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## MKown, J. Le Grange, D.D[[@Headword:MKown, J. Le Grange, D.D]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Guilderland, N.Y., August 13, 1824. He was of Scotch-Irish descent, and reared in the Reformed Church, but at the age of fourteen united with the Methodists. At seventeen he  entered Troy Conference Academy, and later graduated from Wesleyan University, Middletown, Connecticut, in 1849. He was admitted to the Oneida Conference the same year, but ill-health soon obliged him to retire from regular pastoral work, though not from active duty. For eight years he gave his energies to the education of youth, during which time he was professor of Newark Wesleyan Seminary, president of Richmondville Union Seminary, of Cooperstown Seminary, and of Pittsburgh High School. His health improving, in 1858 he was stationed at Union Chapel, Cincinnati. Thence he was transferred to the New York Conference in 1859, and appointed in turn to Trinity Church, New York city; Washington Street, Poughkeepsie; St. James's Church, Kingston; and St. James's Church, New York city. In 1867 he was stationed in the city of Dubuque, and in 1868 at Union Chapel, Cincinnati, Ohio. His subsequent fields of labor were president of Albion-College, Michigan, 1871; pastor of Third Street Church, Rockford, Illinois; Wabash Avenue and Ada Street churches, Chicago; Hedding Church, Jersey City, N.J.; Roseville; and in 1878 he was appointed to Milton-on-the-Hudson, New York Conference, but died before entering upon his work, in Roseville, May 2, 1879. He was refined, amiable, studious, and thorough. He excelled as a pastor. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1880, page 45.

## Maacah[[@Headword:Maacah]]

             (Heb. Maikah', מִעֲכָה, oppression, Sept. Μααχά, but in Gen 22:24, Μοχά; in 1Ch 2:48; 1Ch 3:3. Μωχά; in 1Ch 7:15-16, Μοοχά; in 1Ch 9:35, Μοωχά; in 1Ch 11:43, Μαχά; Vulg. Maacha; Auth. Vers. "Maacah" only 2Sa 3:3; 2Sa 10:6; 2Sa 10:8), the name of a place and also of nine persons. SEE BETH- MAACHAH.

1. A city and region at the foot of Mount Hermon, not far from Geshur, a district of Syria (Jos 13:13; 2Sa 10:6; 2Sa 10:8; 1Ch 19:7). Hence the adjacent portion of Syria is called Aram-Maacah, or Syria of Maachah ("Syria-Maachah," 1Ch 19:6). It appears to have been situated at the southerly junction of Coele-Syria and Damascene- Syria, being bounded by the kingdom of Rehob on the north, by that of Geshur on the south, and by the mountains on either side of the Upper Jordan, on the east and west. SEE GESHUR.

The little kingdom thus embraced the southern and eastern declivities of Hermon, and a portion of the rocky plateau of Itursea (Porter's Damascus, 1:319; comp. Journ. of Sac. Lit. July 1854, page 310). The Israelites seem to have considered this territory as included in their grant, but were never able to get possession of it (Jos 13:13). In the time of David this petty principality had a king of its own, who contributed 1000 men to the grand alliance of the Syrian nations against the Jewish monarch (2Sa 10:6; 2Sa 10:8). The lot of the half-tribe of Manasseh beyond the Jordan extended to this country, as had previously the dominion of Og, king of Bashan (Deu 3:14; Jos 12:5). The Gentile nameis Maacahthite (מִעֲכָתַי, Sept. Μαχαθί, but Μααχαθί in 2Sa 23:24, Μαχαθά in 1Ch 4:19, Μιοχαθεί in Jer 40:8; Auth. Version "Maacathite," but "Maachathi" in Deu 3:14), which is also put for the people (Deu 3:14; Jos 12:5; Jos 13:11; Jos 13:13; 2Ki 25:23). Near or within the ancient limits of the small state of Maacah was the town called for that reason Abbel beth-maacah, perhaps its metropolis, which is represented by the modern Abil el-Kamh, situated on the west side of the  valley and stream that descends from Merj Ayun towards the Huleh, and on a summit, with a large offset on the south. SEE ABELN-BETH MAACHAH.

Rosenmüller explains the name Maacah to press, to press together, which seems to denote a region enclosed and hemmed in by mountains, a land of valleys. The name of this region is Anglicized everywhere "Maachah" in the Auth. Vers., except in 2Sa 3:3; 2Sa 10:6; 2Sa 10:8. Once (Jos 13:13, second clause) it is written in the original Maacath (Hebrew Maakath', מִעֲכָת, Sept. Μαχαθί,Vulg. Maachati, Auth. Vers. "Maachathites"). The identification of the Chaldee version with the district of Epicairus (Ε᾿πικαιρος), mentioned by Ptolemy (5:16, 9) as lying between Callirrhoe and Livias, as also that of the Syriac (on 1 Chronicles) with Charan, according to Rosenmüller (Altelth. 1. 2) a tract in the district of the Ledja (Burckhardt, 1:350), is merely traditionary (Reland, Palest. p. 118).

2. The last named of the four children of Nahor by his concubine Reumah, probably a son, although the sex is uncertain (Gen 22:24). B.C. cir. 2040. Ewald arbitrarily connects the name with the district of Maachah in the Hermon range (Gesch. 1:414, note 1).

3. The sister of Hupham (Huppim) and Shupham (Shuppim), and consequently granddaughter of Benjamin; she married Machir, by whom she had two sons (1Ch 7:15-16). B.C. post. 1856. SEE GILEAD.

4. The second named of the concubines of Caleb (son of Hezron), by whom she had several children (1Ch 2:48). B.C. ante 1658.

5. The wife of Jehiel and mother of Gibeon (1Ch 8:29; 1Ch 9:35). B.C. cir. 1658.

6. A daughter of Talmai, king of Geshur; she became the wife of David, and mother of Absalom (2Sa 3:3). B.C. 1053. In 1Sa 27:8, we read of David's invading the land of the Geshurites, and the Jewish commentators (in Jerome, ad Reg.) allege that he then took the daughter of the king captive, and, in consequence of her great beauty, married her, after she had been made a proselyte according to the law in Deuteronomy 21. But this is a gross mistake. for the Geshur invaded by David was to the south of Judah, whereas the Geshur over which Talmai ruled was to the north, and was regarded as part of Syria (2Sa 15:8). SEE GESIHUI.

The fact appears to be that David, having married  the daughter of this king, contracted an alliance with him, in order to strengthen his interest against Ishbosheth in those parts. Josephus gives her name Μαχάμη (Ant. 7:1, 4). SEE DAVID.

7. The father of Hanan, which latter was one of David's famous body- guard (1Ch 11:43). B.C. ante 1046.

8. The father of Shephatiah, which latter was the military chief of the tribe of Simeon under David and Solomon (1Ch 27:16). B.C. ante 1014.

9. The father of Achish, which latter was the king of Gath, to whom Shimei went in search of his runaway servants, and thus forfeited, his life by transcending the bounds prescribed by Solomon (1Ki 2:39). B.C. ante 1010. He appears to have been different from the Maoch of 1Sa 27:2. SEE ACHISH.

10. A daughter of Abishalom, the wife of Rehoboam, and mother of Abijam (1Ki 15:2). B.C. 973-953. In 1Ki 15:10 we read that Asa's "mother's name was Maachah, the daughter of Abishalom." It is evident that here "mother" is used in a loose sense, and means "grandmother," which the Maachah named in 1Ki 15:2 must have been to the Asa of 1Ki 15:10. It therefore appears to be a great error to make two persons of them, as is done by Calmet and others. The Abishalom who was the father of this Maachah is called Absalom in 2Ch 11:20-22, and is generally supposed by the Jews to have been Absalom, the son of David; which seems not improbable, seeing that Rehoboam's two other wives were of his father's family (2Ch 11:18). In 2Ch 13:2, she is called "Michaiah, the daughter of Uriel of Gibeah." But Josephus says that she was the daughter of Tamar, the daughter of Absalom (Ant. 8:10, 1), and consequently his granddaughter. This seems not unlikely, and in that case this Tamar must have been the wife of Uriel. SEE ABIJAI.

It would appear that Asa's own mother was dead before he began to reign; for Maachah bore the rank and state of queen-mother (resembling that of the sultaness Valide among the Turks), the powers of which she so much abused to the encouragement of idolatry, that Asa commenced his reforms by "removing her from being queen, because she had made an idol (lit. a fright) in a grove" (1Ki 15:10-13; 2Ch 15:16).

## Maacath[[@Headword:Maacath]]

             SEE MAACAH, 1.

## Maachah[[@Headword:Maachah]]

             (Gen 22:24; 1Ki 2:39; 1Ki 15:2; 1Ki 15:10; 1Ki 15:13; 1Ch 2:48; 1Ch 3:2; 1Ch 7:15-16; 1Ch 8:29; 1Ch 9:35; 1Ch 11:43; 1Ch 19:6-7; 1Ch 27:16; 2Ch 11:20-22; 2Ch 15:16). SEE MAACAH.

## Maachathi[[@Headword:Maachathi]]

             (Deu 3:14),

## Maachathites[[@Headword:Maachathites]]

             (Jos 12:5; Jos 13:11; Jos 13:13 [in the second occurrence it should be Maacath]; 2Sa 23:34; 2Ki 25:23; 1Ch 4:19; Jer 40:8). SEE MAACAH, 1.

## Maadai[[@Headword:Maadai]]

             (Heb. Maaday', מִעֲדִי, ornamental; Sept. Μοοδία), one of the "sons" of Bani who divorced his Gentile wife after the exile (Ezr 10:34). B.C. 459.

## Maai[[@Headword:Maai]]

             (Heb. Maay', מָעִי, perhaps compassionate Sept. has two names, Ι᾿αμά, Α᾿ϊvα, the first syllable of the former being apparently taken from the last of the preceding name Gilalai; Vulg. Maai), one of the priests appointed to  perform the music at the celebration of the completion of the walls of Jerusalem after the captivity (Neh 12:36). B.C. 446.

## Maaidiah[[@Headword:Maaidiah]]

             (Heb. Maadyah', מִעִדְיָה, ornament of Jehovah; Septuag. Μααδι῎αςα,Vulg. Madia), one of the priests who returned to Jerusalem with Zerubbabel (Neh 12:5); evidently the same with the MOADIAH (Heb. Moady'ah', מוֹעִדְיָה, festival of Jehovah; Sept. Μααδαί Vulg. Moadia), whose son Piltai is mentioned in Neh 12:17 (where some connection with one Miniamin is obscurely noted); the true pointing being perhaps מֹעִדְיָה, Moadyah', which will make both forms coincide. B.C. 536.

## Maaini[[@Headword:Maaini]]

             (Μαανί v.r. Βαανί), the ancestor of several who had married Gentile wives after the captivity (1Es 9:34); evidently the BANI SEE BANI (q.v.) of the Heb. list (Ezr 10:38).

## Maaleh-acrabbim[[@Headword:Maaleh-acrabbim]]

             (Heb. Maaleh'-Akrabbim', מִעֲלֵה עִקְרִבַּים, the ascent of the scorpions, i.q. scorpion-hill; in Num 34:4, Septuag. (ἀνάβασις Α᾿κραβείν, Auth. Vers. "the ascent of Akrabbim;" in Jos 15:3, προσανάβασις Α᾿κραβίν; in Jdg 1:36, ἀνάβασις Α᾿κραβίν, "the going up to Akrabbimn;" Vulg. everywhere ascensus scorpionis), a pass on the south- eastern border of Palestine. SEE AKRABBIAI.

## Maaleh-adummim[[@Headword:Maaleh-adummim]]

             (Heb. Micaleh'-Adummirm', מִעֲלֵה אֲדֻמַּים, ascent of Adummim; Sept. ἀνάβασις [also πρόσβασις and προσανάβασις] Α᾿κραβίν, Vulg. ascensio Adommim, Auth. Vers. "the going up of Adummim"), a dangerous pass near Gilgal (Jos 15:7; Jos 18:17). SEE ADUMMIM.

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

             a French historian and theologian, was born at Mans near the opening of the 17th century; was prebend of Tours in 1648; official and grand-vicar to the archbishop of Tours in 1651, and died about 1667. His works are Antiqui Casus reservati in dicecesi Turonensi (1648, 4to), written by order of the bishop of Tours: — Sanctas et Metropolitana Ecclesia Turonensis, sacrorumpontificun suorum ornata virtutibus, etc. (1667). See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Maarath[[@Headword:Maarath]]

             (Heb. Maarath', מִעֲרָת, desolation; Sept. Μααρώθ, Vulg. Mareth), a place in the mountains of Judah, mentioned between Gedor and Beth-anoth (Jos 15:59). De Saulcy suggests a place which he calls Kharbet el- Merassas, south-east of Jerusalem (Narrative, 2:17); and Schwarz declares it is a village called Magr, west of Ekron (Palest. page 107): both far from  the indications of the text, which require a locality north of Hebron (Keil's Comment. ad loc.). It may be represented by the ruins marked as Mersia on Van de Velde's Map (1858), on the road room Hebron to Bethlehem, about half way between Bereikut and Solomon's Pools, at Urtas; but on the second edition of his Map (1865) this place disappears, and we have in the required region unappropriated only the ruins Merina, on a little stream just north of Kufin, evidently the "ruined tower called Merrina, seen by him on the high ground south of wady Arub" (Memoir, page 247).

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

             For this site Mr. Tyrwhitt Drake proposes (Quar. Statement of the "Pal. Explor. Fund," April 1874, page 76) the Mons Mardes where St. Euthymius found ruins (Acta Sanctorum, 2:306), now Khirbet Mird, near Mar Saba, on a round, isolated hill, containing the remains of an aqueduct, wells, and cisterns (Memoirs to the Ordnance Survey, 3:212); but Lieut. Conder suggests (Quar. Statement, January 1875, page 13) an ancient site near Beit Ainum, where a valley has the corresponding Arabic name, Wady el-Moghair. This latter ruin is laid down on the Ordnance Map, two miles north-east of Hebron, without any name attached. Later, however, Lieut. Conder suggests (Tent Work, 2:338) Beit Ummar, six miles north of Hebron, probably the Betumair of Eusebius (Onomast. s.v. Baalthamar). It is "a small but conspicuous village, standing on the watershed, and visible from some distance on the north. An ancient road passes through it. Halfa mile north-east is a good spring, Ain Kufin. The mosque has a small tower to it. The surrounding neighborhood is covered with brushwood" (Memoirs to Ordnance Survey, 3:303).

## Maaseiah[[@Headword:Maaseiah]]

             (Heb. Maaseyah', מִעֲשֵׂיָה, or [1Ch 15:18; 1Ch 15:20; 1Ch 23:1; 2Ch 25:11; 2Ch 28:7; 2Ch 34:8; Jer 25:4], Maaseya'hu, מִעֲשֵׂיָהוּ, the work of Jehovah; Sept. Μαασία, with many slight various readings), the name of several men.

1. One of the Levites of the second class, appointed porters of the Temple under David (1Ch 15:18), and also musicians "with psalteries upon Alamoth" (1Ch 15:20). B.C. 1043.

2. The son of Adaiah, and one of the "captains of hundreds" whom Jehoiada associated with himself in restoring the young king Jehoash to the throne (2Ch 23:1). B.C. 877.

3. A chieftain in the time of Uzziah, who had charge of the military in a subordinate rank (2Ch 26:11). B.C. 808.

4. The "king's son," killed by Zichri, the Ephraimitish hero, in the invasion of Judah by Pekah, king of Israel, during the reign of Ahaz (2Ch 28:7). The personage thus designated is twice mentioned in connection with the "governor of the city" (1Ki 22:26; 2Ch 18:25), and appears to have held an office of importance at the Jewish court (perhaps acting as viceroy during the absence of the king), just as the queen dowager was honored with the title of "king's mother" (compare 2Ki 24:12 with Jer 29:2), or gebirah, 1. "mistress," or "powerful lady." SEE MALCHIAH. For the conjecture of Geiger, SEE JOASH, 4. Perhaps, however, the individual here referred to was literally one of the sons of Ahaz. B.C. cir. 738.

5. The "governor of the city," one of those sent by king Josiah to repair the Temple (2Ch 34:8). B.C. 623. The date and rank render it not  improbable that he was the Maaseiah (Heb. Machseyah', מִחְֵֹסיָה, whose refuge is Jehovah; Sept. Μαασααίς v.r. Μασσααίς, etc.), the father of Neriah, and grandfather of Baruch and Seraiah, which latter were two persons of note to whom Jeremiah had recourse in his divine communications (Jer 32:12; Jer 51:59): and in that case he is likewise probably identical with MELCHI, the son of Addi, and father of Neri, in Christ's maternal genealogy (Luk 3:28).

6. The son of Shallum, apparently a priest, since he had a chamber in the Temple, and was one of its custodians (Jer 35:4). B.C. 606.

7. The father of the priest Zephaniah or Zedekiah, which latter was twice sent by the king with a message of inquiry to Jeremiah, and was denounced by the prophet for falsely encouraging the people (Jer 21:1; Jer 37:3; Jer 29:21; Jer 29:25). B.C. ante 589.

8. Son of Ithiel and father of Kolaiah, a Benjamite, one of whose descendants resided at Jerusalem after the exile (Neh 11:7). B.C. long ante 536.

9. One of the descendants of Judah who resided at Jerusalem after the captivity; he was the son of Baruch, and his genealogy is traced back to one Shiloni (Neh 11:5). B.C. 536. In the corresponding narrative of 1Ch 9:5, apparently the same person is called ASAIAH.

10. One of the priests of the kindred of Jeshua, who agreed to divorce their Gentile wives after the captivity (Ezr 10:18). B.C. 459.

11. Another priest, one of the "sons" of Harim, who divorced his Gentile wife after the exile (Ezr 10:21). B.C. 459. Perhaps it was he (apparently a priest) who formed one of the chorus that celebrated the completion of the new cite walls (Neh 12:42). B.C. 446.

12. Still another priest, of the "sons" of Pashur, who divorced his Gentile wife after the return from Babylon (Ezr 10:22). B.C. 459. Perhaps the same with one of the priests who celebrated with trumpets the rebuilding of the walls of Jerusalem (Neh 12:41). B.C. 446.

13. An Israelite, of the "sons" of Pahath-moab, who divorced his Gentile wife after the Babylonian captivity (Ezr 10:30). B.C. 459.

14. The son of Ananiah, and father of Azariah, which last repaired part of the walls of Jerusalem after the exile (Neh 3:23). B.C. ante 446.

15. One of the principal Israelites who stood on Ezra's right hand while he read and expounded the law to the people (Neh 8:4). B.C. cir. 410. He is perhaps identical with one of the popular chiefs who joined in the sacred covenant with Nehemiah (Neh 10:25). B.C. cir. 410.

16. One of the priests who assisted the Levites in expounding the law to the people as it was read by Ezra (Neh 8:7). B.C. cir. 410.

## Maasiai[[@Headword:Maasiai]]

             (Heb. Masay', מִעְשִׂי, or, as it probably should be pointed, Maasay', מִעֲשִׂי, worker, or perhaps contracted for Maaseiah; Sept. Μασαί v.r. Μαασαία ; Vulg. Maasai), the son of Adiel, a descendant of Immer, and one of the priests resident at Jerusalem at or after the captivity (1Ch 9:12). B.C. prob. 536.

## Maasias[[@Headword:Maasias]]

             (Μαασαι῎ας), the son of Sedecias and father of Baruch (Bar 1:1); evidently the same as MAASEIAH (Jer 51:59), 5 (q.v.).

## Maaz[[@Headword:Maaz]]

             (Heb. Ma'aits, מִעִוֹ, wrath; Sept. Μαάς) the first named of the three sons of Ram, the son of Jerahmeel, of the descendants of Judah (1Ch 2:27). B.C. post 1658.

## Maaziah[[@Headword:Maaziah]]

             (Heb. Maazyah', מִעִזְיָה, Neh 10:8, or Maazya'hu, מִעִזְיָהוּ, 1Ch 24:18, strength [or perh. rather consolation, from the Arabic] of Jehovah; Sept. respectively Μααζία and Μααζάλ [v.r. Μαασαί]; Vulg. respectively Maazia and Maazian), the name of two priests.

1. The head of the last of the twenty-four sacerdotal "courses" as arranged by David (1Ch 24:18). B.C. 1014.

2. One of the priests who signed the sacred covenant with Nehemiah (Neh 10:8). B.C. cir. 410. "From the coincidence between many of the names of the priests in the lists of the twenty-four courses established by David, of those who signed the covenant with Nehemiah (Nehemiah 12), it would seem either that these names were hereditary in families, or that they were applied to the families themselves. This is evidently the case with the names of the 'heads of the people' enumerated in Neh 10:14-27."

## Mab[[@Headword:Mab]]

             in poetic art, is queen of the fairies (q.v.).

## Mabdai[[@Headword:Mabdai]]

             (Μαβδαϊv), one of "the sons of Maani" who divorced their Gentile wives after the captivity (1Es 9:34); evidently the BENAIAH SEE BENAIAH (q.v.) of the Hebrew list (Ezr 10:35).

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

             a celebrated Benedictine preacher, and one of the most distinguished men of the 17th century. was born at St. Pierremont, in the diocese of Rheims, November 23, 1632, studied at the college of Rheims, and joined the congregation of St. Maur in 1651. He began his literary career by assisting D'Achery in his labors upon his vast historic recueil entitled Spicilegium. and by an edition of the works of St. Bernard, "which attracted the notice of ecclesiastical scholars, and furnished a sure pledge of the value of his future labors" (Dowling). In 1668 he came forward with a part of his original production, Acta Sancctorum Ordinis S. Benedicti (completed in 1702), one of the greatest historical works extant. He now became the general favorite of ecclesiastical students, and soon was brought to the notice also of his sovereign, Louis XIV, who sent him on literary missions, as the result of which we have from him Museum Italiclum (1689), a kind of antiquarian itinerary of Italy. Besides descriptions of the towns and their attractions, it contains valuable dissertations on ecclesiastical history and paleography; also a very explicit commentary on the ritual of the various services, or liturgy, and rites of the Roman Church. (He had previously published De Liturgti Gallicana libri tres [1685], in which he compares the Gallican with the Mozarabic liturgy). Another work of great importance from the pen of Mabillon is the Lettres et Ecrits sur les Etudes Monastiques, containing a curious controversy between the abbé De  Rancé, the founder of the order of the Trappists (q.v.) and the Benedictines. De Rance, in his ascetic enthusiasm, had forbidden his monks all scientific studies, and, indeed, all reading except the Breviary and a few monastic tracts. The rest of the clergy, both secular and regular, took the alarm, and Mabillon was requested to defend monastic studies and learning as perfectly compatible with piety and religious discipline, as the Benedictine order had fully proved. Mabillon promptly complied with the request, and published his Traite in 1691.

It was received with great applause, and was at once translated into Latin and other languages. See RANCÉ for the reply. His fame spread rapidly, and he was recognized as one of the leading scholars of his day. In 1701 he was chosen member of the Academy of Inscriptions. In 1703 he came before the public with the first volume of his chef-d'oeuvre, Annales Ordinis S. Benedicti. Henceforth, until the day of his death (December 27, 1707), Mabillon faithfully applied himself to the completion of this work, which all critics are agreed is "among the most important works which have been written on the history of the Church" (Dowling). It should certainly be found on the shelves of every real student of Church History. It commences with the year 480 — that of the birth of St. Benedict — and goes down to 1157 (covering in all 6 volumes folio. Mabillon himself completed volumes 1-4, extending to 1066; Massuet completed volume 5 [published in 1713], and Martene volume 6 [published in 1739]; for the different editions, see Ceillier, Hist. des Auteurs sacres, 14:498). It contains an account of St. Benedict, discusses his rules, and everything in any y wa pertaining to the order. The work, besides including a somewhat complete history of the secular affairs of the times, contains a minute account of the doctrines, the ceremonies, the controversies of the Church age by age, with a statement of the writings of each individual whose life is depicted.

Of the manner in which the work is done we will let Dowling (Introd. to the Crit. Study of Eccles. History, page 144 sq.) speak. "His (Mabillon's) unbounded learning, and his penetrating and comprehensive mind, enabled him to discover new truths, and detect and expose inveterate errors. His amiable moderation and unaffected candor introduced into the discussion of ecclesiastical subjects a better tone and spirit. But this was not the full extent of the services which he rendered to Church History. The monastic habit could not restrain his mental independence, nor his religious peculiarities make him feel as a vulgar controversialist. He was the most prominent of a new race of scholars, who communicated to the whole subject a different character; who separated it from polemical theology,  and assumed as a first principle that its subject-matter was not controversy, but facts. It was a new thing to see a congregation of monks taking a lead in a literary movement; but such was the case. The genius of Mabillon did much to purify and ennoble Church History. Excited by his example and precepts, the French Benedictines devoted themselves in an admirable spirit to the cultivation of ecclesiastical learning, and distinguished themselves in the republic of letters by the publication of a number of critical, philological, and antiquarian works connected with such studies, not more remarkable for their erudition than for their moderation and candor."

Mabillon, by the intended publication of a treatise, De Cultu Sanctorum ignotornum, came near being involved in a hot controversy with the authorities of his Church. The book, which aimed to point out some abuses concerning the worship of relics, was on the eve of anonymous publication when it was secured by the Congregation of the Index, and placed among the forbidden ones. He quietly submitted to the exceptions of the authorities, and prepared a new edition purged from the objectionable passages. In his new preface he says: "Haec nova editio non temere nec proprio arbitrio a me facta est, sed ad Ejus nutum et imperium, penes quem residet summa praecipiendi auctoritas!" In return for his ready submission he was to be rewarded by the cardinal's hat, but the intended honor came too late to be of any service in Mabillon's terrestrial course. Mabillon wrote also De Re Diplomatica libri sex, accedunt Commentarius de antiquis Regum Francorum Palatiis: Veterum Scripturarum varia Specimina, etc., a work much esteemed. These and other later works were collected under the title Ouvrages Posthumes de J. Mabillon et de Thierry Ruinart, Benedictines de la Congregation de St. Maur (Paris, 1724, 3 volumes, 4to). A complete list of all his works is given in Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 8:635. See, besides the authorities already mentioned, Vieuville, Bibl. historique d. Auteurs de la Congregation de S. Maur; D. Tassin, Hist. Litter. de la, Cony. de S. Maur; C. de Malan, Hist. de Mabillon; Valery, Corresp. de Mabillon et de Montfaucon; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 32:437. (J.H.W.)

## Mabon, John Scott[[@Headword:Mabon, John Scott]]

             an eminent educator of the (Dutch) Reformed Church, was born in Scotland in 1784; came to this country with his parents in 1796; graduated with high honors at Union College (1806), and at the theological seminary in New Brunswick (1812); was tutor in Union College 1814-15; rector of  the grammar school of Rutgers College 1815-25; temporary professor of Hebrew in the theological seminary at New Brunswick 1818-19. From this time until his death he taught privately, the last fourteen years at Hackensack, N.J. Mr. Malabon was an exact scholar and a profound thinker. a rigid disciplinarian, and a skillful and enthusiastic instructor. His life was a battle with ill health and adversity. There was something truly heroic in his independent spirit, ever struggling for the mastery of unusual difficulties, and for the accomplishment of his life-work. His piety was chastened by almost continual trials. His religious life was one of profound convictions and broad and deep experience. Small of stature, with an intellectual head, and a frail, bent frame, courtly in his demeanor, and retiring in disposition, he was an old-fashioned Christian gentleman, and a teacher to whom many a minister of the Gospel and men of other professions still look up with veneration and thankfulness for their thorough training and ability. He died April 27, 1849. See Sprague's Annals, volume 9; Corwin's Manual; Personal Recollections of J. S. Mabon. (W.J.R.T.)

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

             a French pulpit orator, born of a distinguished family in Paris in 1650, was a long time grand vicar of Poitiers, and from 1708 until his death in May, 1722, bishop of Alert. His works are Oraisons funebres (1749, 12mo) — very eloquent: — Memoires (on constitution Unigenitus) (1749, 4to). See Hoefer, Nouv, Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Mac Gill, Stevenson, D.D[[@Headword:Mac Gill, Stevenson, D.D]]

             a Scotch divine of considerable note, was born at Port Glasgow Jan. 19, 1765, of pious parents. He early chose the service of his Master, and conducted all his studies with a view to the ministry. He was educated at the University of Glasgow, and was licensed to preach in 1790; was appointed minister at Eastwood in 1791; was transferred in 1797 to the Tron Church, Glasgow, and later (1814) was also made a professor of theology in his alma mater. He died Aug. 18,1839. Dr. Mac Gill” commended himself to every man's conscience” not only by his ability in the pulpit, and his laborious visitations of his congregation and parish, but by the Christian interest he took in the public institutions and charities of the city — in the active direction he assumed of the Infirmary, the Prisons, the Magdalene and Lunatic Asylums. His services were also most zealously and actively rendered to ‘ the Society for benefiting the Highlands and Islands of Scotland by means of Gselic Schools,” “the Propagation of the Gospel in India,” and “the Missions on behalf of the Jews.” In 1800 Dr. Mac Gill originated a clerical literary society, to-which for many years he acted as secretary. It was after receiving the full approbation and friendly criticism of this literary society that he favored the world with Considerations addressed to a Young Clergyman (1809, 12mo), a work which, on its first appearance, obtained an extensive circulation, and from the perusal of which no young minister can fail to derive great and permanent advantage. His sermons were published in 1839. See Robt. Burns, Memoir of Dr. Mac Gill (Edhib. 1842, 12mo); Jamieson,  Dictionary of Religious Biography, s.v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Mac Ilvaine[[@Headword:Mac Ilvaine]]

             SEE MCILVAINE.

## Mac-[[@Headword:Mac-]]

             a frequent initial of Scotch and Irish names, being the Gnelic for son. Those in which it is thus written in full are given below in order. For others, see under the abbreviated form M'- or Mc-.

## MacCaghwell (Lat. Cavellus), Hugh[[@Headword:MacCaghwell (Lat. Cavellus), Hugh]]

             an Irish Franciscan of the 17th century, studied at Salamanca, and lectured at Louvain. Urban VIII appointed him archbishop of Armagh and primate of Ireland. He died September 22, 1626, in the fifty-fifth year of his age. He wrote, Scoti Commentaria in Quatuor Libros Sentt. ( Antwerp, 1620, 3 volumes): — Apologia Apologien Scoti contra Nic. Jansenium (Paris, 1623): — Duo Tractatus pro Tuenda Observantia (ibid. 1622). See Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v.; Jeiler, in Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## MacHale[[@Headword:MacHale]]

             SEE MCHALE.

## MacKenzie, Murdoch[[@Headword:MacKenzie, Murdoch]]

             a Scotch prelate, was born in 1600, received Episcopal ordination, and went as chaplain to a regiment under Gustavus Adolphus. After his return from Germany he became minister at Contin, next at Inverness, and afterwards at Elgin. He was made bishop of the see of Moray, January 18, 1662. From this he was translated to the see of Orkney in 1677, where he continued until his death, in February 1688. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, pages 152-228.

## MacMahon, Bernard, D.D[[@Headword:MacMahon, Bernard, D.D]]

             a Roman Catholic divine, was born in Ireland in 1816. He studied for the priesthood in France, and about 1842 went to Africa with the first vicar apostolic of Cape Colony, Mgr. Griffith, and he continued until the last to labor among the English-speaking Catholics of the colony., He was soon  after made vicar-general, holding that position under bishops Grimlev and Leonard, or to his death. He was a hard worker, a close student, and a model priest. Pius I appointed him domestic prelate. He died at Cape Town, February 1, 1882. See (N.Y.) Cath. Annual, 1883, page 117.

## Macalon[[@Headword:Macalon]]

             (Μακάλων), a place whose natives to the number of 122 returned from the captivity (1Es 5:21); evidently the MICHMASH SEE MICHMASH (q.v.) of the Hebrew lists (Ezr 2:27; Neh 7:31).

## Macarians[[@Headword:Macarians]]

             SEE MACARIUS EGYPTUS, and SEE MACARIUS OF ALEXANDRIA.

## Macarites[[@Headword:Macarites]]

             is the name of a Jewish sect, whose, founder is believed to have been Benjamin Nahavendi (q.v.), a Karaite, who flourished about the opening of the 9th century. Their most peculiar doctrine was that God is too elevated to reveal himself directly to man, and that revelation was therefore made by messenger — an angel, a vice-god. If the Bible speaks of God's manifestation to man, it refers, they held, to the manifestation of the divine being in the person of his messenger who was the first being God created. This angel was the creator of the world, not God himself. (Quite like the evolution theory in our day, advocated by Mivart, who likewise holds that  God was only indirectly the creator of the world.) In this and many other respects the Macarites much resemble the Mohammedan sect of Motazalites. See Furst, Gesch. d. Karaerthums, 2:26: sq.; Rule, Karaites, pages 105, 109; Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden,. 5:230 sq., 518 sq.

## Macarius[[@Headword:Macarius]]

             is the name of several distinguished Christians of the early centuries. Among them the most important are,

1. MACARIUS AEGYPTIUS, or, as he is sometimes surnamed, the Great, or the Elder, was born, according to Eusebius, in Upper Egypt, about the year 300. He was a disciple of St. Antonius (some say of St. Ephrem), and while yet a youth was distinguished for his asceticism, which won for him the surname of παιδαριογέρων. At the age of thirty he entered upon a life of asceticism, in the wilderness of Scete or Scetis, a part of the great Libyan desert, and there he remained until about 340, when he was ordained priest. He died about 390. Palladius relates several extraordinary miracles said to have been performed by this saint; among others, a resurrection which he accomplished for the purpose of confounding a heretic. During the persecution of the Egyptian monks by the Arian bishop Lucius of Alexandria, in the reign of Valens, Macarius was banished to an island of the Nile, but allowed to return afterwards. There is yet in Libya, according to Tischendorf (Reise in d. Orient), a convent which bears his name. He left 50 homilies (Greek edit. Morel, Paris, 1559; J.G. Pritius, Leipz. 1698), seven ascetic treatises, together with a number of apophthegmata (J. G. Pritius, Leipzig, 1699). Both these works have been translated into German by G. Arnold, under the title Ein Denkmal d. alt. Christenthums (Gosl. 1702), and by N. Casseder (Banb. 1819). H.J. Floss has published a very able criticism on them, together with several formerly unknown letters and fragments (Colossians 1850). J. Hamberger gives a selection from them in his Stimmen aus d. Heiligthum d.christl. Mystik u. Theosophie.

2. MACARIUS OF ALEXANDRIA, also called πολιτικός, the townsman, a contemporary of the preceding, was by trade a baker, but became subsequently a disciple of St. Antonius, having been baptized when about forty years of age. He also embraced an ascetic life, and became the spiritual adviser of over 5000 monks. Palladius relates a number of miracles said to have been wrought by him. He was likewise one of the victims of the persecution instituted by Valens, and died, according to Tillemont (Memoires, 8:626), in 394, but according to Fabricius (Biblioth. Graeca, 8:365), in 404, aged nearly a hundred years. He is said to have been the author of some regulations for monks contained in the Codex regularum, collectus a sancto Benedicto Ananiensi, auctus a Holstenio (Rome, 1661, 2 volumes, 4to); and a homily, περὶ ἐξόδου ψυχῆς δικαιῶν καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν (J. Tollius, Itinerar. Ital. Traj. 1696; Cave, Hist. Lit. 1; Gallandi, 7), which latter, however, is by some ascribed to a monk called Alexander. Mosheim (Eccles. Hist. book 2, cent. 4, part 2,  chapter 3) says of him and his work: "Perhaps, before all others who wrote on practical piety, the preference is due to Macarius, the Egyptian monk; from whom, after deducting some superstitious notions, and what savors too much of Origenism, we may collect a beautiful picture of real piety." He is commemorated by the Romish Church January 12, and by the Greek January 19. See Smith, Dict. of Greek and Rom. Biog. and Mythol. volume 2, s.v.; Ceillier, Auteurs sacred, 7:709, 712.

3. MACARIUS OF ANTIOCH, a patriarch in the Church of Antioch in the 7th century, is noted for his avowal, at the third Constantinopolitan Council (A.D. 680-81), of his belief in the doctrine "that Christ's will was that of a God-man (θεανδρικήν)." SEE MONOTHELITES.

He and his followers (known as Afacarians) were banished on this account. His Travels were written down by his attendant archdeacon, Paul of Aleppo, in Arabic, and were published in an English dress in 1829-37, in 2 volumes, 4to. See Smith, Dict. of Greek and Rom. Biog. and Mythol. 2:875 (4); Milman's Gibbon, Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, 4:553.

4. MACARIUS OF IRELAND flourished about the close of the 9th century. He is said to have propagated in France the tenet, afterwards maintained by Averrhoes, that one individual intelligence or soul performed the spiritual and rational functions in all the human race.

5. MACARIUS OF JERUSALEM. There were two bishops by this name; one flourished in the 4th century, the other in the 6th. The former became bishop A.D. 313 or 314, and died in or before A.D. 333. He was present at the Council of Nice, and is said to have taken part in the disputations against the Arians. The latter was elected bishop A.D. 544, but the choice was disapproved by the emperor Justinian I, because he was accused of avowing the obnoxious opinions of Origen, and Eutychius was appointed instead. Macarius was, however, after a time. reinstalled (about A.D. 564), and died about 574. A homily of his, De inventione Capitis Praecursoris, is extant in MS. See Smith, Dict. of Greek and Rom. Biog. 2:876.

## Macassar[[@Headword:Macassar]]

             the most southern portion of Celebes, situated in lat. 40 35'-50 50' S., and long. 119° 25'1200 30' E., and traversed by a lofty chain of mountains, formerly the greatest naval power among the Malay states, is divided into the Dutch possessions and Malay Proper; the latter, of little importance, is governed by a native king, who pays tribute to the Netherlanders. The  Portuguese were the first Europeans to form a settlement in Macassar, but they were supplanted by the Dutch, who, after many contests with the natives, gradually attained to supreme power. In 1811 it fell into the hands of the British. who in 1814 defeated the king of Boni, and compelled him to give up the regalia of Macassar. In 1816 it was restored to the Dutch, and continues to enjoy a fair share of the mercantile prosperity of the Netherlands' possessions in the Eastern Archipelago.

The natives are among the most civilized and enterprising, but also the most greedy of the Malay race. SEE MALAYS.

They carry on a considerable trade in tortoise-shell and edible nests, grow abundance of rice, and raise great numbers of horses, cattle, sheep, and goats; fishing is also one of the principal employments. They are chiefly adherents to Mohammedanism, which secured its hold in the Malay Archipelago in the 14th century, and to this day continues to proselyte the Macassars for the religion of the Crescent. For the difficulties in the way towards Christianizing the Malayan race, SEE MALAY ARCHIPELAGO.

## Macassar (and Bugis) Version Of The Scriptures[[@Headword:Macassar (and Bugis) Version Of The Scriptures]]

             The Bugis and the Macassar dialects are the most prevalent of those spoken among the various native states comprised in the large island of Celebes. They both resemble the Malayan; the Bugis being the most cultured of the two, and possessing a separate alphabet. A translation in each of these dialects was begun by Dr. Leyden about the year 1810, but lived only to complete the version of the gospel of Mark, which has never been printed. In 1849 Dr. Mathes was sent out by the Netherlands Society to Celebes to study these languages, but the result has not transpired. See Bible of Every Land, page 374.

## Macaulay, Aulay[[@Headword:Macaulay, Aulay]]

             an English divine, was born near the opening of the 18th century, and was educated at the University of Glasgow. He was minister of the church and parish of Cardross, Dumbartonshire, and died in 1797. He published a sermon on the Peculiar Advantages of Sunday Schools (1792, 8vo); also other sermons. See Lond. Gentl. Mag. 1816 (June), page 535 sq.

## Macaulay, Zachary[[@Headword:Macaulay, Zachary]]

             F.R.S., an English philanthropist, of Scottish descent, born in 1768, father of the historian, a merchant, fought forty years with William Wilberforce in promotion of the British and-slavery movement. He died May 13,1838. See Lond. Genil. Mag. (March, 1838, page 323; December 1838, page 678); Thomas, Dict. of Biog. and Mythol. s.v.

## Macauley, Thomas, D.D., LL.D.[[@Headword:Macauley, Thomas, D.D., LL.D.]]

             a Presbyterian minister of note, was born in 1777, and was educated at Union College, where he afterwards filled a professor's chair. He subsequently entered the ministry, and died May 11, 1862, while pastor of the Murray Street Church in New York City.

## Macbeth[[@Headword:Macbeth]]

             a Scotch prelate, was probably bishop of Ross about 1126. He died in 1128. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 184.

## Macbride, John David, D.C.L., F.S.A.[[@Headword:Macbride, John David, D.C.L., F.S.A.]]

             an eminent English Oriental scholar and author, was born in Norfolk, England, in 1788, and was educated at Exeter College, Oxford, where he became a fellow. He was in 1813 appointed principal of Magdalen Hall, and nominated to the readership in Arabic, and kept these positions until his death in 1868. His principal works are, Diatessaron, or Harmony of the Gospels (used in Oxford University): — Mohammnedanism: — Lectures on the Articles of the United Church of England and Ireland (1853): — Lectures on the Epistles (1858). See New Am. Cyclop. Annual for 1868, page 445.

## Maccabee[[@Headword:Maccabee]]

             (MACCABAE'US), a title (usually in the plural οἱ Μακκαβαῖοι, '"the Maccabees"), which was originally the surname of Judas, one of the sons of Mattathias (see below, § 3), but was afterwards extended to the heroic family of which he was one of the noblest representatives, and in a still wider sense to the Palestinian martyrs in the persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes, SEE MACCABEES 4, a and even to the Alexandrine Jews who suffered for their faith at an earlier time. SEE 3 MACCABEES. In the following account of the Maccabaean family and revolution we shall endeavor to fill up this interesting interval of inspiration.

I. The Name. — The original term Maccabee (ὁ Μακκαβαῖος) has been variously derived. Some have maintained that it was derived from the banner of the tribe of Dan, which contained the last letters of the names of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Others imagine that it was formed from the combination of the initial letters of the Hebrew sentence, "Who among the gods is like unto thee, Jehovah?" (Exo 15:11; Hebrew י, ב, כ, מ), which is supposed to have been inscribed upon the banner of the patriots; or, again, of the initials of the simply descriptive title, "Mattathias, a priest, the son of Johanan." But, even if the custom of forming such words was in use among the Jews at this early time, it is obvious that such a title would not be an individual title in the first instance, as Maccabee undoubtedly was (1Ma 2:4), and still remains among the Jews (Raphall, Hist. of the Jews, 1:249). Moreover, the orthography of the word in Greek and Syriac (Ewald, Geschichte, 4:352, note) points to the form מקבי, and not מכבי. Another derivation has been proposed, which, although direct evidence is wanting, seems satisfactory. According to this, the word is formed from מִקָּבָה, "a hammer" (like Malachi, Ewald, 4:353, n.), giving a sense not altogether unlike that in which Charles CMartel derived a surname from his favorite weapon, and still more like the Malleus Scotorum and Malleus Haereticorum of the Middle Ages.

Although the name Maccabees has gained the widest currency, that of Asmeonaeans, or Hasmonans, is the proper name of the family. The origin of this name also has been disputed; but the obvious derivation from Chashmon (חִשְׁמָן, Α᾿αμωναῖος; comp. Gesenius, Thesaur. page 534 b), great-grandfather of Mattathias, seems certainly correct. How it came to pass that a man, otherwise obscure, gave his name to the family, cannot now be discovered; but no stress can be laid upon this difficulty, nor upon the fact that in Jewish prayers (Herzfeld, Geschichte c. Jud. 1:264) Mattathias himself is called ilashmonai. In Psa 68:32 we meet with a word חִשְׁמִנַּם, to the supposed singular of which, חִשְׁמָן, the name in question is commonly referred. In this case it might have been given to the priest of the course of Joarib to signify that he was a wealthy or a powerful person. In Jos 15:27 we find a town in the tribe of Judah called

חֶשְׁמוֹן, from which this name might equally be derived. Herzfeld's proposed derivation from חסם, "to temper steel," is fanciful and groundless. The word in the first instance appears more like a family than a personal name. The later Hebrew form is חשמונאי. See Zipser, Benennung der Makkabaer (in the Ben-Chananjah, 1860). SEE ASMONAEAN.

II. Pedigree. — The connection of the various members of the Maccabsean family will be seen from the table given below.

III. History of the War of Independence, involving that of the Individuals of the Family. —

1. The first of this family who attained distinction was the aged priest MATTATHIAS, who dwelt at Modin, a city west of Jerusalem and near the sea, of which the site has yet been but partly identified by modern research. He was the son of John, the son of Simon, the son of Asamonneus, as Josephus tells us, and was himself the father of five sons — John, otherwise called Gaddis; Simon, called Thassi; Judas, called  Maccabaeus; Eleazar, called Avaran; and Jonathan, surnamed Apphus. Ewald remarks that Simon and John were favorite names in this family. After the expulsion of Antiochus Epiphanes from Egypt by the Romans, that monarch proceeded to vent his rage and indignation on the Jews. B.C. 168. SEE ANTIOCHIUS.

He massacred vast numbers of them in Jerusalem on the Sabbath, took the women captives, and built a fortress on Mount Zion, which he used as a central position for harassing the people around. He ordered one Athenaeus to instruct, the inhabitants of Judaea and Samaria in the rites of the Grecian religion, with a view to abolishing all vestiges of the Jewish worship. Having succeeded in bringing the Samaritans to renounce their religion, he further went to Jerusalem, where he prohibited the observance of all Jewish ceremonies, obliged the people to eat swine's flesh and profane the Sabbath, and forbade circumcision. The Temple was dedicated to Olympian Jove, and his altar erected upon the altar of burnt-offering, which the first book of Maccabees, apparently quoting Daniel, calls the setting up of the abomination of desolation. When, therefore, Apelles, the king's officer (Josephus, Ant. 12:6, 2), came to Modin to put in force the royal edict against the national religion, he made splendid offers to Mattathias if he would comply. The old man, however, not only refused, but publicly declared his determination to live and die in the religion of his fathers; and when a certain Jew came forward openly to sacrifice in obedience to the edict, he slew him upon the altar. He slew, moreover, the king's commissioner, and destroyed the altar. Then, offering himself as a rallying-point for all who were zealous for the law, he fled to the mountains. Many others, with their wives and children, followed his example, and fled. They were pursued, however, by the officers of Antiochus, and, refusing even to defend themselves on the Sabbath day, were slain to the number of 1000. On this occasion the greatness of Mattathias displayed itself in the wise counsel he gave his companions and countrymen, which passed subsequently into the ordinary custom, that they should not forbear to fight upon the Sabbath day in so far as to defend themselves. While in this position, he was joined by the more austere of the two parties which had sprung up among the Jews after the return from the captivity, viz. the Assidseans, 1. the Hasidim, or pious, SEE CHASIDIM; and the Puritans, who subsequently became the Pharisees. They not only observed the written law, but superadded the constitutions and traditions of the elders, and other rigorous observances. The other party were called the Tsaddikim, or righteous, who contented themselves with that only which was written in the Mosaic law. Thus strengthened, Mattathias and  his comrades carried on a sort of guerrilla warfare, and exerted themselves as far as possible to maintain and enforce the observance of the national religion. Feeling, however, that his advancing age rendered him unfit for a life so arduous, while it warned him of his approaching end, he gathered his sons together like the patriarchs of old, exhorted them to valor in a speech of great piety and faithfulness, and having recommended Simon to the office of counselor or father, and Judas to that of captain and leader, died in the year 166, and was buried in the sepulcher of his fathers at Modin. The speech which he is said to have addressed to his sons before his death is remarkable as containing the first distinct allusion to the contents of Daniel, a book which seems to have exercised the most powerful influence on the Maccabean conflict (1Ma 2:60; comp. Josephus, Ant. 12:6, 3).

