius paid it in foreign cathedrals.

## Quotidiana Oratio[[@Headword:Quotidiana Oratio]]

             (daily prayer) is the name sometimes applied to the Lord's Prayer on account of its daily use by Christians. SEE LORDS PRAYER.

## Qwanti[[@Headword:Qwanti]]

             the god of war among the Chinese. Magnificent processions are held in honor of this deity.Gardner, Faiths of the World, s.v.