2. Mattathias himself named JUDAS, apparently his third son, as his successor in directing the war of independence (1Ma 2:66). The energy and skill of "THE MACCABEE" (ὁ Μακκαβαῖος), as Judas is often called in 2 Macc., fully justified his father's preference. It appears that he had already taken a prominent part in the first secession to the mountains (2Ma 5:27, where Mattathias is not mentioned), and on receiving the chief command he devoted himself to the task of combining for common action those who were still faithful to the religion of their fathers (2Ma 8:1). His first enterprises were night-attacks and sudden surprises, which were best suited to the troops at his disposal (2Ma 8:6-7), and, when his men were encouraged by these means, he ventured on more important operations, and met Apollonitus (1Ma 3:10-12), the king's general, who had gathered a large army at Samaria, of which place he was governor, in the open field. He totally defeated his army, and slew him. He then divided the spoils, and took the sword of Apollonius for a trophy, which he used all his life afterwards in battle.

Exasperated at the defeat of Apollonius, Seron (1Ma 3:13-24), who was general of the army of Coele-Syria, got together a force, partly composed of Jews, and came against Judas as far as Bethhoron, where he pitched his camps This place, which had been rendered memorable many centuries before as the site of Joshua's great victory over the allied forces of the Canaanites, was destined now to witness a victory scarcely less glorious, wrought by a small band of Jews, spent and hungry, against the disciplined troops of Syria. Seron was completely overthrown, and his army scattered. Antiochus, though greatly enraged at this dishonor to his arms, was nevertheless compelled, by the condition of his treasury, to undertake an expedition to Armenia and  Persia, with a view to recruiting his exhausted finances (1Ma 3:27-31).

He therefore left Lysias, one of his highest lieutenants, to take charge of his kingdom, from the River Euphrates to the confines of Egypt, and having etrusted his son Antiochus to his care, and enjoined Lysias to conquer Judaea and destroy the nation of the Jews, he went into Persia. The success of Judas called for immediate attention. The governor of Jerusalem was urgent in his entreaties for assistance; Lysias therefore sent an army of 20,000 men, under the command of Nicanor and Gorgias, into Judaea. It was followed by another of the same number, with an addition of 7000 horse, under Ptolemy Macron, the son of Dorymcnes, as commander-in- chief. The united forces encamped in the plains of Emmaus. To oppose this formidable host Judas could only muster 6000 men at Mizpeh. Here, as Samuel had done a thousand years before at a like period of national calamity, he fasted and prayed, and, in compliance with the Mosaic injunction, advised those who were newly married, or had built houses, and the like, to return to their homes. This reduced his number to one half. The heroic spirit of Judas, however, rose against every difficulty, and he marched towards Emmaus. B.C. 166.

Having heard that Gorgias had been dispatched with a force of 6000 men to surprise him in the passes by night, he instantly resolved to attack the enemies' camp. He rushed upon them unexpectedly, and completely routed them; so that when Gorgias returned, baffled and weary, he was dismayed at finding his camp in flames. In the brief struggle which ensued the Jews were victorious, and took much spoil. The year following, Lysias gathered together an army of 60,000 chosen men, with 5000 horse, went up in person to the hill-country of Judaea, and pitched his camp at a place called Bethsura, the Bethzur of the Old Test. Here Judas met him with 10,000 men, attacked his vanguard, and slew 5000 of them, whereupon Lysias retreated with the remainder of his army to Antioch. After this series of triumphs Judas proceeded to Jerusalem. There he found the sanctuary desolate, shrubs growing in the courts of it, and the chambers of the priests thrown down; so he set to work at once to purify the holy places and restore the worship of God (1Ma 4:36; 1Ma 4:41-53) on the 25th of Kislev, exactly three years after its profanation (1 Mace. 1:59; Grimm on 1Ma 4:59). In commemoration of this cleansing of the Temple, the Jews afterwards kept for eight days annually a festival which was called Lights, and was known as the Feast of Dedication (Joh 10:22). SEE DEDICATION, FEAST OF.

Judas, having strongly fortified the citadel of Mount Zion, and placed a garrison at Bethsura, made an expedition into Idumaea. The Syrians meanwhile, frustrated in their efforts  against Judaea, turned their attention to Galilee and the provinces beyond Jordan. A large army from Tyre and Ptolemais attacked the north, and Timotheus laid waste Gilead, whereupon Judas determined to divide his army into three. He himself, with Jonathan, led 8000 men across the Jordan into Gilead; his brother Simon he sent with 3000 into Galilee; and the rest he left behind, under the command of Joseph, the son of Zacharias, and Azarias, for the protection of Judaea, with strict injunctions to act only on the defensive. These orders, however, they imprudently violated by an attack upon the sea-port Jamnia, where they met with a signal repulse. But the Maccabees in Gilead and Galilee were triumphant as usual, and added to their renown.

Antiochus Epiphanes, meanwhile, had died in his Persian expedition, B.C. 164, and Lysias immediately proclaimed his son, Antiochus Eupator, king, the true heir, Demetrius, the son of Seleucus, being a hostage at Rome. One of the first acts of Lysias was directed against the Jews. He assembled an enormous army of 100,000 men and 32 elephants, and proceeded to invest Bethsura. The city defended itself gallantly. Judas marched from Jerusalem to relieve it, and slew about 5000 of the Syrians. It was upon this occasion that his brother Eleazar sacrificed himself by rushing under an elephant which he supposed carried the young king, and stabbing it in the belly, so that it fell upon him. The Jews, however, were compelled to retreat to Jerusalem, whereupon Bethsura surrendered, and the royal army advanced to besiege the capital. Here the siege was resisted with vigor, but the defenders of the city suffered from straitness of provisions, because of its being the sabbatical year. They would therefore have had to surrender; but Lysias was recalled to Antioch by reports of an insurrection under Philip, who, at the death of Antiochus, had been appointed guardian of the young king. He was consequently glad to make proposals of peace, which were as readily accepted by the Jews. He had no sooner, however, effected an entrance into the city than he violated his engagements by destroying the fortifications, and immediately set out with all haste for the north. There Demetrius Soter, the lawful heir to the Syrian throne, encountered him, and, after a struggle, Antiochus and Lysias were slain, leaving Demetrius in undisputed possession of the kingdom.

Menelaus, the high-priest at this time, had purchased his elevation to that rank by selling the sacred vessels of the Temple. Hoping to serve his own ends, he joined himself to the army of Lysias, but was slain by command of Antiochus. Onias, the son of the high-priest whom Menelaus had  supplanted, fled into Egypt, and Alcimuls or Jacimus, not of the high- priestly family, was raised to the dignity of high-priest. By taking this man under his protection, Demetrius hoped to weaken the power of the Jews. He dispatched Bacchides with Alcimus to Jerusalem, with orders to slay the Maccabees and their followers. Jerusalem yielded to one who came with the authority of the high-priest, but Alcimus murdered sixty of the elders as soon as he got them into his power. Bacchides also committed sundry atrocities in other parts. No sooner, however, had he left Judaea than Maccabaeus again rose against Alcimus, and drove him to Antioch, where he endeavored as far as possible to injure Judas with the king. Upon this Demetrius sent Nicanor with a large army to reinstate Alcimus, and when he came to Jerusalem, which was still held by the Syrians. he endeavored to get Judas into his power by stratagem, but the plot being discovered, he was compelled to meet him in the field.

They joined battle at Capharsalama, and Nicanor lost about 5000 men; the rest fled to the stronghold of Zion. Here he revenged himself with great cruelty, and threatened yet further barbarities unless Judas was delivered up. As the people refused to betray their champion, Nicanor was again compelled to fight. He pitched his camp ominously enough in Bethhoron; his troops were completely routed, and he himself slain. The next act of Judas was to make an alliance with the Romans, who entered into it eagerly; but no sooner was it contracted than the king made one more determined effort for the subjugation of Palestine, sending Alcimus ad Bacchides, with all the flower of his army, to a place called Berea or Bethzetho, apparently near Jerusalem. The Roman alliance seems to have alienated many of the extreme Jewish party from Judas (Midr. Hhanuka, quoted by Raphall, Hist. of Jews, 1:325). Moreover, the terror inspired by this host was such that Judas found himself deserted by all but 800 followers, who would fain have dissuaded him from encountering the enemy. His reply was worthy of him: "If our time be come, let us die manfully for our brethren, and let us not stain our honor." He fought with such valor that the right wing, commanded by Bacchides, was repulsed and driven to a hill called Azotus or Aza, but the left wing doubled upon the pursuers from behind, so that they were shut in, as it were, between two armies. The battle lasted from morning till night. Judas was killed, and his followers, overborne by numbers, were dispersed. His brothers Jonathan and Simon received his body by a treaty from the enemy, and buried it in the sepulcher of his fathers at Modin, B.C. 161. Thus fell the greatest of the Maccabees, a hero worthy of being ranked with the noblest of his country, and conspicuous  among all, in any age or clime, who have drawn the sword of liberty in defense of their dearest and most sacred rights.

3. After the death of Judas the patriotic party seems to have been for a short time wholly disorganized, and it was only by the pressure of unparalleled sufferings that they were driven to renew the conflict. For this purpose they offered the command to JONATHAN, surnamed Apphus (חִפּוּשׂ, the wary), the youngest son of Mattatthias. The policy of Jonathan shows the greatness of the loss involved in his brother's death. He was glad to see safety from Bacchides among the pools and marshes of the Jordan (1Ma 9:42), whither he was pursued by him. At the same time, also, his brother John was killed by a neighboring Arab tribe. Jonathan took occasion to revenge his brother's death upon a marriage-party, for which he lay in wait, and then repulsed an attack of Bacchides, and slew a thousand of his men. At this point Alcimus died, and Bacchides, after fortifying the strong towns of Judaea, returned to Antioch; but upon Jonathan again emerging from his hiding-place, Bacchides came back with a formidable army, and was for some time exposed to the desultory attacks of Jonathan, till weary of this mode of fighting, or for other reasons, he thought it fit to conclude a peace with him, and returned to his master. B.C. 158.

The Maccabee was thus left in possession of Judaea (1Ma 9:73), and had not long afterwards an opportunity offered him of consolidating his position; for there sprung up one Alexander Balas, who was believed to be a son of Antiochus Epiphanes, and laid claim to the throne of Syria. Demetrius and Alexander mutually competed for the alliance of Jonathan, but Alexander was successful, having offered him the high-priesthood, and sent him a purple robe and a golden crown — the insignia of royalty — and promised him exemption from tribute as well as other advantages. Jonathan thereupon assumed the high-priesthood, and became the friend of Alexander, who forthwith met Demetrius in the field, slew him, usurped his crown, and allied himself (B.C. 150) in marriage with Cleopatra, the daughter of Ptolemy Philometor, king of Egypt. Jonathan was invited to the wedding, and was made much of at court. In return, he attacked and defeated Apollonius, the general of Demetrius Nicator, who aspired to his father's throne, besieged Joppa, captured Azotus, and destroyed the temple of Dagon.

The prosperity, however, of Alexander was of short duration, for Ptolemy, being jealous of his power, marched with a large army against him, and after putting him to flight, seized his crown, and gave his wife to Demetrius. On the other hand, the overthrow  of Alexander was speedily followed by the death of Ptolemy, and Demetrius was left in possession of the throne of Syria. Jonathan, meanwhile, besieged Jerusalem, and, leaving it invested, repaired to Antioch. Demetrius not only welcomed, but entered into a treaty with him, upon terms that greatly augmented the power of the Maccabee. After this Demetrius disbanded the greater part of his army and lessened their pay, which being a course contrary to that pursued by former kings of Syria, who kept up large standing armies in time of peace, created great dissatisfaction, so that upon the occasion of Jonathan writing to him to withdraw his soldiers from the strongholds of Judaea, he not only complied, but was glad to ask for the assistance of 3000 men, who were forthwith sent to Antioch. Here they rendered him signal service in rescuing him from an insurrection of his own citizens which his behavior to them had aroused. His friendship for Jonathan, however, was soon at an end, and, contrary to his promises, he threatened to make war upon him unless he paid the tribute which previous kings had exacted. This menace might have been carried out had not a formidable antagonist at home arisen in the person of Trypho, who had formerly been an officer of Alexander Balas, and had espoused the cause of his young son Antiochus Theos.

This man attacked Demetrius, defeated him in battle, captured his city, drove him into exile, and placed his crown on the head of Antiochus, B.C. 144. One of the first acts of the new king was to ingratiate himself with Jonathan; he therefore confirmed him in the highpriesthood, and appointed him governor over Judaea and its provinces, besides showing him other marks of favor. His brother Simon he appointed to be general over the king's forces from what was called the Ladder of Tyre, viz., a mountain lying on the sea-coast between Tyre and Ptolemais, even to the borders of Egypt. Jonathan, in return, rendered good service to Antiochus, and twice defeated the armies of Demetrius. He then proceeded to establish his own power by renewing the treaty with Rome, entering into one also with Lacedamon, and strengthening the fortifications in Judaea. He was destined, however, to fall by treachery, for Trypho, having persuaded him to dismiss a large army he had assembled to support Antiochus, decoyed him into the city of Ptolemais, and then took him prisoner. The Jews immediately raised Simon to the command, and paid a large sum to ransom Jonathan. Trypho, however, took the money, but, instead of releasing Jonathan, put him to death, and then, thinking that the main hinderance to his own ambitious designs was removed, caused Antiochus to be treated in the same manner. Thus fell the third of the illustrious Maccabaean race,  who distinguished himself nobly in the defense of his country, B.C. 143. When Simon heard of his brother's death he fetched his bones from Bascama, where he had been buried, and had them interred at Modin. Here he erected to his memory a famous monument of a great height, built of white marble, elaborately wrought, near which he placed seven pyramids, for his father and mother and their five sons, the whole being surrounded with a stately portico. For many years afterwards this monument served the purpose of a beacon for sailors, and it was standing in the time of Eusebius. SEE MODIN.

4. The last remaining brother of the Maccabee family was thus SIMON, surnamed “Thassi” (Θασσί, Θασσίς; the meaning of the title is uncertain. Michaelis [Grimm, on 1 Maccabees 2] thinks that it represents the Chaldee תִּדְשַׁי). As above related, when he heard of the detention of Jonathan in Ptolemais by Trypho, he placed himself at the head of the patriot party, who were already beginning to despond, and effectually opposed the progress of the Syrians. His skill in war had been proved in the lifetime of Judas (1Ma 5:17-23), and he had taken an active share in the campaigns of Jonathan, when he was entrusted with a distinct command (1Ma 11:59). He was soon enabled to consummate the object for which his family had fought gloriously, but ill vain. When Trypho, after having put Jonathan to death, murdered Antiochus, and seized the throne, Simon made overtures to Demetrius II (B.C. 143) against Trypho. He was consequently confirmed in his position of sovereign high-priest. He then turned his attention to establishing the internal peace and security of his kingdom. He fortified Bethsura, Jamnia, Joppa, and Gaza, and garrisoned them with Jewish soldiers. The Lacedaemonians sent him a flattering embassy, desiring to renew their treaty; to Rome also he sent a shield of gold of immense value, and ratified his league with that nation. See SPARTAN. He moreover took the citadel of Jerusalem by siege, which up to this time had always been occupied by the Syrian faction; and, besides pulling it down, even levelled the hill on which it was built, with immense labor, that so the Temple might not be exposed to attacks from it. Under the wise government of this member of the Asmonaean family Judaea seems to have attained the greatest height of prosperity and freedom she had known for centuries, or even knew afterwards. The writer of the first book of the Maccabees evidently rejoices to remember and record it. “The ancient men,” he says, “sat all in the streets communing together of good things, and the young men put on glorious and warlike apparel. He made  peace in the land, and Israel rejoiced with great joy. For every man sat under his vine and his fig-tree, and there was none to fray them” (1Ma 14:9; 1Ma 14:11-12). This time of quiet repose Simon employed in administering justice and restoring the operation of the law. He also beautified the sanctuary, and refurnished it with sacred vessels.

In the mean time Demetrius had been taken prisoner in an expedition against the Parthians, whereupon his brother Antiochus Sidetes immediately endeavored to overthrow the usurper Trypho. Availing himself of a defection in his troops, he besieged him in Dora, a town upon the sea- coast a little south of Mount Carmel. Simon sent him 2000 chosen men, with arms and money, but Antiochus was not satisfied with this assistance while he remembered the independence of Palestine. He therefore refused to receive them, and, moreover, dispatched Athenobius to demand the restoration of Joppa, Gaza, and the fortress of Jerusalem, or else the payment of a thousand talents of silver; but when the legate saw the magnificence of the high-priest's palace at Jerusalem he was astonished, and as Simon deliberately refused to comply with the terms of the king's message, and offered by way of compensation only a hundred talents for the places in dispute, Athenobius was obliged to return disappointed and enraged. Trypho meanwhile escaped from Dora by ship to Orthosia, a maritime town in Phoenicia, and Antiochus, having deputed Cendebneus to invade Judea, pursued him in person. The king's armies proceeded to Jamnia, and, having seized Cedron and fortified it, Cendebmeus made use of that place as a center from which to annoy the surrounding country. Simon at this time was too old to engage actively in the defense of his native land, and therefore appointed his two eldest sons, Judas and John Hyrcanus, to succeed him in the command of the forces. They forthwith set themselves at the head of 20,000 men, and marched from Modin to meet the king's general: they utterly discomfited and scattered his host, drove him to Cedron, and thence to Azotus, which they set on fire, and afterwards returned in triumph to Jerusalem. But destruction threatened their house from nearer home; for Ptolemy, the son of Abubus, who had married a daughter of Simon, and was governor in the district of Jericho, with plenty of money at his command, aspired to reduce the country under his dominion, and took occasion, upon a visit that Simon paid to that neighborhood, to invite him and two of his sons, with their followers, to a banquet, and then slew them (1Ma 16:11-16). John alone, whose forces were at Gaza, now survived to carry on the line of the Maccabees,  and sustain their glory, B.C. 135. He likewise had been included in the treacherous designs of Ptolemy, but found means to elude them. With the death of Simon the narrative of the first book of the Maccabees concludes.

5. We trace now the fortunes of the next member of the family, JOHN HYRCANUS. Having been unanimously proclaimed high-priest and ruler at Jerusalem, his first step was to march against Jericho, and avenge the death of his father and brothers. Ptolemy held there in his power the mother of Hyrcanus and her surviving sons, and, shutting himself up in a fortress near to Jericho — which Josephus calls Dagon, and Ewald Dok he exposed them upon the wall, scourged and tormented them, and threatened to throw them down headlong unless Hyrcanus would desist from the siege. This had the effect of paralyzing the efforts of Hyrcanus, and, in spite of his heroic mother's entreaties to prosecute it with vigor, and disregard her sufferings, caused him to protract it till the approach of the sabbatical year obliged him to raise the siege. Ptolemy, after killing the mother and brethren of Hyrcanus, fled to Philadelphia (“Rabbath, of the children of Ammon”), which is the last we hear of him. It is not easy to see why Milman calls this reason of the sabbatical year, which is the one assigned by Josephus, “improbable.” Ewald assigns the approach of that year as a reason for the flight of Ptolemy to Zeno, the tyrant of Philadelphia, because it had already raised the price of provisions, so that it became impossible for him to remain. Antiochus meanwhile, alarmed at the energy displayed by John, invaded Judaea, burning up and desolating the country on his march, and at last besieging him in Jerusalem. He compassed the city with seven encampments and a double ditch, and Hyrcanus was reduced to the last extremities. On the recurrence, however, of the Feast of Tabernacles, Antiochus granted a truce for a week, and supplied the besieged with sacrifices for the occasion, and ended with conceding a peace, on condition that the Jews surrendered their arms, paid tribute for Joppa and other towns, and gave him 500 talents of silver and hostages.

On this occasion Josephus says that Hyrcanus opened the sepulcher of David, and took out of it 3000 talents, which he used for his present needs and the payment of foreign mercenaries. This story is utterly discredited by Prideaux, passed over in silence by Milman, but apparently believed by Ewald. Some time afterwards, having made a league with Attiochus, he marched with him on an expedition to Parthia, to deliver Demetrius Nicator, the king's captive brother. This expedition proved fatal to Antiochus, who was killed in battle. Demetrius, however, made his escape, and succeeded him on the  throne of Syria, whereupon Hyrcanus availed himself of the opportunity to shake off the Syrian yoke, and establish the independence of Judaea, which was maintained till the time of the subjugation by the Romans. He took two towns beyond the Jordan, Samega and Medaba, as well as the city of Sichem, and destroyed the hated Samaritan temple on Mount Gerizim, which for 200 years had been an object of abhorrence to the Jews. He then turned his arms towards Ilumsea, where he captured the towns of Dora (Ewald spells it Adora) and Marissa, and forced the rite of circumcision on the Idumaeans, who ever afterwards retained it. He proceeded further to strengthen himself by renewing a treaty, offensive and defensive, with the Romans. Demetrius, meanwhile, had little enjoyment of his kingdom. He was unacceptable to the army, who besought Ptolemy Physcon to send them a sovereign of the family of Seleucus, and he accordingly chose for them Alexander Zebina, a pretended son of Alexander Balas. Demetrius was beaten in the fight which ensued between them, and subsequently slain; whereupon Alexander tool the kingdom and made a league with Hyrcanus. He found a rival, however, in the person of Antiochus Grypus, the son of Demetrius, who defeated and slew him. The struggle which now took place between the brothers Grypus and Cyzicenus, rivals for the throne, only tended to consolidate the power of Hyrcanus, who quietly enjoyed his independence and amassed great wealth. He likewise made an expedition to Samaria, and reduced the place to great distress by siege. His sons Antigonus and Aristobulus were appointed to conduct it; and when Antiochus Cvzicenus came to the relief of the Samaritans, he was defeated and put to flight by Aristobulus. Cvzicenus, however, returned with a re- enforcement of 6000 Egyptians, and ravaged the country, thinking to compel Hyrcanus to raise the siege. The attempt, was unsuccessful, and he retired, leaving the prosecution of the Jewish war to two of his officers. They likewise failed, and, after a year, Samaria fell into the hands of Hyrcanus, who entirely demolished it, and, having dug trenches on the site, flooded it with water. After this, Hyrcanus, who himself belonged to the sect of the Pharisees, was exposed to some indignity from one of their party during a banquet, which exasperated him so far that he openly renounced them, and joined himself to the opposite faction of the Sadducees. This occurrence, however, does not seem to have prevented him from passing the remainder of his days happily. He built the palace or castle of Baris on a rock within the fortifications of the Temple. Here the princes of his line held their court. It was identical with what Herod afterwards called Antonia. There is some confusion as to the length of his  reign. It probably lasted about thirty years. He left five sons. With him terminates the upper house of the Asmoneans or Maccabees, B.C. 107.

6. ARISTOBULUS succeeded his father as high-priest and supreme governor. He was the first, also, after the captivity, who openly assumed the title of king. He threw his mother, who claimed the throne, into prison, and starved her to death. Three of his brothers, also, he held in bonds. Antigonus, the other one, by whose help he subdued Iturnea or Auranitis, a district at the foot of the Anti-Libanus, was killed by treachery; and, after a year of misery and crime, Aristobulus died. His wife, Salome or Alexandra, immediately released his brethren, and Alexander Janneus was made king. One of his brothers, who showed signs of ambition, he slew, the other one he left alone. His first military act was the siege of Ptolemais, which was in the hands of the Syrians. The inhabitants sought help from Ptolemy Lathyrus, who governed Cyprus, but fearing the army of 30,000 men he brought with him, declined to open their gates to him, whereupon he attacked Gaza and Dora. Alexander pretended to treat with him for the surrender of these places, and at the same time sent to Cleopatra, the widow of Physcon, for a large army to drive him from Palestine. He detected the duplicity of this conduct, and took ample vengeance on Alexander by ravaging the country. He also defeated him with the loss of 30,000 men. Judaea was saved by a large army from Cleopatra, commanded by Chelcias and Ananias, two Jews of Alexandria.

They pursued Ptolemy into Coele-Syria, and besieged Ptolemais, which was reduced. Alexander next invaded the country beyond Jordan. Here, also, he was defeated, but not thereby discouraged from attacking Gaza, which, after some fruitless attempts, he captured and totally destroyed. His worst enemies, however, were the Pharisees, who had great influence with the people, and a sedition arose during the Feast of Tabernacles, in which the troops slew 6000 of the mob. He again invaded the transJordanic country, and was again defeated. The Jews rose in rebellion, and for some years the land suffered the horrors of civil war. The rebels applied for aid to Demetrius Euchemrus, brother of Ptolemy Lathyrus, and king of Damascus, who completely routed Alexander. A sudden change of fortune, however, put him at the head of 60,000 men, and he marched in triumph to Jerusalem, where he took signal vengeance on his subjects. The rest of his life was peaceful. After a reign of twenty-seven years he died, B.C. 79, solemnly charging his wife Alexandra to espouse the Pharisaic party if she wished to retain her kingdom. His eldest son, Heranus II, became high-  priest. Aristobulus, the younger son, espoused the opposite party to his mother. In order to employ his active mind, the queen sent him northwards to check the operations of Ptolemy, king of Chalcis. He got. possession of Damascus, and won the affections of the army. After a reign of nine years his mother died, B.C. 70, and Aristobulus forthwith marched towards Jerusalem. Hyrcanus and the Pharisees seized his wife and children as hostages, and met his army at Jericho, but were discomfited, and Aristobulus entered Jerusalem and besieged his brother in the tower of Baris. At length they agreed that Hyrcanus should retire to a private station, and that Aristobulus should be king.

This was a fatal blow to the Pharisees. But there was a worse enemy waiting for the conqueror. This was none other than Antipater, the Idumacan, who had been made general of all Idumnea by Alexander Jannaeus. He was wealthy, active, and seditious, and possessed, moreover, of great influence with the deposed Hyrcanus. Suspicious of the power, successes, and designs of Aristobulus, he persuaded his brother Hyrcanus to fly to Petra, to Aretas, king of Arabia, and with his help an army of 50,000 men was marched against Aristobulus. The Jews were defeated, and the usurper fled to Jerusalem, where he was closely besieged by Aretas, Antipater, and Hyrcanus. Here, however, deliverance was at length brought by Scaurus, the general of Pompeys who, having come to Damascus, and finding that the city had been taken by Metellus and Lollius, himself proceeded hastily into Judaea. His assistance was eagerly sought by both parties. Aristobulus offered him 400 talents, and Hyrcanus the same; but as the former was in possession of the treasure, Scaurus thought that his promises were the most likely to be fulfilled, and consequently made an agreement with Aristobulus, raised the siege, and ordered Aretas to depart. He then returned to Damascus; whereupon Aristobulus gathered an army, defeated Aretas and Hyrcanus, and slew 6000 of the enemy, together with Phalion, the brother of Antipater. Shortly after Pompey himself came to Damascus, when both the brothers eagerly solicited his protection. Antipater represented the cause of Hyrcanus. Pompey, however, who was intent on the subjugation of Petra, dismissed the messengers of both, and on his return from Arabia marched directly into Judaea. Aristobulus fled to Jerusalem, but, finding the city too distracted to make good its defense, offered to surrender.

Gabinius was sent forward to take possession; meanwhile the soldiery had resolved to resist, and when he came he was surprised to find that the gates were shut and the walls manned. Pompey, enraged at this apparent treachery, threw Aristobulus into chains, and advanced to Jerusalem. The fortress of the  Temple was impregnable except on the north, and, notwithstanding his engines, Pompey was unable to reduce it for three months; neither could he have done so then had it not been for the Jewish scruples about observing the Sabbath. The Romans soon found that they could prosecute their operations on that day without disturbance, and after a time the battering- rams knocked down one of the towers, and the soldiers effected an entrance (midsummer, B.C. 63) on the anniversary of the capture of the city by Nebuchadnezzar. Great was the astonishment of Pompey at finding the Holy of Holies empty, without an image or a statue. The wealth he found in the building he magnanimously left untouched; Hyrcanus he reinstated in the high-priesthood; the country he laid under tribute; the walls he demolished; Aristobulus and his family he carried captives to Rome. Alexander, the son of Aristobulus, on the journey made his escape, and, raising a considerable force, garrisoned Macherus, Hyrcania, and the stronghold of Alexandrion. Gabinius, however, subdued him, but had no sooner done so than Aristobulus likewise escaped from Rome, and intrenched himself in Alexandrion. He was taken prisoner, and sent in chains to Rome. At the entreaty of his wife, who had always espoused the Roman cause, Antigonus his son was released, but he remained a prisoner. Alexander, with 80,000 men, once more tried his strength with the Romans on the field of battle, but was put to flight. He was subsequently executed by Metellus Scipio at Antioch, B.C. 49. Thus Hyrcanus retained the sovereignty, but Antipater enjoyed the real power; he contrived to ingratiate himself with Caesar, who made him a Roman citizen and procurator of all Judaea. He began to rebuild the walls of Jerusalem, and made his eldest son, Phasael, governor of that city; and his younger son, Herod, governor of Galilee.

The latter soon began to distinguish himself against the banditti that invested the hills. He carefully contrived also to make friends with the Roman governor of Syria, as a step to his own aggrandizement. His riches enabled him to do this by means of enormous bribes. He found, however, a troublesome enemy in Antigonus, the son of Aristobulus, who allied himself with the Parthians, and for a time held Jerusalem and kept Herod in check. At Masada, also, a city on the west coast of the Dead Sea, Antigonus was nearly successful, until Heroli at last compelled him to raise the siege. he afterwards suffered a defeat by Herod, and was finally vanquished by the Roman general Sosius, who, in derision, called him by the female name Antigona, and sent him in chains to Antony, by whom, at the request of Herod, he was put to death, B.C. 37. Thus fell the last of the Maccabees, who seemed to inherit something of their ancient  spirit. Hyrcanus, who, before this, had been incapacitated for the priesthood by having his ears cut off, was subsequently, B.C. 30, in his eightieth year, put to death by Herod. The latter, meanwhile, by Augustus and Antony, was made king of Judaea, and consolidated his throne by his marriage with Mariarnne, a woman of incomparable beauty, the daughter of Alexander, son of Aristobulus, by Alexandra, the daughter of Hyrcanus II, and therefore granddaughter to both brothers. In her the race of the Asmonmeans came to an end, and by her marriage passed into the Idumaean line of the Herodians.

7. Two of the first generation of the Maccabean family still remain to be mentioned. These, though they did not attain to the leadership of their countrymen like their brothers, shared their fate — Eleazar, by a noble act of self-devotion; John, apparently the eldest brother, by treachery. The sacrifice of the family was complete, and probably history offers no parallel to the undaunted courage with which such a band dared to face death, one by one, in the maintenance of a holy cause. The result was worthy of the sacrifice. The Maccabees inspired a subject-people with independence; they found a few personal followers, and they left a nation.

III. National Effects of the Maccabaean Revolution, —

1. The great outlines of the Maccabaean contest, which are somewhat hidden in the annals thus briefly epitomized, admit of being traced with fair distinctness, though many points must always remain obscure from our ignorance of the numbers and distribution of the Jewish population, and of the general condition of the people at the time. The disputed succession to the Syrian throne (B.C. 153) was the political turning-point of the struggle, which may thus be divided into two great periods. During the first period (B.C. 168-153) the patriots maintained their cause with varying success against the whole strength of Syria; during the second (B.C. 153-139) they were courted by rival factions, and their independence was acknowledged from time to time, though pledges given in times of danger were often broken when the danger was over.

The paramount importance of Jerusalem is conspicuous throughout the whole war. The loss of the Holy City reduced the patriotic party at once to the condition of mere guerrilla bands, issuing from “the mountains” or “the wilderness” to make sudden forays on the neighboring towns. This was the first aspect of the war (2Ma 7:1-7; comp. 1Ma 2:45); and the scene of the early exploits of Judas was the hill-country to the north-east of Jerusalem, from which he  drove the invading armies at the famous battle-fields of Beth-horon and Emmaus (Nicopolis). The occupation of Jerusalem closed the first act of the war (B.C. 165); and after this Judas made rapid attacks on every side-in Idumaea, Ammon, Gilead, Galilee-but he made no permanent settlement in the countries which he ravaged. Bethsura was fortified as a defense of Jerusalem on the south; but the authority of Judas seems to have been limited to the immediate neighborhood of Jerusalem, though the influence of his name extended more widely (1Ma 7:50, ἡ γῆ Ι᾿ούδα). On the death of Judas the patriots were reduced to as great distress as at their first rising; and, as Bacchides held the keys of the “mountains of Ephraim” (9:50), they were forced to find a refuge in the lowlands of Jericho, and, after some slight successes, Jonathan was allowed to settle at Michmash I undisturbed, though the whole country remained absolutely under the sovereignty of Syria. So far it seemed that little had been gained when the contest between Alexander Balas and Demetrius I opened a new period (B.C. 153).

Jonathan was empowered to raise troops: the Jewish hostages were restored, many of the fortresses were abandoned, and apparently a definite district was assigned to the government of the high-priest. The former unfruitful conflicts at length produced their full harvest. The defeat at Eleasa, like the Swiss St. Jacob, had shown the worth of men who could face all odds, and no price seemed too great to secure their aid. When the Jewish leaders had once obtained legitimate power they proved able to maintain it, though their general success was checkered by some reverses. The solid power of the national party was seen by the slight effect which was produced by the treacherous murder of Jonathan. Simon was able at once to occupy his place and carry out his plans. The Syrian garrison was withdrawn from Jerusalem, Joppa was occupied as a sea-port, and “four governments” (τέσσαρες νομοί, 11:57; 13:37)-probably the central parts of the old kingdom of Judah, with three districts taken from Samaria (10:38, 39), were subjected to the sovereign authority of the high-priest.

2. The war, thus brought to a noble issue, if less famous, is not less glorious than any of those in which a few brave men have successfully maintained the cause of freedom or religion against overpowering might. The answer of Judas to those who counselled retreat (1Ma 9:10) was as true-hearted as that of Leonidas; and the exploits of his followers will bear favorable comparison with those of the Swiss, or the Dutch, or the Americans. It would be easy to point out parallels in Maccabmaan history to the noblest traits of patriots and martyrs in other countries; but it  may be enough here to claim for the contest the attention which it rarely receives. It seems, indeed, as if the indifference of classical writers were perpetuated in our own days, though there is no struggle — not even the wars of Joshua or David — which is more profoundly interesting to the Christian student; for it is not only in their victory over external difficulties that the heroism of the Maccabees is conspicuous: their real success was as much imperilled by internal divisions as by foreign force. They had to contend on the one hand against open and subtle attempts to introduce Greek customs, and on the other against an extreme Pharisaic party, which is seen from time to time opposing their counsels (1Ma 7:12-18). It was from Judas and those whom he inspired that the old faith received its last development and final impress before the coming of our Lord.

3. For that view of the Maccabean war which regards it only as a civil and not as a religious conflict is essentially one-sided. If there were no other evidence than the book of Daniel — whatever opinion be held as to the (late of it — that alone would show how deeply the noblest hopes of the theocracy were centered in the success of the struggle. When the feelings of the nation were thus again turned with fresh power to their ancient faith, we might expect that there would be a new creative epoch in the national literature; or, if the form of Hebrew composition was already fixed by sacred types, a prophet or psalmist would express the thoughts of the new age after the models of old time. Yet, in part at least, the leaders of Maccabaean times felt that they were separated by a real chasm from the times of the kingdom or of the exile. If they looked for a prophet in the future, they acknowledged that the spirit of prophecy was not among them. The volume of the prophetic writings was completed, an, as far as appears, no one ventured to imitate its contents. But the Hagiographa, though they were already long fixed as a definite collection, SEE CANON, were equally far removed from imitation. The apocalyptic visions of Daniel, SEE DANIEL, served as a pattern for the visions incorporated in the book of Enoch, SEE ENOCH, BOOK OF; and it has been commonly supposed that the Psalter contains compositions of the Aaccabsean date.

This supposition, which is at variance with the best evidence that can be obtained on the history of the Canon, can only be received upon the clearest internal proof; and it may well be questioned whether the hypothesis not as much at variance with sound interpretation as with the history of the Canon. The extreme forms of the hypothesis, as that of Hitzig, who represents Psalms 1, 2, 44, 60, and all the last three books of  the Psalms (Psalms 73-150) as Maccabaean (Grimm, 1 Maccabees Einleit. § 9, 3), or of Just. Olshausen (quoted by Ewald, Jahrb. 1853, p. 250 sq.), who is inclined to bring the whole Psalter, with very few exceptions, to that date, need only be mentioned as indicating the kind of conjecture which finds currency such a subject. The real controversy is confined to a much narrower field; and the psalms which have been referred with the greatest show of reason to the Alaccabaan age are Isaiah 44, 60, 74, 79, 80, 83. It has been argued that all these speak of the dangers to which the house and people of God were exposed from heathen enemies, at a period later than the captivity; and the one ground for referring them to the time of the Maccabees is the general coincidence which they present with some features of the Greek oppression. But, if it were admitted that, the psalms in question are of a later date n han the captivity, it by no means follows that they are Maccabaean. On the contrary, they do not contain the slightest trace of those internal divisions of the people which were the most marked features of the Maccabaean struggle. The dangers then were as much from within as from without; and party jealousies brought the divine cause to the greatest peril (Ewald, Psalmen, p. 355). It is incredible that a series of Maccabaean psalms should contain no allusion to a system of enforced idolatry, or to a temporizing priesthood, or to a faithless multitude. While the obscurity which hangs over the history of the Persian supremacy from the time of Nehemiah to the invasion of Alexander makes it impossible to fix with any precision a date to which the psalms can be referred, the one glimpse which is given of the state of Jerusalem in the interval (Josephus, Ant. 11:7) is such as to show that they may well have found some sufficient occasion in the wars and disorders which attended the decline of the Persian power (comp. Ewald). It may, however, be doubted whether the arguments for a post-Babylonian date are conclusive. There is nothing in the psalms themselves which may not apply to the circumstances which attended the overthrow of the kingdom; and it seems incredible that the desolation of the Temple should have given occasion to no hymns of pious sorrow.

4. The collection of the so-called Psalms of Solomon furnishes a strong confirmation of the belief that all the canonical Psalms are earlier than the Maccabaean era. This collection, which bears the clearest traces of unity of authorship, is, almost beyond question, a true Maccabeaen work. There is every reason to believe (Ewald, Geschichte, 4:343) that the book was originally composed in Hebrew; and it presents exactly those  characteristics which are wanting in the other (conjectural) Maccabaean Psalms. “The holy ones” (οἱ ὅσιοι, םחסידם SEE ASSIDAEANS; οἱ φοβούμενοι τὸν Κύριον) appear throughout as a distinct class, struggling against hypocrites and men-pleasers, who make the observance of the law subservient to their own interests (Son 4:13-15). The sanctuary is polluted by the abominations of professing servants of God before it is polluted by the heathen (Son 1:8; Son 2:1 sq.; Son 8:8 sq.). National unfaithfulness is the cause of national punishment; and the end of trial is the “justification” of God (Son 2:16; Son 3:3; Son 4:9; Son 8:7 sq.). On the other hand, there is a holiness of works set up in some passages which violates the divine mean of Scripture (Son 1:2-3; Son 3:9); and, while the language is full of echoes of the Old Testament, it is impossible not to feel that it wants something which we find in all the canonical writings. The historical allusions in the Psalms of Solomon are as unequivocal as the description which they give of the state of the Jewish nation. An enemy “threw down the strong walls of Jerusalem,” and “Gentiles went up to the altar” (Son 2:1-3; comp. 1Ma 1:31). In his pride “he wrought all things in Jerusalem, as the Gentiles in their cities do for their gods” (Song of Solomon 17:16). “Those who loved the assemblies of the saints (συναγωγὰς ὁσίων), wandered (lege ἐπλανῶντο) in deserts” (Song of Solomon 27:19; comp. 1Ma 1:54; 1Ma 2:28); and there “was no one in the midst of Jerusalem who did mercy and truth” (Song of Solomon 17:17; comp. 1Ma 1:38). One psalm (8) appears to refer to a somewhat later period. The people wrought wickedly, and God sent upon them a spirit of error. He brought one “from the extremity of the earth” (8:16; compare 1Ma 7:1 — “Demetrius from Rome”). “The princes of the land met him with joy” (1Ma 7:5-8); and he entered the land in safety (1Ma 7:9-12 -Bacchides, his general), “as a father in peace” (1Ma 7:15). Then “he slew the princes and every one wise in counsel” (1Ma 7:16), and “poured out the blood of those who dwelt in Jerusalem” (1Ma 7:17). The purport of these evils, as a retributive and purifying judgment, leads to the most remarkable feature of the Psalms, the distinct expression of Messianic hopes. In this respect they offer a direct contrast to the books of Maccabees (1Ma 14:41). The sorrow and the triumph are seen together in their spiritual aspect, and the expectation of “an anointed Lord” (χριστὸς Κύριος, Song of Solomon 17:36 [[8:8]; comp. Luk 2:11) follows directly after the description of the impious assaults of Gentile enemies (Song of Solomon  17; comp. Dan 11:45; Daniel 12). “Blessed,” it is said, “are they who are born in those days, to see the good things which the Lord shall do for the generation to come. [When men are brought] beneath the rod of correction of an anointed Lord (or the Lord's anointed, ὑπὸ ῥάβδον παιδείας χριστοῦ Κυρίου) in the fear of his God, in wisdom of spirit, and of righteousness, and of might”... then there shall be a “good generation the fear of God, in the days of mercy” (Song of Solomon 18:6-10).

5. Elsewhere there is little which marks the distinguishing religious character of the era. The notice of the Maccabaean heroes in the book of Daniel is much more general and brief than the corresponding notice of their great adversary, but it is not, on that account, less important as illustrating the relation of the famous chapter to the simple history of the period which it embraces. Nowhere is it more evident that facts are shadowed forth by the prophet only in their typical bearing on the development of God's kingdom. In this aspect the passage itself (Dan 11:29-35) will supersede in a great measure the necessity of a detailed comment: “At the time appointed [in the spring of B.C. 168] he [Antiochus Epiph.] shall return and come toward the south [Egypt]; but it shall not be as the first time, so also the last time [though his first attempts shall be successful, in the end he shall fail]. For the ships of Chittim [the Romans] shall come against him, and he shall be cast down, and return, and be very wroth against the holy covenant; and he shall do [his will]; yea, he shall return, and have intelligence with them that forsake the holy covenant (compare Dan 8:24-25). And forces from him [at his bidding] shall stand [remain in Judaea as garrisons; comp. 1Ma 1:33-34]; and they shall pollute the sanctuary, the stronghold, and shall take away the daily [sacrifice]; and they shall set up the abonination that maketh desolate [1Ma 1:45-47]. And such as do wickedly against (or rather such as condemn) the covenant shall be corrupt [to apostasy] by smooth words; but the people that know their God shall be strong and do [exploits]. And they that understand [know God and his law] among the people shall instruct many: yet they shall fall by the sword and by flame, by captivity and by spoil [some] days (1Ma 1:60-64). Now when they shall fall, they shall be holpen with a little help (1Ma 1:28; 2Ma 5:27; Judas Maccabees with nine others . . ); and maney shall cleave to them [the faithful followers of the law] with hypocrisy [dreading the prowess of Judas: 1Ma 2:46, and yet ready to fall away at the first opportunity, 1Ma 7:6]. And some of them of understanding  shall fall, to make trial among them, and to purge and to snake them white, unto the time of the end; because [the end is] yet for a time appointed.” From this point the prophet describes in detail the godlessness of the great oppressor (1Ma 7:36-39), and then his last fortunes and death (1Ma 7:40-45), but says nothing of the triumph of the Maccabees or of the restoration of the Temple, which preceded the last event by some months. This omission is scarcely intelligible unless we regard the facts as symbolizing a higher struggle — a truth wrongly held by those who from early times referred 1Ma 7:36-45 only to Antichrist, the antitype of Antiochus-in which that recovery of the earthly temple had no place. At any rate, it shows the imperfection of that view of the whole chapter by which it is regarded as a mere transcription of history.

6. The history of the Maccabees does not contain much which illustrates in detail the religious or social progress of the Jews. It is obvious that the period must not only have intensified old beliefs, but also have called out elements which were latent in them. One doctrine at least, that of a resurrection, and even of a material resurrection (2Ma 14:46), was brought out into the most distinct apprehension by suffering. “It is good to look for the hope from God, to be raised up again by him” (πάλιν ἀναστήσεσθαι ὑπ᾿ αὐτοῦ), was the substance of the martyr's answer to his judge; “as for thee, thou shalt have no resurrection to life” (ἀνάστασις εἰς ζωήν, 2Ma 7:14; comp. 2Ma 6:26; 2Ma 14:46). “Our brethren,” says another, “have fallen, having endured a short pain leading to everlasting life, being under the covenant of God” (2Ma 7:36, πόνον, ἀεννάου ζωῆς). As it was believed that an interval elapsed between death and judgment, the dead were supposed to be in some measure still capable of profiting by the intercession of the living. Thus much is certainly expressed in the famous passage, 2Ma 12:43-45, though the secondary notion of a purgatorial state is in no way implied in it. On the other hand, it is not very clear how far the future judgment was supposed to extend. If the punishment of the wicked heathen in another life had formed a definite article of belief, it might have been expected to be put forward more prominently (2Ma 7:17; 2Ma 7:19; 2Ma 7:35, etc.), though the passages in question may be understood of sufferings after death, and not only of earthly sufferings; but for the apostate Jews there was a certain judgment in reserve (2Ma 6:26). The firm faith in the righteous providence of God shown in the chastening of his people, as contrasted with his neglect of other nations, is another proof of the widening view of the spiritual  world which is characteristic of the epoch (2Ma 4:16-17; 2Ma 5:17-20; 2Ma 6:12-16, etc.). The lessons of the captivity were reduced to moral teaching; and in the same way the doctrine of the ministry of angels assumed an importance which is without parallel except in patriarchal times. SEE 2 MACCABEES. It was perhaps from this cause also that the Messianic hope was limited in its range. The vivid perception of spiritual truths hindered the spread of a hope which had been cherished in a material form; and a pause, as it were, was made, in which men gained new points of sight from which to contemplate the old promises.

7. The various glimpses of national life which can be gained during the period show, on the whole, a steady adherence to the Mosaic law. Probably the law was never more rigorously fulfilled. The importance of the Antiochian persecution in fixing the canon of the Old Testament has already been noticed. SEE CANON.

The books of the law were specially sought out for destruction (1Ma 1:56-57; 1Ma 3:48), and their distinctive value was in consequence proportionately increased. To use the words of 1 Maccabees, “the holy books” (τὰ βιβλία τὰ ἃγια τὰ ἐν χερσίν ἡμῶν) were felt to make all other comfort superfluous (1Ma 12:9). The strict observance of the Sabbath (1Ma 2:32; 2Ma 6:11; 2Ma 8:26, etc.) and of the sabbatical year (1Ma 6:53), the law of the Nazarites (1Ma 3:49), and the exemptions from military service (1Ma 3:56), the solemn prayer and fasting (1Ma 3:47; 2Ma 10:25, etc.), carry us back to early times. The provision for the maimed, the aged, and the bereaved (2Ma 8:28; 2Ma 8:30),. was in the spirit of the law; and the new Feast of the Dedication was a homage to the old rites (2Ma 1:9), while it was a proof of independent life. The interruption of the succession to the high-priesthood was the most important innovation which was made, and one which prepared the way for the dissolution of the state. After various arbitrary changes the office was left vacant for seven years upon the death of Alcimus. The last descendant of Jozadak (Onias), in whose family it had been for nearly four centuries, fled to Egypt, and established a schismatic worship; and at last, when the support of the Jews became important, the Maccabaean leader, Jonathan, of the family of Joarib, was elected to the dignity by the nomination of the Syrian king (1Ma 10:20), whose will was confirmed, as it appears, by the voice of the people (comp. 1Ma 14:35).  8. Little can be said of the condition of literature and the arts which has not been already anticipated. In common intercourse the Jews used the Aramaic dialect which was established after the return: this was “their own language” (2Ma 7:8; 2Ma 7:21; 2Ma 7:27; 2Ma 12:37); but it is evident from the narrative quoted that they understood Greek, which must have spread widely through the influence of Syrian officers. There is not, however, the slightest evidence that Greek was employed in Palestinian literature till a much later date. The description of the monument which was erected by Simon at Modin in memory of his family (1Ma 13:27-30) is the only record of the architecture of the time. The description is obscure, but in some features the structure appears to have presented a resemblance to the tombs of Porsena and the Curiatii (Pliny, H. N, 36:13), and perhaps to one still found in Idumsea. An oblong basement, of which the two chief faces were built of polished white marble (Josephus, Ant. 13:6, 5), supported “seven pyramids in a line ranged one against another,” equal in number to the members of the Maccabaean family, including Simon himself. To these he added other works of art (μηχανήματα), placing round (on the two chief faces?) great columns (Josephus adds, each of a single block), bearing trophies of arms and sculptured ships, which might be visible from the sea below.” The language of 1 Maccabees and Josephus implies that these columns were placed upon the basement, otherwise it might be supposed that the columns rose only to the height of the basement supporting, the trophies on the same level as the pyramids. So much, at least, is evident, that the characteristics of this work and probably of later Jewish architecture generally bore closer affinity to the styles of Asia Minor and Greece than to that of Egypt or the East, a result which would follow equally from the Syrian dominion and the commerce which Simon opened by the Mediterranean (1Ma 14:5). SEE MODIN.

9. The only recognized relics of the time are the coins which bear the name of “Simon,” or Simon, prince (nasi) of Israel,” in Samaritan letters. The privilege of a national coinage was granted to Simon by Antiochus VII, Sidetes (1Ma 15:6, κόμμα ἵδιον νόμισμα τῆ χώρᾷ); and numerous examples occur which have the dates of the first, second, third, and fourth years of the liberation of Jerusalem (Israel, Zion); and it is a remarkable confirmation of their genuineness, that in the first year the name Zion does not occur, as the citadel was not recovered till the second year of Simon's supremacy, while after the second year Zion alone is found (Bayer, De Nummis, p. 171). The privilege was first definitely accorded to  Simon in B.C. 140, while the first year of Simon was B.C. 143 (1Ma 13:42); but this discrepancy causes little difficulty, as it is not unlikely that the concession of Antiochus was made in favor of a practice already existing. No date is given later than the fourth year, but coins of Simon occur without a date, which may belong to the last four years of his life. The emblems which the coins bear have generally a connection with Jewish history — a vine-leaf, a cluster of grapes, a vase (of manna?), a trifid flowering rod, a palm branch surrounded by a wreath of laurel, a lyre (1Ma 13:51), a bundle of branches symbolic of the Feast of Tabernacles. The coins issued in the last war of independence by Bar- cochba repeat many of these emblems, and there is considerable difficulty in distinguishing the two series. The authenticity of all the Maccabaean coins was impugned by Tychsen (Die Unächtheit d. Jud. Münzen... bewiesen... O. G. Tychsen, 1779), but on insufficient grounds. He was answered by Bayer, whose admirable essays (De Nunmmnis e br. Saunaritanis, Val. Ed. 1781; Vindiciae... 1790) give the most complete account of the coins, though he reckons some apparently later types as Maccabaean. Eckhel (Doctr. Numim. 3:455 sq.) has given a good account of the controversy, a anan accurate description of the chief types of the coins. Compare De Saulcy, Numism. Judaique; Ewald, Gesch. 7:366,476. SEE MONEY.

IV. Literature. — The original authorities for the history of the Maccabees are extremely scanty; but for the course of the war itself the first book of Maccabees is a most trustworthy, if an incomplete witness. SEE MACCABEES, BOOKS OF. The second book adds some important details to the history of the earlier part of the struggle, and of the events which immediately preceded it; but all the statements which it contains require close examination, and must be received with caution. Josephus follows 1 Maccabees, for the period which. it embraces, very closely, but slight additions of names and minute particulars indicate that he was in possession of other materials, probably oral traditions, which have not been elsewhere preserved. On the other hand, there are cases in which, from haste or carelessness, he has misinterpreted his authority. From other sources little can be gleaned. Hebrew and classical literature furnishes nothing more than a few trifling fragments which illustrate Maccabmean history. So long an interval elapsed before the Hebrew traditions were committed to writing, that facts, when not embodied in rites or precepts, became wholly distorted. Classical writers, again, were little likely to  chronicle a conflict which probably they could not have understood. Of the great work of Polybius — who alone might have been expected to appreciate the importance of the Jewish war — only fragments remain which refer to this period; but the omission of all mention of the Maccabaean campaign in the corresponding sections of Livy, who follows very closely in the track of the Greek historian seems to prove that Polybius also omitted them. The account of the Syrian kings in Appian is too meagre to make his silence remarkable; but indifference or contempt must be the explanation of a general silence which is too widespread to be accidental. Even when the fall of Jerusalem had directed unusual attention to the past fortunes of is defenders. Tacitus was able to dismiss the Maccabaean conflict in a sentence remarkable for scornful carelessness. “During the dominion of the Assyrians, the Medes, and the Persians, the Jews,” he says, “were the most abject of their dependent subjects. After the Macedonians obtained the supremacy of the East, king Antiochus endeavored to do away with their superstition, and introduce Greek habits, but was hindered by a Parthian war from reforming a most repulsive people” (teterrimam gentem, Tacitus, Hist. v. 8).

For a table of contemporary Syrian kings, SEE ANTIOCHUS; and for further information, see Milman, Hist. of the Jews, vol. ii; Prideaux. Connection, vol. ii (Oxford, 1838); Ewald, Geschichte des V. Israel, vol. iii, part ii; Herzfeld, Geschichte d. Volkes Isr.; Raphall, Hist. of the Jews; Grätz, Gesch. d. Juden, vol. iii; Jost, Gesch. I. Israeliten; Weber und Holtzmann, Gesch. d. Volkes Israel (Leipsic, 1867, 2 vols. 8vo), vol. ii, ch. iii.

## Maccabees, Books Of[[@Headword:Maccabees, Books Of]]

             (Μακκαβαίων ά, β᾿, etc.). Four books which bear the common title of “Maccabees” are found in some MSS. of the Sept.; a fifth is found in an Arabic version. Two of these were included in the early current Latin versions of the Bible, and hence passed into the Vulgate. As forming part of the Vulgate, they were received as canonical by the Council of Trent, and retained among the Apocrypha by the Reformed churches. The two other books obtained no such wide circulation, and have only a secondary connection with the Maccabaean history. But all the books, though they differ most widely in character, and date, and worth, possess points of interest which make them a fruitful field for study. If the historic order were observed, the so-called third book would come first, the fourth  would be an appendix to the second, which would retain its place, and the first would come last; but it will be more convenient to examine the books in the order in which they are found in the MSS., which was probably decided by some vague tradition of their relative antiquity. In the following account of these books we adopt much of the matter found in the dictionaries of Kitto and Smith.

The controversy as to the mutual relations and historic worth of the first two books of Maccabees has given rise to much very ingenious and partial criticism. The subject was very nearly exhausted by a series of essays published in the last century. which contain, in the midst of much unfair reasoning. the substance of what has been written since. The discussion was occasioned by E. Frolich's Annals of Syria. (Annalles... Syriae.... numis veteribus illustrati, Vindob. 1744). In this great work the author-a Jesuit-had claimed paramount authority for the books of Maccabees. This claim was denied by E. F. Wernsdorf in his Prolusio de fontibus historiae Syriae in Libris Maccabees (Lipsiae, 1746). Frolich replied to this essay in another, De fontibus hist. Syriae in Libris Maccabees prolusio... in examen vocata (Vindob. 1746), and then the argument fell into other hands. Wernsdorf's brother (Gli. Wernsdorf) undertook to support his cause, which he did in a Commentatio historico-critica de fide librorumn Maccab. (Wratisl. 1747); and nothing has been written on the same side which can be compared with his work. By the vigor and freedom of his style, by his surprising erudition and unwavering confidence-almost worthy of Bentley — he carries his readers often beyond the bounds of true criticism, and it is only after reflection that the littleness and sophistry of many of his arguments are apparent. But, in spite of the injustice and arrogance of the book, it contains very much which is of the greatest value, and no abstract can give an adequate notion of its power. The reply to Wernsdorf was published anonymously by another Jesuit: Auctoritas utriusque Libri Maccabees canonico-historica adserta... a quodam Soc. Jesu sacerdote (Vindob. 1749). The authorship of this was fixed upon J. Khell (Welte, Einleit. p. 23, note); and while in many points Khell is unequal to his adversary, his book contains some very useful collections for the history of the canon. In more recent times, F. X. Patritius (another Jesuit) has made a fresh attempt to establish the complete harmony of the books, and, on the whole, his essay (De Consensu utriusque Libri Maccabees Romae, 1856), though far from satisfactory, is the most able defense of the books which has been published.  For a copious list of original editions, translations, and commentaries on the first three books of Maccabees, see Fürst, Bibliotheca Judaica, 2:316 sq.

## Maccabees, Festival of the[[@Headword:Maccabees, Festival of the]]

             In the 4th century, when fasts and festivals had greatly multiplied, not only were festivals of Christian martyrs celebrated, but also those of some of the more eminent martyrs of the Old Testament. The conduct of the Maccabees (q.v.) in opposing Antiochus Epiphanes (q.v.), and dying in  defense of the Jewish law, seems to have been generally celebrated at this time. The authors of that period are extravagant in their commendations of these patriots. Chrysostom has three homilies on the subject. At Antioch there was a church called by the name of the Maccabees; and Augustine, who wrote two sermons on their festival, calls them Christian martyrs. The reason assigned for the adoption of this festival was that, as these men had suffered martyrdom so bravely before Christ's coming, what would they not have done had they lived after him, and been favored with the death of Christ for their example? The Roman Martyrology places this festival on August 1st. Augustine and Gregory Nazianzen allude to this feast. — Farrar, Eccles. Dict. s.v.; Eadie, Eccles. Cyclop. s.v.

## Maccabees, The Fifth Book Of[[@Headword:Maccabees, The Fifth Book Of]]

             an important chronicle of Jewish affairs, which was for the first time printed in Arabic in the Paris Polyglot (1645), and was thence copied into the London Polyglot (1657).

I. Title. — The name, the fifth book of Maccabees, has been given to this production by Cotton, who placed it as fifth in his order of the books of Maccabees. According to the remark at the end of chap. 16, the first, part of this book, i.e. chap. 1:50-16:26, is entitled The second Book of Maccabees according to the Translation of the Hebrews, while the second part, i.e. chap. 17:1-59:96, is simply called The second Book of Maccabees. The fact that this second part gives the history of John Hyrcanus (ch. 20) has led Calmet (Dict. of the Bible, s.v. Maccabees) and others to suppose that it is the same as the so-called fourth book of Maccabees, a unique MS. of which, written in Greek, Sixtus Senensis saw in the library of Sanctes Pagninus, at Lyons, and which was afterwards destroyed by fire, so that the fifth of Maccabees is sometimes also called the fourth. The description of the MS. given by Sixtus Senensis (Bibl. Sancta, lib. i, sec. 3) has been printed in English by Whiston (Authentic Records, 1:206, etc.) and Cotton, The five Books of Maccabees, Introd. p. 38, etc. See MACCABEES, FOURTH BOOK OF (b).

II. Contents. — This book contains the history of the Jews from Heliodorus's attempt to plunder the treasury at Jerusalem till the time when Herod revelled in the noblest blood of the Jews, and completed the tragedy of the Maccabaean princes by slaughtering his own wife Mariamne, her mother Alexandra, and his own two sons Alexander and Aristobulus, i.e. B.C. 184 to B.C. 6, thus embracing a period of 178 years. The subjoined table shows the parallelism between the narrative recorded in this book and the accounts contained in 1 and 2 Maccabees and the works of Josephus.

III. Historical and Religious Character. — It will be seen from the annexed table that the first part of this production (1-19), which embraces the Maccabaean period, is to a great extent parallel with 1 and 2 Maccabees, whilst the second part, which records the post-Maccabaean history down to the birth of Christ (20-59), is parallel with Josephus, Ant. 13:15-16:17; War, 1:317. The historical worth of 5 Maccabees is therefore easily ascertained by comparing its narrative with that of 1 and 2 Maccabees, and with the corresponding portions of Josephus. By this means it will be seen that. notwithstanding its several historical and chronological blunders (compare 5 Maccabees 10:16, 17, with 2Ma 10:29; 2 Maccabees 5 Maccabees 9, with 1Ma 7:7; 1 Maccabees 5 Maccabees 8:1-8, with 1Ma 9:73; 1Ma 12:48; Joseph. Ant. 13:11; 5 Maccabees 20:17, with Ant. 13:15; 5 Maccabees 21:17, with Ant. 7:12), especially when recording foreign history (comp. 5 Maccabees 12), it is a trustworthy and valuable narrative. There can be no question that some of its blunders are owing to mistakes committed by transcribers (e.g. the name Felix, which stands five times for three different persons, 5 Maccabees 3:14; 7:8, 34, comp. with 1Ma 3:10; 2Ma 5:22; 2Ma 8:33; the name Gorgias, 5 Maccabees 10, is a mistake for Timotheus, as is evident from 2 Maccabees 10; Joseph. Ant. 12:11; so also two for nine, 5 Maccabees 19:8); and that, as a whole, it is far more simple and natural, and far less blundering and miraculous, and therefore more credible than 2 Maccabees As to its religious character, the book shows most distinctly that the Jews of those days firmly believed in the survival of the soul after the death of the body, in a general resurrection of the dead, and in a future judgment (5:12, 13, 17, 22, 43, 48-51; 59:14, etc.).

IV. Author, Date, and Original Language — This book is a compilation, made in Hebrew, by a Jew who lived after the destruction of Jerusalem,  from ancient Hebrew memoirs or chronicles, which were written shortly after the events transpired. This is evident from the whole complexion of the document, even in the translation for the original has not as yet come to light-as may be seen from the few features here offered for consideration:

1. When speaking of the (lead (15:11, 15; 12:1; 21:17) the compiler uses the well-known euphemisms, God be mercful to him — ירחם עליו אלהים; to whom be peace =עליו השלום, which came into vogue among the Jews in the Talmudic period (comp. Tosiphta Chullin, 100, a; Zunz, Zur Geschichte, p. 338), and are used among the Jews to the present day, thus showing that the compiler was a Jew, and lived after the destruction of the Temple.

2. He calls the Hebrew Scriptures (3:3, 9) the twenty-four books = וארבע עשרים, a name which is thoroughly Jewish, and came into use long after the close of the Hebrew canon; leaves Torah (תורה), the Hebrew name for the Pentateuch, untranslated (21:9), in accordance with the Jewish custom; speaks of the deity as the great and good God — אל גדול וטוב(1:8, 13, 15; 5:27; 7:21, 22; 8:5, 11; 9:4; 10:15; 11:8; 12:1; 15:4; 16:24; 28:4; 35:9; 48:14; 57:35; 59:58); and names Jerusalem the city of the holy house (20:17; 21:1; 23:5; 28:23, 34, 37; 30:8; 35:4, 33; 36:6, 38, 39; 37:3, 5; 38:5; 52:7, 24; 59:68); city of the holy house of God (31:10); or simply holy city (16:11, 17; 20:18; 21:26; 34:7; 35:32; 36:9, 19, 25; 38:3; 41:15; 43:12; 49:5; 1, 16; 54:13, 26; 55:27; 57:22; 59:2); holy house (20:7, 17; 23:3; 36:35; 1, 8; 52:19; 53:6; 56:17, 44; 59:35, 68); house of God (7:21; 9:7; 11:7; 15:14; 16:16, 17; 21:11; 27:4; 34:10; 51:5; 52:31; 54:13; 55:20); the Temple he calls the house of the sanctuary בית המקדש(8:11), in accordance with the later Hebrew idiom.

3. This later date of the compilation of the book is corroborated by the fact that the compiler refers to the destruction of Jerusalem (21:30), and to the period of the second Temple, as something past (22:9).

4. He speaks of the original author of the book as a distinct person (25:5; 55:25), and explains the original writer's allusions (56:45).

5. The original writer of the work must have lived before to destruction of Jerusalem, for he terminates his narrative six sears before this catastrophe, and does not know of any of the calamities which befell his brethren after the conquest of Palestine by Titus. His name is unknown; all that we can  gather from this book is that he is also the author of other historical works which are now lost, as he himself refers to them (59:96), and, judging from his terse and experienced style, it is not at all improbable that he was the public chronographer. The book is entirely devoid of the Hagadcic legends which form a very striking characteristic of the Jewish productions of a later age. Graitz (Geschichte der Juden, 5:281) identifies it with an Arabic chronicle written about A.D. 900, entitled “Torich al Makkabain, Jussuff Ibn-Gorgion,” History of the Maccabees, or Joseph b. Gorion, a part of which he says is printed in the London Polyglot under the title of Arabic Book of Maccabees, and the whole of which, extending to the time of Titus, is in two Bodleian MSS. (Uri, Nos. 782, 829). He moreover tells us that it is this work which the well-known Hebrew chronicler called Josippon, SEE JOSIPPON BEN-GORION, translated into Hebrew, and supplemented, and this he has promised to prove at some future time. We must confess that we are unable to trace the identity; and we are astonished at Dr. Davidson's confident assertion that “it is another form or recension of our book [i.e. 5 Maccabees] which exists in the work of Joseph ben- Gorion or Josippon, a legendary Jewish history” (Introduction to the Old Testament, 3:466).

V. Versions and Literature. — Though this book is in our estitimation as important as 2 Maccabees, yet there has hardly anything been done to elucidate its narrative. In the absence of the original Hebrew, the Arabic version of it, printed in the Paris and London Polyglots, is the text upon which we must rely. The editors of this version have not even given any account of the MS. from which it has been taken. A Latin translation of it by Gabriel Sionita is given in both Polyglots; a French translation is given in the appendix to De Sacy's Bible: another French translation, by M. Baubrun, is given in vol. iii of Le Maitre's Bible; and Calmet translated chapters 20-26, containing the history of John Hyrcanus, which he thought Sixtus Senensis had taken for the legitimate 4 Maccabees The only English version of it is that by Cotton, The Five Books of Maccabees (Oxford, 1832).

## Maccabees, The First Book Of[[@Headword:Maccabees, The First Book Of]]

             the most important one of the five apocryphal productions which have come down to us under this common title.

I. Title and Position of the Book. — In the editions of the Sept. which we follow, this book is called the first of Maccabees (Μακκαβαίων ά), because in the MSS. it is placed at the head of those apocryphal books which record the exploits and merits of the Maccabaean family in their struggles for the restoration of their ancestral religion and the liberation of their Jewish compatriots from the Seleucidian tyranny. According to Origen, however (comp. Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. 6:25), the original Hebrew title of this book was Σαρβὴθ Σαρβανὲ ἔλ. Great difficulty has been experienced in the endeavor to obtain the exact Hebrew equivalent to these words. They have been resolved —

1. Into שרֵ שרי(or שר) בני אל, History of the Princes of the Sons of God, that is, of Israel (Michaelis, Orient. Biblioth. 12:115, and most modern commentators).

2. Into אל שרביט שר בני, The Sceptre of the Prince of the Sons of God, i.e. of Simon, who is called prince in 1Ma 13:41; 1Ma 14:47 (Bochart, Buddeus, and Ewald, Geschichte d. V. Israel 4:528). But this makes chapters 13-16 the principal part of the book, and the rest a mere introduction.

3. Into שר בית שר בני אל, Princeps templi (i.e. epontifex maximus), Princeps filiorum Dei (i.e. dux populi Judaici), based upon the words Σίμωνος ἀρχιερέως μεγάλου καὶ στρατηγοῦ καὶ ἡγουμένου Ι᾿ουδαίων, 1Ma 13:42; and ἐπὶ Σίμωνος ἀρχιερέως ἐν Σαραμέλ, ibid. 14:27 (Wernsdorf, Comment. de fide libb. Maccab. p. 173).

4. Into שרביט סרבני אל, Sceptrum rebellium Dei. i.e. of the Syrian kings, who were regarded as rebelling against God because they persecuted the Jews (Junius, Huetiun, etc.), or as Herzfeld, who espouses this solution of the words, explains it, the chastisizng rod of the apostates, which he  submits is an appropriate appellation of the Maccabaeans (Geschichte d. V. Israel, 1:265). We incline to the first explanation, because it escapes the censure which the second incurs, and is less artificial than the third and fourth. It must, however, be remarked that this title does not occur in the Hebrew literature, and that both the ancient and modern Jews call the book ספר החשמונאים, The Book of the Hashmonaeans; ראשון לחשמונאי, Hashnmoneans; מגלת בית חשמונאי, The Scroll of the Family of the Hashmonaeans, or simply מגלת חשמונאי, The Scroll of the Hashmonaeans, after the title Hashmonaeans or Ashmoneans, by which the Maccabmean family are denominated. SEE MACCABEE.

Though the book occupies the first position, it ought, according to the historic order, to be the fourth of Maccabees, inasmuch as its narrative commences at a later period than the other three books. Tradition, however, in determining the priority of position, was evidently guided by the age and the intrinsic value of these books, since 1 Maccabees is obviously the oldest, and surpasses the other three books in importance. Cotton, in his translation of the Maccabees, has departed from this traditional and commonly accepted arrangement, and placed the first book as second in order.

II. Contents and Division. — This book contains a lucid and chronological history of the tyrannical proceedings of Antiochus Epiphanes, commencing with the year B.C. 175, and of the series of patriotic struggles against this tyranny, first organized by Mattathias, B.C. 168, down to settled sovereignty and the death of Simon, B.C. 135, thus embracing a period of forty years.

1. The first part, of which Mattathias is the hero, comprises chap. 1-2, 70, and embraces a period from the commencement of Antiochus Epiphanes's reign to the death of Mattathias, B.C. 175-167.

2. The second part, of which Judas Maccabaeus is the hero, comprises chap. 1Ma 3:1-9; 1Ma 3:22, and describes the exploits and fame of this defender of the faith, B.C. 167-160.

3. The third part, of which Jonathan, the high-priest, surnamed Apphus (Α᾿πφοῦς חפוש, the simulaltor, the sly one), is the hero, comprises ch. 1Ma 9:23 to 1Ma 12:50, and records the events which transpired during the period of his government, B.C. 160-143.

4. The fourth part, of which Simon, surnamed Thassi (θασαί=תדשי, the flourishing) is the hero, comprises ch. 13, l-16. 24, and records the events which occurred during his period of government, B.C. 143-135.

III. Historical and Religious Character. — There is no book among all the Apocrypha which is distinguished by greater marks of trustworthiness than 1 Maccabees. Simplicity, credibility, and candor alike characterize its description of friends and foes, victories and defeats, hopes and fears. When the theme so animates the writer that he gives expression to his feelings in lyric effusions (e.g. 1Ma 1:25-28; 1Ma 1:37-40; 1Ma 2:7-13; 1Ma 2:49-68; 1Ma 3:3-9; 1Ma 3:18-22; 1Ma 4:8-11; 1Ma 4:30-33; 1Ma 4:38; 1Ma 6:10-13; 1Ma 7:37-38; 1Ma 7:41-42), no poetic exaggerations and hyperboles deprive the description of its substantially historic character. When recording the victories of his heroes, struggling for their liberties and their religion, he wrests no laws of nature from their regular course to aid the handful of Jewish champions against the fearful odds of their heathen oppressors; and when speaking of the arch-enemy, Antiochus Epiphanes (1Ma 1:10, etc.), he indulges in no unjust and passionate vituperations against him. Yet he marks in one expressive phrase (ῥίζα ἁμαρτωλός) the character of the Syrian type of Antichrist (comp. Isa 11:10; Dan 11:36).

If no mention is made of the reckless profligacy of Alexander Balas, it must be remembered that his relations to the Jews were honorable and liberal, and these alone fall within the scope of the history. So far as the circumstances admit, the general accuracy of the book is established by the evidence of other authorities; but for a considerable period it is the single source of our information. Even the few historical and geographlical inaccuracies in the description of foreign nations and countries, such as the foundation of the Greek empire in the East (1Ma 1:5-9), the power and constitution of Rome (1Ma 8:1-16), “the great city Elymaias, in the country of Persia” (1Ma 6:1), etc., so far from impairing the general truthfulness of the narrative when it confines itself to home and the immediate past, only show how faithfully the writer has depicted the general notions of the time, and for this reason are of intrinsic value and instructive. The subjugation of the Galatians, who were the terror of the neighboring people (comp. Livy, 38:37), and the conquest of Spain, the Tarshish (ch. 1Ma 8:3) of Phoenician merchants, are noticed, as would be natural from the immediate interest of the events; but the wars with Carthage are wholly omitted (Josephus adds these in his narrative, Ant. 1Ma 12:10; 1Ma 12:6). The errors in detail — as the capture of Antiochus the Great by the Romans (1Ma 1:7), the numbers of his armament (1Ma 1:6), the  constitution of the Roman senate (1Ma 1:15), the one supreme yearly officer at Rome (1Ma 1:16; compare 1Ma 15:16) — are only such as might be expected in oral accounts; and the endurance (1Ma 1:4, μακροθυμία), the good faith (1Ma 1:11), and the simplicity of the republic (1Ma 1:14, οὐκ ἐπέθετο οὐδεὶς αὐτων διάδημα καὶ οὐ περιεβάλοντο πορφύραν éστε ἁδρυνθῆναι ἐν αὐτῇ, contrast 1Ma 1:9), were features likely to arrest the attention of Orientals.

That the writer used written sources and important official documents in his history is evident from 1Ma 8:2, etc.; 1Ma 10:18, etc.,1Ma 10:25-45; 1Ma 11:30-37; 1Ma 12:5-23; 1Ma 12:36-40; 1Ma 14:25, etc.; 1Ma 15:2-9; 1Ma 16:23-24; some of these passages being expressly described as copies (ἀντίγραφα). It is questionable whether the writer designed to give more than the substance of the originals. Some bear clear marks of authenticity (1Ma 8:22-28; 1Ma 12:6-18), while others are open to grave difficulties and suspicion; but it is worthy of notice that the letters of the Syrian kings generally appear to be genuine (1Ma 10:18-20; 1Ma 10:25-45; 1Ma 11:30-37; 1Ma 13:36-40; 1Ma 15:2-9).

Though the strictly historical character of the book precludes any description of the religious and theological notions of the day, so that no mention is made in it of a coming Messiah or a future state, even in the dying speech of Mattathias, wherein he exhorts his sons to sacrifice their lives for the law of God and the covenant of their fathers, and recounts the faith and rewards of Abraham, Joseph, Phinehas, Joshua, Caleb, David, Elijah, Haanaiah, Azariah, Mishael, and Daniel (1Ma 2:49-60), yet the whole is permeated with the true spirit of religion and piety. The writer mentions the time from which “a prophet was not seen among them” (1Ma 9:27) as a marked epoch; and twice he anticipates the future coming of a prophet as of one who should make a direct revelation of the will of God to his people (1Ma 4:46), and supersede the temporary arrangements of a merely civil dynasty (1Ma 14:41). God is throughout acknowledged as overruling all the machinations of the enemy, and prayer is offered up to him for success after all the preparations are made for battle, and before the faithful host encounter their deadly enemies (1Ma 3:18-19; 1Ma 3:44; 1Ma 3:48; 1Ma 3:53; 1Ma 3:60; 1Ma 4:10, etc., 1Ma 4:24-25; 1Ma 4:30, etc.; 1Ma 5:34; 1Ma 5:54; 1Ma 7:36-38; 1Ma 7:41-42; 1Ma 9:45, etc.); and even the tyrant Antiochus Epiphanes is made to acknowledge in his dying hour that he is punished for profaning the Temple and destroying the inhabitants of Judaea (1Ma 6:8-13). The absence of even the remotest allusion to a future state in the hour of death, or to a resurrection of the dead, it must be confessed, rather favors the conclusion of the ingenious but daring critic,  Dr. Geiger, rabbi at Breslau, that the author of this book was a Sadducee (comp. Urschrift und Uebenrsetzuln der Bibel, p. 216 sq.).

IV. Author, Date, and Original Language. — All that can be said with certainty about the author of this book is that he was a Palestinian Jew. This is indicated by the whole spirit which pervades the book, by the lively sympathies which the writer manifests for the heroes whom he describes, and by his intimate acquaintance with the localities of Palestine.

Not so certain, however, is its date. Prideaux, Michaelis, Hengstenberg, Bertheau, Welte. Scholtz. Keil. and others, though discarding the notion of Lapide, Huet, etc., that John Hyrcanus was the author, are yet of opinion that the concluding words, τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν λόγων Ι᾿ωάννου καὶ τῶν πολέμων αὐτοῦ... ἰδοὺ ταῦτα γέγραπται ἐπὶ βιβλίῳ ἡμερῶν ἀρχιερωσύνης αὐτοῦ, ἀφ᾿ ου ἐγενήθη ἀρχιερεύς μετὰ τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ (1Ma 16:24), plainly show that the book was written during the government of this high-priest, perhaps about B.C. 120106. inasmuch as this passage only gives the terminus a quo of the high-priesthood of John, without the terminus ad quem, thus indicating that John was still living, and that his pontificate was not as yet terminated. After the close of the priesthood, or after the death of John, this remark would be superfluous, because no reader could take the words, “diary of his priesthood,” in any other sense than that they denote a chronicle of the whole duration of it from the beginning to the end. Nor can the words ἔως τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης, in 1Ma 13:30, be adduced as implying a later date; for it was something remarkable that, in those days of war and devastation, the sepulcher which Simon made for his family in Modin remained between twenty and thirty years unhurt. Eichhborn, Bertholdt, De Wette, Ewald, Grimm, and others, however, maintain that the book was written after the death of John Hyrcanus oscillating between B.C. 105 and 64.

The language of the book does not present any striking peculiarities. Both in diction and structure it is generally simple and unaffected, with a marked and yet not harsh Hebraisti chararacter. The number of peculiar words is not very considerable, especially when compared with those in 2 Maccabees. Some of these are late forms, as ψογέω (ψογίζω), 1Ma 11:5; 1Ma 11:11; ἐξουδένωσις, 39; ὁπλοδοτεω, 1Ma 14:32; ἀσπιδίσκη, 1Ma 4:57; δειλόομαι, 1Ma 4:8; 1Ma 4:21; 1Ma 5:4; 1Ma 16:6; ὅμηοα, 1Ma 8:7; 1Ma 9:53, etc.; ἀφαίρεμα, 1Ma 15:5; τελωνεῖσθαι, 1Ma 13:39; ἐξουσιάζεσθαι, 1Ma 10:70; or compounds, such as ἀποσκορίζω, 1Ma 11:55; ἐπισυστρέφω, 1Ma 14:44; δειόψυχος, 1Ma 8:15; 1Ma 16:5;  φονοκτονία, 1Ma 1:24. Other words are used in new or strange senses, as ἀδρύνω, 1Ma 8:14; παράστασις, 1Ma 15:32; διαστολή, 1Ma 8:7. Some phrases clearly express a Shemitic idiom (1Ma 2:48, δοῦναι κέρας τῷ ἁμαρτ. 1Ma 6:23; 1Ma 10:62; 1Ma 12:23), and the influence of the Sept., is continually perceptible (e.g. 1Ma 1:54; 1Ma 2:63; 1Ma 7:17; 1Ma 9:23; 1Ma 14:9). Josephus undoubtedly made use of the Greek text (Ant. Deu 12:5 sq.).

That this book, however, was originally written in Hebrew is not only attested by Origen, who gives the Hebrew title of it (see above, § 1), and by St. Jerome, who saw it (“Maccabaeorum primum librum Hebraicum reperi” — Prol. Galatians ad Libr. Reg.), but is evident from the many Hebraisms which are literal translations of the Hebrew (comp. καὶ ἡτοιμάσθη ἡ βασιλεαί — מלכות ותכן, 1Ma 1:16, with Sept. 1Sa 20:31; 1Ki 2:12; εἰς διάβολον πονηρόν=לשטן רע, 1Ma 1:36; ἐν τῷ ἐλέῳ ατὐου=בחסדו, 1Ma 2:57, with Jer 2:2; ἀπολλυμένους=אבדים, 1Ma 3:9; ἀπὸ γένους τῆς βασιλείας =המלוכה מזרע, 1Ma 3:32, with Jer 41:1), as well as from the difficulties in the Greek text, which disappear on the supposition of mistakes made by the translator (compare καὶ ἐσείσθη ἡ γῆ ἐπὶ κατοικοῦντας αὐτήν=ותרעש הארוֹ על יושביה, 1Ma 1:28; ἐγένετο ὁ ναὸς αὐ τῆς ώς ἀνἡρ ἄδοξος'=ביתה כאיש נבזה, i.e. כבית איש נבזה ביתה, 1Ma 2:8; see also 1Ma 2:34; 1Ma 3:3; 1Ma 4:19; 1Ma 4:24, etc.). The Hebrew of this book, however, like that of the later canonical writings of the O.T., had a considerable admixture of Aramaic expressions (compare 1Ma 1:5; 1Ma 4:19; 1Ma 8:5; 1Ma 11:28; and Grimm's Comment. on these passages).

As to the Heb. Megillath Antiochus (מגלת אנטיוכס) still existing, which was first published in the editions of the Pentateuch of 1491 and 1505 along with the other Megilloth; is given in the Spanish and Italian Ritual for the Festivals (מחזורים) of 1555-56, etc.; is inserted, with a Latin translation, in Bartolocci's Bibliotheca Mallgna Rabbinica, 1:383; is printed separately, without the translation (Berlin, 1766); and which has recently been republished by Jellinek in his Beth Ha-Midrash, 1:142-146- this simply gives a few of the incidents of the Maccabaean wars, and makes John, the high-priest who it says slew Nicanor in the Temple, play the most conspicuous part. It tells us that Antiochus began persecuting the Jews in the 23d year of his reign and 213th after the building of the second Temple; and that the descendants of the Maccabees, who crushed the armies of this  tyrant, ruled over Israel 206 years, thus following the chronology of the Talmud (comp. Aboda Zaru, 9 a; Seder Olam Sutta; De Rossi, Meor Enajim, c. xxvi; Zunz, Gottesdienzst. Vortrage, p. 134). That the Aramaic (Chaldee). which was for the first time published by Filipowski, together with the Hebrew and an English version (London, 1851), is the original, and that the Hebrew is a translation, may be seen from a most cursory comparison of the two texts. — The Hebrew version slavishly imitates the phrases of the Aramaic original instead of giving the Hebrew idioms. Thus, for instance, the Chaldee בה שעתאis rendered in the Hebrew version by באותה שעה, instead of בעת ההיא; אלין לאליןby אלה לאלה, instead of איש אל אחיוor איש אל רעהו, etc. It is perfectly astonishing that this document, which was evidently got up about the 7th century of the Christian sera. to be recited on the Feast of Dedication in commemoration of the Maccabean victories over the enemies of Israel, should be regarded by Hengstenberg (Genuineness of Daniel. English transl., p. 237) as the identical “Chaldee copy of the first book of Maccabees to which Origen and Jerome refer.” Hengstenberg, moreover, most blunderingly calls the Hebrew version published by Bartolocci the Chaldee.

The date and person of the Greek translator of the first book of Maccabees are wholly undetermined, but it is unlikely that such a book would remain long unknown or untranslated at Alexandria.

V. Canonicity and Importance of the Book. — This book never formed a part of the Jewish canon, and is excluded from the canon of sacred books in the catalogues of Melito, Origen, the Council of Laodicea, St. Cyril, St. Hilary, St. Athanasius, St. Jerome, etc. In the Chronicle of Eusebius it is put in the same category as the writings of Josephus and Africanus, so as to distinguish it from the inspired writings. Still the book is cited with high respect, and as conducive to the edification of the Church, at a very early period (August. De Civit. Dei, lib. 18, c. 36). The councils at Hippo and Carthage (A.D. 393 and 397) first formally received it into the canon, and in modern times the Council of Trent has settled for the Catholic Church all disputes about its canonical authority by putting it into the catalogue of inspired Scripture.

But, though the Protestant Church rejects the decisions of these councils, and abides by the ancient Jewish canon, yet both the leaders of the Reformation and modern expositors rightly attach great importance to this  book. The great value of it will be duly appreciated when it is remembered that it is one of the very few surviving records of the most important, but very obscure period of Jewish history between the close of the O.T. and the beginning of the N.T. It is, therefore, not to be wondered at that the far-seeing Luther remarks, in his introduction to the translation of this book — “This is another of those books not included in the Hebrew Scriptures, although in its discourses and description it almost equals the other sacred books of Scripture, and would not have been unworthy to be reckoned among them, because it is a very necessary and useful book for the understanding of the prophet Daniel in the eleventh chapter” (Vorraede aufidas erste Buch Maccabaorum, German Bible, ed. 1536). It is rather surprising that the Anglican Church has not prescribed any lessons to be read from this book. A reference to 1Ma 4:59, however, is to be found in the margin of the A. V., Joh 10:22.

VI. Versions and Literature. — The books of Maccabees were not included by Jerome in his translation of the Bible. “The first book,” he says, “I found in Hebrew” (Prol. Galatians in Reg.), but he takes no notice of the Latin version, and certainly did not revise it. The version of the two books which has been incorporated in the Romish Vulgate was consequently derived from the old Latin current before Jerome's time. This version was obviously made from the Greek, and in the main follows it closely. Besides the common text, Sabatier has published a version of a considerable part of the first book (cap. 1-14 1) from a very ancient Paris MS. (S. Germ. 15) in 1751, which exhibits an earlier form of the text. Angelo Mai has also published a fragment of another Latin translation, comprising chap. 2:49-64, which differs very materially from both texts (Spicilegium Romanorum, 9:60 sq.). The old Syriac version given in the Paris and London Polyglots, and byr De Lagarde, Libri Veteris Testamenti Apocryphi Syriace (Lond. 1861), is, like the Latin, made literally from the Greek.

Of commentaries and exegetical helps we specially mention the works of Drusius and Grotius, reprinted in the Critici Sacri; Calmet, Conmmentaire Litelal, etc., vol. 8 (Paris, 1724); Michaelis, Deutsche Uebersetzung des 1 Maccab. B.'s mit Amerkk. (Gottingen und Leipsic, 1778); Eichhorn, Einleit. in die apokryphischen Schrift. d. A. T. (Leipsic, 1795), p. 218-248; Hengstenberg, Genuineness of Daniel (English transl., Edinburgh, 1847), p. 235-239, 267-270; Cotton, The five Books of Maccabees (Oxford, 1832); Ewald, Geschichte des Volkes Israel, 4:526 sq.; the masterly work  of Grimm, Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zu den Apokryphen (Leipsic, 1853); Geiger, Urschrift und Uebersetzung der Bibel (Breslau, 1857), p. 206-219. SEE APOCRYPHA.

## Maccabees, The Fourth Book Of[[@Headword:Maccabees, The Fourth Book Of]]

             (a), though not given in the Roman Vulgate, and therefore not inserted in the Apocrypha contained in the Bibles translated by the Reformers, yet  exists in Greek in two leading texts. One, which, on account of its more extensive circulation, may be called the received or common text, is contained in the early edition of the Sept. printed at Strasburg, 1.526, Basel, 1545 and 1550, Frankfurt, 1597, Basel, 1582, and in the editions of Josephus's work, and is given in its purest form in Bekker's edition of Josephus (Leips. 1855-56, 6 vols.). The other is the Alexandrian, or that of the Codex Alexandrinus, and is the more ancient and preferable one; it is contained in the editions of the Sept. by Grabe and Breitinger, and is adopted, with some few alterations after the common text, in Apel's edition of the Apocrypha (Leipsic, 1837). See Schaack, De libro εἰς Μακκαβαίους qui Josepho tribuitur (Kopenhagen, 1814).

I. Title. — This book is called 4 Maccab. (Μακκαβαίων δ῎ ἡ τετάρτη τῶν ΜακκαβÞκῶν βίβλος) in the various MSS., in the Codex Alexandrinus, by Philostorgius and Syncellus (p. 529, 4, and 530,17, ed. Dind.); in Cod. Paris. A, it is denominated Maccab., a Treatise on Reason (Μακκαβαίων τέταρτος περὶ σώφρονος λογισμοῦ), by Eusebius (Hist. Sir 3:10, b) and Jerome (Catal. Script. Ecclesiast.) it is called On the Supremacy of Reason (περὶ αὐτοκράτορος λογισμοῦ), and in the editions of Josephus's works, Josephus's Treatise on the Maccabees (Φλαβ. Ι᾿ωσγ῎που εἰς Μακκαβαίους λόγος).

II. Design, Division, and Contents. — The design of this book is to encourage the Jews, who — being surrounded by a philosophical heathenism, and taunted by its moral and devout followers with the trivial nature and apparent absurdity of some of the Mosaic precepts — were in danger of being led astray from their faith, to abide faithfully by the Mosaic law, and to stimulate them to observe in every way their ancestral religion, by convincing them of the reasonableness of their divine law, and its unparalleled power to control the human passions (comp. 18:1, 2). To carry out this design the book is divided into two parts, opening with an introduction, as follows:

1. The introduction, comprising ch. 4Ma 1:1-12, contains the resumd of the whole book, and the grand problem for discussion, viz. whether the rational will, permeated and regulated by true piety, has perfect mastery over the passions (ὅτι αὐτοδέσποτός ῾αὐτοκράτωρ] ἐστι τῶν παθῶν εὐσεβὴς λογιόμός).

2. The first part, comprising ch. 4Ma 1:13 to 4Ma 3:19, contains a philosophical disquisition on this problem, giving a definition of reason, or the rational will, and of the wisdom which is to be gained by studying the Mosaic law, and which shows itself in the four cardinal virtues discernment, justice, prudence, and fortitude; describes the different passions, and shows that reason, pervaded by piety, has the mastery over them all, except forgetfulness and ignorance.

3. The second part, comprising chap. 4Ma 3:20 to 4Ma 18:20, demonstrates the proposition that sanctified reason has the mastery over the passions by giving a summary of the Maccabaean martyrdoms (4Ma 3:20 to 4Ma 4:26) narrated in 2Ma 3:4; 2Ma 3:7-17; 2Ma 5:1 to 2Ma 6:11; describes the martyrdom of Eleazar (4Ma 5:1 to 4Ma 7:19) and the seven brothers (4Ma 8:1 to 4Ma 12:16), with moral reflections on it (4Ma 13:1 to 4Ma 14:10), as well as the noble conduct and death of their mother (4Ma 14:11 to 4Ma 17:6), and then deduces the lessons to be learned from the character and conduct of these martyrs (4Ma 17:7 to 4Ma 18:2), showing that the Israelites alone are invincible in their struggles for virtue (ὅτι μόνοι παῖδες ῾Εβραίων ὑπὲρ ἀρετῆς εἰσιν ἀνίκητοι). Ch. 4Ma 18:21-23, is evidently a later addition.

III. Author, Date, and Original Language. — In harmony with the general tradition, Eusebius (Hist. Ecc 3:10), Jerome (Catalog. Script. Eccles. s.v. Josephus), Photius (ap. Philostorgius, Hist. Eccles. i), Suidas (s.v. Ι᾿ώσηπος), many MSS., and the early editions of the Sept. (Strasburg, 1526; Basle, 1545; Frankfurt, 1595), as well as the editions of Josephus's works, ascribe the authorship of this book to the celebrated Jewish historian Flavius Josephus. But this is utterly at variance with the style and structure of the book itself, and has most probably arisen from a confusion of names, as the work may have been written by some one of the name of Josephus, or from the fact that it was regarded as supplementing this historian, and hence was appended to his writings. Not only is the language quite different from that of Josephus's writings, but —

1. In 4 Maccabees all the proper names in the Bible, except ῾Ιεροσόλυμα and Ε᾿λεάζαρος, are retained in their Hebrew form, and treated as indeclinable (e.g. Α᾿βραάμ, Ι᾿σαάκ Νῶε), whereas Josephus gives them a Greek termination.

2. Fourth Maccabees derives its historical matter from 2 Maccabees, as we have seen in the preceding section, or perhaps from the original work of  Jason; while Josephus manifests utter ignorance about the existence of this work.

3. The historical blunders contained in this book (4Ma 4:15; 4Ma 4:26; 4Ma 5:1; 4Ma 17:22-23, etc.) are such as Josephus would never have committed.

4. The form and tone of the book unquestionably show that the writer was an Alexandrian Jew, who resided in Egypt or somewhere far away from the Holy Land — comp. 4Ma 4:5; 4Ma 4:20, etc., where the writer speaks of “our fatherland,” i.e. the Holy Land far away. From this and other passages in which the Temple is spoken of as still existing, and from the fact that 4Ma 14:9 speaks of the Egyptian Jews as having enjoyed external peace and security at the time when this book was written, Grimm dates it before the fall of Jerusalem and the persecutions of the Egyptian Jews by Caligula, i.e. B.C. 39 or 40.

That the Greek is the original language of the book requires no proof. The style is very pompous, flowing, vigorous, and truly Greek. The author's eloquence, however, is not the spontaneous outburst of a heart inspired with the grandeur of the divine theme (εὐσέβεια) upon which he discourses, but is produced artificially by resorting to exclamations and apostrophes (4Ma 5:33, etc.; 4Ma 7:6; 4Ma 7:9-10; 4Ma 7:15; 4Ma 8:15-16; 4Ma 11:14, etc.), dialogues and monologues (4Ma 8:16-19; 4Ma 16:5-10), far-fetched figures and comparisons (4Ma 7:1, etc.; 4Ma 13:6; 4Ma 17:3; 4Ma 17:5; 4Ma 17:7), and he abounds in ἃπαξ λεγόμενα (4Ma 1:27; 4Ma 1:29; 4Ma 2:9; 4Ma 4:18; 4Ma 6:6; 4Ma 6:17; 4Ma 7:11; 4Ma 8:15; 4Ma 11:4; 4Ma 13:24; 4Ma 14:15; 4Ma 14:18; 4Ma 15:26; 4Ma 17:5).

IV. Canonicity and Importance. — Among the Jews this book is hardly known, and though some of the fathers were acquainted with it, and Gregory of Nazianzum, Augustin Jere, Jerome, etc., quoted with respect its description of the Maccabsean martyrs, yet it was never regarded as canonical or sacred. As a historical document the narrative is of no value. Its interest centers in the fact that it is a unique example of the didactic use which the Jews made of their history. Ewald (Geschichte, 4:556) rightly compares it with the sermon of later times, in which a scriptural theme becomes the subject of an elaborate and practical comment. The philosophical tone of the book is essentially stoical, but the stoicism is that of a stern legalist. The dictates of reason are supported by the remembrance of noble traditions, and by the hope of a glorious future. The prospect of the life to come is clear and wide. The faithful are seen to rise to endless bliss; the wicked to descend to endless torment, varying in  intensity. But while the writer shows, in this respect, the effects of the full culture of the Alexandrian school, and in part advances beyond his predecessors, he offers no trace of that deep spiritual insight which was quickened by Christianity. The Jew stands alone, isolated by character and by blessing (comp. Gfrorer, Philo, etc., 2:173). Still the book is of great importance, inasmuch as it illustrates the history, doctrines, and moral philosophy of the Jewish people prior to the advent of Christ. It shows that the Jews believed that human reason, in its natural state, has no power to subdue the passions of the heart, and that it is only able to do it when sanctified by the religion of the Bible (4Ma 5:21; 4Ma 5:23; 4Ma 6:17; 4Ma 10:18); that the souls of all men continue to live after the death of the body; that all will rise, both righteous and wicked, to receive their judgment for the deeds done in the body (4Ma 5:35; 4Ma 9:8; 4Ma 12:13-14; 4Ma 16:22; 4Ma 17:17-18); that this is taught in the Pentateuch (comp. 4Ma 17:18, with Deu 33:3); and that the death of the righteous is a vicarious atonement (4Ma 6:29). Allusion seems also to be made in the N.T. to some passages of this book (comp. 4Ma 7:18, with Luk 20:37; Mat 22:32; Mar 12:26; Rom 6:10; Rom 14:8; Gal 2:19 : 4Ma 12:11, with Act 17:26 : 4Ma 13:14, with Luk 16:22-23 : 4Ma 16:22, with Luk 20:37).

V. Versions and Exegetical Helps. — The book was translated into Syriac, the MS. of which is in the Ambrosian Library of Milan; into Latin, but loosely, by Erasmus; and again, greatly improved, by Combefis, Bibliothecae Graecorum patrum auctoriunm novissimum (pars i, Paris, 1672). This version is in the editions of Josephus by Havercamp, Oberthiir, and Dindorf. Both a Latin and French version are given by Calmet, Conmment. literal. in Scriptursam V. et N. Test. 3:702 sq.; a very loose English version was first published by L'Estrange in his Translation of Josephus (Lond. 1702); and an improved translation is given by Cotton, The Five Books of Maccabees (Oxford, 1832).

Of exegetical helps we mention Reutlinger, These d'exegese sur le iv live des Maccabees (Strasburg, 1826); Gfrorer, Philo u. d. Alex. — Theosophie, 2:175 sq.; Dihne, Jud. — Alex. Relig. — Philos. 2:190 sq.; Ewald, Geschichte des Volkes Israel, 4:554 sq.; the elaborate commentary of Grimm, Kurzgefasstes exeyetisce handb. z. d. Apok. d. A. T. (pt. iv, Leips. 1857), p. 285 sq.; Keil, Einleitung in d. A. T. (1859), p. 69 b, sq.

## Maccabees, The Fourth Book Of (B)[[@Headword:Maccabees, The Fourth Book Of (B)]]

             Though it is certain that the foregoing book is that which old writers described, Sixtus Senensis (Biblia Sancta, p. 37, ed. 1575) gives a very interesting account of another fourth book of Maccabees which he saw in a library at Lyons, which was afterwards burnt. It was in Greek, and contained the history of John Hyrcanus, continuing the narrative directly after the close of the first book. Sixtus quotes the first words: Καὶ μετὰ τὸ ἀποκτανθῆναι τὸν Σίμωνα ἐγενήθη Ι᾿ωάνης υἱὸς αὐ τοῦ ἀρχιερεύς ἀντ αὐτοῦ, but this is the only fragment which remains of it. The history, he says, was nearly the same as that in Josephus, Ant. 13, though the style was very different from his, abounding in Hebrew idioms. The testimony is so exact and explicit that we can see no reason for questioning its accuracy, and still less for supposing (with Calmet) that Sixtus saw only the socalled fifth book, which is at present preserved in Arabic. SEE MACCABEES, FIFTH BOOK OF.

## Maccabees, The Second Book Of[[@Headword:Maccabees, The Second Book Of]]

             according to the order of the Sept., which is followed both by the ancient versions and modern expositors of the Apocrypha.

I. Position. — This book ought, according to the historic order, to be the first of the Maccabees, because its narrative begins with an event which occurred in the reign of Seleucus Philopator, about B.C. 180, i.e. four years earlier than the preceding book. Its being placed second in order is evidently owing to the fact that it is both of a later date and of less intrinsic worth than the one denominated the first of the Maccabees. Cotton, in his translation of the Maccabees, has put this book as the third of Maccabees.

II. Design, Contents, and Division. — The design of this book is to admonish and encourage the Jews to keep the religion of their fathers, and especially to inculcate in the Israelites resident in Egypt a reverence for the Temple in Jerusalem, urging them to take part in the celebration of the festivals instituted to commemorate the dedication of the Temple as the sacred and legitimate place for divine worship (2Ma 10:6), and the defeat of Nicanor (2Ma 15:36). To effect this design, the writer gives a condensed history of the Maccabees struggles for their religion and sanctuary, beginning with the attempts of Heliodorus to plunder the Temple, cir. B.C. 180, and terminating with the victory of Judas Maccabaeus over Nicanor, B.C. 161. The whole narrative, therefore, which is partly (2Ma 3:1 to 2Ma 4:6) anterior to 1 Maccabees, partly (2Ma 4:7, 2Ma 7:42) supplementary to the brief summary in 1Ma 1:10-64, and partly (2Ma 7:1-15) parallel with 1Ma 3:1 to 1Ma 7:48, embraces a period of about nineteen years, and is divided into three sections, each of which is made to terminate with the great event commemorated by the festival which the writer is so anxious that his Egyptian brethren should celebrate.

1. The first section (2Ma 1:1 to 2Ma 2:32) comprises two epistles, the relation of which to the substance of the book is extremely obscure. The first (2Ma 1:1-9) is a solemn invitation to the Egyptian Jews to celebrate “the feast of tabernacles in the month Casleu” (i.e. the feast of the dedication, 2Ma 1:9), as before they had sympathized with their brethren in Judaea in “the extremity of their trouble” (2Ma 1:7). The second (2Ma 1:10 to 2Ma 2:18, according to the received  division), which bears a formal salutation from “the council and Judas” to “Aristobulus... and the Jews in Egypt,” is a strange, rambling collection of legendary stories of the death of “Antiochus,” of the preservation of the sacred fire and its recovery by Nehemiah, of the hiding of the vessels of the sanctuary by Jeremiah, ending, if, indeed, the letter can be said to have any end — with the same exhortation to observe the feast of dedication (2Ma 2:10-18). Then follows an account given by the writer of this book of the sources from which he derived his information, and of the trouble he had in compiling it (2Ma 2:19-32).

2. The second section (2Ma 3:1 to 2Ma 10:9) gives important information about the origin of the persecutions (2Ma 3:1 to 2Ma 7:42), which is simply hinted at in 1 Maccabees, and then describes and supplements (in 2Ma 8:1 to 2Ma 9:29) the events recorded in 1 Maccabees, concluding with the dedication of the Temple (2Ma 10:1-9), which is the great object of the book, cir. B.C. 180-165.

3. The third section (2Ma 10:10 to 2Ma 15:37) records the various victories of the Jews, terminating in the crowning success of Judas Maccabaeus and the death of Nicanor, which led to the institution of the feast commemorating the victory over him, B.C. 164-161.

This is followed by an epilogue (2Ma 15:38-39) which is wanting in Coverdale's (after the Zurich) Bible; in Matthew's, 1537; in Cranmer's, 1539; and in the various reprints of these editions; and which the Geneva Bible, 1560, followed by the Bishops', 1568, was the first to insert.

The latter two of the above sections, taken together, present several natural subdivisions, which appear to coincide with the “five books” of Jason on which it was based. The first (ch. 3) contains the history of Heliodorus, as illustrating the fortunes of the Temple before the schism and apostasy of part of the nation (cir. B.C. 180). The second (ch. 4-7) gives varied details of the beginning and course of the great persecution-the murder of Onias, the crimes of Menelaus, the martyrdom of Eleazar, and of the mother with her seven sons (B.C. 175-167). The third (ch. 2Ma 8:1 to 2Ma 10:9) follows the fortunes of Judas to the triumphant restoration of the Temple service (B.C. 166,165). The fourth (2Ma 10:10-13) includes the reign of Antiochus Eupator (B.C. 164-162). The fifth (ch. 14, 15) records the treachery of Alcimus, the mission of Nicanor, and the crowning success of Judas (B.C. 162,161). Each of these divisions is closed by a phrase which seems to mark the end of a definite subject (2Ma 3:40; 2Ma 7:42; 2Ma 10:9; 2Ma 13:26;  2Ma 15:37); and they correspond, in fact, with distinct stages in the national struggle.

III. Author, Date, and original Language. — The compiler of this book distinctly declares that the original author of it, or of the “five books” from which he condensed the narrative before us, was “Jason of Cyrene” (2Ma 2:23). Herzfeld thinks that this Jason is the same as Jason, the son of Eleazar, whom Judas Maccabaeus sent with Eupolemus as envoy to Rome after the defeat of Nicanor to conclude a treaty with the Romans (1Ma 8:17; Josephus, Ant. 2Ma 12:10; 2Ma 12:6); because it is only a Hellenistic Jew who, being master of the Greek language, would be qualified for such a mission to a foreign court. This hypothesis, moreover, explains the otherwise anomalous circumstance that this book, which records the Maccabaean struggles, goes no further in its history than the victory over Nicanor, inasmuch as up to this point Jason was an eye-witness to the exploits of Judas, and was sent to Rome after this most important event; and it is confirmed by the accurate knowledge which the writer displays of the events (2Ma 4:21 sq.; 2Ma 8:1 sq.; 2Ma 9:29 sq.; 2Ma 10:12-13; 2Ma 14:1; Herzfeld, Geschichte d. Volkes Israel, 1:445 sq.). Accordingly, the original work must have been written about B.C. 160, immediately after the victory over Nicanor, and prior to the defeat and death of Judas (1Ma 9:16-18), which brought new calamities upon the Holy City, and again transferred the power to the heathenishly-inclined Jews under the pontificate of Alcimus (1Ma 9:23-29). The errors in the order of the events and of history must be ascribed to the epitomator, whose great object was not to narrate history faithfully, but to make the facts harmonize with his design.

As a Cyrenian Jew, Jason most naturally composed his work in Greek; and Jerome's testimony, “Secundus [Machabaeorum liber] Graecus est, quod ex ipsa quoque phrasi probari potest” (Prol. Gal.), is fully borne out by the style of the epitome. (See below.) The epitomator or compiler of the present book was a Hellenistic Jew, residing in Palestine, and must have lived a considerable period after the events transpired. The date of the compilation is put within the limits B.C. 150-124. The two epistles with which the book begins do not proceed from Jason, and are of a much later date, though the first purports to have been written B.C. 124, or 188 of the Seleucidae; and the second, by mentioning a recent deliverance from great perils, evidently implies that it was written after the news of the death of Antiochus Epiphanes, i.e. 148 of the Seleucidae. The original language of these letters seems to be Hebrew. Indeed, Geiger shows that the difficult  passage, ἀφ᾿ οà ἀπέστη Ι᾿άσων καὶ οἱ μετ᾿ αὑτοῦ ἀπὸ τῆς ἁγίας γῆς καὶ τῆς βασιλείας (2Ma 1:7), which is ambiguous, and, as commonly understood, represents Jason and his companions as apostatizing from the land and the kingdom is, when retranslated into Hebrew, ואשר אתו מאדמת הקדש והמלוכה הת סר יאסון, shown to mean, from the time that Jason and those who sided with him front the holy land and the kingdom, apostatized; חמלוכהeither standing for זרע המלוכה, royal descent (comp. 2Ki 25:25; Jer 41:1; Eze 17:13; Dan 1:3), or referring back to אדמת in the sense of עיר המלוכה (2Sa 12:26), i.e. those who call themselves after the sacred ground of the royal residence. The same is the case with 2Ma 1:9; 2Ma 1:18, where the Feast of Dedication is most extraordinarily called the Feast of Tabernacles, which can only be explained when the passages are retranslated into Hebrew. Now the Hebrew for ἵνα ἄγητε τὰς ἡμέρας τῆς σκηνοπηγίας τοῦ Χασελεῦ μηνός (2Ma 1:9) is למען תחגו ימי חג חדש כסליו; and for ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ ἄγητε τῆς σκηνοπηγίας (καὶ) τοῦ πυρός (2Ma 1:18) is חג האש למען תחגו גם אתם את. When it is borne in mind that the expression חג, which is the general term for feast in earlier Hebrew (Exo 10:9; Exo 12:14; Lev 23:39), was afterwards used for the feast of tabernacles (1Ki 8:2; 2Ch 5:3; Josephus, Ant. 2Ma 8:4; 2Ma 8:1), it will at once be seen that the translator of these epistles, instead of rendering the word in question simply by test, attached to it the later sense of the specific festival, which he was evidently led to do by the fact that both these festivals are of eight days' duration, and that the feast of tabernacles is mentioned in 2Ma 10:6. So also διαοίξαι τὴν καρδίαν ὑμῶν ἐν τῷ νόμῳ αὐτοῦ (2Ma 1:4) is a translation of בתורתו יפתה לבכם

The style of the book is extremely uneven. At times it is elaborately ornate (2Ma 3:15-39; 2Ma 5:20; 2Ma 6:12-16; 2Ma 6:23-28; 2 Maccabees 7, etc.), and, again, it is so rude and broken as to seem more like notes for an epitome than a finished composition (2Ma 13:19-26); but it nowhere attains to the simple energy and pathos of the first book. The vocabulary corresponds to the style. It abounds in new or unusual words. Many of these are forms which belong to the decay of a language, as ἀλλοφυλισμός, 2Ma 4:13; 2Ma 6:24; ῾Ελληνισμός, 2Ma 6:13 (ἐμφανισμός, 2Ma 3:9); ἐτασμός, 2Ma 7:37; θωρακισμός, 2Ma 5:3; σπλαγχνισμός, 2Ma 5:6-7; 2Ma 5:21; 2Ma 7:42; or compounds which betray a false pursuit of emphasis or precision: διεμπίμπλημι, 2Ma 4:40; ἐπευλαβεῖσθαι, 2Ma 14:18; κατευθικτεῖν, 2Ma 14:43; προσαναλέγεσθαι, 2Ma 3:19; προσυπομιμνήσκω,  2Ma 15:9; συνεκκεντεῖν, 2Ma 15:26. Other words are employed in novel senses, as δευτερολογεῖν, 2Ma 13:22; εἰσκυκλεῖσθαι, 2Ma 2:24; εὐαπάντητος, 2Ma 14:9; πεφρενωμένος, 2Ma 11:4; ψυχικῶς, 2Ma 4:37; 2Ma 14:24. Others bear a sense which is common in late Greek, as ἀκλερεῖν, 2Ma 14:8; ἀναζυγή, 2Ma 9:2; 2Ma 13:26; διάληψις, 2Ma 3:32; ἐναπερείδω, 2Ma 9:4; φρυάσσομαι. 34; περισκυθόζω, 2Ma 7:4. Others appear to be peculiar to this book, as διάσταλσις, 2Ma 13:25; δυσπέτημα, 2Ma 5:20; προσπυροῦν, 2Ma 14:11; πολεμοτροφεῖν, 2Ma 10:14-15; - ὁπλολογεῖν, 2Ma 8:27; 2Ma 8:31; ἀπενθανατίζειν, 2Ma 6:28; δοξικός, 2Ma 8:35; ἀνδρολογία, 2Ma 12:43. Hebraisms are very rare (2Ma 8:15; 2Ma 9:5; 2Ma 14:24). Idiomatic Greek phrases are much more common (2Ma 4:40; 2Ma 12:22; 2Ma 15:12, etc.); and the writer evidently had a considerable command over the Greek language, though his taste was deformed by a love of rhetorical effect.

IV. Historical and Religious Character. — As the avowed design of the book is religio-didactic and parmnetic, the aim of the writer was not to recount a series of dry facts in chronological order, but rather to select such events from the period on which he treats, and arrange, embellish, and comment upon them in such a manner as should most strikingly set forth to his Egyptian brethren the marvelous interposition of God to preserve the only legitimate and theocratic sanctuary in Jerusalem. Hence the desire to point out the signal punishment of the wicked according to the principle in eo gener e quisque punitur. in quo peccavit (2Ma 5:9-10; 2Ma 9:5-6; 2Ma 13:8; 2Ma 15:32-33); the moral reflections (2Ma 5:17-20; 2Ma 6:12-16; 2Ma 9:8-10; 2Ma 12:43-45); the colored descriptions (2Ma 3:14-23; 2Ma 5:11-20); the exaggerated account of the martyrdom of the seven brothers and their mother, which king Antiochus, for the sake of effect, is made to witness in Jerusalem (2Ma 6:18 to 2Ma 7:42); the enormous numbers of the enemy slain by a handful of Jews (2Ma 8:24; 2Ma 8:30; 2Ma 10:23; 2Ma 10:31; 2Ma 11:11; 2Ma 12:16; 2Ma 12:19; 2Ma 12:23; 2Ma 12:26; 2Ma 12:28; 2Ma 15:27); the numerous and strange miracles (2Ma 3:25-27; 2Ma 5:2-3; 2Ma 10:29-31; 2Ma 11:8-10; 2Ma 15:12, etc.); the historical and chronological inaccuracies, making Antiochus witness the death of the Jewish martyrs (2Ma 7:3); the death of Antiochus (ch. 9); the representing of the sacrifices as having been renewed after two years' interruption (2Ma 10:3, comp. with 1Ma 4:52; 1Ma 4:54; 1Ma 1:54; 1Ma 1:59); the description of the different battles which the Jews fought between the purification of the Temple and the death of Antiochus (2Ma 8:30; 2Ma 10:15-38; 2Ma 12:24, comp. with 1 Maccabees 5); the campaign of Lysias (2Ma 11:12, comp. with 1Ma 4:26-32); etc.

But apart from these embellishments, traditional stories, inversions of events, etc., which, in accordance with ancient usage, the author adopted in order to carry out  his design, and in spite of the fact that the two letters with which the book begins are now generally given up as spurious, the best critics accept the groundwork of the facts as true. Grimm, whose elaborate, thorough, and impartial comment on this book is unparalleled, has shown that there is no ground to question the historical import of the most important section (chap. 4-6. 10), which is not only most consistent in itself. but, fits most appropriately the space of 1Ma 1:10-64; or the truthfulness of ch. 3, when stripped of the miraculous. He says that its truthfulness, within the specified limits, is supported by the fact that, 1. Notwithstanding the many differences, it agrees in not a few portions with 1 Maccabees, though both these books are perfectly independent of each other; and, 2. In four events which it records anterior to 1 Maccabees, it agrees with Josephus, who is entirely independent of it, viz. the account of the Temple at Gerizirn (6:2, comp. with Josephus, Ant. 12:5, 5); the execution of Menelaus at Beroea (13:38, comp. with Josephus, Ant. 12:9, 7); the landing of Demetrius at Tripolis (14:1); and of the priestly intrigues (ch. 4) which were the cause of the protracted series of struggles between the Jews and the Syrian monarchs.

The religious character of the book is one of its most important and interesting features. God is throughout recognized as ordaining even the most minute affairs of his people; the calamities which befel them are looked upon by the Jews as a temporary visitation for their sins (2Ma 4:16-17; 2Ma 5:17-20; 2Ma 6:12-17; 2Ma 7:32-33; 2Ma 12:40); and the sufferings which come upon the righteous in this common visitation are regarded as atoning for the sins of the rest of the people, and staying the anger of God (2Ma 7:38). The book. moreover, shows that the interposition of angels for the salvation of the people (2Ma 10:29, etc.; 2Ma 13:2, etc.), and supernatural manifestations (2Ma 3:25; 2Ma 5:2, etc.; 2Ma 13:2, etc.), which play a very important part in the N.T., were of no common occurrence. What is, however, most striking, is, that not only did the Jews then believe in the surviving of the soul after the death of the body, in the resurrection of the dead, and in their reunion with those near and dear to them (2Ma 7:6; 2Ma 7:9; 2Ma 7:11; 2Ma 7:14; 2Ma 7:23; 2Ma 7:29; 2Ma 7:36), but that God does not irrevocably seal the eternal doom of man immediately after his departure, and that the decision o our heavenly Father may be influenced by the prayers and sacrifices of the surviving friends of the departed (2Ma 12:43-45). This passage also shows that the offering of sacrifices for the dead must have been common in those days, inasmuch as it is spoken of in very commendable terms. The striking distinction between the religious  sentiments of this book and those of the former goes far to justify Geiger's conclusion that “the two books of Maccabees are party productions; the author of the first was a Sadducee, and a friend of the Maccabman dynasty while the author or epitomator of the second was a Pharisee, who looked upon the Maccabees with suspicion” (Urschrif, p. 206). Still the second book, like the first, contains no hopes about the coming of a Messiah.

V. Canonicity. — Though portions of this book are incorporated in the Jewish writings, and form a part of the ritual, viz., the martyrdom of the seven brothers and their mother (ch. 6:1-42), which is not only mentioned in the Talmud (Gittin, 57, b), the Midrash of the ten commandments (ed. Jellinek; Beth Ha-Midrash, 1:70, etc.), Midrash Jalkut (On Deuteronomy section תבא, 301, b), etc., but is interwoven in the service for the Feast of Dedication (compare The Jozer, אודכִי אנפת); the martyrdom of Eleazar (ch. 6:18-31), also embodied in the same service, and described by Josippon, who also speaks of the wonderful appearance of the horsemen, and other circumstances narrated in 2 Maccabees (compare Josippon, lib. ii, c. ii-iv, ed. Breithaupt, p. 172 sq.), yet the book was never part of the Jewish canon. Hence, even if it could be shown more unquestionably that the apparent parallels between 2 Maccabees and diverse passages in the N.T. (compare 2Ma 1:4, with Act 16:14; 2Ma 5:19, with Mar 2:27; 2Ma 6:19; 2Ma 7:2, etc., with Heb 11:35; 2Ma 7:14, with Joh 5:29; 2Ma 7:22, etc.; 14:46, with Act 17:24-26; 2Ma 7:36, with Rev 6:9; 2Ma 8:2, with Luk 21:24; Rev 11:2; 2Ma 10:7, with Rev 7:9; 2Ma 15:3-5, with Eph 6:9) are actual quotations, it would only prove that the apostles, like the rest of their Jewish brethren, alluded to the incidents recorded in this book without regarding the book itself as canonical.

The only references, however, to be found in the A. V. are from Heb 11:35-36, to 2Ma 6:18-19; 2Ma 7:7, etc.; and 2Ma 7:1-7; but even these are disputed, and it is quite possible that the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews refers to the sufferings of the Essenes (compare Ginsburg, The Esssenes, etc., Longman, 1864, p. 36). In harmony with the decisions of the Jewish Church, this book is excluded from the canon of sacred books in the catalogues of Melito, Origen, the Council of Laodicea, St. Cyril, St. Hilary, etc. (compare Du Pin, History of the Canon, London, 1699, 1:12). Jerome emphatically declares: “Maccabaeorum libros legit quidem ecclesia, sed eos inter canonicas scripturas non recipit” (Praef. in Prov.); and  Augustine, though stating that this book, like 1 Maccabees, was regarded by the Christians as not unuseful, yet expressly states that the Jews did not receive it into the canon (Contra ep. Gaudent. 1:31), and draws a distinction between it and the canonical Scriptures (De Civ. Dei, 18:36). The Council of Trent, however, has settled (April 8, 1546) the canonicity of it for the Roman Church. The Protestant Church generally agrees with Luther, who remarks, “We tolerate it because of the beautiful history of the Maccabaean seven martyrs and their mother, and other pieces. It is evident, however, that the writer was no great master, but produced a patchwork of various books; he has likewise a perplexing knot in ch. 14, in Razis, who committed suicide, which was also troublesome to Augustine and other fathers. For such example is of no use, and is not to be commended, though it may be tolerated and charitably explained. It also describes the death of Antiochus, in ch. 1, differently from 1 Maccabees To sum it all up: Just as 1 Maccabees deserves to be adopted in the number of sacred Scriptures, so 2 Maccabees deserves to be thrown out, though there is something good in it” (Vorrede auf das Zweite Buch Maccabaeorum, in the German Bible, ed. 1536).

VI. Versions and Literature. — There are two ancient versions of this book, a Latin and a Syriac. The Latin, which was current before Jerome, and does not always follow closely the Greek, is now incorporated in the Roman Vulgate, while the Syriac, which is still less literal, is given both in vol. iv of the London Polyglot and by De Lagarde, Libri Veteris Testamenti Apocryphi Syriace (Loud. 1861). The Arabic so-called version of 2 Maccabees is really an independent work. SEE MACCABEES, FIFTH BOOK OF.

Of commentaries and exegetical helps, we may mention Whitaker, A Disputations on Holy Scripture, Parker Society (Cambridge, 1849), p. 93- 102; Whiston, A Collection of Authentick Records (Lnondon, 1727), 1:200-232; Hasse, Das and. Buck der Makhk. neu iibers. nm. Anmerk. (Jena, 1786); Eichhorn, Einleitung in die apok. Schriften d. Alten Test. (Leipzig, 1795), p. 249-278; Bertheau, De Secundo Maccabceor. libro (Getting. 1829); Cotton, The Five Books of Maccabees (Oxford, 1832), p. 148-217; Ewald, Geschichte des Volkes Israel, 4:530 sq.; Schliinkes, Epistolce que Secundo Maccab. libro, cap. i-ii. 9, legitur explicatio, commentat. crit. (Colon. 1854); Herzfeld, Geschichte des Volkes Israel (Nordhausen, 1854), 1:443456; Patritius, De Consensu utriusque librii Macctbceor. (Romans 1856); Geiger, Urschrift und Uebersetzanqen der  Bibel (Breslau, 1857), p. 219-230; and, above all, the valuable work of Grimm, Kurzgefasstes exegyetisches Hlandbuch zu d. Apokryphen d. A Iten Testanents, pt. 4 (Leipz. 1857). SEE APOCRYPHA.

## Maccabees, The Third Book Of[[@Headword:Maccabees, The Third Book Of]]

             not given in the Romish Vulgate, the Apocrypha of the A. V., nor in Protestant versions generally, but still read in the Greek Church.

I. Title and Position. — This book is improperly called the “third of Maccabees,” since it does not at all record the exploits of the Maccabaean heroes, but narrates events of an earlier date. It, however, derives its name from the fact that this appellation, which originally belonged to Judas, was afterwards used in the sense of martyrs, and was extended to the Alexandrian Jews who suffered for their faith's sake either immediately before or after the Maccabaean period. In the Synopsis of the Pseudo- Athanasius, it is apparently also called Ptolemaica, from the name of the royal hero (compare ΜακκαβαÞκὰ βιβλια δ ΠτολεμαÞκά, p. 432, ed. Migne, for which Credner, Grimm, etc., suggest that the true reading is Μακκαβαικὰ καὶ ΠτολεμαÞκά, and that this book is to be understood by Πτολεμ —Grimm, Comment. p. 220). Properly speaking, this book ought to precede the two former productions, and occupy the first position, since it is prior in time to both the first and second Maccabees. But tradition has assigned to it a third position, because it came into circulation later than the others, and was regarded as being of third-rate importance. Cotton, in his edition of the Five Books of Maccabees, has placed it as “1 Maccabees.”

II. Design and Contents. — The design of this book is to comfort the Alexandrian Jews in their sufferings for their faith in the God of Abraham, and to encourage them to steadfastness and perseverance by recounting to them the experience of the past, which most unquestionably shows that the theocracy cannot perish; that, though tyrants might. vent their rage on the chosen people, the Lord will not suffer the enemy to triumph over them, but will appear for their deliverance, and avenge himself on their persecutors, as well as put to confusion those of the Israelites who have apostatized from their ancestral religion. To illustrate this, the writer narrates the following incident from the dealings of Providence with his covenant people: Ptolemy IV (Philopator), on returning from his victory over Antiochus the Great (B.C. 217), was waited upon by envoys from  Jerusalem to congratulate him on his success, which made him visit the Holy City and offer sacrifices in the Temple; but he was seized with a desire to penetrate into; the Holy of Holies (3Ma 1:1-11), and as the entreaties of the people failed to make the king relinquish his outrageous desire, the high-priest Simon prayed to the King of kings, who immediately chastised this insolent heathen; by throwing him down paralyzed on the ground (3Ma 2:12). Enraged at this, the king wreaked his vengeance, on. his arrival in Egypt, on the Alexandrian Jews, ordering that they should be deprived of their citizenship and be branded with an ivy leaf unless they agreed to be initiated into the orgies of Bacchus (3Ma 2:24-30). SEE DIONYSUS.

A few complied, but the bulk of the chosen people refused to apostatize from their ancestral religion (3Ma 2:31-32). Not content with this order, which was thus generally evaded or despised, he commanded all the Jews in the country to be arrested and sent to Alexandria (ch. 3). This was done as well as might be, though the greater part escaped (3Ma 4:18), and the gathered multitudes were confined in the Hippodrome outside the city (comp. Josephus, Ant. 17:6, 5). The resident Jews, who showed sympathy for their countrymen, were imprisoned with them, and the king ordered the names of all to be taken down preparatory to their execution. Here the first marvel happened: the scribes to whom the task was assigned toiled for forty days from morning till evening, till at last reeds and paper failed them, and the king's plan was defeated (ch. 4). However, regardless of this, the king ordered the keeper of his elephants to drug the animals, five hundred in number, with wine and incense, that they might trample the prisoners to death on the morrow. The Jews had no help but in prayer, and here a second marvel happened: the king was overpowered by a deep sleep, and when he awoke the next day it was already time for the banquet which he had ordered to be prepared, so that the execution was deferred. The Jews still prayed for help; but when the dawn came, the multitudes were assembled to witness their destruction, and the elephants stood ready for their bloody work. Then was there another marvel: the king was visited by deep forgetfulness, and chided the keeper of the elephants for the preparations which he had made, and the Jews were again saved. But at the evening banquet the king recalled his purpose, and with terrible threats prepared for its immediate accomplishment at daybreak (ch. 5).

Then Eleazar, an aged priest, earnestly praved for his people (3Ma 6:1-15), and, just as he finished praying, the royal train and the elephants arrived at the Hippodrome, when suddenly two angels appeared in terrible form, visible to all but the Jews, making the affrighted elephants go backwards and  crush the soldiers (3Ma 2:16-21). This changed the king's anger into pity, and, with tears in his eyes, he at once “set free the sons of the Almighty, heavenly, living God,” and made a great feast for them (3Ma 2:22-30). To commemorate this marvelous interposition of their heavenly Father, the Jews instituted an annual festival, to be celebrated “through all the dwellings of their pilgrimage for after generations” (3Ma 2:31-33). The faithful Jews had not only their mourning turned into joy, and the royal protection for the future, but were permitted by the king to inflict condign punishment on those of their brethren who had forsaken the religion of their fathers in order to escape the temporary sufferings; “thus the most high God worked wonders throughout for their deliverance” (3Ma 7:1-23).

III. Historical Character. — Though the parmenetic design of the book made the writer so modify and embellish the facts which he records as to render them most subservient to his object, yet the assertion of Dr. Davidson, that “the narrative appears to be nothing but an absurd Jewish fable” (Introduction to the O.T. 3:454), is far too sweeping. That the groundwork of it is true, as Prideaux rightly remarks (The O. and N. Test. connected, part ii, book ii, anno 216), is attested by collateral history.

1. The account it gives of Ptolemy's expedition to Coele-Syria, and his victory over Antiochus at Raphia (1:1-7), is corroborated both by Polybius (5. 40, 58-71, 79-87) and Justin (30:1).

2. The character which it ascribes to Ptolemy — that he was cruel, vicious, and given to the orgies and mysteries of Bacchus — is literally confirmed both by Plutarch, who, in his essay How to distinguish Flatterers from Friends, says, “Such praise was the ruin of Egypt, because it called the effeminacy of Ptolemy, his wild extravagances, loud pravers, his marking with an ivy leaf (κρίωνω), and his drums, piety” (cap. 12; compare also In Cleomene, cap. 33 and 36), and by the author of the Greek Elymologicon, who tells us that Philopator was called Gallus because he was marked with the leaf of an ivy, like the priests called Galli, for in all the Bacchanalian solemnities they were crowned with ivy (Γάλλος ὁ φιλοπάτωρ Πτολεμαῖος διὰ τὸ φύλλα κισσοῦ καταστιχθαι ὠς οἱ Γάλλοι, etc.).

3. Josephus's deviating account (Apion, 3:5) of the events here recorded, which shows that he has derived his information from an independent source, proves that something of the sort did actually take place, altlhough  at a different time, namely, in the reign of Ptolemy VII (Physcon). “The king,” as he says, “exasperated by the opposition which Onias, the Jewish general of the royal army, made to his usurpation, seized all the Jews in Alexandria, with their wives and children, and exposed them to intoxicated elephants. But the animals turned upon the king's friends, and forthwith the king saw a terrible visage which forbade him to injure the Jews. On this he yielded to the prayers of his mistress, and repented of his attempt; and the Alexandrine Jews observed the day of their deliverance as a festival.” The essential points of the story are the same as those in the second part of 3 Maccabees, and there can be but little doubt that Josephus has preserved the events which the writer adapted to his narrative.

4. The statement in 6:36, that they instituted an annual festival to commemorate the day of their deliverance, to be celebrated in all future time, the fact that this festival was actually kept in the days of Josephus (comp. ib. 2:5), and the consecration of a pillar and synagogue at Ptolemais (7:20), are utterly unaccountable on the supposition that this deliverance was never wrought. The doubts which De Wette (Einleitung, sec. 305), Ewald (Gesch. d. V. 4:535 sq.), Grimm (Comment. p. 217), and Davidson (Introd. 3:455) raise against the historic groundwork of this narrative, are chiefly based upon the fact that Dan 11:11, etc., does not allude to it. Those critics, therefore, submit that the book typically portrays Caligula, who commanded that his own statue should be placed in the Temple, under the guise of a current tradition respecting the murderous commands of Ptolemy VII (Physcon) against the Jews, transferred by mistake to Ptolemy Philopator. If it be true that Ptolemy Philopator attempted to enter the Temple at Jerusalem, and was frustrated in his design — a supposition which is open to no reasonable objection — it is easily conceivable that tradition may have assigned to him the impious design of his successor, or the author of 3 Maccabees may have combined the two events for the sake of effect. The writer, in his zeal to bring out the action of Providence, has colored his history, so that it has lost all semblance of truth. In this respect the book offers an instructive contrast to the book of Esther, with which it is closely connected both in its purpose and in the general character of its incidents. In both a terrible calamity is averted by faithful prayer; royal anger is changed to royal favor, and the punishment designed for the innocent is directed to the guilty. But here the likeness ends. The divine reserve, which is the peculiar characteristic of Esther, is exchanged in 3 Maccabees for rhetorical exaggeration, and once  again the words of inspiration stand ennobled by the presence of their later counterpart.

IV. Author, Original Language, Integrity, and Date. It is generally admitted that the author of this book was an Alexandrian Jew, and that he wrote in Greek. This, indeed, is evident from its ornate, pompous, and fluent style, as well as from the copious command of expression which the writer possessed. Though this book resembles 2 Maccabees in the use of certain expressions (e.g. ἀγέρωχος, 3Ma 1:25; 3Ma 2:3, comp. with 2Ma 9:7) in the employment of purely Greek proper names to impart a Greek garb to Jewish things and ideas (3Ma 5:20; 3Ma 5:42; 3Ma 7:5, comp. with 2Ma 4:47), etc., yet the style of the two books is so different that it is impossible to claim for them the same author. The author of this book surpasses 2 Maccabees in offensively seeking after artificial, and hence very frequently obscure phrases (e.g. 3Ma 1:9; 3Ma 1:14; 3Ma 1:17; 3Ma 1:19; 3Ma 2:31; 3Ma 3:2; 3Ma 4:5; 3Ma 4:11; 3Ma 5:17; 3Ma 7:5), in poetic expression and ornamental turns (3Ma 1:8; 3Ma 2:19; 3Ma 2:31; 3Ma 3:15; 3Ma 4:8; 3Ma 5:26; 3Ma 5:31; 3Ma 5:47; 3Ma 6:4; 3Ma 6:8; 3Ma 6:20), in bombastic sentences to designate very simple ideas (e.g. δρόμον συνίστασθαι ῟τρέχειν, 3Ma 1:19; ἐν πρεσβείῳ τὴν ἡλικίαν λελογχώς, 3Ma 6:1), in using rare words or such as occur nowhere else (e.g. 3Ma 1:20; 3Ma 2:29; 3Ma 4:20; 3Ma 5:25; 3Ma 6:4; 3Ma 6:20), or using ordinary words in strange senses (e.g. 3Ma 1:3; 3Ma 1:5; 3Ma 3:14; 3Ma 4:5; 3Ma 7:8; compare Grimm, Comment. p. 214). There is also an abruptness about the book (e.g. its beginning with ὁ δὲ Φιλοπάωρ, and its reference, in τῶν προαποδεδειγμένων, 3Ma 2:25, to some passage not contained in the present narrative), which has led to the supposition that it is either a mere fragment of a larger work (Ewald, Davidson, etc.), or that the beginning only has been lost (Grimm, Keil, etc.). Against this, however, Gratz rightly urges that it most thoroughly and in a most complete manner carries through its design.

All the attempts to determine the age of the book are based upon pure conjecture, and entirely depend upon the view entertained about its contents, as may be seen from the two extremes between which its date has been placed. Thus Allin (Judgment of the Jewish Church, p. 67) will have it that “it was written by a Jew of Egypt, under Ptolemy Philopator. i.e. about B.C. 200;” while Grimm places it about A.D. 39 or 40.

V. Canonicity. — Like the other Apocrypha, this book was never part of the Jewish canon. In the Apostolic canons, however, which are assigned to the 3d century, it is considered as sacred writing (Can. 85); Theodoret, too  (died cir. A.D. 457), quotes it as such (in Dan 11:7). Still it was never accepted in the Western churches, and formed no part of the Roman Vulgate; it was therefore not received into the canon of the Catholic Church, nor inserted as a rubric in the Apocrypha contained in the translation of the Bible made by the Reformers.

VI. Versions and Literature. — The Greek is contained in the Alexandrian and Vatican MSS., and is given in Valpy's edition of the Sept. The oldest version of it is the Syriac, which is very free, and full of mistakes; it is given in the London Polyglot, and has lately been published by De Lagarde, Libri Veteris Testamenti Apocryphi (London, 1861). The first Latin version of it is given in the Complutensian Polyglot; another Latin version, by F. Nobilius, is given in the London Polyglot; the first German translation. as far as we can trace it, is given in the Zurich Bible printed by Froschover (1531); another, by Joachim Ciremberger, appeared in Wittenberg (1554); De Wette, in the first edition of his translation of the Bible, made conjointly with Augusti (1809-14), also gave a version of this book, which is now excluded from his Bible; and another German version is given in Gutmann's translation of the Apocrypha (Altona, 1841). The first English version was put forth by Walter Lynne in 1550, which was appended, with some few alterations, to the Bible printed by John Daye (1551), and reprinted separately in 1563; a new and better version, with some notes, was published by Whiston, Authentick Records (Lond. 1727), 1:162-208; a third version, made by Crutwell, is the Bible with Bp. Wilson's Notes (Bath, 1785); and a fourth version, with brief but useful notes, was made by Cotton, The Five Books of Maccabees (Oxford, 1832).

Of exegetical helps we mention Eichhorn, Einleitung in d. apokr. Schrifiten d. A. T. (Leips. 1795), p. 278-289; Ewald, Geschichte des Volkes Israel, 4:535 sq.; Herzfeld, Geschichte des Volkes Israel, 1:457, etc.; Groitz, Geschichte der Juden (2d edition, Leips. 1863), 3:444, etc.; Gaab, Handbuch zuan philologischen Verstehen der apokryphisccen- Schriften d. A. T. (Tubing. 1818), 2:614 sq.; and especially Grimm, Kurzgefasstes exegetisches slandbuch zu (dena Apokryphen d. A. T. (Leips. 1857), p. 213 sq.

## Maccarthy, Nicholas Tuite De[[@Headword:Maccarthy, Nicholas Tuite De]]

             a noted Roman Catholic pulpit orator, was born of a noble family at Dublin, Ireland, May 19, 1769. His parents removed to France on account of religious persecution, and Nicholas was educated at the College du Plessis, later at the College de France, and then at the Sorbonne. During the Revolution he returned to his parents at Toulouse, and lived there in great retirement, his time devoted mainly to study. In 1814 he became a priest, and early gained for himself distinction as a pulpit orator. In 1819 he entered the “Society of Jesus.” Thereafter he traveled from place to place, preaching everywhere with great success. His name had already, in 1819, been regarded at court, and he had then declined a bishopric, preferring his association with the Jesuits to an official position. In 1826 he was invited to preach before the royal household, and created quite a sensation. Now his name was placed among the foremost of the nation. After the fall of Charles X, Maccarthy moved to Savoy, and thence to Rome, where he died, May 3,1833. His sermons, which were published in 2 vols. 8vo (Paris, 1836), were translated into German and other modern languages. See the excellent article in Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 32:482; Regensburg Real-Encyklopädie, s.v.

## Maccarty, Thaddeus[[@Headword:Maccarty, Thaddeus]]

             a Congregational minister, was born in Boston in 1721; graduated from Harvard University in 1739; studied theology three years, and was ordained pastor of the Congregational Church at Kingston, Mass., on Nov. 3, 1742. When Whitefield appeared in that region in 1745, he appointed a committee “to prevent the intrusion of roving exhorters.” A false report  spread that Whitefield was to open communion for him, whereupon his parishioners nailed the doors and windows, and Maccarthy's request for dismission was granted. He then preached in Worcester, Mass., from Nov. 27,1746, until the time of his death, July 20, 1784. His publications are, Farewell Sermon at Kingston (1745): -Two Discourses on the Day of the Annual Fast (before the expedition into Canada, 1759); and other sermons. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 1:423.

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

             a Congregational minister, was born May 1, 1732, at Medford, Mass.; graduated at Princeton in 1751, and in 1756 was ordained pastor in Greenland, N. H., where he labored until his death, April 27, 1804, excepting only the Revolutionary period, when he acted as chaplain. He was a participant in the battle of Bunker Hill, and figures prominently in Trumbull's picture of that great event. He published A Sermon on the Justice of God in the Mortality of Man (1759): — The Artifices of Deceivers detected, and Christians warned against them, a sermon (1770): — Herodias, or Cruelty and Revenge the Effects of unlawful Pleasure, a sermon (1772): — A Sermon at the Commencement of the new Constitution of New Hampshire (1784): — An Epistolary Correspondence with Rev. John C. Ogden (1791): — The Choice, a sermon (1798): — An Oration commemorative of Washington (1800). See Sprague, Annals, 1:525; Christian Examiner, 1844, p. 404.

## Maccovius Or Makowsky, John[[@Headword:Maccovius Or Makowsky, John]]

             a Polish Reformed theologian and writer, was born at Lobzenic in 1588; studied at the principal German universities; was received doctor of theology at Franecker in 1614; appointed extraordinary professor of theology in that university in 1615; ordinary professor in 1616; and died in 1644. He was particularly renowned as an opponent of the Jesuits, Socinians, and Arminians, and by his severity against the latter created many enemies. In his own Church he caused much disturbance by his attempts to restore the use of the scholastic method in the treatment of dogmatics.

He used it first in his lectures, and afterwards also in his writings. See his Collegia theologica (Amstelod. 1623,1631): — Loci communes theologici (Fran. 1626): — Disinctiones et regules theologicae et philosophicae (published by Nicholas Arnold, Amsterd. 1656; Geneva, 1661). He was thereupon accused of heresy before the States of Friesland,  at the instigation, it is said, of his colleague Sibrand Lubbertus. The affair was brought by Maccovius himself before the Synod of Dort, and a commission, having been appointed to investigate the case, reported that “Maccovium nullius Gentilismi, Judaismi, Pelagianismi, Socinianismi, aut alterius cujuscunque hbereseos reum teneri; immeritoque illum fuisse accusatum. Peccasse eum. quod quibusdamn ambiguis et obscuris phrasibus Scholasticis usus sit; quod Scholasticum docendi modum conetur in Belgicis Academiis introducere; quod eas selegerit qumestiones disceptandas, quibus gravantur Ecclesiae Belgicme. Monendum esse eum, ut cum Spiritu sancto loquatur, non cum Bellarmino aut Suarezio. Hoc vitio vertendum ipsi, quod distinctionem sufficientiam et efficientiae mortis Christi asseruerit esse futilem; quod negaverit, humanum genus lapsum esse objectnm predestinationis; quod dixerit, in ele t dee pea; uixeitDeum velle et deceere peccata; qud dixerit,Deum nullo modo velle omnium hominum salutem; quod dixerit, duas esse electiones” (see Epp. eccl. et thel. prcest. et erud. vtror . [Amst. 1684], p. 572 sq.). The synod adopted the report, and acted accordingly. Still this did not purge the Reformed Church of the scholastic method, as neither Maccovius himself nor his disciples abandoned it. See J. Cocceji Or. hab. in funere J. M. (1644); Bayle, Dict. Hist. et. Crit. 3:290 sq.; Heinrichs, Versuch einer Gesch. d. christl. Glaubenswahrheifen, p. 355; Schröckh, Christl. K. G. s. d. Ref: 5:148; Herzog, Real - Encyklop. 8:745; Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctr. 2:170 sq.; Gass, Dogmengesch. 2:441 sq. SEE SCHOLASTICISM.

## Macdill, David, D.D[[@Headword:Macdill, David, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in South Carolina, studied under the celebrated American Presbyterian pulpit orator and theologian Dr. John Mason, of New York, and commenced preaching in Ohio. Macdill spent the latter part of his life in successfully performing the duties of an editor and director in collegiate and theological institutions. He died June 15, 1870.

## Macdonald, James Madison, D.D[[@Headword:Macdonald, James Madison, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Limerick, Maine, May 22, 1812. In 1828 he entered Bowdoin College, but at the end of two years removed to Union College, Schenectady, entered the junior class, and was graduated with high honor in 1832. He then spent a year in the theological seminary at Bangor, Maine, and thence to Yale Divinity School, graduating in 1835. He was licensed to preach, August 6, 1834, and ordained pastor of the Third Congregational Church of Berlin, Connecticut, known as the parish of Worthington, April 1, 1835. In 1837 he accepted a call to the recently formed Second Congregational Church in New London; in 1841 to the Presbyterian Church at Jamaica, L.I.; in 1850 to the Fifteenth Street Church in New York city; in 1853 he was installed as pastor of the First Presbyterian Church at Princeton; N.J., and here he continued over twenty- two years. He died April 19, 1876. Dr. Macdonald was a man of untiring industry. In a high degree his ministrations were able, varied, and evangelical. As a preacher he was solid, dignified, instructive, earnest, and tender. He published a number of his sermons at various times, also about six volumes, among which the best known is My Father's House; or, The  Heaven of the Bible. His greatest and most valuable work appeared since his decease, The Life and Writings of St. John. See Necrol. Report of Princeton Theol. Sem. 1877, page 9:

## Mace, Francois[[@Headword:Mace, Francois]]

             a French theologian and Biblical writer, was born in Paris in 1640, and became successively canon and curate of Sainte-Opportune. He was also counsellor and almoner to the king. He died in Paris Feb. 5,1721. His works are, Psaumnes et Cantiques de l'glise (Paris, 1677): — Abrege historique, chronologique, et moral de l'Ancien et du Nouveau Testament  (Par. 1704, 2 vols. 12mo): — La Science de l'Ecriture Sainte, reduite en quatre tables generates (Paris, 1708, 8vo), containing a comparison of the Old with the New Testament: — Les Testaments des douze Patriarches (Par. 1713, 12mo): — Meditations (of Busee, 2 vols. 12mo): — Limitation de Jesus-Christ (Par. 1698-9): — Epitres et Evangiles des dimanches etfetes, et pour le Careme et Advent (2d ed. Par. 2 vols. 12mo): — Melanie, ou la veuve charitable: — L'Esprit de Saint Augustin, ou analyse de tout les outrages de ce pire (5007 pages 8vo): — Explication des Propheties de l'Ancien et du Nouveau Testament qui prouvent que Jesus-Christ est le Fils de Dieu, le veritable Messie et que la Religion Chretienne est la vraie et seule religion, ouvrage en deux parties et destine “a confondre les athdes, les impies, les libertins, les Jufs, les heretiques:” — Histoire critique des papes depuis Saint Pierrejusqu'a Alexandre VII. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, vol. 32, s.v.

## Macedo, Antonio[[@Headword:Macedo, Antonio]]

             a Portuguese Jesuit and writer, was born at Coimbra in 1612. He was regent and instructor among the Jesuits, and passed two years in the African missions. He had charge of the confessional of the Vatican church until 1671, from which time he directed the College of Evora, and afterwards that of Lisbon. He died at Lisbon in 1693. His works are, among others, Elogia nonnulla et descriptio Coronationis Christinae, reginae Sueciae (Stockholm, 1650): — Lusitania innfulata et pupeurata, seu pontificibus et cardinalibus illustrata (Paris, 1663, 1673, 4to): — De Vita et Moribus Joannis de Alnseida (Padua, 1669; Rome, 1671): — Divi tutelares orbis Christiani (Lisbon, 1687).

## Macedo, Francisco de[[@Headword:Macedo, Francisco de]]

             a Portuguese Jesuit and prolific writer, was born at Coimbra in 1596, entered the Jesuit order at fourteen, and became successively teacher of rhetoric, philosophy, and chronology. In 1630 he left the Jesuits and entered the order of Cordeliers, with the surname Francois de Saint- Augustin, under which most of his works are published. He was called to the professorship of polemic theology in the College of the Propaganda at Rome, and afterwards (1657) visited Venice, lecturing de omnzi re scibili. He occupied the chair of moral philosophy at the University of Padua from 1667 until the time of his death in May, 1680. In 1675 he had composed 53 panegyrics, 60 Latin discourses, 32 funeral orations, 123 elegies, 115  epitaphs, 212 dedicatory epistles, 700 familiar epistles, 2600 epic poems, 110 odes, 3000 epigrams, 4 Latin comedies, 2 tragedies, and 1 Spanish satire. He had a sharp discussion with cardinal Bona on the subject of consubstantiation, and with cardinal Noris on the monachism of St. Augustine. Among his writings are Apotheosis S. Francisci Xaverii (Lisbon, 1620, 8vo), an epic poem: — Thesaurus Er uditionis pro sole, Viridarium eloquentie (denoting the author's vanity): — Scrinium S. Augustini de praedestinatione gratiae et libero arbitrio (Paris, 1648, 4to; 3d edit. Lond. 1654): — Controversia ecclesiacstica inter F. F: Minores (1653, 8vo): — Lituus Lusitanus, contra tubam Anglicanam (Lond. 1652, 4to): — Encyclopeedia in Agonenm litteractorumnproducta (Rome, 1657): — De clavibus Patri, 4 lib. (Rome, 1660): — Theatrum Meteorologicunm (Rome, 1661, 8vo): — Scholce Theologiae positivae (Rome, 1664): — Medulla historice ecclesiasticse emaculata: — Collationes doctrinae S. Thomce et Scoti, cume dierentiis inter utrumque (Padua, 1671, 2 vols.): — Joannis Bona Doctrina de usu.fermentati in sacrificio missce (Ingolstadt [Venice , 1673, 8vo; reprintVerona): — Disquisitio de ritu azymi etfernmentati (Verona, 1673, 4to): — Myrotheciunm morale documentorum xiii (Padua, 1675, 4to): — Schema Conqregationis S. Qulcii Romani cum elogis cardinaliumn et corollarium de infallibili auctoritate summi pontificis in mysteriis fidei proponendis (Padua, 1676, 4to): — Elogia poetica in Rermp. Venetam, cuan iconibus (Padua, 1680); — De Incarnationis Mysterio (Padua, 1681), containing also itinerarium sancti Augustini. See Hoefer, Noev. Biog. Generale, s.v.; Wetzer und Welte, Kirchen-Lexikon, 12:748.

## Macedonia[[@Headword:Macedonia]]

             (Μακεδονία, from a supposed founder Macenus or Macedon), a name originally confined to the district lying north of Thessaly, east of the Cardanian mountains (a prolongation of Mount Pindus), and west of the River Axius; but afterwards extended to the country lying to the north of Greece Proper, having on the east Thrace and the AEgaean Sea, on the west the Adriatic and Illyria, on the north Dardania and Moesia, and on the south Thessaly and Epirus. “In a rough and popular description it is enough to say that Macedonia is the region bounded inland by the range of Haemus or the Balkan northwards and the chain of Pindus westwards, beyond which the streams flow respectively to the Danube and Adriatic; that it is  separated from Thessaly on the south by the Cambunian hills, running easterly from Pindus to Olympus and the AEgmean; and that it is divided on the east from ‘Thrace by a less definite mountain boundary running southwards from Haemus. Of the space thus enclosed, two of the most remarkable physical features are two great plains, one watered by the Axius, which comes to the sea at the Thermaic Gulf, not far from Thessalonica; the other by the Strymon, which, after passing near Philippi, flows out below Amphipolis. Between the mouths of these two rivers a remarkable peninsula projects, dividing itself into three points, on the farthest of which Mount Athos rises nearly into the region of perpetual snow.” The whole region was intersected by mountains (among these were the famous Olympus and Athos), which supplied numerous streams (especially the Strymon and Axius), rendering the intervening valleys and plains highly fruitful (Pliny, 4:17; Mela, 2:3; Ptol. 3:13). The natives were celebrated from the earliest times for their hardy independence and military discipline. The country is supposed to have been first peopled by Chittim or Kittim, a son of Javan (Gen 10:4), and in that case it is probable that the Macedonians are sometimes intended when the word CHITTIM occurs in the Old Testament. Macedonia was the original kingdom of Philip and Alexander, by means of whose victories the name of the Macedonians became celebrated throughout the East. The rise of the great empire formed by Alexander is described by the prophet Daniel under the emblem of a goat with one horn (Dan 8:3-8). As the horn was a general symbol of power, the oneness of the horn implies merely the unity of that power. It is, however, curious and interesting to know that Daniel did describe Macedonia under its usual symbol, as gems and other antique objects still exist in which that country is represented under the figure of a one-horned goat. (See Murray's Truth of Revelation Illustrated, and the art. Macedonia, in Taylor's Calmet.) SEE GOAT.

Monuments are still extant in which this symbol occurs, as one of the pilasters of Persepolis, where a goat is depicted with one immense horn on his forehead, and a Persian holding the horn, by which is intended the subjection of Macedon by Persia. In Esther 16:10, Haman is described as a Macedonian, and in 16:14 he is said to have contrived his plot for the purpose of transferring the kingdom of the Persians to the Macedonians. This sufficiently betrays the late date and spurious character of these apocryphal chapters; but it is curious thus to have our attention turned to the early struggle of Persia and Greece. Macedonia played a great part in this struggle, and there is little doubt that Ahasuerus is Xerxes. The history of the Maccabees opens with  vivid allusions to Alexander, the son of Philip, the Macedonian king (Α᾿λέξανδρος ὁ τοῦ Φιλιππου ὁ βασιλεὺς ὁ Μακεδών), who came out of the land of Chettiim and smote Darius, king of the Persians and Medes (1Ma 1:1), and who reigned first among the Grecians (ib. 6:2). A little later we have the Roman conquest of Perseus, “king of the Citims,” recorded (ib. 8:5). Subsequently in these Jewish annals we find the term “Macedonians” used for the soldiers of the Seleucid successors of Alexander (2Ma 8:20). In what is called the Fifth Book of Maccabees this usage of the word is very frequent, and is applied not only to the Seleucid princes at Antioch, but to the Ptolemies at Alexandria (see Cotton's Five Books of Maccabees, Oxf. 1832). When subdued by the Romans (Livy, 44) under Paulus AEmilius (B.C. 168), Macedonia was divided into four provinces (Livy, 45:29). Macedonia Prima was on the east of the Strymon, and had Amphipolis for the capital. Macedonia Secunda stretched between the Strymon and the Axius, with Thessalonica for its metropolis. The third and fourth districts lay to the south and the west. Of two, if not three of these districts, coins are still extant (Akerman, Numismatic Illust. of the N.T. p. 43). Afterwards (B.C. 142) the whole of Greece was divided into two great provinces, Macedonia and Achaia. SEE ACHAIAA; SEE GREECE.

Macedonia therefore constituted a Roman province, governed by a propraetor, with the title of proconsul (provincia proconsularis; Tacit. Annal. 1:76; Sueton. Claud. 26), in the time of Christ and his apostles. (See fully in Smith's Dict. of Class. Geog. s.v.) The apostle Paul being summoned in a vision, while at Troas, to preach the Gospel in Macedonia, proceeded thither, and founded the churches of Thessalonica and Philippi (Act 16:9), A.D. 48. This occasions repeated mention of the name, either alone (Act 18:5; Act 19:21; Rom 15:26; 2Co 1:16; 2Co 11:9; Php 4:15), or along with Achaia (2Co 9:2; 1Th 1:8). The principal cities of Macedonia were Amphipolis, Thessalonica, Pella, and Pelagonia (Livy, 45:29); the towns of the province named in the New Testament are Philippi, Amphipolis, Thessalonica, Neapolis, Apollonia, and Beroea. When the Roman empire was divided, Macedonia fell to the share of the emperor of the East, but in the 15th century it fell into the hands of the Turks. It now forms a part of Turkey in Europe, and is called Makdonia. It is inhabited by Wallachians, Turks, Greeks. and Albanians. The south- eastern part is under the pasha of Salonika; the northern under beys or agas, or forms free communities. The capital, Salonika, the ancient Thessalonica, is a commercial town, and the only one of any consequence,  containing about 70,000 inhabitants. (See Cellarii Notit. 2:828 sq.; Mannert, 7:420 sq.; Conybeare and Howson, 1:315.) On the question whether Luke includes Thrace in Macedonia, SEE THRACE. “Nothing can exceed the interest and impressiveness of the occasion (Act 16:9) when a new and religious meaning was given to the well-known ἀνὴρ Μακεδών of Demosthenes (Philippians i, p. 43), and when this part of Europe was designated as the first to be trodden by an apostle. The account of St. Paul's first journey through Macedonia (Act 16:10 to Act 17:15) is marked by copious detail and well-defined incidents. At the close of this journey he returned from Corinth to Syria by sea. On the next occasion of visiting Europe, though he both went and returned through Macedonia (Act 20:16), the narrative is a very slight sketch, and the route is left uncertain except as regards Philippi. Many years elapsed before St. Paul visited this province again; but from 1Ti 1:3, it is evident that he did accomplish the wish expressed during his first imprisonment (Php 2:24). The character of the Macedonian Christians is set before us in Scripture in a very favorable light. The candor of the Beraeans is highly commended (Act 17:11); the Thessalonians were evidently objects of St. Paul's peculiar affection (1Th 2:8; 1Th 2:17-20; 1Th 3:10); and the Philippians, besides their general freedom from blame, are noted as remarkable for their liberality and self-denial (Php 4:10; Php 4:14-19; see 2Co 9:2; 2Co 11:9). It is worth noticing, as a fact almost typical of the change which Christianity has produced in the social life of Europe, that the female element is conspicuous in the records of its introduction into Macedonia. The Gospel was first preached there to a small congregation of women (Act 16:13); the first convert was a woman (ib. Act 16:14); and, at least at Philippi, women were prominent as active workers in the cause of religion (Php 4:2-3). It should be observed that, in St. Paul's time, Macedonia was well intersected by Roman roads. especially by the great Via Egnatia, which connected Philippi and Thessalonica, and also led towards Illyricum (Rom 15:19).” For the antiquities of this region, see Cousinery, Voyage dans le Macedoine (Paris, 1831); Leake, Travels in Northern Greece (London, 1835); compare also Holland, Travels in the Ionian Isles, etc. (Lond. 1812-13).

## Macedonian[[@Headword:Macedonian]]

             (Μακεδών) occurs in the A.V. of the N.T. only in Act 27:2. In the other cases (Act 16:9; Act 19:29; 2Co 9:2; 2Co 9:4) our translators render it “of Macedonia.” The “Macedonians” are also mentioned in the Apocrypha (Esther 16:10, 14; 1Ma 1:1; 2Ma 8:20). SEE MACEDONIA.

## Macedonians [[@Headword:Macedonians ]]

             SEE MACEDONIUS.

## Macedonius[[@Headword:Macedonius]]

             a patriarch of Constantinople, flourished in the 4th century. After the death of bishop Alexander, of Constantinople, in 336, Macedonius and Paulus became candidates for his succession. The latter was elected by the Athanasian party, but was soon after (338) deposed by the emperor Constance, who put Eusebius of Nicomedia in his place. Upon the death of Eusebius, Paulus was reinstated, but was again deposed by the Semi-Arian emperor, who in 342 pronounced Macedonius patriarch, notwithstanding the opposition of the people, who rose in insurrection, resulting in great bloodshed (comp. Gibbon, Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire [Milman's ed.], 2. 357 sq.). The orthodox rival, however, succeeded, after a time, in making his influence felt throughout the country, and Macedonius was finally obliged to yield him the patriarchate. In 350, after having thoroughly reorganized his party, Macedonius returned, and by the aid of the civil authorities regained. the superintendence over the churches. His decided connection with the Semi-Arians, and the widening of the gulf between the Arians and Semi-Arians, proved, however, fatal to his credit, and in 360 his enemies succeeded in securing his deposition by a synod at Constantinople. He is supposed to have died soon after. His followers at once adopted his name. The Macedonians are generally regarded as Semi- Arians of that period, especially those in and around Constantinople, in Thrace, and in the surrounding provinces of Asia Minor (Sozomen, 4:27). There is, however, one point in which the Macedonians, although not opposed to, are yet distinguished from the Semi-Arians; it is their idea of the antagonism of the divinity and the homoousia of the Holy Spirit. On this point the Macedonians are identical with the Pneumatmaachians, and  therefore the latter finally joined the former. They professed that the Holy Spirit is a divine energy diffused throughout the universe, but denied its being distinct, as a person, from the Father and the Son (Epiphanius, Haeres. 74; Augustine, De Haeres. c. 52). In 381 Theodosius the Great assembled a council of one hundred and fifty bishops at Constantinople (second oecumenical), which condemned this doctrine, and the Macedonians soon after disappeared. See Mosheim, Eccles. Hist. 1:305 sq. (N. Y. 1854, 3 vols. 8vo); Hase, Hist. of the Christ. Church, p. 115 (N. York, 1855); Basilius, De Spiritu S. opp . (ed. Garn.), 3:1 sq.; Thilo, Bibl. pp. Gr. dogyn. 1:666 s.; 2:182 s.; A. Maji, Nov.patr. bibl. t. iv (Romans 1847); Didymus, De Spir. Scto. interpr. Hier. (in Opp. Hier. ed. Mart. IV, 1:494 sq.); Walch, Ketzergeschichte, vol. iii; Bauer, Dreieinigkeitslehre, vol. i; Neander, Hist. of Christ. Dogmas, 1:350 sq.: Milman, Lat. Christianity, I, 334, 338 sq. (J. H.W.)

## Macfarlane, John, LL.D[[@Headword:Macfarlane, John, LL.D]]

             a Scotch Presbyterian minister, was born at Dunfermline, Fifeshire, in 1807. He was licensed to preach in 1830, and the following vear was ordained to the pastorate of the Secession congregation of Kincardine-on- Forth. In 1840 he was called to Glasgow, where he remained till 1861, when he removed to London. Here he labored most faithfully and with much success for twelve years. He died February 7, 1875. As a preacher Dr. Macfarlane was powerful, eloquent, and attractive; as a writer he was able and ready. His works are, Jubilee of the World: — Christian Missions to the Heathen (Glasgow, 1842):Mountains of the Bible (2d ed. 1850; 3d ed. 1856): — The Night Lamp (1850, 1851, 1853 ): — The Hiding-Place (1852; 3d ed. 1854): — Why Weepest Thou? (1854). See The (Lond.) Evangelical Magazine, June 1875, page 343, Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Machaerus[[@Headword:Machaerus]]

             (Μαχαιρούς), a strong fortress of Peraea, first mentioned by Josephus in connection with Alexander, the son of Hyrcanus I, by whom it was built (Ant. 12:16, 3; War, 7:6, 2). It was delivered by his widow to her son Aristobulus, who first fortified it against Gabinius (Ant. 14:5, 2), to whom it afterwards surrendered, and by whom it was dismantled (ib. 4; compare Strabo, 16:762). Aristobulus, on his escape from Rome, again attempted to fortify it, but it was taken after two days' siege (War, 7:6). In his account of this last capture by Bassus, Josephus gives a detailed description of the place. It was originally a tower built by Alexander Jannaeus as a check to the Arab marauders. It was on a lofty point, surrounded by deep valleys, and of immense strength, both by nature and art (compare Pliny, Hist. Nat. v. 15). After the fall of Jerusalem it was occupied by the Jewish banditti. The Jews say that it was visible from Jerusalem (Schwarz, Palestine, p. 54). Its site was identified in 1806 by Seetzen with the extensive ruins now called Ilikrauer, on a rocky spur jutting out from Jebel Attarus towards the north, and overhanging the valley of Zerka Main (Reise, 1:330-4). Josephus expressly states that it was the place of John the Baptist's beheading (Ant. 18:5, 2), although he had said immediately before (ib. 2) that it was at the time in the possession of Aretas. See JOHN THE BAPTIST.

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

             This place, represented by the modern Makaur, is fully described by Tristram (Land of Moab, page 271 sq.). The fortress stands on a round hill at the eastern end of a narrow and isolated ridge, on which the inhabited city must have been built. It is very different in character from any other ruins in Moab. Nothing remains but a few courses of stones above the  foundations. But the whole building material has been collected by the hand of man into one prodigious mass on the crest of the ridge, where it remains in wild desolation, a monument of the vengeance taken by the Roman legions against the last desperate patriots of the Jewish revolts. The outline of the fortress may still be traced very clearly, and in it two dungeons, one of them deep, and its sides scarcely broken in. One of them must have been the prison-house of the Baptist.

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

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Brechin, Scotland, in 1798. He was educated at King's College, Aberdeen, and afterwards at the University of Edinburgh. On receiving license to preach, he became assistant to the parish minister, and in 1828 emigrated to Canada, and took charge of the Church in Kingston, C.W. In 1833 he was moderator of the synod; and at a meeting of lay delegates, assembled from all parts of the province, he was nominated commissioner to proceed to Britain, and attend to the interests of the Canadian branch of the Church of Scotland in one of the crises of her history. From 1846 to 1853 he was acting principal of Queen's College, Kingston, in which institution, during several sessions, he taught the Hebrew classes, and examined the candidates for license in the Oriental tongues. He died Feb. 7, 1863. Dr. Machar's attainments both in sacred and secular learning were exact and varied; he was familiar with English  literature, and could read with ease Hebrew, Greek, and the modern languages. He was always a close student, an earnest preacher, and a faithful pastor. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1864, p. 388.

## Machatus, Saint[[@Headword:Machatus, Saint]]

             a Scotch prelate, was bishop of the Isles in 498 and 518. To this saint there are many churches dedicated in Scotland. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 295.

## Machault, Jean de[[@Headword:Machault, Jean de]]

             a French Jesuit, was born at Paris Oct. 25,1561; was admitted into the order in 1579; became professor of rhetoric at the College de Clermont, Paris, and afterwards rector of the College of Rouen. He died as provincial of Champagne arch 25, 1619, at Paris. He published In Jacobi Thusani historiarum libros notationes lectoribus utiles etnecessarim (Ingolstadt, 4to), which was condemned to be burned.See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Machault, Jean-Baptiste de[[@Headword:Machault, Jean-Baptiste de]]

             a French scholar and Jesuit, nephew of the foregoing, was born at Parl in 1591. He taught rhetoric at Paris, and directed successively the colleges of Rouen and Nevers. He died at Pontoise May 22, 1640. His works are, among others, S. Anselmi Cantuariensis archiep. de Felicitate Sanctorumr Dissertatio, ex scriptore Eadinero Anglo, canon. regulari (Paris, 1639, 8vo): — Histoire des eveques d'Evr-eux: — Gesta a Soc. Jes. in Regno Sinensi, AEthiopico, et Tibetino. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

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

             a French Jesuit. was born at Paris in 1600; entered the order at eighteen, and afterwards taught ethics and philosophy, and was rector at Alenoon, Orleans, and Caen. He died in 1680 at Paris. His works are, De Missionibus Paraguarice et allis in America meridionali (Paris, 1636, 8vo): — De Rebits Japonicis (Paris, 1646, 8vo): — De Regno Cochinchinensi (Paris, 1652, 8vo): — De Missionibus in India (Paris, 1659, 8vo): — De Missionibus religiosorum Soc. Jesu in Perside (Paris, 1659,8vo): — De Reqno Madurensi (Paris, 1663, 8vo). See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Machazor[[@Headword:Machazor]]

             SEE MACHZOR.

## Machbanai[[@Headword:Machbanai]]

             (Heb. Makbannay', מִכְבִּנִּי, binding, or perhaps clad with a mantle; Sept. Μαχαβαναϊv v. r. Μελχαβαναϊv; Vulg. lMachbanai). the eleventh of the Gadite braves who joined David's troop in the wilderness of Adullam (1Ch 12:13). B.C. cir. 1061.

## Machbenah[[@Headword:Machbenah]]

             (Heb. Makbena', מִכְבֵּנָא, something bound on, perh. a cloak; Sept. Μαχαβηνά v. r. Μαχαμηνά; Vulg. Maochbena), apparently a place in the tribe of Judah founded by (a person of that name, the son of) Sheva (1Ch 2:49), and probably situated in the vicinity of Gibeah, in connection with which it is mentioned. It is thought to have been the same with CABBON (Jos 15:40).

## Macheboeuf, Joseph Projectus[[@Headword:Macheboeuf, Joseph Projectus]]

             a Roman Catholic bishop, was born in the diocese of Clermont, France, August 11, 1812. He was educated by the Sulpicians at Montferran. After three years' labor in his own country, he came to America to preside over the diocese of Cleveland, and was located at Sandusky. He went to New Mexico in 1851; from thence to Colorado, where he erected the first Catholic church at Denver. When Colorado became a vicariate, he was consecrated bishop of Epiphania and vicar apostolic. In 1887 he was made bishop of Denver. He died July 9, 1889.

## Machet, Gerard Or Girard[[@Headword:Machet, Gerard Or Girard]]

             a French cardinal, confessor of Charles VII, was born at Blois in 1380; entered the College de Navarre, Paris, in 1391; was made doctor of divinity in 1411; attached himself to the College de Navarre as professor, was made vice-chancellor of that institution, and as such addressed the emperor Sigismond in 1416. Driven from his college by the Burgundian invasion (May 30, 1418), he became the confessor of his pupil, the future emperor, Charles VII. He lived a while at Lyons. Machet was one of the clergy who conducted the examination of the Maid of Orleans. His influence in Troyes, Champagne, was powerful in opening that city and province to the army of Charles VII. Machet was successively canon of Paris, Chartres, Tours, and in 1432 bishop of Castres. He died at Tours July 17, 1448. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Machi[[@Headword:Machi]]

             (Heb. Maki' , מָכַי, smiting; Sept. Μακχίl, Vulg. Machi), the father of Geuel, which latter was the commissioner on the part of the tribe of Gad to explore Canaan (Num 13:15). B.C. ante 1657.

## Machir[[@Headword:Machir]]

             (Heb. hakir', מָכַיר, sold; Sept. Μαχείρ and Μαχίρ), the name of two men.

1. The oldest son of Manasseh (Jos 17:1), who even had children born to him during the lifetime of Joseph (Genesis 1, 23). B.C. 1802. His descendants were called MACHIRITES (מָכַירי, Sept. Μαχειρί, Num 26:29), being the offspring of Gilead (1Ch 7:17), whose posterity settled in the land taken from the Amorites (Num 32:39-40; Deu 3:15; Jos 13:31; 1Ch 2:23),  but required a special enactment as to their inheritance, owing to the fact that the grandson Zelophehad had only daughters (Num 27:1; Num 36:1; Jos 17:3). Once the name of Machir is put poetically as a representative of the tribe of Manasseh east (Jdg 5:14). His daughter became the mother of Segub by Hezron in his old age (1Ch 2:21). The mother of Machir was an Aramitess, and his wife was Maachah, the granddaughter of Benjamin, by whom he had several sons (1Ch 7:14-16). “The family of Machir come forward prominently in the history of the conquest of the trans-Jordanic portion of the Promised Land. In the joint expedition of Israel and Ammon, their warlike prowess expelled the Amoritish inhabitants from the rugged and difficult range of Gilead, and their bravery was rewarded by Moses by the assignment to them of a large portion of the district, ‘half Gilead' (Jos 13:31), with its rich mountain pastures, and the towns of Ashtaroth and Edrei, the capitals of Og's kingdom (Num 32:39-40; Deu 3:15; Jos 13:31; Jos 17:1). The warlike renown of the family of Machir is given as the reason for this grant (Jos 17:1), and we can see the sound policy of assigning a frontier land of so much importance to the safety of the whole country, exposed at the same time to the first brunt of the Syrian and Assyrian invasions, and to the never-ceasing predatory inroads of the wild desert tribes, to a clan whose prowess and skill in battle had been full proved in the subjugation of so difficult a tract (Stanley, S. and Pal. p. 327).” “The connection with Benjamin may perhaps have led to the selection by Abner of Maahanaim, which lay on the boundary between Gad and Mansasseh, as the residence of Ishbosheth (2Sa 2:8); and that with Judah may have also influenced David to go so far north when driven out of his kingdom.”

2. A descendant of the preceding, son of Ammiel, residing at Lo-debar, who maintained the lame son of Jonathan until provision was made for him by David's care (2Sa 9:4-5), and afterwards extended his hospitality to the fugitive monarch himself (2Sa 17:27). B.C. 1037-1023. Josephus calls him the chief of the country of Gilead (Ant. 7:9, 8). SEE DAVID.

## Machir Of Toledo[[@Headword:Machir Of Toledo]]

             who flourished towards the end of the 14th century, is the author of אבקת רוכל, or an eschatology of Judaism, in three parts-the first. treats of the sufferings in the Messianic time, of the advent of the Messiah, resurrection, last judgment, and world to come; the second treats of reward and punishment, paradise and hell; the third of the oral law (Rimini, 1526 and often); a Judaeo-German translation appeared at Fuirth in 1691, and the first part was translated into Latin by Hulsius, Tractatus de Messia (reprinted in his Theologia Judaica, Breda, 1653). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 2:285; De' Rossi, Dizionario Storico (Germ, transl.), page 190 sq.; and his Bibliotheca Judaica Antichristiana, page 61. (B.P.)

## Machirite[[@Headword:Machirite]]

             (Num 26:29). SEE MACHIR, 1.

## Machmas[[@Headword:Machmas]]

             (Μαχμάς), 1Ma 9:73; elsewhere MICMASH SEE MICMASH (q.v.).

## Machnadebai[[@Headword:Machnadebai]]

             (Heb. Maknadbsay', מִכְנִדְבִי, perh. what is like the liberal? other copies read מִבְנִדְבִּיMabnadbay'; Sept. Μαχναδααβού v. r. Μαχαδναβού; Vulg. Mechnedebai), an Israelite of the sons of Bani who divorced his Gentile wife after the exile (Ezr 10:40). B.C. 459.

## Machpelah[[@Headword:Machpelah]]

             (Heb. Makpelah', מִכְפֵּלָה, probably a portion, but, according to others, double, and so the Sept. διπλοῦς, Vulg. duplex), the name of the plot of ground in Hebron containing the cave which Abraham bought of Ephron the Hittite for a family sepulcher (Gen 23:9), where it is described as being located in one extremity of the field, and in Gen 23:17 it is stated to have been situated “before Mamre,” and to have likewise contained trees. SEE MAMRE.

The only persons mentioned in Scripture as buried in this cemetery are Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, with their wives Sarah, Rebekah, and Leah (Gen 23:19; Gen 25:9; Gen 49:30; Gen 1:13). “Beyond the passages already cited, the Bible contains no mention either of the name Machpelah or of the sepulcher of the patriarchs. Unless this was the sanctuary of Jehovah to which Absalom had vowed, or pretended to have vowed, a pilgrimage, when absent in the remote Geshur (2Sa 15:7), no allusion to it has been discovered in the records of David's residence at Hebron, nor vet in the struggles of the Maccabees, so many of whose battles were fought in and around it” (Smith). “It is a remarkable fact that none of the sacred writers refer to this celebrated tomb after the burial of Jacob, though it was unquestionably held in reverence by the Jews in all ages. Josephus, in his short notice of the burial of Sarah, says that both Abraham and his descendants built themselves sepulchres at Hebron (Ant. 1:14), and in another passage he states that the monuments of the patriarchs ‘are to this very time shown in Hebron, the structure of which is of beautiful marble, wrought after the most elegant manner' (War, 4:9,7).

Jerome mentions the mausoleum of Abraham at Hebron as standing in his  day (Onomast. s.v. Arboch); and in the Jerusalem Itinerary, a work of the 4th century, it is described as a quadrangular structure built of stones of wonderful beauty (Itin. Hieros. ed. Wessel. p. 599). It is also mentioned by Antoninus Martyr in the beginning of the 7th century (Itin. 30); by Arculf towards its close (Early Travels in Pal., Bohn, p. 7); by Willibald in the 8th (ib. p. 20); by Sewulf in the 12th (ib. p. 45); and by numerous others (see Ritter, Pal. und Syr. 3:237 sq.). From these notices, it appears to be certain that the venerable building which still stands is the same which Josephus describes. Hebron lies in a narrow valley which runs from north to south between low ridges of rocky hills. The modern town is built partly in the bottom of the vale and partly along the lower slope of the eastern ridge. On the hill-side, above the latter section of the town, rise the massive walls of the Haram, forming the one distinguishing feature of Hebron, conspicuous from all points. The building is rectangular, about 200 feet long by 115 wide, and 50 high. The walls are constructed of massive stones varying from 12 to 20 feet in length, and from 4 to 5 in depth. Dr. Wilson mentions one stone 38 feet long and 3 feet 4 inches in depth, of ancient workmanship (Lands of the Bible, 1:366). The edges of the stones are grooved to the depth of about two inches, so that the whole wall has the appearance of being formed of raised panels, like the Temple-wall at Jerusalem. SEE MASONRY.

The exterior is further ornamented with pilasters, supporting without capitals a plain molded cornice. The building is thus unique; there is nothing like it in Syria. The style of its architecture, independent even of the historical notices above given, proves it to be of Jewish origin; and it cannot be much, if at all, later than the days of Solomon. The interior of this massive and most interesting building was described about fifty years ago by a Spaniard, who conformed to Islamism and assumed the name of Ali Bey (Travels, 1:232). The Rev. J. L. Porter was assured when at Hebron, and subsequently by a mollah of rank who had visited the tombs of the patriarchs, that there is an entrance to the cave, which consists of two compartments, and that the guardian can on special occasions enter the outer one (Handbook, p. 69). With this agree the statements of M. Pierotti, of Benjamin of Tudela, who gives a description of the caves (Itin. by Asher, p. 76 sq.), and of others (Wilson, Lands of the Bible, 1:364 sq.). We cannot doubt that the cave of Machpelah, in which the patriarchs were buried, is beneath this venerable building, and that it has been guarded with religious jealousy from the earliest ages; consequently, it is quite possible that some remains of the patriarchs may still lie there. Jacob was embalmed in Egypt, and his body  deposited in this place (Genesis 1, 2-13). It may still be there perfect as an Egyptian mummy. The Moslem traditions and the cenotaphs within the Haram agree exactly with the Biblical narrative, and form an interesting commentary on Jacob's dying command — ‘And he charged them... bury me with my fathers... in the cave which is in the field of Machpelah, which is before Mamre... There they buried Abraham, and Sarah his wife; there they buried Isaac, and Rebekah his wife; and there I buried Leah' (Gen 49:29-31).

There also they buried Jacob. Now within the enclosure are the six cenotaphs only, while the belief is universal among the Mohammedans that the real tombs are in the cave below. Projecting from the west side of the Haram is a little building containing the tomb of Joseph-a Moslem tradition states that his body was first buried at Shechem, but was subsequently transferred to this place (Stanley, Jewish Church, 1:498). The Jews cling around this building still, as they do around the ruins of their ancient Temple-taking pleasure in its stones, and loving its very dust. Beside the principal entrance is a little hole in the wall, at which they are permitted at certain times to pray.” “A belief seems to prevail in the town that the cave communicates with some one of the modern sepulchers at a considerable distance outside of Hebron (Lowe, in Zeitung des Judenth., June 1, 1839). The ancient Jewish tradition ascribes the erection of the mosque to David (Jichus ha-Aboth in Hottinger, Cippi Hebr. 30), thus making it coeval with the pool in the valley below; but, whatever the worth of this tradition, it may well be of the age of Solomon, for the masonry is even more antique in its character than that of the lower portion of the south and south-western walls of the Haram at Jerusalem, which many critics ascribe to Solomon, while even the severest allows it to be of the date of Herod. The date must always remain a mystery, but there are two considerations which may weigh in favor of fixing it very early.

1. That, often as the town of Hebron may have been destroyed, this, being a tomb, would always be spared.

2. It cannot, on architectural grounds, be later than Herod's time, while, on the other hand, it is omitted from the catalogue given by Josephus of the places which he rebuilt or adorned.” The fullest historical notices of Machpelah will be found in Ritter, Pal. und Syr. vol. 3, and Robinson, Bib. Res. vol. 2. The chief authorities are Arculf (A.D. 700); Benjamin of Tudela (A.D. cir. 1170); the Jewish tract Jichlus ha-Aboth (in Hottinger, Cippi hebraici; and also in Wilson, 1:365); Ali Bey (Travels, A.D. 1807, 2:232,233); Giovanni Finati (Life by Bankes, 2:236); Monro (Summer  Ramble in 1833, 1:243); Lowe, in Zeittung des Judenth., 1839, p. 272, 288. In a note by Asher to his edition of Benjamin of Tudela (2:92), mention is made of an Arabic MS. in the Bibliotheque Royale at Paris, containing an account of the condition of the mosque under Saladin. This MS. has not yet been published. The travels of Ibrahim el-Khijari in 166970, a small portion of which, from the manuscript in the Ducal Library at Gotha, has been published by Tuch, with translation, etc. (Leipzig, 1850), are said to contain a minute description of the mosque (Tuch, p. 2). The best description of the interior is that of Stanley, Jewish Church and Sermons in the East (the two are identical), in which he gives the singular narrative of rabbi Benjamin, and a letter of M. Pierotti, which appeared in the Times immediately after the prince of Wales's visit. A plan of the mosque is attached to Stanley's narrative. The description given by Ali Bey (Travels, vol. 2) is substantially the same as that of Dean Stanley. A few words about the exterior, a sketch of the masonry, and a view of the town, showing the enclosure standing prominently in the foreground, will be found in Bartlett's Walks, etc., p. 216-219. A photograph of the exterior, from the East (?), is given as No. 63 of Palestine as it is, by Rev. G. W. Bridges. A ground-plan exhibiting considerable detail, made by two Moslem architects who lately superintended some repairs in the Haram, and given by them to Dr. Barclay of Jerusalem, is engraved in Osborn's Palestine, Past and Present, p. 364. Thomson, Land and Book, 2:385 sq., gives some additional particulars; also Tristram, Land of Israel, p. 393 sq. SEE HEBRON.

## Machzor[[@Headword:Machzor]]

             (מִחְזוֹר, i.e. cycle) is the title of that part of Jewish liturgy which contains generally the prayers used in the synagogues on the Sabbath and feast- days, but principally those of the three most important festivals. They are usually rythmical, and are the productions of the most eminent Jewish writers. Unfortunately, many of the modern Jews cannot understand them in the original, and are obliged to have recourse to translations. The first author of such a collection of Sabbath and feast-day prayers, Piutim (פיוטּים), is R. Eleazar ben-Jacob Kalir, usually known only as Kallr (קליר), who lived in the second half of the 10th century. This was followed by others (Peitanim, ייטנים, ποιηται). The time of the Peitanim really closes with the 12th century, although fragmentary works still appeared in the 13th and 14th centuries.

These collections vary generally  according to the nationality of the author, as divers rites and liturgies obtained in the synagogues of different countries. Thus there are Machzors according to the rites of the German, Polish, Spanish, and Italian Jews, and also translations from the Hebrew into the different languages, the use of which translations in the synagogues is, however, not general. The first scientific work on the Machzor is that of W. Heidenheim, published in 1800. This author corrected the text by means of ancient MSS., according to the German and Polish rites, and added to it a commentary and a historical introduction. His work gave rise also to further researches on the Peitanim and liturgies by other modern Jewish writers. Among them may be mentioned Rapoport (Biographie Kalirs, etc., in Bikkure Haïttim, Vienna, 1829-32), Zunz (Gottesdienstl. Vorträge d. Juden, p. 380395), S. D. Luzzatto ( כמנהג בני רומא טביא למהזורEinleit. z. Micachsor nach röm. Ritus, Livorno, 1856), and L. Landshuth (עמודי חעבודה, Onomasticon auctorum hymnorum Hebraeorum eorumque carminum, fasciculus 1, Berol. 1857). There is a beautiful edition of the Machzor, and a masterly version of it in German by the late Dr. Sachs, of Berlin. See Bartolocci, Biblioth, Magna Rabbin. 1:672; 4:307 sq., 322 sq.; Wolf, Biblioth. Hebr. 2:1334-49; 3:1200 sq.; 4:1049 sq. SEE LITURGY.

## Mack, Martin Joseph[[@Headword:Mack, Martin Joseph]]

             a Roman Catholic theologian of Germany, was born February 17, 1805. In 1832 he was professor of New-Test, exegesis at Tublngen, and in 1839-40 rector magnificus of the university. His publication of Die Einsegnung der gemischten Ehen (Tubingen, 1840) brought him in conflict with the government. He was deposed from his office, and relegated to the  Ziegelbach parish in Wiirtemberg. He died September 24, 1885, leaving, Bericht uber Strauss' kritische Bearbeitung des Lebens Jesu (Tubingen, 1837): — Commentar uber die Pastoral briefe des Apostels Paulus (2d ed. 1841). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:552. (B.P.)

## Mack, William, D.D[[@Headword:Mack, William, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Flushing, L.I., July 29, 1807. He graduated from Union College, Schenectady, in 1831, and from Princeton Theological Seminary in 1834. He was licensed by the Presbytery of New York, February 4 of that year; ordained at Rochester, February 5, 1835; and subsequently was pastor at Knoxville and Columbia, Tennessee. In 1858 he became a voluntary evangelist, devoting half his time to the Presbytery of Columbia, and the other half beyond its bounds. From the time of the division of the General Assembly, in 1861, he adhered to the southern portion. He was for some time president of Jackson College at Columbia. He died January 10, 1879. See Necrol. Report of Princeton Theol. Sem. 1879, page 31.

## Mackee[[@Headword:Mackee]]

             C. B., a Presbyterian minister and educator, was born in Indiana County, Pa., March 28, 1792; was educated at the University of Pennsylvania, studied theology in the Seminary of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, and was licensed by Philadelphia Presbytery in 1819, and ordained in 1821. By untiring self-application he made himself a thorough and critical scholar, especially in the ancient classics, ecclesiastical history, Biblical literature, and theology. In 1824 he was chosen professor of languages in Cincinnati College, Ohio, which position he held until 1835, when he accepted a call as pastor of a church in Rochester, N. Y.; in 1861 he removed to Washington, D. C., to accept an appointment in the government service. He died June 5,1866. Mr. Mackee was a man of great conscientiousness, a profound scholar, a close thinker, and an instructor with rare capabilities for imparting knowledge. He published a small  volume entitled A Critical Examination of the Offices of Christ. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1868, p. 117.

## Mackellar, Angus[[@Headword:Mackellar, Angus]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Scotland near the close of the 18th century, was ordained to the charge of Carmunnock, in the west of Scotland, in 1812, accepted a call to Pencaitland in 1814, was moderator of the Church of Scotland in 1840, and when the disruption came was one of the acknowledged leaders of the Free Church. On leaving his country parish he removed to Edinburgh, and for some years exercised a sort of general superintendence over the missionary and educational interests of the Church. He was moderator of the Assembly of the Free Church in Scotland in 1852. He died May 11,1859. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1860, p. 263.

## Mackenzie, Charles Frederick[[@Headword:Mackenzie, Charles Frederick]]

             D.D., a prelate of the Church of England, and one of the noblest characters of our day, was born at Harcus Cottage, Peebleshire, Scotland, April 10, 1825, and was educated at Cambridge University, where he graduated with honor in 1848. After lecturing for a time at his alma mater, he decided upon the ministry, and was ordained by the bishop of Ely, and labored for some time in England as a parish minister. In 1854, bishop Selwyn, of New Zealand, returned to England, and pleaded earnestly for more laborers in the missionary field. Mackenzie felt persuaded that his duty lay in this direction, and in 1855 he accepted the position of archdeacon of Natal, and went out with the noted Colenso. His zeal in this new field, and his exemplary piety, are attested by all who knew Mackenzie at this time. In 1859 he returned to England to propose the establishment of other missions in Africa. Livingstone had just preceded him on a visit to England, and personally, as well as by the publication of his book on Central Africa, had awakened an unprecedented enthusiasm for that country. The establishment of a mission on the ground lately explored by Livingstone had just been determined upon, and Mackenzie's arrival at this time led to his appointment as the head of it. He was consequently consecrated bishop at Cape Town Jan. 1,1861; four days after he sailed for the Zambesi, and, after some necessary explorations, settled for his work at a village named Magomero. The climate, which in his former work he had withstood so well, here soon undermined his health, and he died Jan. 31, 1862. “In any  calling Mackenzie would have been distinguished for his fine natural qualities. His cheerfulness, gentleness, and simplicity, supported as they were by manly candor and enduring firmness of purpose, and guided by an innate purity and integrity that shrank from the faintest touch of wrong, could not fail to excite the admiration of the most worldly-minded. Consecrated as these qualities were to the service of religion, and warmed by a glowing zeal that had nothing in common with fanaticism, they assume something like heroic proportions. Nor are the battles he fought, the victories he won, the sacrifices he made, for the great objects to which he devoted his life, and the sufferings he endured, unworthy of a record among the achievements of England's illustrious sons.” The Christian spirit which the bishop manifested towards his Christian brethren of other churches is worthy of special mention. He labored in concurrence with them with cordiality and good will. His opposition to the slave-trade was decided, and made him many enemies. See Goodwin, Memoir of Bishop Mackenzie (Cambr. 1864, 8vo); Spectator (Lond.), March 5,1864, p. 269; Mrs. Yonge, Pioneers and Founders (Lond. 1871, 12mo), p. 285 sq. (J. H. W.)

## Mackenzie, Sir George[[@Headword:Mackenzie, Sir George]]

             an eminent Scotch lawyer and politician, was born at Dundee in 1636, and was educated at St. Leonard's College. He deserves our notice, first, for his Religio Stoici, or a short Discourse upon several Divine and Moral Subjects (1663); his Moral Essay upon Solitude (1665); and his Moral Gallantry (1667); and also on account of his unhappy connection with the government of Charles II as criminal prosecutor in the memorable days of the Covenant. By his severity in this position he earned for himself the ugly name of the “bluidy Mackenzie;” nor, we fear, can it be disproved — in spite of his liberal antecedents — that he became a willing instrument of despotism. He has, however, written a defense of himself, entitled A Vindication of the Government of Charles II. After the Revolution Sir George retired to Oxford. He died in London May 2, 1691. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Am. Aluth. 2:1175, where many references are to be found.

## Mackey, James Love[[@Headword:Mackey, James Love]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Lancaster County, Pa., Jan. 26, 1820. His early educational privileges were few, but, being fond of study, he  struggled hard to qualify himself for teaching. When fourteen years old he opened a school in his father's house; subsequently he taught public school in the neighborhood, attended Hopewell Academy and New London Academy, Pa., and taught in the latter. He entered the seminary at Princeton, N. J., resolved to do work in foreign missions. In 1849 he sailed for Corisco Island. In April of 1851 he founded the Evangasimba Mission, after surmounting many obstacles. In June of 1865 he returned to reside at home and soon after became principal of the academy at New London, Pa. He died April 30, 1867. Mr. Mackey was a man thoroughly qualified for missionary labors; his mental training, varied and accurate information, and scientific attainments, prepared him for the great work. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Alm., 1868, p. 119.

## Mackie, Josias[[@Headword:Mackie, Josias]]

             one of the earliest Presbyterian ministers who came to America, was born in Donegal County, Ireland. The year of his arrival in this country is uncertain, but the first notice hitherto found of him bears date June 22, 1692. His first settlement appears to have been on the Elizabeth River, Va., where in all probability he became the successor of Francis Mackemie, the first regular Presbyterian minister in America. After a formal oath in 1692, made publicly, and in confirmation of his belief in the Articles of Religion, as allowed in the case of Dissenters, he was licensed. He selected three different places for public worship, many miles apart, on Elizabeth River. These were in the Eastern Branch, in Tanner's Creek precincts, and in the Western Branch, to which was added, in 1696, the Southern Branch. Here, with the care of a farm and a store, he found time to preach, but the record of his labors has not as yet been discovered. — Sprague, Annals, 3:5.

## Mackintosh, Sir James[[@Headword:Mackintosh, Sir James]]

             one of the most celebrated literary characters of the 19th century, distinguished alike as a philosopher, jurist, statesman, and historian was born at Aldourie, in the county of Inverness, Scotland, October 24, 1765. His early instruction and training fell into the hands of his grandfather, a man of great excellence. In 1783 he entered King's College, Aberdeen, where he formed an intimate acquaintance with the celebrated Robert Hall — a happy association which told upon the whole career of Mackintosh. He himself records the great influence which Hall's society and conversation had on his mind. They lived in the same house, were  constantly together, and led each other into controversies on the most abstruse points of theology and metaphysics. By their fellow students they were regarded as the intellectual leaders of the university, and under their auspices a society was formed in King's College, which was commonly designated “The Hall and Mackintosh Club.” In 1784 he quitted King's College as IM.A., and removed to Edinburgh. His own inclinations were to the bar; family circumstances, however, obliged him to enter upon the study of medicine. But he by no means confined himself to his professional studies. “He mingled freely with the intellectual society of the place; divided his studious hours between medicine, metaphysics, and politics, intermingling with each excursions into its lighter literature and passing or past controversies, and he became a prominent speaker in the medical, physical, and speculative societies.” Three years had been thus pleasantly spent when the time for his examination came, and, with diploma in hand, he turned southwards, and settled at London. It was a season of great political excitement when Mackintosh arrived in the great English metropolis, and, as the political arena was much more to his taste and inclination than walking the wards of a hospital, he improved the opportunity, and determined upon a strictly literary life. He supported himself for a while by writing for the newspapers, at the same time engaged in philosophical studies.

In 1791 he finally published his Vindiciae Gallicae, in reply to Burke's Reflections on the French Revolution — a work which, though containing juvenile errors, at once gave him great renown; three editions were sold within the first year of its appearance before the public. “In sober philosophic thought, sound feeling, and common sense, it greatly surpassed the splendid philippic against which it was directed, and was enthusiastically lauded.” The leading statesmen of England, among them Fox, Sheridan, and others, sought the author's acquaintance; and when the “Association of the Friends of the People” was formed, he was appointed secretary. Encouraged by this success, he turned to the legal profession in 1789, was called to the bar in 1795, and attained high eminence as a forensic lawyer. In 1799 he delivered a course of lectures on the Law of Nature and of Nations before the benchers of Lincoln's Inn, which were attended by audiences of the most brilliant description. Later he was made recorder of Bombay, and in 1806 was appointed judge of the Admiralty Court. His Indian career was highly creditable to his capacity and honorable to his character. After his return to England he entered Parliament as Whig member for Nairn (1813).

In 1818 he accepted the professorship of law in the college of Haileybury,  continuing, however, to take an active part in the political affairs of his country, as the representative of Knaresborough in the nation's council. In 1822. and again in 1823, he filled the honorable position of lord-rector of the University of Glasgow. In 1828, his great attainments as a philosopher were acknowledged by his selection to complete Dugald Stewart's unfinished dissertation on the “Progress of Metaphysical, Ethical, and Political Philosophy since the Revival of Letters in Europe” for the Encyclopdedia Britannica. Sir James Mackintosh (he was knighted in 1803) at once set to work, and in 1830 completed his part of the task, entitled Dissert. on the Progress of Ethical Philosophy chiefly during the 18th and 19th Centuries. Unfortunately, however, his professional and other duties, as well as sickness, had prevented him from treating the subject as carefully and completely as he might have desired, and so far curtailed the original plan that a survey of political philosophy and the history of the ethical philosophy of the Continent were left unnoticed. But, “notwithstanding these deficiencies,” says our distinguished late countryman, Alexander H. Everett (N. Am. Review, 35:451),” it will be read with deep interest by students of moral science, and by all who take an interest in the higher departments of intellectual research, or enjoy the beauties of elegant language applied to the illustration of divine philosophy.' It gives us, on an important branch of the most important of the sciences, the reflection of one of the few masterminds that are fitted by original capacity and patient study to probe it to the bottom.” See the article ETHICS in vol. 3, p. 322 sq. He died May 22, 1832.

We have thus far sketched the life of Sir James Mackintosh somewhat more in detail than the limited space of our Cyclopaedia really warrants, in order to enable our readers fully to appreciate the valuable services of this master-mind in the department of philosophy, not only so far as they were exerted directly, but also indirectly. It is not without reason that his distinguished friend Robert Hall said “that if Sir James Mackintosh had enjoyed leisure, and had exerted himself, he would have completely outdone Jeffrey and Stewart, and all the metaphysical writers of our time” (Works [Gregory's edition, New York, 1833,3 vols. 8vo], 3:80). Neither can we afford to pass hastily by the man whom so eminent an authority as Morell (Hist. and Crit. View of the Speculative Philosophy of Europe in the 19th Century [N. Y. 1849, 8vo], p. 405) points out as one of the most eminent moralists of our day. “The ardor, the depth, and the learning,” says Morell, “with which he combated the selfish systems, and pleaded for the  authority and sanctity of the moral faculty in man, contributed perhaps more than any single cause, not of a religious nature, to oppose the bold advances of utilitarianism, and infuse a healthier tone into the moral principles of the country. Without signifying our adherence to his peculiar theory respecting conscience [viz. “that conscience, or the moral faculty, is not an original part of our constitution, but a ‘secondary formation,' created at a later period of life by the effect of the association of ideas out of a variety of elements existing in the mind” (comp. N. A. Rev. 35:451; also M'Cosh, Intuitions of the Mind, p. 253)], we still regard his thoughts and speculations as taking eminently the right direction, and had he obtained leisure to mature his views, and give them to the world in his own forcible and glowing style, it is the opinion of some best able to judge upon the subject (e.g. Robert Hall and Dr. Chalmers) that he would have placed the whole theory of morals upon a higher and more commanding position than it had ever occupied before in this country [England].” Besides this work on Ethical Philosophy (republished Philad. 1834, 8vo), Mackintosh's chief metaphysical writings were published in the Edinburgqh Review, to which he frequently contributed (for a list of them, see Allibone). His Miscellaneous Works, including the contributions to the Edinburgh Review, were published in 1846, 3 vols. 8vo, and also in a single volume sq. crown 8vo. See Memoirs of the Life of the Right Hon. Sir James Mackintosh, edited by his son, Robert James Mackintosh, Esq. (1835, 2 vols. 8vo); Edinb. Rev. 1835 (Oct.); Brit. Quart. Rev. 1846 (Nov.); North Am. Rev. 1832 (Oct.); and especially the very elaborate and able article in Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Am. Authors, 2:1179-1188. (J. H. W.)

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

             an eminent Scotch divine, was born in October, 1693, at Glendarnel. Argyleshire, where his father was then pastor. John was unfortunately early made an orphan, and he was taken in care by his uncle, the Rev. David Macklaurin, who educated John for the ministry, first at Glasgow, and later at Leyden, Holland. In 1717 he was licensed by the Presbytery of Dumbarton, and two years after was appointed minister at Luss, on the west bank of Loch Lomond. In 1723 he was promoted to a more responsible charge, the north-west parish of Glasgow. Here he died, Sept. 8, 1754, ‘ deeply regretted by a numerous and attached congregation, as well as by the general community of Christians in Britain.” His sermons and essays, many of which have been published, have received the highest commendations, and are even in our day in general favor with the clergy of  Great Britain. The most valuable are An Essay on the Prophecies relating to the Messiah, and three Sermons (Edinb. 1773, 8vo), said to have been the germ of the large and valuable work of bishop Hurd On Prophecy; Prejudices against the Gospel; and his sermons On the Sins of Men not chargeable to God, and Glorying in the Cross of Christ, all contained in his Sermons and Essays, published by the Rev. John Gillies (2d ed. London, 1772, 12mo), where may also be found an account of the life of John Macklaurin. See Jamieson, Cyclopaedia of Religious Biography, s.v.; Brown, Introductory Essay in Works of Macklaurin (1824).

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

             a Presbyterian divine, was born in Lambeg Parish, Down County, Ireland. Jan. 15, 1808. After receiving a good academical training, he graduated at Belfast College, Ireland; studied theology in Hill Hall School, Belfast, under Dr. John Edgar; was licensed by Belfast Presbytery in 1830, and ordained in 1831. During this same year he emigrated to America, and in 1832 was installed pastor of the Presbyterian Church in Clinton, N. J.; in 1835 he accepted a call to the Scotch Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, where he labored with great success until near his death, July 6,1859. Dr. Macklin was a man of quick apprehension and sound judgment, and of noble and generous impulses. He wrote a Tribute to the Memory of Archibald Robertson, Esq., a ruling elder, which was published in a pamphlet in 1859. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1861, p. 96.

## Macknight, James, D.D.[[@Headword:Macknight, James, D.D.]]

             an eminent Scotch divine, was born in Ayrshire in 1721. He studied in the University of Glasgow, but, like many of the Presbyterian divines both of his own country and of England, went abroad, and finished his studies at Leyden. On his return he entered the ministry in the Scotch Church (in 1753) as pastor of Maybole, in Ayrshire. Here he spent sixteen years, during which time he prepared three works: A Harmony of the Gospels (Land. 1756, 2 vols. 4to), with copious illustrations, being, in fact, a life of Christ, embracing everything which the evangelists have related concerning him: — A new Translation of the Epistles (published in 1795 in 4 vols. 4to, and later in 6 vols. 8vo): — and Truth of Gospel History (1763, 4to). These works were favorably received, and are to this day highly esteemed. The Harmony has been repeatedly printed, and to the later editions there are added several dissertations on curious points in the history or  antiquities of the Jews. The theology of them is what is called moderately orthodox. For these his valuable services to sacred literature Dr. Macknight received the rewards in the power of the Presbyterian Church to give. The degree of D.D. was conferred upon him by the University of Edinburgh. In 1769 he was removed from Maybole to the more desirable parish of Jedburgh, and in 1772 he became one of the ministers at Edinburgh. Here he continued for the remainder of his life, useful in the ministry and an ornament of the Church. He died Jan. 13, 1800. Of Dr. Macknight's translation of the epistles, universally regarded as his best production, Horne says that it is “a work of theological labor not often paralleled. If we cannot always coincide with the author in opinion, we can always praise his diligence, his learning, and his piety-qualities which confer no trifling rank on any scriptural interpreter or commentator.” Dr. W. L. Alexander, however, is not quite so commendatory of Dr. Macknight's scholarship: “This work, which was the result of thirty years' labor, soon obtained and long kept a high reputation. Of late years it has perhaps sunk into unmerited neglect, for there is much in it well deserving the attention of the Biblical student. Its greatest defects are traceable to two causes — the author's imperfect knowledge of the original languages of the Bible, and the want of fixed hermeneutical principles. In tracing out, however, the connection of a passage, especially of an argumentative kind, he often shows great ability.” See Life, by his son, prefixed to the Epistles (in the editions since 1806); Kitto, Bibl. Cyclop. s.v.; English Cyclop.

## Maclaine, Archibald, D.D[[@Headword:Maclaine, Archibald, D.D]]

             an Irish divine, was born at Monaghan, Ireland, in 1722. He was educated at the University of Glasgow, was minister of the English Church at the Hague from 1745-94, and afterwards settled at Bath, in England. He died at Bath, Nov. 25, 1804. He published a Sermon (1752, 8vo), Letters to Soame Jenyns (1772, 12mo), in defense of Christianity, and a very imperfect translation of Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History.

## Maclaren, John Finley, D.D[[@Headword:Maclaren, John Finley, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Manlius, Onondaga County, N.Y., February 7, 1803. He graduated from Union College in 1825; studied three winters (1825-28) in Princeton Theological Seminary, was licensed in 1828, and ordained pastor of the Church at Geneva in 1830. He edited the Christian Magazine at that place, afterwards settled at Hagerstown, Md. (1845), and Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania (1846). He was president for a time (1855-58) of the Western University of Pennsylvania. He died at Princeton, March 14, 1883. See Necrol. Report of Princeton Theol. Sem. 1883, page 18.

## Maclay, Archibald, D.D[[@Headword:Maclay, Archibald, D.D]]

             or, as he was familiarly known by Christians of all denominations, “Father Maclay,” a noted Baptist minister, was born in Killearn, Scotland, May 14, 1778, and in 1802 entered the ministry at Kirkaldy, in Fifeshire. In 1804 he was appointed a missionary to the East Indies, but the government objected, and he was obliged to stay at home. By advice of his friends he  quitted his native land, and in 1805 emigrated to this country. Immediately after his arrival he commenced to preach, and built up a Church in Rose Street, New York. Hitherto his connection was with the Established Church of Scotland, but in 1808 he united with the Baptists, and, most of his congregation following his example, a new Church was organized, known as the “Mulberry Street Church” (now the Tabernacle, Second Avenue Church), where he remained until 1837. He then resigned to become agent of the “American and Foreign Bible Society” just organized, and served this body to great advantage until 1850, when he was called within the domain of his own denomination to succeed the late Dr. Cone as the second president of the “American Bible Union.” In this capacity he made an official tour of England, presenting the claims of the Bible Union and collecting funds for the revision of the Bible, in which work that society is now engaged. In this mission he was very successful, owing, no doubt, to his fame as an eminent Baptist divine. One of the addresses made while abroad was translated into several languages, and circulated in more than 100,000 copies. On his return to this country he made a similar tour South, and with his usual success. In 1856 he resigned his presidency of the Bible Union on account of dissatisfaction with the manner in which the internal affairs of the Bible Union were conducted. He continued to preach, and labored for his Master till within a few months of his death, May 2, 1860. Dr. Maclay enjoyed the respect of his brethren in the ministry, and the affection of all Christian people who knew him. “He was surpassed by no man in zeal, friendliness, and good sense. He was a safe counselor, a cheery, hearty, healthy soul, as incapable of cant as of frivolity. It was evident to all who approached him that he was a man as well as a clergyman. He retained to the last that strong, homely, Scottish common- sense which renders the sons of old Scotia indomitable and victorious all over the world. A man of more absolute and immovable honesty never breathed.” (J. H. W.)

## Maclean[[@Headword:Maclean]]

             a Scotch prelate, was early minister at Morevern, Dunoon, and Eastwood, from which last charge he was advanced to the see of Argyle in 1680. He died there in 1687. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 292.

## Maclean, Archibald[[@Headword:Maclean, Archibald]]

             an English Baptist minister, was born May 1, 1733 (0. S.), at East Kilbride, in Lanarkshire. He was for many years pastor of the Baptist Church in Edinburgh, and was founder of the Baptist congregations in Scotland. He died in Edinburgh Dec. 12, 1812. Mr. Maclean published Paraphrase and Commentary onl the Epistle to the Hebrews (Edinb. 1811-17, 2 vols. 12mo; Lond. 1819, 2 vols. 12mo; Aberdeen, 1847, 2 vols. 12mo). A collective edition ofMaclean's works, including the above work,  sermons,etc., with a memoir of his life and writings by Rev. W. Jones, was published (Lond. 1823, 6 vols. 8vo; vol. 7, 1852, 18mo; Edinb. 6 vols. 12mo). — Kitto, Cyclop. Of Bibl. Lit. vol. 2, s.v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Am. Authors, s.v.

## Maclean, John, D.D., LL.D[[@Headword:Maclean, John, D.D., LL.D]]

             an eminent Presbyterian divine, was born at Princeton, N.J., March 3, 1800. He graduated from the college of his native place in 1816, and its theological seminary in 1819; became teacher in his alma mater in 1822, and in 1823 professor, a position which he retained, with a transfer of chairs, until his election as president in 1854. He resigned in 1857, but continued to reside at Princeton, loved and honored, until his death, August 10, 1886. He often wrote for the religious press, and published several sermons, essays, etc. See Nevin, Presb. Encyclop. s.v.

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

             a Scotch prelate, was probably bishop of the Isles about 1549. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 307.

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

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, a native of Scotland, came to the United States In early manhood, furnished with a good classical education. He had been brought up in the bosom of the Established Church of Scotland, and fully believed all its doctrines, but, owing to his Calvinistic views, had given himself no personal concern about his salvation. He was, however, awakened and converted during a revival of religion in Pontotoc, Miss., joined the Methodists, and, feeling it to be his duty to preach the Gospel, entered the Mississippi Conference Dec. 3, 1840. He took position at once in the Conference on account of his educational advantages. His first appointment was Jackson Station, then he preached in Lake Washington country, on the Mississippi River, and in 1849 was elected secretary of the Conference. For several years following he located; from 1863 to 1867 he was presiding elder of the Granville District, and in 1865 was elected a delegate to the General Conference held in New Orleans in 1866. At the time of his death, in 1870, he was supernumerary on the Lake Lee and Leota Circuit. “Brother Maclennan was a man of strong character,... a simple-hearted Christian, dearly loved the Church of his choice, and literally laid his life a ‘living sacrifice upon her altars.'“ — Minutes of the I. E. Church South, 1870.

## Macleod, Norman, D.D[[@Headword:Macleod, Norman, D.D]]

             a Scotch Presbyterian minister, was born June 3, 1812, at Campbelton, a seaport of Scotland. He was educated at a school in Morven, and at Glasgow University, where he was exceedingly popular. In 1837 he obtained his first ministerial charge, the parish of Loudoun, in Ayrshire, which he served for five years. About this period the disruption of the Scotch Kirk took place, and in the controversy which preceded and followed, Mr. Macleod took an active part. He adhered to the Established Church of Scotland, and in 1843 was appointed to the parish of Dalkeith. In July 1851, he was inducted minister of the Barony parish, Glasgow, which contained 37,000 souls. At that time he assumed the editorship of Good Words, designed as a popular periodical, with a spirit and aim decidedly Christian. Of his journey to the Holy Land in 1867, he gave a full account in his Eastward. He was also the author of several other popular works. In 1862 he was chosen by the General Assembly to represent the Church in India; and his reception, when he returned, was very warm. He was unanimously elected by the General Assembly to the office of moderator, in 1869. From 1871 his health gradually declined, and he died June 16, 1872. Dr. Macleod was a genial, large-hearted man, whose untiring energy and Christian philanthrophy placed him in the first rank of public benefactors. See (Lond.) Christian Observer, December, 1876, page 907; Memoir, by his brother (Lond. 1876).

## Macmillanites[[@Headword:Macmillanites]]

             SEE SCOTLAND, REFORMED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN.

## Macnaughton, Donald[[@Headword:Macnaughton, Donald]]

             a Scotch prelate, was elected bishop of Dunkeld in 1436, and died on his way to Rome the same year. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 87.

## Macneile, Hugh, D.D.[[@Headword:Macneile, Hugh, D.D.]]

             an Irish divine of note, was born in 1793, at Ballycastle, in the county of Antrim, Ireland; was educated at Trinity College, Dublin, where he received both the degree of A.M. and D.D.; also the appointment of canon of Chester. In 1822 he married the daughter of Dr. Magee, late archbishop of Dublin, in whose family he had been tutor. After preaching for some years in London, where he attracted large congregations, chiefly at Charlotte-Street Chapel, Fitzroy Square, he became successively incumbent of St. Jude's, Liverpool, and of St. Paul's, Prince's Park, near  Liverpool. In 1868 he was made dean of Ripon. He died in 1872. He published The Church and the Churches, or the Church of God in Christ militant here on Earth (1847, 8vo): — Lectures on the Church of England (12mo): — Lectures on the Prophecies of the Jews (1842, 12mo): — Lectures on the Sympathies, etc., of our Saviour: — (12mo): — Letters on Seceding from the Church (12mo): — Sermons on the Second Advent (12mo): — Seventeen Sermons (12mo). He also published several separate sermons, addresses, and controversial pamphlets.

## Macon, Councils Of[[@Headword:Macon, Councils Of]]

             (Concilium Matisconense). Ecclesiastical councils were held in this city of Burgundy in 584 and 585. At the former there were enactments to regulate the clerical dress, and forbidding Jews “to appear in the streets from Maunday Thursday until Easter Monday;” at the latter, over which Priscus, archbishop of Lyons, presided, enactments were passed-memorial in the history of the Church — on the conduct of the laity towards the clergy. Among other things, it was required that whenever one of the laity met one of the clergy in the public streets, the former should make a lowly and reverent bow; if both parties are on horseback, then the layman should take off his hat; but if the layman be on horseback and the clergy on foot, the former is to dismount and make his obeisance. See Riddle, Hist. of Papacy, 1:240; Landon, Man. of Councils, 1:386-9.

## Macrobius[[@Headword:Macrobius]]

             an ecclesiastical writer, flourished in the first half of the 4th century. He was a preacher in the Church in Africa after Gennadius became entangled in the Donatist heresy, and as a Donatist bishop secretly labored at Rome at one time. Before his separation from the orthodox he composed a discourse, Ad confessores et virgines, in which he insisted principally upon the beauty and the sanctity of chastity. After his union with the Donatists he addressed a letter to the laity of Carthage, De Passionea Maximiani et Isaaci Donatistatrum (published by Mabillon, Analecta [Paris, 1675], 4:119, and Optatus [Paris, 1700, Amst. 1701, Antwerp, 1702]). — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 32:607.

## Macron[[@Headword:Macron]]

             (Μάκρων, i.e. long-head; Vulg. Macer), the surname of Ptolemaus or Ptolemee, the son of Dorymenes (1Ma 3:38) and governor of Cyprus under Ptolemy Philometor (2Ma 10:12).

## Macurdy[[@Headword:Macurdy]]

             Elisha Presbyterian minister, was born in Carlisle, Pa., Oct. 15, 1763; was educated at the Academy of Cannonsburg. and was licensed by the Presbytery of Ohio about 1799. His first labors were as a missionary in the regions bordering on Lake Erie. In June, 1800, he was ordained and installed pastor of the united congregations of Cross Roads and Three Springs. During this connection he had an important agency in the revival in Western Pennsylvania, and was one of those who formed the “Western Miss. Society.” In 1823 he went on a mission to Maumee, and on his return was obliged, from ill health, to resign his charge of the church of Three Springs, and to confine himself to that of Cross Roads. He died July 22, 1845. See Sprague, Annals, 4:241.

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

             a Presbyterian divine, born in Newcastle County, Delaware, July 15, 1734; graduated at Princeton College, N. J., in 1757; settled near Newark in 1759; was employed as a missionary to North Carolina in 1764-6; was chaplain to Knox's Brigade in 1778; settled in Charlotte, N. C., in 1779, but removed in 1780 to Newark, N. J., where he preached until his death, July 20, 1807. In 1788 he was prominent in settling the Confession of Faith and forming the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church. The degree of D.D. was conferred on him by Yale College in 1776. See Sprague, Annals, 3:208 sq.

## Mad[[@Headword:Mad]]

             SEE MADNESS.

## Madagascar[[@Headword:Madagascar]]

             an island situated to the south-east of the African continent, in lat. 11° 57'- 25° 38' S., and longitude about 430 - 510; length, 1030 miles; greatest breadth, 350 miles; area estimated at 240,000 square miles, therefore  covering a territory larger than the British Isles, contains a population of nearly five millions.

History up to the Introduction of Christianity. — The early history of this interesting island is involved in the deepest mystery. It is supposed to have been known to the ancients, by whom it was generally considered as an appendage to the main land, and was probably discovered by the Phoenicians. As an island, we find it first mentioned by Marco Polo, in the 13th century, as Magascar or Madagascar; but its discoverer is now admitted to have been the Portuguese Antao Gonalves, who named it Isla de San Lourseno. The unhealthy climate made the stay of Europeans for a long time impossible. In 1774, Europeans attempted to establish a colony at Antongil Bay, on the eastern side of the island; it was mainly composed of Frenchmen; but, failing to receive encouragement and assistance from the French government, the settlement proved a failure. With the Christian missionaries (1818) skillful mechanics and tradesmen entered Madagascar, and to-day the island contains, in spite of its unhealthfulness of climate, quite a number of Europeans.

The natives consist of many tribes, of which the Hovas inhabit the center and northern portion of the island, and are at present so powerful as to hold in subjection most of the others. The features of the inhabitants of this section present a striking resemblance to those of the South Sea Islanders; they are evidently of different extraction from the other and darker tribes, whose features are wholly African. The men are generally well made, having finely-proportioned limbs, and usually present a high type of physiological development. The women are well formed and active, but by no means so prepossessing in feature as the other sex. The complexion of the Hovas is a ruddy brown or tawny color, while that of the other tribes is much darker. Another and very peculiar distinction is the long, straight hair of the former as compared to the woolly growth of their neighbors. The principal article of dress in use among the Hovas is the lamba, a garment very similar to the Roman toga, and made of cotton or linen materials.

The religion of these natives not converts to Christianity, is strictly heathen. Mohammedanism never made its way to them, and has no converts among them. Aside from Christianity, they have no accurate conception of God. The Supreme Being they style Fragrant Prince. “Their ideas of a future state, and, indeed, their whole religious system, is indefinite, discordant, and puerile; it is a compound of heterogeneous  elements, borrowed in part from the superstitious fears and practices of Africa, the opinions of the ancient Egyptians, and the prevalent idolatrous systems of India, blended with the usages of the Malayan Archipelago. There are no public temples in honor of any divinity, nor any order of men exclusively devoted to the priesthood, but the keeper of idols receives the offerings of the people, presents their requests, and pretends to give the response of the god. They worship also at the grave or the tomb of their ancestors” (Newcomb, p. 521). They practice circumcision, have the division of weeks into seven days, abstain from swine's flesh, and follow other Jewish practices. Marriage is general, but polygamy prevails, and conjugal fidelity scarcely exists among the non-Christianized.

Introduction of Christianity. — In 1816, Radama, the king of the Hovas, virtually even then the prince of all Madagascar, entered into diplomatic and commercial relations with the English. Only two years later — in 1818 Protestant missionaries set out for it, and ultimately this African isle became “one of the countries where the rapid and easy triumph of Christianity equals the most brilliant episodes in the history of Christian propagandism,” and a lasting rebuke to those Roman Catholics who have dared to pronounce Protestant missions a failure. The first Protestant missionaries were sent out by the London Missionary Society; and their mission. from the beginning, was very successful. The whole Bible was circulated in the native language; about one hundred schools were established, and from ten to fifteen thousand persons received Christian instruction. Suddenly, however, Radama died (July 27, 1828), and was succeeded by Ranavala Manjaka, a woman of great cruelty, and inimical to Europeans. With her accession to the throne of Madagascar opened a fiery ordeal of persecution, lasting for nearly thirty years. Europeans were banished from the isle; the public profession of Christianity was forbidden; churches and schools were closed, and many of the members of the churches were persecuted to death. The conduct of the converts was most exemplary; by their constancy, and many by their death, they refuted the slanders of Romanists that the converts of the Protestant mission churches consist, for a large part, of men who seek to obtain a lucrative position. In 1862 queen Ranavala Manjaka died, and her son was proclaimed king under the title of Radama II. With his accession to the throne of Madagascar the period of religious toleration recommenced, and, although for a moment the assassination of the king (in 1863; he was strangled, and his own wife selected as his successor, the government having been  modified into a constitutional form) spread alarm among the Christians, the missionaries of the London Society resumed their labors, and they were agreeably surprised in seeing that, in spite of all persecution, the Christian congregations had maintained themselves. . In 1867, the erection of four memorial churches on places where the first martyrs of Christianity fell a prey to heathen superstitions of Madagascar was projected; three of these have already been completed, and the fourth is in progress. (See Christian Advocate, Nashville, Tenn., Dec. 2, 1871.) But the greatest triumph the Gospel achieved in Madagascar in 1869 was when the now reigning queen, Ranavala II (she succeeded to the throne April 1I 1868), and, with her, a majority of the natives, threw away their idols, and embraced Christianity much in the same way as the ancient Britons did many centuries ago. Se e the Missionary Advocate (N. Y., Feb. 15, 1870).

Among those particularly worthy of praise, for services rendered in the missionary efforts in Madagascar, is the Rev. William Ellis (died in July, 1872). By years of missionary labors performed in the South Sea Islands he had become thoroughly acquainted with the missionary work; and when, by the death of Ranavala Manjaka, Madagascar seemed again open to the Europeans, he was selected by the London Missionary Society to visit the country, in company with Mr. Cameron, in order to ascertain the actual condition of things, with a view to resuming missionary labor. The manner in which Mr. Ellis conducted the most delicate negotiations with the government of Madagascar, so as to secure an entrance for the Christian teachers to the country, and the influence he exerted in high places, are well known to all persons acquainted with modern missionary enterprise. On three occasions he visited Madagascar, always on important missions, and always with signal success. He went before, and prepared the way for those who have gone in and occupied the field. On each occasion of his return to England he had marvelous things to tell of Madagascar and the prospects that were opening for the Church of God there. His Martyr Church of Madagascar, Madagascar Revisited (London, 1867, 8vo), and Three Visits to Madagascar, give a history of that mission-field which leaves nothing to be desired (compare, however, Westminster Rev. April, 1867, p. 249). It was he, too, who completed and revised the translation of the Scriptures into the Malagasy language.

The number of Christians in Madagascar is now estimated at more than 325,000. In 1888, the English missionaries (Episcopalians, Methodists, and Friends), — who have their head-quarters at the adjoining island of  Mauritius (an English possession), had in operation 924 schools, attended by 93,388 pupils. The Roman Catholics have, since 1861, missionaries (Jesuits) in the island, but they are mainly at the capital, Tamatave, and vicinity, and in the French possessions, the adjoining island of Reunion. See, besides the works of Ellis, already mentioned, M'Leod, Madagascar and its People (London, 1865); Oliver, Madagascar and the Malagasi (London, 1866); J. Sibree, Madagascar and its People (London, 1870); Chambers's Cyclop. s.v.: Newcomb, Cyclop. of Missions, s.v.; Edinb. Rev. 1867, p. 212; Grundemann, Missions-Atlas, No. 17; N. Y. Methodist, 1867; N. Y. Christian Intelligencer, July 11, 1872.

## Madagascar Version[[@Headword:Madagascar Version]]

             SEE MAILAGASI.

## Madai[[@Headword:Madai]]

             (Heb. Maday', מָדִי, Sept. Μαδοί, Gen 10:2, a MEDE SEE MEDE [q.v.], as elsewhere rendered), the third son of Japhet (Gen 10:2), from whom the Medes, etc., are supposed to have descended. B.C. post 2514. SEE ETHNOLOGY.

## Madan, Martin[[@Headword:Madan, Martin]]

             an Anglican divine, was born near Hertford, England, in 1726. He first studied law, but finally entered the ministry, and was for a number of years chaplain to the Lock Hospital, London. He died in 1790. Mr. Madan gained great notoriety by a work which he published in 1780, entitled Thelypthora, a treatise on female ruin, in which he stoutly advocated the practice of polygamy. The pamphlets which his work elicited he replied to in a number of tracts. Madan's object in advocating polygamy was the removal of seduction. He was quite a pulpit orator; several of his sermons have been published. — Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and American Authors, vol. ii, s.v.; Darling, Cyclopaedia Bibliog. 2:1920.

## Madan, Spencer[[@Headword:Madan, Spencer]]

             (1), D.D., an Anglican prelate, was born about the middle of the 18th century; became bishop of Bristol in 1792, and of Peterborough in 1794. He died in 1813. Bishop Madan published several occasional Sermons (London, 1792, 8vo, and often), and a translation of Grotius's De Veritate Christianae Religionis (1781-83,1813). See Gentleman's Magazine, 1837, 1:206.

## Madan, Spencer (2)[[@Headword:Madan, Spencer (2)]]

             (2), D.D., an English divine, son of the preceding, was born in 1759; was educated at Westminster School and Trinity College, Cambridge; was rector first of Ibstock, Leicestershire, and later of Thorp, in Staffordshire. He was also chaplain for the king about thirty years, and prebend of Peterborough. He died in 1836. He published several sermons.

## Madeira[[@Headword:Madeira]]

             (a Portuguese word signifying wood, and given because of the unusual abundance of timber) is an island in the North Atlantic Ocean, off the N.W. coast of Africa, in lat. 32° 43' N., long. 17° W., with an area of 345 sq. miles, and a poptulation in 1885 of 123,481, and belongs to Portugal. It constitutes a part of a grounp of islands sometimes called “the Northern Canaries,” which were discovered in 1419. ‘The coasts of Madeira are steep and precipitous, rising from 200 to 2000 feet above sea-level, comprising few bays or landing-places, and deeply cut at intervals by narrow gorges, which give to the circumference the appearance of having been crimped. From the shore the land rises quickly to a height of 5000 feet; its highest point, the Pico Rhuivo, is 6050 feet high. It is of volcanic origin, and slight earthquakes occasionally occur. The lower portions of the island abound in tropical plants, as the date-palm, plantain, sweet potato, Indian corn, coffee, sugar-cane, pomegranate, and fig. The fruits and grains of Europe are somewhat cultivated, but the country has until lately been mainly devoted to the cultivation of the vine and sugar-cane. Funchal, with a population of 25,000, is both the capital and port of the island. The climate is remarkable for its constancy. There is only 10° difference between the temperatures of summer and winter, the thermometer in Funchal showing an average of 74° in summer and of 64° in winter. At the coldest season the temperature is rarely less than 60°, while in summer it seldom rises above 78°; but sometimes a waft of the leste, or east wind, raises it to 90°. The natives of Madeira are of a mixed race, principally of Portuguese, Moorish, and negro blood. “They are meagre, sallow, and short-lived, which is attributed to their want of wholesome food [the poorer classes chiefly subsist on the eddoc-root, sweet potatoes, and chestnuts], a life of drudgery, and a total disregard of cleanliness.”

The Roman Catholic Church is the established religion of Madeira, and until recently none other was tolerated. In 1839, Dr. Kalley, a physician,  began to disseminate Protestant doctrines, and ultimately the Scotch Church took up the work most successfully began by Dr. Kalley. The spirit of persecution, so general in Romish countries, was not wanting here, and there was great opposition to Protestantism. The first missionary to the island was the Rev. W. Hewitson, who arrived there in 1845, but for a long time the opposition of the government was so severe that he was obliged to confine his labors mainly to Dr. Kalley's converts. So uncomfortable were natives who chose the Protestant communion, that in 1846 some 800 of them left for Trinidad and for the United States. At present the Protestants have quite a hold on the country. Besides an English Church, there are other places of worship, including a Presbyterian Church in connection with the Free Church of Scotland. The educational institutions comprise the Portuguese College, and Lancasterian and government schools. See White, Madeira, its Climate and Scenery; Schultze, Die Insel Madeiras (Stuttg. 1864); Chambers's Eyncyclop. s.v.; Newcomb, Cyclopaedia of Missions, s.v.

## Madhava[[@Headword:Madhava]]

             is one of the names of the deity Vishnu (q.v.) in Hindu mythology and in Sanskrit poetry.

## Madhavacharya[[@Headword:Madhavacharya]]

             (i.e. Madhava, the Acharya or spiritual teacher), one of the greatest Hindu scholars and divines of the mediaeval literature of India, is said to have been born at Pampa, a village situated on the bank of the river Tungabhadra, probably near the beginning of the 14th century. He was prime minister of Sangama, the son of Kampa, whose reign at Vijayanagara commenced about 1336, and also under king Bukka I, who succeeded Harihara I about 1361. He died at the age of ninety, probably towards the close of the 14th century. Maldhavacharya is famed for his numerous and important works on Vedic, philosophical, legal, and grammatical writings of the ancient Hindus. The most important of these are his great commentaries on the Rig-, Yajur-, and Sima-veda, SEE VEDA; an exposition of the Mimhnsa philosophy; a summary account of fifteen religious and philosophical systems of Indian speculation; some treatises on the Vedanta philosophy; another on salvation; a history of Sankara's (q.v.) polemics against multifarious misbelievers and heretics; a commentary on Parasara's code of law; a work on determining time, especially in reference  to the observation of religious acts; and a grammatical commentary on Sanscrit radicals and their derivatives. The chief performance of Mcdhava is doubtless the series of his great commentaries on the Vedas, for without them no conscientious scholar could attempt to penetrate the sense of those ancient Hindu works. In these commentaries Mhdhava labors to account for the grammatical properties of Vedic words and forms, records their traditional sense, and explains the drift of the Vedic hymns, legends, and rites. So great was Madhavacharya's learning and wisdom that popular superstition assigned them a supernatural origin. He was supposed to have received them from the goddess Bhuvaneswari, the consort of Siva, who, gratified by his incessant devotions, became manifest to him in a human shape, conferred on him the gift of extraordinary knowledge, and changed his name to Vidyâranya (the “Forest of Learning”), a title by which he is sometimes designated in Hindu writings.

## Madhavis[[@Headword:Madhavis]]

             an order of Hindu mendicants, founded by Madho, an ascetic. They travel up and down the country soliciting alms, and playing on-stringed instruments.

## Madhwacharis[[@Headword:Madhwacharis]]

             a division of the Vaishnava sect of the Hindus, founded by Marlhwacharya (q.v.). They have their headquarters at Udipi, where their founder erected a temple, and deposited an image of Krishna. Their appearance is thus described: "The ascetic professors of Madhwacharya's school adopt the external appearance of the Dondis, laying aside the Brahmanical cord, carrying a staff and a water-pot, going bare-headed, and wearing a single wrapper stained of an orange color with an ochrey clay; they are usually adopted into the order from their boyhood, and acknowledge no social affinities nor interests. The marks common to them and the lay votaries of the order are the impress of the symbols of Vishnu upon their shoulders and breasts, stamped with a hot iron, and the frontal mark, which consists of two perpendicular lines made with Gopichandana, and joined at the root of the nose like that of the Sri Vaishnavas; but instead of the red line down the centre, the Madhwacharis make a straight black line, with the charcoal from incense offered to Narayana, terminating in a round mark made with turmeric."

## Madiabun[[@Headword:Madiabun]]

             ([Ι᾿ησοῦ] ᾿Ημαβαδούν v. r. Μαδιαβούν; Vulg. omits), a name interpolated in 1 Esdras V, 38 as that of a Levite whose “sons” assisted at the restoration of the Temple under Zorobabel; but the Heb. list (Ezr 3:9) has nothing resembling or corresponding to it.

## Madian[[@Headword:Madian]]

             (Jdt 2:26; Act 7:29). SEE MIDIAN.

## Madison, James, D.D.[[@Headword:Madison, James, D.D.]]

             an early Episcopal prelate in America, was born near Port Republic, Rockingham County, Va., Aug. 27, 1749; passed A.B. in the Collegeof William and Mary in 1772; was soon after admitted to the bar, which he abandoned for the ministry; in 1773 became professor of mathematics in his alma mater; in 1775 proceeded to England for ordination, was licensed for Virginia, but on his return resumed his duties as professor in his alma mater, of which he became president in 1777. He afterwards revisited England to see Cavallo and other scientific men. In 1784 he was changed to the chair of natural and moral philosophy. In 1788 he was chosen bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Virginia, and in 1790 was consecrated in England. Under his care the College of William and Mary advanced steadily in reputation. He discharged his duties with zeal and fidelity until his death, March 6, 1812. In his theology bishop Madison was  much of a rationalist, and is charged by bishop Coxe (Am. Ch. Rev. Jan. 1872, p. 35 and 46) with having given “something worse than a negative support” to this dangerous element in the Church. He published some Sermons, Letters, and Addresses; also A Eulogy on Washington (1800). See Sprague, Annals, v. 318; Drake, Dict. of Am. Biog. S. v.

## Madman[[@Headword:Madman]]

             SEE MADNESS.

## Madmannah[[@Headword:Madmannah]]

             For this site Lieut. Conder suggests (Tent Work, 2:338) Um Deimneh, twelve miles north-east of Beersheba, consisting of "heaps of stones, foundations, and two or three caves" (Memoirs to Ordnance Survey, 3:399); but the name has little resemblance.

## Madmannnah[[@Headword:Madmannnah]]

             (Hebrew Madmannah', מִדְמִנָּה, dunghill; Sept. Μεδεμηνά and Μαδμηνά, v. r. Μαχαρίμ and Βέδ; Vulg. Medemena and hadnmena), a town in the extreme south of Judah (Jos 15:31, where it is mentioned between Ziklag and Sansannah), hence included in the territory afterwards assigned to Simeon. From 1Ch 2:49, it appears to have been founded or, rather, occupied by Shaaph (or perhaps by a son of his whose name it bore), the son of Caleb's concubine Maachah. Eusebius and Jerome identify it with a town of their time called Menoïs (Μηνωϊvς), near the city of Gaza (Onomnast. p. 89). SEE MADMENAH.

Instead of Madmannah and Sansannah of Jos 15:31, the parallel passage (Jos 19:5; comp. 1Ch 4:31), enumerating the Simeonitish cities, has BETH-MARCABOTH and Hazar-susim, probably the same respectively (Keil's Joshua, ad loc.). Schwarz thinks (Palestine, p. 101) that it was the Levitical city Mandah, in which, according to the “Book of Jasher,” Simeon was buried; but this locality is wholly apocryphal. The first stage southward from Gaza is now el-Minyây (Robinson, Researches, 1:563), which, in default of a better, is suggested by Kiepert (in his Map, 1856) as the modern representative of Menois, and therefore of Madmannah.' A more plausible identification, however, is that of Van de Velde (Travels, 2:130) of the modern ruined village Mirkihb, west of the south end of the Dead Sea, as a representative of the ancient Beth-marcaboth.

## Madmen[[@Headword:Madmen]]

             (Heb. Madmen', מִדְמֵן, dunghill; Sept. παῦσις v. r. Μαδαιβημά, Μαδαμημά, and Μαδενηβά; Vulg. silens), a Moabitish town, threatened with destruction by the sword from the Babylonian invasion in connection with the neighboring Heshbon (Jer 48:2). Some (as Hitzig, after  the Sept.,Vulg., etc.) regard it as an appellative; and in some editions of the Auth. Vers. it is actually printed “O madmen!” The slight notice only affords an approximate location opposite the northern extremity of the Dead Sea. SEE MADMENAH.

## Madmenah[[@Headword:Madmenah]]

             (Heb. Madmenah', מִדַמֵנָה, dunghill; Sept. Μαδεβηνά, Vulg. Medemena), a town named in Isa 10:31, where it is placed on the route of the Assyrian invaders, in the northern vicinity of Jerusalem, between Nob and Gibeah. It has been confounded by Eusebius and Jerome with MADMANNAH, which is much too far southward to suit the context. “Gesenius (Jesaias, p. 414) points out that the verb in the sentence is active — ‘Madmenah flies,' not, as in the A. Vers., ‘is removed' (so also Michaelis, Bibelfii- Ungelehrten). Madmenah is not impossibly alluded to by Isaiah (25:10) in his denunciation of Moab, where the word rendered in the Auth. Vers. ‘dunghill' is identical with that name. The original text (or Kethib), by a variation in the preposition ( במיfor במו), reads the ‘waters of Madmenah.' If this is so, the reference may be either to the Madmenah of Benjamin — one of the towns in a district abounding with corn and threshing-floors — or, more appropriately still, to MADMEN, the Moabitish town. Gesenius (Jesaias, p. 786) appears to have overlooked this, which might have induced him to regard with more favor a suggestion that seems to have been first made by Joseph Kimchi.”

## Madness[[@Headword:Madness]]

             The words rendered by “mad,” “madman,” “madness,” etc., in the A. Vers., vary considerably in the Hebrew of the O.T. In Deu 28:28; Deu 28:34; 1Sa 21:13-15, etc. (μανία, etc., in the Sept.), they are derivatives of the root שָׁגִע, shaga', “to be stirred or excited;” in Jer 25:16; Jeremiah 1, 38; Jer 51:7; Ecc 1:17, etc. (Sept. περιφορά), from the root הָלִל, hal', “to flash out,” applied (like the Greek φλέγειν) either to light or sound; in Isa 44:25, from סִכּל, sakkel', “to make void or foolish” (Sept. μωραίνειν); in Zec 12:4, from תָּמִתּ, tamah', “to wander” (Sept. ἔκστασις). In the N.T. they are generally used to render μαίνεσθαι or μανία (as in Joh 10:20; Act 26:24; 1Co 14:23); but in 2Pe 2:16 the word is παραφρονία, and in Luk 6:11, ἄνοια The term is used in Scripture  in its proper and old sense of a raving maniac or demented person (Deu 28:34; 1Sa 21:13; Joh 10:20; 1Co 14:23), and may be medically defined to be delirium without fever. Our Lord cured by his word several who were deprived of the exercise of their rational powers, and the circumstances of their histories prove that there could neither be mistake nor collusion respecting them. See LUNATIC. How far madness may be allied to, or connected with demoniacal possession (as implied in one passage, Joh 10:20), is a very intricate inquiry; and whether in the present day (as perhaps anciently) evil spirits may not take advantage from distemperature of the bodily frame to augment evils endured by the patient is more than may be affirmed, though the idea seems to be not absolutely repugnant to reason (see Thomson, Land and Book. 1:213). SEE DAEMONIAC.

The term “mad” is likewise applied in Scripture, as in common life, to any subordinate but violent disturbance of the mental faculties, whether springing from a disordered intellect (as by over-study, Act 26:24-25; from startling intelligence, Act 12:15; from preternatural excitement, Hos 9:7; Isa 44:25; from resistance of oppression, Ecc 7:7; from inebriety, Jer 25:16; Jer 51:7; or simple fatuity, 2Ki 9:11; Jer 29:26), or from irregular and furious passion (e.g. as a persecutor, Act 26:11; Psa 102:8; from idolatrous hallucination, Jeremiah 1, 38; or wicked and extravagant jollity, Ecc 2:2). In like manner, “madness” expresses not only proper insanity (Deu 28:28, and so “madman,” 1Sa 21:15; Pro 26:18). but also a reckless state of mind (Ecc 10:13), bordering on delirium (Zec 12:4), whether induced by overstrained intellectual efforts (Ecc 1:17; Ecc 2:12), from blind rage (Luk 6:12), or the effect of depraved tempers (Ecc 7:25; Ecc 9:3; 2Pe 2:6). David's madness (1Sa 21:13) is by many supposed not to have been feigned, but a real epilepsy or falling sickness; and the Sept. uses words which strongly indicate this sense (ἔπιπτεν ἐπὶ τὰς θύρας). It is urged in support of this opinion that the troubles which David underwent might very naturally weaken his constitutional strength, and that the force he suffered in being obliged to seek shelter in a foreign court would disturb his imagination in the highest degree. A due consideration, however, of the context and all the circumstances only serves to strengthen the opinion that it was feigned for obvious reasons (see Kitto's Daily Bible Illustr. ad loc.). “It is well known that among Oriental, as among most semi-civilized nations, madmen were  looked upon with a kind of reverence, as possessed of a quasi-sacred character (see Lane, in od E. 2:346). This arises partly, no doubt, from the feeling that one on whom God's hand is laid heavily should be safe from all other harm, but partly also from the belief that the loss of reason and self- control opened the mind to supernatural influence, and gave it therefore a supernatural sacredness. This belief was strengthened by the enthusiastic expression of idolatrous worship (see 1Ki 18:26; 1Ki 18:28), and (occasionally) of real inspiration (see 1Sa 19:21-24; comp. the application of ‘mad fellow' in 2Ki 9:11, and see Jer 29:26; Act 2:13).”

## Madon[[@Headword:Madon]]

             (Heb. hadon', מָדוֹן, strife, as in Pro 15:18, etc.; Sept. Μαδών v. r. Μαρῶν), a Canaanitish city in the north of Palestine, ruled over by a king named Jobab in the time of Joshua, who captured it (Jos 11:1; Jos 12:19). Calmet (Dict. s.v.), arbitrarily conjecturing that Maron is the true reading, refers to Maronia, a small village of Syria thirty miles east of Antioch (Jerome, Vit. Malachi 2), probably the place alluded to by Ptolemy (5:15, 8, Μαρωνιάς) as lying in the province of Chalcidtice. Schwarz infers (Palest. p. 90, 173) from labbinical notices (chiefly a statement of the early Jewish traveler hap-Parchi in Asher's Benj. of Tudela, p. 430) that the site is that of the present Kefrenda, a considerable village at the foot of the hills north of Diocaesarea, containing a very deep well and some traces of antiquity, which Dr. Robinson (new edit. of Researches, 3:109-111) is inclined to regard as marking the place of the Asochis of Josephus (Lije, 41, 45, 68; War, 1:4, 2; int. 13:12, 4), although admitting that the latter may be referred to Tell ed-Bedawiveh, in the vicinity.

“In the Sept. version of 2Sa 21:20, the Hebrew words אֵישׁ מָדוֹן‘a man of stature,' are rendered ἀνὴρ Μαδών, ‘a man of Madon.' This may refer to the town Madon, or may be merely an instance of the habit which these translators had of rendering literally in (Greek letters Hebrew words which they did not understand. Other instances will be found in 2Ki 6:8; 2Ki 9:13; 2Ki 12:9; 2Ki 15:16, etc.”

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

             is perhaps the modern ruin Khurbet Madin (Conder, Tent Work, 2:338), a quarter of a mile south of Hattin, near Lake Tiberias, consisting of "heaps of ruins, some well-dressed stones" (Memoirs to Ordnance Survey, 1:403).

## Madonna[[@Headword:Madonna]]

             (Italian, My Laddy), a term applied in the language of art to representations of the Virgin Mary. Such representations first made their appearance after the 5th century, when the Virgin was declared to be the “Mother of God.” The face of the mother is generally full, oval, and of a mild expression; a veil adorns the hair. At first the lineaments of the Virgin's countenance were copied from the older pictures of Christ, according to the tradition which declared that the Savior resembled his mother. A chronological arrangement of the pictures of the Virgin would exhibit in a remarkable manner the development of the Roman Catholic doctrine on this subject. The Madonna has been a principal subject of the pencils of the great masters. The grandest success has been achieved by Raphael (q.v.), in whose pictures of the Madonna there prevails now the loving mother, now the ideal of feminine beauty, until in that of St. Sixtus there is reached the most glorious representation of the “Queen of Heaven.” Murillo's “Conceptions” also should be noticed here. SEE MURILLO. One of these has lately been presented to the American public in chromo by the American art publisher Prang, of Boston.

Among symbolic representations may be mentioned Mary with the white mantle, i.e. the mantle of love under which she receives the faithful; and the Virgin with the half-moon or with the globe under her feet, according to the meaning put upon the twelfth chapter of Revelation. The Virgin was never represented without the Child until comparatively recent times. See Mrs. Jameson's delightful work, Legends of the Madonna (3d ed. Lond. 1863, 8vo); Christian Remembrancer, 1868 (July), p. 130; Old and New, 1872 (April).

## Madox, Isaac, D.D[[@Headword:Madox, Isaac, D.D]]

             an English divine, was born in London in 1697; was educated at one of the universities of Scotland, and at Queen's College, Cambridge; was successively curate of St. Bride's, domestic chaplain to Dr. Waddington, bishop of Chichester; rector of St. Vedast, in Foster Lane, London. In 1729 he was appointed clerk of the closet to queen Caroline; in 1733 became dean of Wells; in 1736, bishop of St. Asaph; was translated to the see of Worcester in 1743, and died in 1759. Dr. Madox published a number of Sermons (London, 1734-53), and a review of the first volume of Neal's Hist. of the Puritans, entitled A Vindication of the Government,  Doctrine, and Worship of the Church of England established in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth (1733, 8vo). — Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Hook, Eccles. Biog. 7:208.

## Madras[[@Headword:Madras]]

             one of the three presidencies of the Indian Empire, occupies the greater part of the south of the peninsula of Hindustan, including the coast lands, Malabar, the Laccadive Islands, and the Coromandel coast, in all covering an area of 138,856 square miles, with 31,672,613 inhabitants in 1885 (according to Behm, Geoagr. Jahrbuch, 1870, eleven twelfths are Hindus, and some 80,000 adherents of Mohammedanism). The tributary states Mysore, Cochin, Travancore, Pudocotta, and Djayapur are virtually a part of Madras, and are therefore included in our statistics of Madras. The capital of this presidency is a city of like name, and is situated on the Coromandel coast, the western shore of the Bay of Bengal, in lat. 130 5' N. It stretches along the coast, with its nine suburbs, for nine miles, with an average breadth of three and one half miles. Its inhabitants number 405,948 (1887), among them about 30,000 native Christians. Madras was the first hold of the English secured by the occupation of Fort George (situated on the coast midway between the north and south extremities of the city) in 1639. It is now truly an Indo-European city. Like Calcutta and Bombay, it is a gathering-place for the missionaries of the different denominations and associations, and the basis for all missionary enterprise in southern India. Madras is the seat of the Anglican see of Madras, established in 1835.

The missionary societies at work there are the “Society for the Propagation of the Gospel,” the “London Missionary Society,” the “Church Missionary Society” (which started in 1805), the “Wesleyan Missionary Society,” the “Church of Scotland,” the “American Board” (commenced there in 1836), and the “Free Church of Scotland.” Its principal buildings and institutions are the Government House, a handsome edifice, though much inferior to the similar establishments in Calcutta, and even in Bombay; one of the finest light-houses in the world; the Scotch Church of St. Andrew, founded in 1818, a stately and beautiful edifice; a university, with three European professors, and numerous teachers both European and native, and containing a valuable museum and a library; St. George's Cathedral, from which a magnificent view of the city and its vicinity may be obtained, and containing several monuments by Chantrey (including one of bishop Heber), and some figures by Flaxman. There are also male, military, and female orphan asylums, a medical school, a branch of the Royal Asiatic  Society, the Madras Polytechnic Institution, the Government Observatory, a mint, eight established Episcopal churches, among them a cathedral, besides numerous places of worship of other Christian denominations, and the Madras Club, to which members of the Bengal and Bombay clubs are admitted as honorary members. See Grundemann, Missions-Atlas, No. 14 and 15; Newcomb, Cyclop. of Missions, s.v., also under Hindostan; Wheeler, Madras in the Olden Times (Madras, 1861-62, 3 vols. 8vo); Aikman, Cyclop. of Missions, p. 148, 272. SEE INDIA.

## Madrasses[[@Headword:Madrasses]]

             are colleges in Mohammedan countries, for the training of priests who are to officiate in the mosques.

## Madrazo, Jos. Madrazo Y Aguda[[@Headword:Madrazo, Jos. Madrazo Y Aguda]]

             a Spanish painter, was born at Santander, April 22, 1781. He studied at the Academy of Madrid, under David in Paris, and in Rome. Returning to the former city in 1818, he became director of the Academy, and afterwards of the museum. He died there, May 8, 1859. Among his principal paintings are Jesus in the House of Ananias; The Sacred Heart of Jesus; and The Seizure of Breda.

## Madruzzius, Christopher[[@Headword:Madruzzius, Christopher]]

             a Roman Catholic ecclesiastic of note, was born at Bologna in 1512, and was educated at the high-schools of Bologna and Padua. He was ambassador of Ferdinand at Bologna, and in 1539 became prince-bishop of Trent. In 1543 the bishopric of Brixen was added to his livings. Later he became cardinal. He died in 1578. — Regensburg Real-Encyklopädie, vol. 9, s.v.

## Madura[[@Headword:Madura]]

             (1), an island in the Indian Ocean, the possession of the Netherlands, separated from Java on the north-east by the strait of Madura, contains about ninety-seven square miles, and is inhabited by 763,724 people, who adhere either to the religion of Brahma, or are of the Mohammedan faith- about evenly divided. The remains of Hindu temples, however, would lead us to the belief that Hinduism was once the prevailing religion. As in Java, probably Brahmanism was crowded out by the inroads of the Mohammedans in the 14th century, when the Arabs invaded the country. Madura is governed by natives, tributary to the Netherlands, and is divided into three kingdoms. The products of the islands, which are included in the trade-returns of Java (q.v.), are sugar, tobacco, indigo, cocoa-nut oil, edible birds' nests, etc.; but, owing to the extortions of the princes, agriculture is not flourishing.

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

             (2), a maritime district in the south of British India, in the presidency of Madras (q.v.), has an area of about 10,700 square miles, and a population of 1,790,000. Eastward from the shore runs a narrow ridge of sand and rocks, mostly dry, and .which almost connects Ceylon with the continent. Cotton is the chief commercial crop; and sugar-cane, betel-nut, and  tobacco are also grown. In this district the “American Board” began its labors in 1834, and now sustains a very successful mission in fourteen stations. The Roman Catholics gained a strong hold here by the accommodation theory of Roberto dei Nobili in the opening of the 17th century. A vicariate, formerly a part of Pondicherry, was established for Madura in 1846, and is in the care of the Jesuits, who recommenced labors there in 1836. The principal town is Madura, on the river Vygat, with several noteworthy public buildings, and the seat of a Roman Catholic and a Protestant mission. Madura, in former days, was the capital of a kingdom, the center of South Indian culture and learning. See Grundemann, Missions-Atlas, No. 14 and 15. SEE INDIA.

## Maduwa[[@Headword:Maduwa]]

             the place in which the Bana, or sacred books of the Buddhists, are publicly read. It is usually a temporary structure, the roof having several breaks or compartments, gradually decreasing in size as they approach the top, in the form of a pagoda, or of a pyramid composed of several platforms. There is one of these structures in the precincts of nearly all the wiharas (q.v.). In the centre of the interior area is an elevated platform for the convenience of the priests, and the people sit around it upon mats spread on the ground. The platform is sometimes occupied by several priests at the same time, one of whom reads a portion of the sacred books, in a tone between singing and reading. The Maduwa is also used for other purposes. In it there is a labyrinth made of withs ornamented with the cocoanut leaf; and the people amuse themselves by finding their way through its intricate mazes. In some instances lines are drawn upon the ground in an open  space, and these lines are regarded as the limits of the regions assigned to particular daemons. Dancers approach these lines and defy the daemons, receiving the applause of the people for their boldness.

## Maelus[[@Headword:Maelus]]

             (Μαῆλος v. r. Μίληλος,Vulg. Michelus), given (1Es 9:26) as the name of an Israelite whose posterity returned from Babylon, in place of the MIAMIN (q.v.) of the Hebrew text (Ezr 10:25).

## Maffei, Bernard[[@Headword:Maffei, Bernard]]

             a cardinal, and secretary of pope Paul III, was born at Bergamo in 1514, and died in 1553. He wrote a commentary on Cicero's Letters, and some other works, which were highly esteemed in his time. — Herzog, Real- Encyklopädie, 8:660.

## Maffei, Francesco Scipione de[[@Headword:Maffei, Francesco Scipione de]]

             a noted Italian scholar, known chiefly as a dramatic writer, was born at Verona June 1, 1675; studied at the Jesuit college of Parma, there led a literary life, went to Rome in 1698, and afterwards entered the army, and distinguished himself in the war of the Spanish Succession; resumed his literary pursuits, and died Feb. 11, 1755. Aside from his merely literary productions, he wrote some theological works, such as Istoria teologica delle dottrine, e delle opinione corse ne, cinque primi secoli della chiesa in proposito della divina grazia, del libero arbitrio e della predestinazione (Tridenti. 1712; translated into Latin by the Jesuit Frederick Reissenberg [Francf. ad. M. 1736]): — Giunsenismo nuovo dimonstrato nelle conseguenze il medesimo (Venet. 1732). Among his works on morals, the mostimportant is Della scienza chiamata cavallaresca (Rom. 1720, and often), in which he condemns duelling. HisDe teatri antiche e moderni (Verona, 1753) is a defenseof the theater as a moral institution. His  collectedworks were published at Venice (1790, 18 vols. 8vo). — Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 8:661; Life and Times of Palleario (Rome, 1860, 2 vols. 8vo), vol. 1 and 2.

## Maffei, Giovanni Pietro[[@Headword:Maffei, Giovanni Pietro]]

             a noted Italian Jesuit, was born at Bergamo about 1536; was for a time professor at Genoa, became in 1564 secretary of the government at that place, and in 1565 joined the Jesuits, among whom he gained a great reputation. Brought to the notice of cardinal Henry, of Portugal, he was called to Lisbon. He died in Tivoli in 1603. Maffei wrote De vita et moribus Sancti Ignatii Loyole (Venet. 1685, and Berg. 1747): — Historiarumn indicationuns libri 16; rerum a Societate Jesu in Oriente gestarum volumen (Florentiae, 1588; often reprinted): — De rebus Japonicis libri v. At the request of Gregory XIII he wrote a history of the reign of that pope, which remained in MS. until 1743, when it was published at Rome by Carlo Coquetines. A History of India, written by request of cardinal Henry, was published without Maffei's name, though he was its author. His collected works, accompanied by a biographical sketch, were published under the style J. P. Maffei Opera omnia Latine scripta nunc primum in unum corpus collecta (Verona, 1747, 2 vols. 4to). — Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 8:660.

## Maffei, Vegius[[@Headword:Maffei, Vegius]]

             an Italian priest, canon of St. John of Lateran, was born at Lodi, in Lombardy, in 1407, and died at Rome in 1458. He enjoyed great reputation as a theologian and writer. His most important work is Tractatus de educatione liberorum et clsais eorum studiis ac moribus (Paris, 1511). It was often reprinted, and was considered in its day one of the best on the subject of education. He also wrote Philalethes seu de amore veritatis invisce et exulantis dialogus; de perseverantia religionis; de quatuor homines rebus novissi-nis; also biographies of St. Bernard of Sienna, St. Peter Celestin, Augustine, and Monica, and a continuation of Virgil's AEneid in 13 vols., etc. — Herzog, Real-Encyclopädie, 8:660.

## Maffit, John Newland[[@Headword:Maffit, John Newland]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born of Episcopal parentage at Dublin, Ireland, Dec. 28, 1794; was destined for the mercantile profession by his parents, but, joining the Wesleyans in 1813, he  determined upon the ministry. Opposed by his friends and family at home, he emigrated to this country in 1819, and not long after his arrival became a member of the New England Conference. For twelve succeeding years he was stationed in the different cities of New England, then removed to New York, acting thereafter only as a local preacher, moving at his own discretion, and preaching and lecturing at such points as offered. In 1835, conjointly with Rev. Lewis Garrett, he issued in Nashville, Tenn., the first number of The Western Methodist (now The Christian Advocate, the central organ of the Methodist Episcopal Church South). In 1836-1837 he was agent for La Grange College, in Alabama, and subsequently was elected to the chair of elocution and belles-lettres in that institution; but he gave little attention to its duties, and the chair was soon discontinued. In 1841 he was chaplain of the lower house of Congress. His advent West and South-west was marked by a quickened religious interest in the popular mind.

Vast assemblies gathered to hear him, and thousands, directly through his instrumentality, were added to the Church. Returning to New York, he became somewhat lax in his Church relations, and consequently lost his membership. In 1847 he removed to Arkansas, and there joined the Methodist Episcopal Church South, and was licensed to preach de novo. After laboring for a year or two with a success small in comparison with his previous history, he left Arkansas for the Gulf cities. His last days were spent in carrying on a religious meeting, in a small chapel of a suburban villa of Mobile, Ala. Public interest could no more be evoked by him who had been its master in the wilderness and in the city, as well as the street- preacher, the lecturer, or the camp-meeting leader. The spell was broken, or the spirit of the man. He died suddenly, of heart rupture, near Mobile, May 28, 1850. “Though amiable, he had the appearance of vanity, which provoked criticisms; and, though forgiving and gentle, his zeal in the prosecution of his Master's cause and his boldness in the rebuke of sin often waked up enemies. His social relaxations were thought by many to run into indiscretions and follies that marred his character and his influence in private life. See Sprague, Annals of the American Pulpit, vol. 7.

## Mag[[@Headword:Mag]]

             SEE RAB-MAG.

## Magalhaeus, Gabriel de[[@Headword:Magalhaeus, Gabriel de]]

             a Portuguese missionary, was born at Pedrogao, near Coïmbre, in 1609; was admitted to the “Society of Jesus” when only sixteen, and, desiring to enter the missionary work, departed for Goa, India, in 1634. On his way he stopped at Macao, and was led to make an extended tour through China, and so great became his interest in that country that he abandoned his intention of proceeding to India, and preached Christianity in the Chinese empire with zeal and apparent success. At first he was in favor at court, but he fell into displeasure during the Christian persecutions, and barely saved his life. He died a peaceful death, May 6,1677. He wrote several works on China. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 32:662.

## Magalhaeus, Pedro de[[@Headword:Magalhaeus, Pedro de]]

             a Portuguese theologian, was born at Torres-Vedras about 1592; was for some time instructor in theology at the convent of the Dominican order to which he himself belonged: and died in 1677. He published De Scientia Dei (Lisbon, 1866, 4to): — De Praedestinationis Excequatione (ibid. 1667, 4to; Lyons, 1674): — De Voluntate et de Trinitate (ibid. 1669, 4to). He also left several valuable works in MS. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, vol. 32, s.v.

## Magallianus, Cosmas[[@Headword:Magallianus, Cosmas]]

             a Jesuit and professor of theology at Coimbra, who died October 9, 1624, wrote Catechismus Japonensis: — Comment. in Moysis Cantica et Benedictiones Patriarcharum,: — Comment. in Josuam: Comment. in Epistolas Pauli ad Timotheum et Titum: Explanationes Morales in Indicum. Historiamn: — Opus Hierarchicum sen de Principatu Ecclesiastico Libri III. See Witte, Diaritum Biographicum; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Magarita, Magarites[[@Headword:Magarita, Magarites]]

             names given by some writers of the Middle Ages to the apostates from Christianity, especially to such as became Mohammedans. The origin of the name is unknown. See Du Cange, s.v.: Herzog, Real-Encyklopadie, 8:661.

## Magarites[[@Headword:Magarites]]

             SEE PEARL.

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

             a Protestant Episcopal clergyman, graduated from the University of Pennsylvania in 1757. Having received ordination, he became a missionary of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, and served as such in Dover and Duck Creek, Del. In 1779 he was invited to St. Paul's Church, Philadelphia, but did not accept the rectorship until January 1781. In 1786 the Reverend Joseph Pilmore became his assistant, but Dr. Magaw continued rector until 1804. He was vice-provost of the University of Pennsylvania from 1782 to 1791. About 1800 he aided in founding the Philadelphia Academy, which had a brief existence. He was secretary of several of the early conventions of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Pennsylvania. His death occurred in Philadelphia, Dec. 1, 1812. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 5:246.

## Magbish[[@Headword:Magbish]]

             (Hebrew Magbish', מִגַבַּישׁ, gathering; Sept. Μαγεβίς,Vulg. Megbis), a man whose descendants (so Clericus, ad loc., who compares the Persian name Megabyzus, Herod. 2:70, 160) to the number of 156 returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Ezr 2:30). It is omitted in the parallel list (Neh 7:33-34). Most interpreters regard it as the name of a place, probably in Palestine, and if so, doubtless in Benjamin, as the associated names are those of localities in that tribe. But it was perhaps rather another form for that of the Maygpiash (q.v.) of Neh 10:20, where some of the same names are mentioned in a similar connection.

## Magdala[[@Headword:Magdala]]

             (Μαγδαλά [v. r. Μαγαδᾶν], prob. the Chald. emphatic form of the Hebrew מַגְדָּל, Migdal, a tower; see Paulus, Comm. 2:437 sq.), a town in Galilee opposite the Sea of Tiberias (Otho, Lex. Rabb. p. 401). It is mentioned only in Mat 15:39, as a place to which Jesus repaired after having crossed the lake, “though the best MSS. (Sin., Vat., D.) read Magadan, which, Alford observes, ‘appears to have been the original reading, but the better-known name Magdala was substituted for it.' It is not unusual, however, for Syrian villages to have two names, and for the same name to have different forms. The parallel passage in Mar 8:10 has Dalmnanutha (Δαλμανουθά), though here also some MSS. read Magdalas and some Magada (Alford, ad loc.).

A close examination of the Gospel narrative, and a comparison of the parallel passages in Matthew and Mark (Mat 15:39; Mat 16:1-13, with Mar 8:10-27), prove that Magdala or Magadan must have been situated on the western shore of the Sea of Galilee, and Dalmanutha was probably a village near it, for the whole shore of the lake was then lined with towns and villages. Eusebius and Jerome locate this place, which they call Magedan, on the east of the Sea of Galilee, and they say there was in their day a district of Magedena around Gerasa (καί έστι νῦν ἡ Μαγαιδανὴ περὶ τὴν Γεράσαν; Onomast. s.v. Magedan). They also state that Mark (8:10) reads Μαγαιδάν, though Jerome's version has Dalmanutha. The old Latin version has Magada. In some editions of Josephus a Magdala is mentioned on the east side of the lake (Life, p. 24), but the best MSS. read Gamala (Robinson, B.. R. 2:397; Josephus, by Hudson, ad loc.). Lightfoot places Magdala beyond Jordan, but his reasons are not satisfactory (Operat, 2:413)” (Kitto). The above position on the western shore, although it has usually been located on the eastern (see Robinson's Researches, 3:278; Strong's Harmony of the Gospels, § 70), is confirmed by the Jerusalem Talmud (compiled at Tiberias), which several times speaks of Magdala as being adjacent to Tiberias and Hamath, or the hot springs (Lightfoot, Choaog. Cent. cap. lxxvi). It was a seat of Jewish learning after the destruction of Jerusalem, and the rabbins of Magdala are often mentioned in the Talmud (Lightfoot, 1. c.). M. De Saulcy, however, takes an opposite view on all these points (Narrative, 2:355-357), as Pococke had done before (Observations, 2:71).

In the Gospels it is principally referred to as probably the birthplace of Mary Magdalen, i.e. the Magdalene (q.v.), or of Magdala. A small Moslem village, bearing the name of Illejdel, is now  found on the shore of the lake about three miles north by west of Tiberias, and the name and situation are very strongly in favor of the conclusion that it represents the Magdala of Scripture. It evidently (like the ancient town) derived its name from a tower or castle, and here Buckingham found the ruins of an old structure of this kind (Trav. 1:404). He speaks of it as being a small village close to the edge of the lake, beneath a range of high cliffs, in which small grottoes are seen, with the remains of an old square tower, and some larger buildings of rude construction, apparently of great antiquity. “A large solitary thorn-tree stands beside it. The situation, otherwise unmarked, is dignified by the high limestone rock which overhangs it on the south-west, perforated with caves, recalling, by a curious though doubtless unintentional coincidence, the scene of Correggio's celebrated picture. These caves are said by Schwarz (p. 189) — though on no clear authority — to bear the name of Teliman, i.e. Talmanutha. ‘A clear stream rushes past the rock into the sea, issuing in a tangled thicket of thorn and willow from a deep ravine at the back of the plain' (Stanley, S. and P. p. 382, 383). Jerome, although he plays upon the name Magdalene — ‘recte vocatam Magdalenen, id ist Turritam, ob ejuls singularem fidei ac ardoris constantiam does not appear to connect it with the place in question. By the Jews the word מגרלאis used to denote a person who platted or twisted hair, a practice then much in use among women of loose character. A certain ‘Miriam Magdala' is mentioned by the Talmudists, who is probably intended for Mary Magdalene. (See Otho, Lex, Rua). s.v. Maria; and Buxtorf, Lex. Talm. col. 389, 1459.) Magdalum is mentioned as between Tiberias and Capernaum as early as by Willibald, A.D. 722; since that time it is occasionally named by travelers, among others Quaresmius, Elucidatio, p. 866 b; Sir R. Guyltorde, Pilgrymage; Breydenbach, p. 29; Bonar, Land of Promise, p. 433, 434, and 549. Buchanan (Clerical Furlough, p. 375) describes well the striking view of the northern part of the lake which is obtained from el-Mejdel.” This was probably also the MIGDAL-EL (q.v.) in the tribe of Naphtali, mentioned in Jos 19:38. See Burckhardt, Syria, p. 559; Seetzen, in Monat. Corresp. 18:349; Fisk, Life, p. 316; Tobler, Dritte Wanderung, p. 46; Schubert, 3:250.

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

             The present site, el-Mejdel, is merely "a mud and stone village, containing eighty Moslems; situated in the plain; of partly arable soil; no gardens" (Memoirs to Ordnance Survey, 1:361, comp. page 369).

## Magdalen[[@Headword:Magdalen]]

             (or Magdalene) (Μαγδαληνή, fem. adj. from Magdala), a surname regularly applied to one of the. Marys in the Gospels, derived from her  place of nativity or former residence, in order to distinguish her from the other Marys (Mat 27:56; Mat 27:61; Mat 28:1; Mar 15:40; Mar 15:47; Mar 16:1; Mar 16:9; Luk 8:2; Luk 24:10; Joh 19:25; Joh 20:1; Joh 20:18). SEE MAGDALA.

## Magdalen, Religious Order Of[[@Headword:Magdalen, Religious Order Of]]

             a denomination given to divers communities of nuns, consisting generally of reformed prostitutes; sometimes also called Magdalenettes. They were established at Naples in 1324, at Paris in 1492, at Mentz in 1542, and at Rouen and Bordeaux in 1618. In each of these monasteries there were three kinds of persons and congregations: (1) nuns proper and under vow, bearing the name of St. Magdalen; (2) the congregation of St. Martha, composed of those not yet fully avowed; (3) the congregation of St. Lazarus, composed of such as were detained by force. The Order of St. Magdalen at Rome was established by pope Leo X. Clement VIII settled a revenue on them, and further appointed that the effects of all public prostitutes dying intestate should fall to them, and that the testaments of the rest should be invalid unless they bequeathed to them a portion of their effects, at least a fifth part. The term originated in the mistaken notion that Mary Magdalen, of whom we read in the Gospel, was a woman of bad character; a notion which is still very prevalent, notwithstanding the increased attention that has been given to the interpretation of holy Scripture. SEE MARY MAGDALEN.

## Magdalena De Pazzi[[@Headword:Magdalena De Pazzi]]

             a saint of the Romish Church, was born at Florence April 2, 1566. She belonged to one of the highest families in Tuscany: was educated in the convent of the Hospitable Nuns of St. John the Little; refused to marry, and, May 27, 1584, took the veil in the Carmelite convent of St. Mary of the Angels. Her name, hitherto Catharine de Gere de' Pazzi, was now changed to Maria Magdalena. She became wild in her religious enthusiasm, claimed to have visions, and to hold converse with the angels, with the Virgin, and even with Christ himself. She filled divers offices in her convent, and died May 25. 1607. Pope Urban VIII in the same year beatified her, and in 1669 she was canonized by Alexander VII. Her biography was written by her confessor Puccini, and her works were collected by the Carmelite Salvi of Bologna (Ven. 1739). See Bolland, ad 25 Maii; Baillet, Vies des Saints; Richard et Giraud, Bibliotheque Sacrae; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 8:662; Hoefer, Nouv.Biog. Gen., 32:615.

## Magdeburg Centuries[[@Headword:Magdeburg Centuries]]

             SEE CENTURIES OF MAGDEBURG.

## Magdiel[[@Headword:Magdiel]]

             (Heb. lMagdiea , מִגְדַּיאֵל, endowed of God; Sept. Μαγεδιήλ and Μεδιήλ v. r. Μετοδιήλ), the successor of Mibzar, and predecessor of Iram among the Edomitish chiefs who held sway along with the native princes in Mount Seir (Gen 36:43; 1Ch 1:54). B.C. ante 1619.

## Maged[[@Headword:Maged]]

             (Μακέδ, Vulg. Mageth), a false Anglicizing (1Ma 5:36) of the name MAKED (1Ma 5:26).

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

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Limerick, Ireland, March 11, 1822; was brought to America at nine years of age; was converted near Whitehall, Green Co., Ill., in 1841; joined the Illinois Conference in 1843; was very successful as a minister, and in 1852 signally so as agent of the Illinois Wesleyan University. In 1852-3 he was stationed at Springfield. He died at Bloomington, Ill., Mar. 23,1854. From orphanage and neglected wickedness, and after majority by the transforming power of grace and strenuous effort, Mr. Magee became in fourteen years one of the foremost ministers of his Conference. His powerful frame, decided talents, and indomitable energy enabled him to labor mightily for God. — Minutes of Conferences, v. 476.

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

             D.D., a noted Anglican prelate, was born March 18, 1766, in the county of Fermanat, Ireland, and was educated at the University of Dublin (Trinity College). He obtained all the college honors, and graduated A.B. in 1785, and in 1788 was elected a fellow. His friends desired him to enter the legal profession, but he himself inclined to the ministry, and in 1790 he was ordained, acting at this time as a tutor in his alma mater; later he became assistant professor of the Oriental languages, and in 1806 senior fellow and professor of mathematics. In 1812 he retired from the university, and accepted the livings of Kappagh, in Tyrone, and Killyleagh, in Down; in  1814 he was appointed dean of Cork, and there became greatly celebrated as a pulpit orator. Notwithstanding the length of his discourses (he never preached less than one hour) he was followed by crowds, though no man less courted popularity. His sermons, his biographer says, “might be characterized as solid Gospel truth, strongly and plainly enforced in simplicity and sincerity.” Bishop Barrington, a contemporary, thus comments upon Dr. Magee's eloquence: “I have often heard and admired Mr. Pitt, but while I am listening to my friend dean Magee I feel that if I were to shut my eyes I could fancy that Mr. Pitt was speaking.” In 1819 Dr. Magee was promoted to the bishopric of Raphoe; in 1821, when George IV visited Dublin, he was appointed by the king dean of the Viceregal Chapel at the castle; and in 1822, after declining the archbishopric of Cashel, he became archbishop of Dublin. He died Aug. 18, 1831. Archbishop Magee is noted particularly for his opposition to Romanism and Unitarianism. Against the latter he sent forth his Discourses on the Atonement and Sacrifice (1811, 8vo; 2d edit. 1812, 2 vols. 8vo; 3d edit. 1816, 3 vols. 8vo; 7th edit. 1841, 1 vol. royal 8vo), universally pronounced one of the ablest critical and controversial works of modern times. His Works were published in 1842, in 2 vols. 8vo, with a memoir of his life by Arthur H. Kinney, D.D. See, besides this Memoir in Works, the Dublin University Magazine, 26:480 sq.; 27:750 sq.; Christian Observer, 1843 (May and June); Christian examiner, 28:63 sq.; Allibone, Dict. of British and American A uthors, s.v. (J. H. W.)

## Maghrebi[[@Headword:Maghrebi]]

             SEE AARON HA-RISSON.

## Magi[[@Headword:Magi]]

             is the Latin form of the Greek term μάγοι, magians, rendered “wise men” in Mat 2:1 l 7, 16, and occurring likewise in the singular μάγος, “sorcerer,” with reference to Elymas (Act 12:6; Act 12:8). Compare the epithet Simon Magus. The term is still extant on the cuneiform inscriptions (see Olshausen, ad loc. Matt.). It corresponds to the Heb. מִג Mag. The term magi was used as the name for priests and wise men among the Medes, Persians, and Babylonians. So the word Rabmag, in our version of Jer 39:3, used as a proper name, properly signifies the prince magus or chief of the magi. While the priests and literati were known by the general name of magi, they were also known by the name of wise men,  and likewise Chaldaeans (Isaiah 44:52; Jeremiah 1:35; Dan 2:12-27; Dan 4:6; Dan 4:18; Dan 5:7; Dan 5:11-12; Dan 5:15). To their number doubtless belonged the astrologers and star-gazers (Isa 47:13). So, also, the Chaldee soothsayers and dream-interpreters either denote various orders of magi, or they are merely different names of the same general class (Dan 1:20; Dan 2:2; Dan 4:7; Dan 5:7; Dan 5:11). SEE MAGICIAN. In the following account of this important and interesting class, we supplement what we have elsewhere said upon the subject.

I. Etymology of the Name. — In the Pehlvi dialect of the Zend, mogh means priest (Hyde, Relig. Vet. Pers. c. 31); and this is connected by philologists with the Sanscrit mahat (great, μέγας, and magnus; Anquetil du Perron's Zend-Avesta, 2:555). The coincidence of a Sanscrit mâya, in the sense of “illusion, magic,” is remarkable; but it is probable that this, as well as the analogous Greek word, is the derived rather than the original meaning (comp. Eichhoff, Vergleichung der Sprache, ed. Kaltschmidt, p. 231). Hyde (1. c.) notices another etymology given by Arabian authors, which makes the word — cropt-eared (parvis auribus), but rejects it. Prideaux, on the other hand (Connection, under B.C. 522), accepts it, and seriously connects it with the story of the pseudo-Smerdis who had lost his ears in Herod. 3:69. Spanheim (Dub. Esvangc. 18) speaks favorably, though not decisively, of a Hebrew etymology.

II. Their Original Seat. — This name has come to us through the Greeks as the proper designation of the priestly class among the Persians (Herod. 1:132, 140; Xenoph., Cyrop. 8:1, 23; Plato, Alcib. 1:122; Diog. Laert. Parouem. 1, 2; Cicero, De Divin. 1:41; Apul. Apol. 1p. 32 ed. Casaubon, p. 290 ed. Elmenhorst; Porphyr. De Abst. 1. 4.; Hesych. s.v. Μάγος). It does not appear, however, that Magism was originally a Persian institution, and it may be doubted if in its original form it ever existed among the Persians at all.

The earliest notice extant of the magi is in the prophecies of Jeremiah (Jer 39:3; Jer 39:13), where mention is made of Rab-mag, a term which, though regarded in the A.V. as a proper name, is a compound of רב and מג, and signifies chief nmagus, after the analogy of such terms as רִבאּקָרַיס(ch (chief eunuch), רִבאּשָׁקֵה(chiefbufler), etc. (See below, § iv.) The Rab-mag of Jeremiah is the same as the Rab Signin al kol Chakimin (כל חקמיו רב סגנון על) of Daniel (2:48); the τῶν ἱερέων  ἐπισημότατος οὕά Βαβυλώνιοι καλοῦσι Χαλδαιους of Diodorus Sic. (2:24); and the ἀρχίμαγος of the later Greek writers (Sozomen, Hist. Ecc 1:13). This indicates the existence among the Chaldaeans of the magian institute in a regular form, and as a recognized element in the state, at a period not later than 600 years B.C. In Jeremiah 1, 35, ittevidently the same class that is referred to under the designation of the “wise men of Babylon.” In the time of Daniel we find the institute in full force in Babylon (Dan 2:2; Dan 2:12; Dan 2:18; Dan 2:24; Dan 4:3; Dan 4:15; Dan 5:7-8). From him we learn that it comprised five classes-the Chartumsinim, expounders of sacred writings and interpreters of signs (1:20; 2:2; 5:4); the Ashaphim, conjurors (2:10; 5:7, 11; comp. 47:9,12); the Meekashephim, exorcists, soothsayers, magicians, diviners (2:2; comp. Isa 47:9; Isa 47:13; Jer 27:9); the Gozerim, casters of nativities, astrologists (2:27; 5:7,11); and the Chasdin, Chaldaeans in the narrower sense (2:5, 10; 4:4; 5:7, etc.; compare Hengstenberg, Beitrage, 1:343 sq.; Havernick, Comment üb. Daniel, p. 52; Gesenius, Thes. ad voc.). So much was Magism a Chaldtean institution that the term Chaldaean came to be applied as a svnonym for the class (Diod. Sic. 2:29 sq.; Strabo, 16:762; Diog. Laertius, Proaem. 1; Cicero, de Divinat. 1:1; Curtius, Hist. 3:3, 6; Josephus, War, 2:7, 3; Aul. Gellius, 15:20, 2; Apuleius, Asin. 2:228, etc.).

Whether Magism was indigenous in Chaldaea, and was thence carried to the adjacent countries, or was derived by the Chaldaeans from Assyria, it is impossible now to determine with any certainty. In favor of its Assyrian origin it has been urged that the word מג is found as the name of the Assyrian fire-priest (Movers, 1:64, 240), and that the priests of the Assyrian Artemis at Ephesus were called Meg-Abyzi (Strabo, 14:641). But on this nothing can be built, as we find the syllable Meg or Mag occurring in names and titles belonging to other peoples, as Mag-Etzer (fire-priest), the father of Artemis among the Phoenicians; Teker-Mag, Teker the Magus (on a Cilician coin), etc. When it is considered that the Chaldaean was the older nation, and that the Assyrians derived many of their religious beliefs and institutions from the Chaldaeans (Rawlinson, Five Great Monarchies, 1:308; 2:228), the probability is that they derived the institution of the magi also. That the institution was originally Shemitic is further confirmed by the Phoenician tradition preserved by Sanchoniathon (ap. Euseb. Praep. Evang. 1:10), that Magos was a descendant of the Titans, and, with his brother Amynos, made men acquainted with villages and flocks. It must be confessed, however, that the word מגhas more obvious affinities in the  Indo-Germanic than in the Shemitic tongues (see above, § 1); but this can hardly be allowed to weigh much against the historical evidence of the existence of the magi in Shemitic nations anterior to their existence among those of the Aryan stock.

That Magism was not, as commonly stated, a Persian institution, is shown from several considerations:

1. The word does not appear to have existed in the Zend language; at any rate, it does not occur in the Zend-Avesta.

2. The religious system of the ancient Persians was a system of Dualism, as the most ancient documents concur with the monumental evidence to prove (see Rawlinson's Herodotus, 1:426), but with this Magism had no affinity.

3. In the Zend-Avesta, the Yatus, the practicer of magical arts, is vehemently denounced, and men are enjoined to pray and present offerings against his arts, as an invention of the Dews.

4. Xenophon informs us (Cyrop. 8:1, 23) that the magi were first established in Persia by Cyrus (comp. also Ammian. Marc. 23:6; Porphyr. De abstin. 4:16, etc.), a statement which can be understood only, as Haeren suggests (I, 1:451 sq.), as intimating that the magian institute, which existed long before this among the Medes, was introduced by Cyrus among the Persians also.

5. Herodotus (1:101) states that the magi formed one of the tribes of the Medes; and he also attributes the placing of the pseudo-Smerdis on the Persian throne to the magi, who were moved thereto by a desire to substitute the Median for the Persian rule (3:61 sq.; compare Ctesias, Persica, c. 10-15; Justin, Hist. 1:9; and the Behistun inscription as translated by Sir H. Rawlinson; see Rawlinson's Herodotus, 1:427).

6. Herodotus mentions that, after this attempt of the magi had been frustrated, it became a usage among the Persians to observe a festival in celebration of the overthrow of the magi, to which they gave the name of Magoplonia (μαγοφονία), and during which it was not safe for any magus to leave the house (3:79; Agathias, 2:25), a usage which could have had its origin only at a time when Magism was foreign to Persian beliefs and institutions.  7. We find no allusion to the magi in connection with any of the Medo- Persian kings mentioned in Scripture, a circumstance which, though not of itself of much importance, falls in with the supposition that Magism was not at that time a predominant Persian institution. The probability is, that this system had its source in Chaldaea, was thence propagated to Assyria, Media, and the adjoining countries, and was brought from Media into Persia, where it came at first into collision both with the national prejudices and with the ancient religious faith of the people. With this accord the traditions which impute to Zoroaster, after he came to be regarded as the apostle of Magism, sometimes a Parthian and sometimes a Bactrian origin. SEE ZOROASTER. Eventually, however, Magism seems to have been adopted into or reconciled with Zoroasterism, perhaps by losing its original theosophic character, and taking on a more practical or thaumaturgic phase.

III. Profane Accounts of the Order. — The magi were originally one of the six tribes (Herod. 1:101; Pliny, Hist. Nat. v. 29) into which the nation of the Medes was divided, who, like the Levites under the Mosaic institutions, were entrusted with the care of religion, an office which naturally, in those early times, made this caste likewise the chief depositaries of science and cultivators of art. Little in detail is known of the magi during the independent existence of the Median government; but under the Medo-Persian sway the magi formed a sacred caste or college, which was very famous in the ancient world (Xenoph. Cyrop. 8:1, 23; Ammian. Marcell. 23:6; Heeren. Ideen, 1:451; Schlosser, Universal Uebers. 1:278). Porphyry (Abst. 4:16) says, “The learned men who are engaged among the Persians in the service of the Deity are called magi;” and Suidas, “Among the Persians the lovers of wisdom (φιλόσοφοι) and the servants of God are called magi.” According to Strabo (2:1084, ed. Falcon.), the magi practiced different sorts of divination — 1, by evoking the dead; 2, by cups or dishes (Joseph's divining-cup, Gen 44:5); 3, by means of water.

By the employment of these means the magi affected to disclose the future, to influence the present, and to call the past to their aid. Even the visions of the night they were accustomed to interpret, not empirically, but according to such established and systematic rules as a learned priesthood might be expected to employ (Strabo, 16:762; Cicero, De Divin. 1:41; AElian. V. H. 2:17). The success, however, of their efforts over the invisible world, as well as the holy office which they exercised, demanded in themselves peculiar cleanliness of body, a due regard to which  and to the general principles of their caste would naturally be followed by professional prosperity, and this, in its turn, conspired with prevailing superstition to give the magi great social consideration, and make them of high importance before kings and princes (Diog. Laert. 9:7, 2) — an influence which they appear to have sometimes abused, when, descending from the peculiar duties of their high office, they took part in the strife and competitions of politics, and found themselves sufficiently powerful even to overturn thrones (Herod. 3:61 sq.). These abuses were reformed by Zoroaster, who appeared, according to many authorities, in the second half of the 7th century before Christ. He was not the founder of a new system, but the renovator of an old and corrupt one, being, as he himself intimates (Zend-Avesta, 1:43), the restorer of the word which Ormuzd had formerly revealed, but which the influence of Dews had degraded into a false and deceptive magic. After much and long-continued opposition on the part of the adherents and defenders of existing corruptions, he succeeded in his virtuous purposes. and caused his system eventually to prevail. He appears to have remodeled the institute of the magian caste, dividing it into three great classes: 1, Herbeds, or learners; 2, Mobeds, or masters; 3, Destur Mobeds, or perfect scholars (Zend-Av. 2:171,261). The magi alone he allowed to perform the religious rites; they possessed the forms of prayer and worship; they knew the ceremonies which availed to conciliate Ormuzd, and were obligatory in the public offerings (Herod. 1:132).

They accordingly became the sole medium of communication between the Deity and his creatures, and through them alone Ormuzd made his will known; none but them could see into the future, and they disclosed their knowledge to those only who were so fortunate as to conciliate their good will. Hence the power which the magian priesthood possessed. The general belief in the trustworthiness of their predictions, especially when founded on astrological calculations, the all but universal custom of consulting the will of the divinity before entering on any important undertaking, and the blind faith which was reposed in all that the magi did, reported, or commanded, combined to create for that sacerdotal caste a power, both in public and in private concerns, which has probably never been exceeded. Indeed the soothsayer was a public officer, a member, if not the president, of the privy council in the Medo-Persian court, demanded alike for show, in order to influence the people, and for use, in order to guide the state. Hence the person' of the monarch was surrounded by priests, who, in different ranks and with different offices, conspired to sustain the throne, uphold the established religion, and conciliate or enforce the obedience of  the subject. The fitness of the magi for, and their usefulness to, an Oriental court were not a little enhanced by the pomp of their dress, the splendor of their ceremonial, and tie number and gradation of the sacred associates. Well may Cyrus, in uniting the Medes to his Persian subjects, have adopted, in all its magnificent details, a priesthood which would go far to transfer to him the affections of his conquered subjects, and promote, more than any other thing, his own aggrandizement and that of his empire.

Neither the functions nor the influence of this sacred caste were reserved for peculiar, rare, and extraordinary occasions, but ran through the web of human life. At the break of day they had to chant the divine hymns. This office being performed, then came the daily sacrifice to be offered, not indiscriminately, but to the divinities whose day in each case it was an office, therefore, which none but the initiated could fulfill. As an illustration of the high estimation in which the magi were held, it may be mentioned that it was considered a necessary part of a princely education to have been instructed in the peculiar learning of their sacred order, which was an honor conceded to no other but royal personages, except in very rare and very peculiar instances (Cicero, De Divin. 1:23; Plutarch, Themistocles). This magian learning embraced everything which regarded the higher culture of the nation, being known in history under the designation of “the law of the Medes and Persians.” It comprised the knowledge of all the sacred rites, customs, usages, and observances, which related not merely to the worship of the gods, but to the whole private life of every worshipper of Ormuzd — the duties which, as such, he had to observe, and the punishments which followed the neglect of these obligations, whence may be learned how necessary the act of the priest on all occasions was. Under the veil of religion the priest had bound himself up with the entire public and domestic life. The judicial office, too, appears to have been, in the time of Cambyses, in the hands of the magi, for from them was chosen the college or bench of royal judges, which makes its appearance in the history of that monarch (Herod. 4:31; 7:194; comp. Est 1:13). Men who held these offices, possessed this learning, and exerted this influence with the people, may have proved a check to Oriental despotism no less powerful than constitutional, though they were sometimes unable to guarantee their own lives against the wrath of the monarch (Herod. 7:194; compare Dan 2:12); and they appear to have been well versed in those courtly arts by which the hand that bears the sword is won to protect instead of destroying. Thus Cambyses, wishing to marry his sister, inquired of the magi (like Henry VIII) if the laws permitted such a union: “We  have,” they adroitly answered, “no law to that effect; but a law there is which declares that the king of the Persians may do what he pleases” (Heeren, Ideen, I, 1:451 sq.; Hyde, Rel. Vet. Persarum, ch. 31, p. 372 sq.; Brisson, Princip. Pers. p. 179 sq.).

Among the Greeks and Romans they were known under the name of Chaldseans (Strabo, 16:762; Diog. Laert. Proaem. 1), and also of magi (Diog. Laert. 8:1, 3). They lived scattered over the land in different places (Strabo, 16:739; compare Dan 2:14), and had possessions of their own. The temple of Belus was employed by them for astronomical observations, but their astronomy was connected with the worship of the heavenly bodies practiced by the Babylonians (Diod. Sic. 2:31; Ephraem Syrus, Op. 2:488; consult Ideler, in the Transactions of the Berlin Academy for 1824-25), and was specially directed to vain attempts to foretell the future, predict the fate of individuals or of communities, and sway the present, in alliance with augury, incantation, and magic (Aul. Gell. 3:10. 9; 14:1; Am. Marcell. 23:6; p. 352, ed. Bipont; Diod. Sic. 2:29; comp Isa 47:9; Isa 47:13; Daniel 2).

IV. Position occupied by the Magi in theperiod covered by the History of the O.T. — In the Hebrew text the word occurs but twice, and then only incidentally. In Jer 39:3; Jer 39:13 we meet, among the Chaldaean officers sent by Nebuchadnezzar to Jerusalem, one with the name or title of Rab-Mag (רִבאּמִג). This word is interpreted, after the analogy of Rab- shakeh and Rab-saris, as equivalent to chief of the magi (Ewald, Propheten, and Ilitzig, ad loc., taking it as the title of Nergal-Sharezer), and we thus find both the name and the order occupying a conspicuous place under the government of the Chaldieaus. It is clear that there were various kinds of wise men, and it is probable that these were classes belonging to one great order, which comprised, under the general name of magi, all who were engaged in the service of religion; so that we find here an ample priesthood, a sacred college, graduated in rank and honor (see Bertholdt, 3 Excurs. zumn Daniel; Gesenius, Comment. on Isaiah 2:351 sq.). The word Rab-Mag (if the received etymology of magi be correct) presents a hybrid formation. The first syllable is unquestionably Shemitic, the last is all but unquestionably Aryan. The problem thus presented admits of two solutions:

(1.) If we believe the Chaldaeans to have been a Hamitic people, closely connected with the Babylonians, SEE CHALDAEAN, we must then  suppose that the colossal schemes of greatness which showed themselves in Nebuchadnezzar's conquests led him to gather round him the wise men and religious teachers of the nations which he subdued, and that thus the sacred tribes of the Medes rose under his rule to favor and power. His treatment of those who bore a like character among the Jews (Dan 1:4) makes this hypothesis a natural one: and the alliance which existed between the Medes and the Chaldaeans at the time of the overthrow of the old Assyrian empire would account for the intermixture of religious systems belonging to two different races.

(2.) If, on the other hand, with Renan (Histoire des Langues Shenitiques, p. 66, 67), following Lassen and Ritter, we look on the Chaldaeans as themselves belonging to the Aryan family, and possessing strong affinities with the Medes, there is even less difficulty in explaining the presence among the one people of the religious teachers of the other. It is likely enough, in either case, that the simpler Median religion which the magi brought with them, corresponding more or less closely to the faith of the Zend-Avesta, lost some measure of its original purity through this contact with the darker superstitions of the old Babylonian population. From this time onward it is noticeable that the names both of the magi and Chaldaeans are identified with the astrology, divination, and interpretation of dreams, which had impressed themselves on the prophets of Israel as the most characteristic features of the old Babel religion (Isa 44:25; Isa 47:13). The magi took their places among “the astrologers, and stargazers, and monthly prognosticators.”

It is with such men that we have to think of Daniel and his fellow-exiles as associated. They are described as “ten times wiser than all the magicians (Sept. μάγους) and astrologers” (Dan 1:20). Daniel himself so far sympathizes with the order into which he is thus, as it were enrolled, as to intercede for them when Nebuchadnezzar gives the order for their death (Dan 2:24), and accepts an office which, as making him “master of the magicians, astrologers, Chaldaeans, soothsayers” (Dan 5:11), was probably identical with that of the Rab-Mag who first came before us. May we conjecture that he found in the belief which the magi had brought with them some elements of the truth that had been revealed to his fathers, and that the way was thus prepared for the strong sympathy which showed itself in a hundred ways when the purest Aryan and the purest Shemitic faiths were brought face to face with each other (Dan 6:3; Dan 6:16; Dan 6:26; Ezr 1:1-4; Isa 44:28), agreeing as they did in their hatred of  idolatry and in their acknowledgment of the “God of Heaven?” The acts which accompanied his appointment serve as illustrations of the high reverence in which the magi were held: “Then the king, Nebuchadnezzar, fell upon his face and worshipped Daniel, and commanded that they should offer an oblation and sweet odors unto him” (Isa 44:46; see also Isa 44:48). From the 49th verse it would seem not unlikely that the administration of justice in the last resort belonged to this priestly order, as we know it did to the hierarchy of northern and more modern courts. (See Münter, Antiq. Abhandlung. p. 144; Bleek, in Schleiermacher's Theol, Zeitschr. 3:277; Hengstenberg's Daniel, p. 341.)

The name of the magi does not meet us in the Biblical account of the Medo-Persian kings. If, however, we identify the Artaxerxes who stopped the building of the Temple (Ezr 4:17-22) with the pseudo-Smerdis of Herodotus, SEE ARTAXERXES, and the Gomates of the Behistun inscription, we may see here also another point of contact. (Compare Sir Henry Rawlinson's translation of the Behistun inscription: ‘The rites which Gomates the magian had introduced I prohibited. I restored to the state the chants, and the worship, and to those families which Gomates the magian had deprived of them” [Journ. of Asiatic Soc. vol. 10, and Blakesley's Herodotus, Excurs. on 3:74]). The magian attempt to reassert Median supremacy, and with it probably a corrupted Chaldaized form of Magianism, in place of the purer faith in Ormuzd of which Cyrus had been the propagator, would naturally be accompanied by antagonism to the people whom the Persians had protected and supported. The immediate renewal of the suspended work on the triumph of Darius (Ezr 4:24; Ezr 5:1-2; Ezr 6:7-8) falls in, it need hardly be added, with this hypothesis. The story of the actual massacre of the magi throughout the dominions of Darius, and of the commemorative magophonia (Herod. 3:79), with whatever exaggerations it may be mixed up, indicates in like manner the triumph of the Zoroastrian system. If we accept the traditional date of Zoroaster as a contemporary of Darius, we may see in the changes which he effected a revival of the older system. It is, at any rate, striking that the word magi does not appear in the Zend-Avesta, the priests being there described as atharva (guardians of the fire), and that there are multiplied prohibitions in it of all forms of the magic which, in the West, and possibly in the East also, took its name from them, and with which, it would appear, they had already become tainted. All such arts, auguries, necromancy, and the like, are looked on as evil, and emanating from Ahriman, and are  pursued by the hero-king Feridoun with the most persistent hostility (Du Perron, Zend-Avesta, vol. 1, part 2, p. 269, 424).

The name, however, kept its ground, and with it probably the order to which it was attached. Under Xerxes the magi occupy a position which indicates that they had recovered from their temporary depression. They are consulted by him as soothsayers (Herod. 7:19), and are as influential as they had been in the court of Astyages. They prescribe the strange and terrible sacrifices at the Strymon and the Nine Ways (Herod. 7:114). They were said to have urged the destruction of the temples of Greece (Cicero, De Legg. 2:10). Traces of their influence may perhaps be seen in the regard paid by Mardonius to the oracles of the Greek god that offered the nearest analogue to their own Mithras (Herod. 8:134), and in the like reverence which had previously been shown by the Median Datis towards the island of Delos (Herod. 6:97). They come before the Greeks as the representatives of the religion of the Persians. No sacrifices may be offered unless one of their order is present chanting the prescribed prayers, as in the ritual of the Zend-Avesta (Herod. 1:132). No great change is traceable in their position during the decline of the Persian monarchy. The position of Juidaoea as a Persian province must have kept up some measure of contact between the two religious systems. The histories of Esther and Nehemiah point to the influence which might be exercised by members of the subject-race. It might well be that the religious minds of the two nations would learn to respect each other, and that some measure of the prophetic hopes of Israel might mingle with the belief of the magi. As an order they perpetuated themselves under the Parthian kings. The name rose to fresh honor under the Sassanidae. The classification which was ascribed to Zoroaster was recognized as the basis of a hierarchical system, after other and lower elements had mingled with the earlier dualism, and might be traced even in the religion and worship of the Parsees.

V. Transition-stages in the History of the Word and of the Order between the close of the O.T. and the time of the N.T. — In the mean while the title magi was acquiring a new and wider signification. It presented itself to the Greeks as connected with a foreign system of divination, and the religion of a foe whom they had conquered, and it soon became a by-word for the worst form of imposture. The rapid growth of this feeling is traceable perhaps in the meanings attached to the word by the two great tragedians. In AEschylus (Persae, 291) it retains its old significance as denoting simply a tribe. In Sophocles (Ed. Tyr. 387) it appears among the epithets of  reproach which the king heaps upon Tiresias. The fact, however, that the religion with which the word was associated still maintained its ground as the faith of a great nation, kept it from falling into utter disrepute, and it is interesting to notice how at one time the good and at another the bad side of the word is uppermost. Thus the μαγεία of Zoroaster is spoken of with respect by Plato as a θεῶν θεραπεία, forming the groundwork of an education which he praises as far better than that of the Athenians (Alcib. 1:122 a). Xenophon, in like manner, idealizes the character and functions of the order (Cyrop. 4:5, 16; 6, 6). Both meanings appear in the later lexicographers. The word magos is equivalent to ἀπατέων καὶ φαρμακευτής, but it is also used for the θεοσεβὴς καὶ θεόλογος καὶ ἱερεύς (Hesych.). The magi, as an order, are οἱ παρὰ Περσαῖς φιλόσοφοι καὶ φιλόφεοι (Suidas). The word thus passed into the hands of the Sept., and from them into those of the writers of the N.T., oscillating between the two meanings, capable of being used in either. The relations which had existed between the Jews and Persians would perhaps tend to give a prominence to the more favorable associations in their use of it. In Daniel (Dan 1:20; Dan 2:2; Dan 2:10; Dan 2:27; Dan 5:11) it is used, as has been noticed, for the priestly diviners with whom the prophet was associated. Philo, in like manner (Quod omnis probus liber, p. 792), mentions the magi with warm praise, as men who gave themselves to the study of nature and the contemplation of the divine perfections, worthy of being the counselors of kings. It was perhaps natural that this aspect of the word should commend itself to the theosophic Jew of Alexandria. There were, however, other influences at work tending to drag it down. The swarms of impostors that were to be met with in every part of the Roman empire, known as “Chaldaei,” “Mathematici,” and the like, bore this name also. Their arts were “artes magicse.” Though philosophers and men of letters might recognize the better meaning of which the word was capable (Cicero, De Divin. 1:23, 41), yet in the language of public documents and of historians they were treated as a class at once hateful and contemptible (Tacitus, Ann. 1:32; 2:27; 12:22, 59), and, as such, were the victims of repeated edicts of banishment. See Lenormant, Chaldaean Magic (Lond. 1877).

VI. The Magi as they appear in the N.T. — We need not wonder, accordingly, to find that this is the predominant meaning of the word as it appears in the N.T. The noun, and the verb derived from it (μαγεία and μαγεύω), are used by Luke in describing the impostor, who is therefore known distinctively as Simon Magus (Act 8:9). Another of the same  class (Bar-jesus) is described (Act 13:8) as having, in his cognomen Elymas, a title which was equivalent to Magus. SEE ELYMAS.

In one memorable instance, however, the word retains (probably, at least) its better meaning. In the Gospel of Matthew, written (according to the general belief of early Christian writers) for the Hebrew Christians of Palestine, we find it, not as embodying the contempt which the frauds of impostors had brought upon it through the whole Roman empire, but in the sense which it had had of old, as associated with a religion which they respected, and an order of which one of their own prophets had been the head. In spite of patristic authorities on the other side, asserting that the Μάγοι ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν of Mat 2:1 were sorcerers whose mysterious knowledge came from below, not from above, and who were thus translated out of darkness into light (Justin Martyr, Chrysostom. Theophylact, in Spanheim, Dub. Evang. 19; Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. in Matthew 2), we are justified, not less by the consensus of later interpreters (including even Maldonatus) than by the general tenor of Matthew's narrative, in seeing in them men such as those that were in the minds of the Sept. translators of Daniel, and those described by Philo — at once astronomers and astrologers, but not mingling any conscious fraud with their efforts after a higher knowledge. The vagueness of the description leaves their country undefined, and implies that probably the evangelist himself had no certain information. The same phrase is used as in passages where the express object is to include a wide range of country (compare ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν, Mat 8:11; Mat 24:27; Luk 13:29). Probably the region chiefly present to the mind of the Palestinian Jew would be the tract of country stretching eastward from the Jordan to the Euphrates, the land of “the children of the East” in the early period of the history of the O.T. (Gen 29:1; Jdg 6:3; Jdg 7:12; Jdg 8:10). It should be remembered, however, that the language of the O.T., and therefore probably that of Matthew, included under this name countries that lay considerably to the north as well as to the east of Palestine. Balaam came from “the mountains of the East,” i.e. from Pethor, on the Euphrates (Num 23:7; Num 22:5). Abraham, (or Cyrus?) is the righteous man raised up “from the East” (Isa 41:2). The Persian conqueror is called “from the East, from a far country” (Isa 46:11).

We cannot wonder that there should have been very varying interpretations given of words that allowed so wide a field for conjecture. Some of these are, for various reasons, worth noticing.

(1) The feeling of some early writers that the coming of the wise men was the fulfillment of the prophecy which spoke of the gifts of the men of Sheba and Seba (Psa 72:10; Psa 72:15; compare Isa 60:6) led them to fix on Arabia as the country of the magi (Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Epiphanius, Cyprian, in Spanheim, Dub. Evang. 1. c.), and they have been followed by Baronius, Maldonatus, Grotius, and Lightfoot.

(2) Others have conjectured Mesopotamia as the great seat of Chaldaean astrology (Origen, Hom. in Matthew 6, 7), or Egypt as the country in which magic was most prevalent (Meyer, ad loc.).

(3) The historical associations of the word led others again, with greater probability, to fix on Persia, and to see in these magi members of the priestly order, to which the name of right belonged (Chrysostom, Theophylact, Calvin, Olshausen), while Hyde (Rel. Pers. l. c.) suggests Parthia, as being at that time the conspicuous Eastern monarchy in which the magi were recognized and honored.

It is, perhaps, a legitimate inference from the narrative of Matthew 2 that in these magi we may recognize, as the Church has done from a very early period, the first Gentile worshippers of the Christ. The name, by itself, indeed, applied as it is in Act 13:8 to a Jewish false prophet, would hardly prove this; but the distinctive epithet ‘“from the East” was probably intended to mark them out as different in character and race from the Western magi, Jews, and others, who swarmed over the Roman empire. So, when they come to Jerusalem, it is to ask, not after “our king” or “the king of Israel,” but, as the men of another race might do, after “the king of the Jews.” The language of the O.T. prophets and the traditional interpretation of it are apparently new things to them. The narrative of Matthew 2 supplies us with an outline which we may legitimately endeavor to fill up, as far as our knowledge enables us, with inference and illustration. Some time after the birth of Jesus there appeared among the strangers who visited Jerusalem these men from the far East. They were not idolaters. Their form of worship was looked upon by the Jews with greater tolerance and sympathy than that of any other Gentiles (compare Wisdom of Solomon 13:6, 7).

Whatever may have been their country, their statement indicates that they were watchers of the stars, seeking to read in them the destinies of nations. They said that they had seen a star in which they recognized such a prognostic. They were sure that one was born king  of the Jews, and they came to pay their homage. It may have been simply that the quarter of the heavens in which the star appeared indicated the direction of Judaea. It may have been that some form of the prophecy of Balaam, that a “star should rise out of Jacob” (Num 24:17), had reached them, either through the Jews of the Dispersion, or through traditions running parallel with the O.T., and that this led them to recognize its fulfillment (Origen, c. Cels. 1; Hon. in Numbers 13; but the hypothesis is neither necessary nor satisfactory; comp. Ellicott, Hulsean Lectures, p. 77). It may have been, lastly, that the traditional predictions ascribed to their own prophet Zoroaster, leading them to expect a succession of three deliverers, two working as prophets to reform the world and raise up a kingdom (Tavernier, Travels, 4:8), the third (Zosiosh), the greatest of the three, coming to be the head of the kingdom, to conquer Ahriman and to raise the dead (Du Perron, Zend A v. 1:2, p. 46; Hyde, c. 31; Ellicott, Hulsean Lect. 1. c.), and in strange fantastic ways connecting these redeemers with the seed of Abraham (Tavernier, 1. c.; and D'Herbelot, Biblioth. Orient. s.v. Zerdascht), had roused their minds to an attitude of expectancy, and that their contact with a people cherishing like hopes on stronger grounds may have prepared them to see in a king of the Jews the Oshanderbegha (“Homo Mundi,” Hyde, 1. c.) or the Zosiosh whom they expected. In any case they shared the “vetus et constans opinio” which had spread itself over the whole East, that the Jews, as a people, crushed and broken as they were, were yet destined once again to give a ruler to the nations. It is not unlikely that they appeared, occupying the position of Destur-Mobeds in the later Zoroastrian hierarchy, as the representatives of many others who shared the same feeling. They came, at any rate, to pay their homage to the king whose birth was thus indicated, and with the gold, and frankincense, and myrrh which were the customary gifts of subject nations (comp. Gen 43:11; Psa 72:15; 1Ki 10:2; 1Ki 10:10; 2Ch 9:24; Son 3:6; Son 4:14). The arrival of such a company, bound on so strange an errand, in the last years of the tyrannous and distrustful Herod, could hardly fail to attract notice and excite a people among whom Messianic expectations had already begun to show themselves (Luk 2:25; Luk 2:38). “Herod was troubled, and all Jerusalem with him.” The Sanhedrim was convened, and the question where the Messiah was to be born was formally placed before them. It was in accordance with the subtle, fox-like character of the king that he should pretend to share the expectations of the people in order that he might find in what direction they pointed, and then take whatever steps were  necessary to crush them. SEE HEROD.

The answer given, based upon the traditional interpretation of Mic 5:2, that Bethlehem was to be the birthplace of the Christ, determined the king's plans. He had found out the locality. It remained to determine the time: with what was probably a real belief in astrology, he inquired of them diligently when they had first seen the star. If he assumed that that was contemporaneous with the birth, he could not be far wrong. The magi accordingly were sent on to Bethlehem, as if they were but the forerunners of the king's own homage. As they journeyed they again saw the star. which for a time, it would seem, they had lost sight of, and it guided them on their way. ( SEE STAR IN THE EAST for this and all other questions connected with its appearance.) The pressure of the crowds, which a fortnight, or four months, or well-nigh two years before, had driven Mary and Joseph to the rude stable of the caravanserai of Bethlehem, had apparently abated, and the magi, entering “the house” (Mat 2:11), fell down and paid their homage and offered their gifts. Once more they received guidance through the channel which their work and their studies had made familiar to them. From first to last, in Media, in Babylon, in Persia, the magi had been famous as the interpreters of dreams. That which they received now need not have involved a disclosure of the plans of Herod to them. It was enough that it directed them to “return to their own country another way.” With this their history, so far as the N.T. carries us, comes to an end.

It need hardly be said that this part of the Gospel narrative has had to bear the brunt of the attacks of a hostile criticism. The omission of all mention of the magi in a Gospel which enters so fully into all the circumstances of the infancy of Christ as that of Luke, and the difficulty of harmonizing this incident with those which he narrates, have been urged as at least throwing suspicion on what Matthew alone has recorded. The advocate of the “mythical theory” sees in this almost the strongest confirmation of it (Strauss, Leben Jesu, 1:272). “There must be prodigies gathering round the cradle of the infant Christ. Other heroes and kings had had their stars, and so must he. He must receive in his childhood the homage of the representatives of other races and creeds. The facts recorded lie outside the range of history, and are not mentioned by any contemporary historian.” The answers to these objections may be briefly stated.

(1) Assuming the central fact of the early chapters of Matthew, no objection lies against any of its accessories on the ground of their being wonderful and improbable. It would be in harmony with our expectations  that there should be signs and wonders indicating its presence. The objection therefore postulates the absolute incredulity of that fact, and begs the point at issue (compare Trench, Star of the Wise Men, p. 124).

(2) The question whether this, or any other given narrative connected with the nativity of Christ, bears upon it the stamp of a mythus, is therefore one to be determined by its own merits, on its own evidence; and then the case stands thus: A mythical story is characterized for the most part by a large admixture of what is wild, poetical, fantastic. A comparison of Matthew 2 with the Jewish or Mohammedan legends of a later time, or even with the Christian mythology which afterwards gathered round this very chapter, will show how wide is the distance that separates its simple narrative, without ornament, without exaggeration, from the overflowing luxuriance of those figments (comp. § VII, below).

(3) The absence of any direct confirmatory evidence in other writers of the time may be accounted for, partly at least, by the want of any full chronicle of the events of the later years of Herod. The momentary excitement of the arrival of such travelers as the magi, or of the slaughter of some score of children in a small Jewish town, would easily be effaced by the more agitating events that followed. The silence of Josephus is not more conclusive against this fact than it is (assuming the spuriousness of Ant. 18:4, 3) against the fact of the crucifixion and the growth of the sect of the Nazarenes within the walls of Jerusalem.

(4) The more perplexing absence of all mention of the magi in Luke's Gospel may yet receive some probable explanation. So far as we cannot explain it, our ignorance of all, or nearly all, the circumstances of the composition of the Gospels is a sufficient answer. It is, however, at least possible that Luke, knowing that the facts related by Matthew were already current among the churches, sought rather to add what was not yet recorded. Something, too, may have been due to the leading thoughts of the two (Gospels. Matthew, dwelling chiefly on the kingly office of Christ as the Son of David, seizes naturally on the first recognition of that character by the magi of the East (comp. on the fitness of this, Mill, Pantheistic Principles, p. 375). Luke, portraying the Son of Man in his sympathy with common men, in his compassion on the poor and humble, dwells as naturally on the manifestation to the shepherds on the hills of Bethlehem. It may be added further that everything tends to show that the latter evangelist derived the materials for this part of his history much more  directly from the mother of the Lord, or her kindred, than did the former; and, if so, it is not difficult to understand how she might come to dwell on that which connected itself at once with the eternal blessedness of peace, good will, salvation, rather than on the homage and offerings of strangers, which seemed to be the presage of an earthly kingdom, and had proved to be the prelude to a life of poverty, and to the death upon the cross.

VII. Later Traditions which have gathered round the Magii of Matthew 2 :— In this instance, as in others, what is told by the Gospel writers in plain, simple words has become the nucleus for a whole cycle of legends. A Christian mythology has overshadowed that which itself had nothing in common with it. The love of the strange and marvelous, the eager desire to fill up in detail a narrative which had been left in outline, and to make every detail the representative of an idea — these, which tend everywhere to the growth of the mythical element within the region of history, fixed themselves, naturally enough, precisely on those portions of the life of Christ where the written records were the least complete. The stages of this development present themselves in regular succession.

(1) The magi are no longer thought of as simply “wise men,” members of a sacred order. The prophecies of Psalms 72; Isa 49:7; Isa 49:23; Isa 60:16, must be fulfilled in them, and they become princes (“reguli,” Tertull. c. Jud 1:9; c. Marc. 5). This tends more and more to be the dominant thought. When the arrival of the magi, rather than the birth or the baptism of Christ, as the first of his mighty works, comes to be looked on as the great epiphany of his divine power, the older title of the feast receives as a synonym, almost as a substitute, that of the Feast of the Three Kings.

(2) The number of the wise men, which Matthew leaves altogether undefined, was arbitrarily fixed. They were three (Leo Magn. Serm. ad Epiph.), because thus they became a symbol of the mysterious trinity (Hilary of Aries), or because then the number corresponded to the threefold gifts, or to the three parts of the earth, or the three great divisions of the human race descended from the sons of Noah (Bede, De Collect.).

(3) Symbolic meanings were found for each of the three gifts. The gold they offered as to a king. With the myrrh they prefigured the bitterness of the passion, the embalment for the burial. With the frankincense they adored the divinity of the Son of God (Suicer, Thes. s.v. Μάγοι; Brev. Romans in Epiph. passim).

(4) Later on, in a tradition which, though appearing in a Western writer, is traceable probably to reports brought back by pilgrims from Italy or the East, the names are added, and Gaspar, Melchior, and Balthasar take their place among the objects of Christian reverence. and are honored as the patron saints of travelers. The passage from Bede (De Collect.) is in many ways interesting, and as it is not commonly quoted by commentators, though often referred to, it may be worth while to give it: “Primus dicitur fuisse Melchior, qui senex et canus, barba prolixa et capillis, aurum obtulit regi Domino. Secundus, nomine Gaspar, juvenis imberbis, rubicundus, thure, quasi Deo oblatione dignla, Deum honoravit. Tertius fiuscus, integre barbatus, Baltassar nomine, per myrrham filium hominis moriturulm professus.” The treatise De Collectaneis is, in fact, a miscellaneous collection of memoranda in the form of question and answer. The desire to find names for those who have none given them is very noticeable in other instances as well as in that of the magi; e.g. it gives those of the penitent and impenitent thief. The passage quoted above is followed by a description of their dress, taken obviously either from some early painting, or from the decorations of a miracle-play (comp. the account of such a performance in Trench, Star of the Wise Men, p. 70). The account of the offerings, it will be noticed, does not agree with the traditional hexameter of the Latin Church: “Gaspar fert myrrham, thus Melchior, Balthasar aurum.” We recognize at once in the above description the received types of the early pictorial art of Western Europe. It is open to believe that both the description and the art-types may be traced to early quasi-dramatic representations of the facts of the nativity. In any such representations names of some kind would become a matter of necessity, and were probably invented at random. Familiar as the names given by Bede now are to us, there was a time when they had no more authority than Bithisarca, Melchior, and Gathaspar (Moroni, Dizionar. s.v. Magi); Magalath, Pangalath, Saracen; Appellius, Amerius, and Damascus, and a score of others (Spanheim, Dub. Evang. 2:288).

In the Eastern Church, where, it would seem, there was less desire to find symbolic meanings than to magnify the circumstances of the history, the traditions assume a different character. The magi arrive at Jerusalem with a retinue of 1000 men, having left behind them, on the further bank of the Euphrates, an army of 7000 (Jacob. Edess. and Bar-hebreus, in Hyde, l. c.). They have been led to undertake the journey, not by the star only, or by expectations which they shared with the Israelites, but by a prophecy of  the founder of their own faith. Zoroaster had predicted that in the latter days there should be a mighty One and a Redeemer, and that his descendants should see the star which should be the herald of his coming. According to another legend (Opus inmperf. in Matthew ii apud Chrysost. t. 6, ed. Montfaucon) they came from the remotest East, near the borders of the ocean. They had been taught to expect the star by a writing that bore the name of Seth. That expectation was handed down from father to son. Twelve of the holiest of them were appointed to be ever on the watch. Their post of observation was a rock known as the Mount of Victory. Night by night they washed in pure water, and prayed, and looked out on the heavens. At last the star appeared, and in it the form of a young child bearing a cross. A voice came from it and bade them proceed to Judaea. They started on their two years' journey, and during all that time the meat and the drink with which they started never failed them. The gifts they bring ‘ are those which Abraham gave to their progenitors the sons of Keturah (this, of course, on the hypothesis that they were Arabians), which the queen of Sheba had in her turn presented to Solomon, and which had found their way back again to the children of the East (Epiphan. in Comp. Doctr. in Moroni, Dizion. 1. c.). They return from Bethlehem to their own country, and give themselves up to a life of contemplation and prayer. When the twelve apostles leave Jerusalem to carry on their work as preachers, St. Thomas finds them in Parthia. They offer themselves for baptism, and become evangelists of the new faith (Opus impsers: in Mat 2:1. c.).

The pilgrim-feeling of the 4th century includes them also within its range. Among other relics supplied to meet the demands of the market which the devotion of Helena had created, the bodies of the magi are discovered somewhere in the East, are brought to Constantinople, and placed in the great church which, as the Mosque of St. Sophia, still bears in its name the witness of its original dedication to the divine Wisdom. The favor with which the people of Milan had received the emperor's prefect Eustorgius called for some special mark of favor, and on his consecration as bishop of that city he obtained for it the privilege of being the resting-place of the precious relics. There the fame of the three kings increased. The prominence given to all the feasts connected with the season of the Nativity — the transfer to that season of the mirth and joy of the old Saturnalia — the setting apart of a distinct day for the commemoration of the Epiphany in the 4th century all this added to the veneration with which they were regarded. When Milan fell into the hands of Frederick Barbarossa (A.D. 1162), the influence of the archbishop of  Cologne prevailed on the emperor to transfer them to that city. The Milanese, at a later period, consoled themselves by forming a special confraternity for perpetuating their veneration for the magi by the annual performance of a “Mystery” (Moroni. 1. c.); but the glory of possessing the relics of the first Gentile worshippers of Christ remained with Cologne. (For the later medieval developments of the traditions, comp. Joan. von Hildesheim, in Quart. Rev. 78. 433.) In that proud cathedral which is the glory of Teutonic art the shrine of the Three Kings has for six centuries been shown as the greatest of its many treasures. The tabernacle in which the bones of some whose real name and history are lost forever lie enshrined in honor, bears witness, in its gold and gerns, to the faith with which the story of the wanderings of the Three Kings has been received. The reverence has sometimes taken stranger and more grotesque forms. As the patron saints of travelers they have given a name to the inns of earlier or later date. The names of Melchior, Caspar, and Balthasar were used as a charm against attacks of epilepsy (Spanheim, Dub. Evaung. 21).

Compare, in addition to authorities already cited, Trench, Star of the Wise Men (Lond. 1850); Upham, Wise Men of the East (N.Y. 1869); J. F. Müller, in Herzog's Real-Encyklop. s.v. Magi; Triebel and Miegius, in Csrit. Sacri (Thes. Nov. 2:111, 118); and Rhoden, in Crit. Sacri (Thes. Theol. Phil. 2:69). For the Talmudic views of the magi, see Lakemeyer, Observ. 2:132 sq.

Other monographs on the general subject have been written by Nothnagel (Viteb. 1652), Müller (Tigur. 1660), Stolberg (Viteb. 1663), Olearius (Lips. 1671), and Moller (Altd. 1688).

## Magians[[@Headword:Magians]]

             SEE MAGI.

## Magic[[@Headword:Magic]]

             (only occurs in the A.V. at Wisdom of Solomon 17:7, μαγική s.v. τεξνή, “art magic;” but the term “magician” [q.v. is frequent), a word used to designate the power or art of working wonders beyond the range of science or natural skill. It is derived from the Greek, and refers ultimately to the nmagi (q.v.), who were anciently regarded as its depositaries or experts. The magical arts spoken of in the Bible are those practiced by the Egyptians, the Canaanites, and their neighbors, the Hebrews, the Chaldaeans, and probably the Greeks. In all ages and parts of the world they have played an important part in popular superstitiou (q.v.).  I. Position of Magic in relation to Religion and Philosophy in Anicient Times. — The degree of the civilization of a nation is not the measure of the importance of magic in its convictions. The natural features of a country are not the primary causes of what is termed superstition in its inhabitants. With nations as with men — and the analogy of Plato in the “Republic” is not always false — the feelings on which magic fixes its hold are essential to the mental constitution. Contrary as are these assertions to the common opinions of our time inductive reasoning forbids our doubting them.

1. With the lowest race magic is the chief part of religion. The Nigritians, or blacks of this race, show this in their extreme use of amulets and their worship of objects which have no other value in their eves but as having a supposed magical character through the influence of supernatural agents. With the Turanians, or corresponding whites of the same great family — we use the word white for a group of nations mainly yellow, in contradistinction to black incantations and witchcraft occupy the same place, Shamanism characterizing their tribes in both hemispheres. In the days of Herodotus the distinction in this matter between the Nigritians and the Caucasian population of North Africa was what it now is. In his remarkable account of the, journey of the Nasamonian young men-the Nasamones, be it remembered, were “a Libyan race,” and dwellers on the northern coast, as the historian here says — we are told that the adventurers passed through the inhabited maritime region, and the tract occupied by wild. beasts, and the desert, and at last came upon a plain with trees, where they were seized by men of small stature, who carried them across marshes to a town of such men black in complexion. A great river, running from west to east, and containing crocodiles, flowed by that town, and all that nation were sorcerers (ἐς τοὺς ουτοι ἀπικοντο ἀνθρωπους, γόητας ειναι παντας, 2:32, 33). It little matters whether the conjecture that the great river was the Niger be true, which the idea adopted by Herodotus that it was the upper Nile seems to favor: it is quite evident that the Nasamoines came upon a nation of Nigritians beyond the Great Desert, and were struck with their fetishism. So, in our own days, the traveler is astonished at the height to which this superstition is carried among the Nigritians, who have no religious practices that are not of the nature of sorcery, nor any priests who are not magicians, and magicians alone. The strength of this belief in magic in these two great divisions of the lowest race is shown in the case of each by its having maintained its hold in an  instance in whiclh is tenacity must have been severely tried. The ancient Egyptians show their partly-Nigritian origin not alone in their physical characteristics and language, but in their religion. They retained the strange, low nature-worship of the Nigritians, forcibly combining it with more intellectual kinds of belief, as they represented their gods with the heads of animals and the bodies of men, and even connecting it with truths which point to a primeval .revelation. The Ritual, which was the great treasury of Egyptian belief, and explained the means of gaining future happiness, is full of charms to be said, and contains directions for making and for using amulets. As the Nigritian goes on a journey hung about with amulets, so amulets were placed on the Egyptian's embalmed body, and his soul went on its mysterious way fortified with incantations learned while on earth. In China, although Buddhism has established Itself, and the system of Confucius has gained the power its positivism would insure it with a highly-educated people of low type, another belief still maintains itself which there is strong reason to hold to be older than the other two, although it is usually supposed to have been of the same age as Confucianism; in this religion magic is of the highest importance, the distinguishing characteristic by which it is known.

2. With the Shemites magic takes a lower place. Nowhere is it even part of religion, yet it is looked upon as a powerful engine, and generally unlawful or lawful according to the aid invoked. Among many of the Shemitic peoples there linger the remnants of a primitive fetishism. Sacred trees and stones are reverenced from an old superstition, of which they do not always know the meaning, derived from the nations whose place they have taken. Thus fetishism remains, although in a kind of fossil state. The Importance of astrology with the Shemites has tended to raise the character of their magic, which deals rather with the discovery of supposed existing influences than with the production of new influences. The only direct association of magic with religion is where the priests, as the educated class, have taken the functions of magicians; but this is far different from the case of the Nigritians, where the magicians are the only priests. The Shemites, however, when depending on human reason alone, seem never to have doubted the efficacy of magical arts, yet recourse to their aid was not usually with them the first idea of a man in doubt. Though the case of Saul cannot; be taken as applying to the whole race, yet, even with the heathen Shemites, prayers must have been held to be of more value than incantations.  The Iranians assign to magic a still less important position. It can scarcely be traced in the relics of old nature-worship, which they with greater skill than the Egyptians interwove with their more intellectual beliefs, as the Greeks gave the objects of reverence in Arcadia and Crete a place in poetical myths, and the Scandinavians animated the hard remains of primitive superstition. The character of the ancient belief is utterly gone with the assigning of new reasons for the reverence of its sacred objects. Magic always maintained some hold on men's minds, but the stronger intellects despised it, like the Roman commander who threw the sacred chickens overboard, and the Greek who defied an adverse omen at the beginning of a great battle. When any, oppressed by the sight of the calamities of mankind, sought to resolve the mysterious problem, they fixed, like AEschylus, not upon the childish notion of a chance-government by many conflicting agencies, but upon the nobler idea of a dominating fate. Men of highly sensitive temperaments have always inclined to a belief in magic, and there has therefore been a section of Iranian philosophers in all ages who have paid attention to its practice; but, expelled from religion, it has held but a low and precarious place in philosophy.

The Hebrews had no magic of their own. It was so strictly forbidden by the law that it could never afterwards have any recognized existence save in times of general heresy or apostasy, and the same was doubtless the case in the patriarchal ages. The magical practices which obtained among the Hebrews were therefore borrowed from the nations around. The hold they gained was such as we should have expected with a Shemitic race, making allowance for the discredit thrown upon them by the prohibitions of the law. From the first entrance into the Land of Promise until the destruction of Jerusalem we have constant glimpses of magic practiced in secret, or resorted to, not alone by the common, but also by the great. The Talmud abounds in notices of contemporary magic among the Jews, showing that it survived idolatry notwithstanding their original connection, and was supposed to produce real effects. The Koran in like manner treats charms and incantations as capable of producing evil consequences when used against a man. It is a distinctive characteristic of the Bible that from first to last it warrants no such trust or dread. In the Psalms, the most personal of all the books of Scripture, there is no prayer to be protected against magical influences. The believer prays to be delivered from every kind of evil that could hurt the body or the soul, but he says nothing of the machinations of sorcerers. Here and everywhere magic is passed by, or, if  mentioned, mentioned only to be condemned (comp. Psa 106:28). Let those who affirm that they see in the Psalms merely human piety, and in Job and Ecclesiastes merely human philosophy, explain the absence in them, and throughout the Scriptures, of the expression of superstitious feelings that are inherent in the Shemitic mind. Let them explain the luxuriant growth, in the after-literature of the Hebrews and Arabs, and notably in the Talmud and the Koran, of these feelings with no root in those older writings from which that after-literature was derived. If the Bible, the Talmud, and the Koran be but several expressions of the Shemitic mind, differing only through the effect of time, how can this contrast be accounted for? — the very opposite of what obtains elsewhere: for superstitions are generally strongest in the earlier literature of a race, and gradually fade, unless a condition of barbarism restore their vigor. Those who see in the Bible a divine work can understand how a God taught preacher could throw aside the miserable fears of his race, and boldly tell man to trust in his Maker alone. Here, as in all matters, the history of the Bible confirms its doctrine. In the doctrinal Scriptures magic is passed by with contempt, in the historical Scriptures the reasonableness of this contempt is shown. Whenever the practisers of magic attempt to combat the servants of God, they conspicuously fail. Pharaoh's magicians bow to the divine power shown in the wonders wrought by Moses and Aaron. Balaam, the great enchanter, comes from afar to curse Israel, and is forced to bless them.

II. Biblical Notices. — In examining the references to magic in the Bible, we must keep in view the curious inquiry whether there be any reality in the art. We would at the outset protest against the idea, once very prevalent, that the conviction that the seen and unseen worlds were often more manifestly in contact in the Biblical ages than now necessitates a belief in the reality of the magic spoken of in the Scriptures. We do indeed see a connection of a supernatural agency with magic in such a case as that of the damsel possessed with a spirit of divination mentioned in the Acts; yet there the agency appears to have been involuntary in the damsel, and shrewdly made profitable by her employers. This does not establish the possibility of man being able at his will to use supernatural powers to gain his own ends, which is what magic has always pretended to accomplish. Thus much we premise, lest we should be thought to hold latitudinarian opinions because we treat the reality of magic as an open question.  Without losing sight of the distinctions we have drawn between the magic of different races, we shall consider the notices of the subject in the Bible in the order in which they occur. It is impossible in every case to assign the magical practice spoken of to a particular nation, or, when this can be done, to determine whether it be native or borrowed, and the general absence of details renders any other system of classification liable to error.

1. The theft and carrying away of Laban's teraphin (תְּרָפַים) by Rachel seems to indicate the practice of magic in Padan-aram at this early time. It appears that Laban attached great value to these objects from what he said as to the theft and his determined search for them (Gen 31:19; Gen 31:30; Gen 31:32-35). It may be supposed, from the manner in which they were hidden, that these teraphim were not very small. The most important point is that Laban calls them his “gods” (Gen 31:30; Gen 31:32), although he was not without belief in the true God (Gen 31:24; Gen 31:49-53); for this makes it almost certain that we have here, not an indication of the worship of strange gods, but the first notice of a superstition that afterwards obtained among those Israelites who added corrupt practices to the true religion. The derivation of the name “teraphim” is extremely obscure. Gesenius takes it from an “unused” root, תָּרִ, which he supposes, from the Arabic, probably signified “to live pleasantly” (Thesaur. s.v.). It may, however, be reasonably conjectured that such a root would have had, if not in Hebrew, in the language whence the Hebrews took it or its derivative, the proper meaning “to dance” corresponding to this, which would then be its tropical meaning. We should prefer, if no other derivation be found, to suppose that the name teraphim might mean “dancers” or “causers of dancing,” with reference either to primitive nature-worship or its magical rites of the character of Shamanism, rather than that it signifies, as Gesenius suggests, “givers of pleasant life.” There seems, however, to be a cognate word, unconnected with the “unused” root just mentioned, in ancient Egyptian, whence we may obtain a conjectural derivation. We do not, of course, trace the worship of teraphim to the sojourn in Egypt.

They were probably those objects of the pre-Abrahamite idolatry, put away by order of Jacob (Gen 35:2-4), yet retained even in Joshua's time (Jos 24:14); and, if so, notwithstanding his exhortation, abandoned only for a space (Judges 17, 18); and they were also known to the Babylonians, being used by them for divination (Eze 21:21). But there is great reason for supposing a close connection between the oldest language and religion of Chaldaea and the ancient Egyptian language and religion. The Egyptian  word ter signifies “a shape, type, transformation,” and has for its determinative a mummy: it is used in the Ritual, where the various transformations of the deceased in Hades are described (Todtenbuch, ed. Lepsius, ch. 76 sq.). The small mummy-shaped figure, shebti, usually made of baked clay covered with a blue vitreous varnish, representing the Egyptian as deceased, is of a nature connecting it with magic, since it was made with the idea that it secured benefits in Hades; and it is connected with the word ter, for it represents a mummy, the determinative of that word, and was considered to be of use ill the state in which the deceased passed through transformations, teru. The difficulty which forbids our doing more than conjecture a relation between ter and teraphim is the want in the former of the third radical of the latter; and in our present state of ignorance respecting the ancient Egyptian and the primitive language of Chaldaea in their verbal relations to the Shemitic family, it is impossible to say whether it is likely to be explained. The possible connection with the Egyptian religious magic is, however, not to be slighted, especially as it is not improbable that the household idolatry of the Hebrews was ancestral worship, and the shebti was the image of a deceased man or woman, as a mummy. and therefore as an Osiris, bearing the insignia of that divinity, and so in a manner as a deified dead person, although we do not know that it was used in the ancestral worship of the Egyptians. It is important to notice that no singular is found of the word teraphim, and that the plural form is once used where only one statue seems to be meant (1Sa 19:13; 1Sa 19:16): in this case it may be a “plural of excellence.” If the latter inference be true, this word must have become thoroughly Shemiticized. There is no description of these images; but. from the account of Michal's stratagem to deceive Saul's messengers, it is evident, if only one image be there meant, as is very probable, that they were at least sometimes of the size of a man, and perhaps in the head and shoulders, if not lower, of human shape, or of a similar form (1Sa 19:13-16).

The worship or use of teraphim after the occupation of the Promised Land cannot be doubted as having been one of the corrupt practices of those Hebrews who leaned to idolatry, but did not abandon their belief in the God of Israel. Although the Scriptures draw no marked distinction between those who forsook their religion and those who added to it such corruptions, it is evident that the latter always professed to be orthodox. Teraphim, therefore, cannot be regarded as among the Hebrews necessarily connected with strange gods, whatever may have been the case with other  nations. The account of Micah's images in the book of Judges, compared with a passage in Hosea, shows our conclusion to be correct. In the earliest days of the occupation of the Promised Land, in the time of anarchy that followed Joshua's rule, Micah, “a man of Mount Ephraim,” made certain images and other objects of heretical worship, which were stolen from him by those Danites who took Laish and called it Dan, there setting up idolatry, where it continued the whole time that the ark was at Shiloh, the priests retaining their post “until the day of the captivity of the land” (Judges 17, 18, esp. 30, 31). Probably this worship was somewhat changed, although not in its essential character, when Jeroboam set up the golden calf at Dan. Micah's idolatrous objects were a graven image, a molten image, an ephod, and teraphim (Jdg 17:3-5; Jdg 18:17-18; Jdg 18:20).

In Hosea there is a retrospect of this period where the prophet takes a harlot, and commands her to be faithful to him “many days.” It is added: “For the children of Israel shall abide many days without a king, and without a prince, and without a sacrifice, and without an image [or “pillar,” מִצֵּבָה, and without an ephod, and teraphim: afterward shall the children of Israel return, and seek Jehovah their God, and David their king; and shall fear Jehovah and his goodness in the latter days” (3, esp. 4, 5). The apostate people are long to be without their spurious king and false worship, and in the end are to return to their loyalty to the house of David and their faith in the true God. That Dan should be connected with Jeroboam “who made Israel to sin,” and with the kingdom which he founded, is most natural; and it is therefore worthy of note that the images, ephod, and teraphim made by Micah, and stolen and set up by the Danites at Dan, should so nearly correspond with the objects spoken of by the prophet. It has been imagined that the use of teraphim and the similar abominations of the heretical Israelites are not so strongly condemned in the Scriptures as the worship of strange gods. This mistake arises from the mention of pious kings who did not suppress the high places, which proves only their timidity, and not any lesser sinfulness in the spurious religion than in false systems borrowed from the peoples of Canaan and neighboring countries. The cruel rites of the heathen are indeed especially reprobated, but the heresy of the Israelites is too emphatically denounced, by Samuel in a passage soon to be examined, and in the repeated condemnation of Jeroboam, the son of Nebat, “who made Israel to sin,” to render it possible that we should take a view of it consistent only with modern sophistry.  We pass to the magical use of teraphim.

By the Israelites they were consulted for oracular answers. This was apparently done by the Danites, who asked Micah's Levite to inquire as to the success of their spying expedition (Jdg 18:5-6). In later times this is distinctly stated of the Israelites where Zechariah says “For the teraphim have spoken vanity, and the diviners have seen a lie, and have told false dreams” (Zec 10:2). It cannot be supposed that, as this first positive mention of the use of teraphim for divination by the Israelites is after the return from Babylon, and as that use obtained with the Babylonians in the time of Nebuchadnezzar, therefore the Israelites borrowed it from their conquerors; for these objects are mentioned in earlier places in such a manner that their connection with divination must be intended, if we bear in mind that this connection is undoubted in a subsequent period. Samuel's reproof of Saul for his disobedience in the matter of Amalek associates “divination” with “vanity,” or “idols” (אָוֶן), and “teraphim,” however we render the difficult passage where these words occur (1Sa 15:22-23). (The word rendered “vanity,” אָוֶן, is especially used with reference to idols. and even in some places stands alone for an idol or idols.) When Saul, having put to death the workers in black arts, finding himself rejected of God in his extremity, sought the witch of Endor, and asked to see Samuel, the prophet's apparition denounced his doom as the punishment of this very disobedience, as to Amalek. The reproof would seem, therefore, to have been a prophecy that the self-confident king would at the last alienate himself from God, and take refuge in the very abominations he despised. This apparent reference tends to confirm the inference we have indicated. As to a later time, when Josiah's reform is related, he is said to have put away “the wizards, and the teraphim, and the idols” (2Ki 23:24); where the mention of the teraphim immediately after the wizards, and as distinct from the idols, seems to favor the inference that they are spoken of as objects used in divination.

The only account of the act of divining by teraphim is in a remarkable passage of Ezekiel relating to Nebuchadnezzar's advance against Jerusalem. “Also, thou son of man, appoint thee two ways, that the sword of the king of Babylon may come: both twain [two swords] shall come forth out of one land: and choose thou a place, choose [it] at the head of the way to the city. Appoint a way, that the sword may come to Rabbath of the Ammonites, and to Judah in Jerusalem the defenced. For the king of Babylon stood at the parting of the way, at the head of the two ways, to  use divination: he shuffled arrows, he consulted with teraphim, he looked in the liver. At his right hand was the divination for Jerusalem” (Eze 21:19-22). The mention together of consulting teraphim and looking into the liver may not indicate that the victim was offered to teraphim and its liver then looked into, but may mean two separate acts of divining. The former explanation seems, however, to have been adopted by the Sept. in its rendering of the account of Michal's stratagem, as if Michal had been divining, and on the coming of the messengers seized the image and liver and hastily put them in the bed. The accounts which the Rabbins give of divining by teraphim are worthless. SEE TERAPHIM.

2. Joseph, when his brethren left after their second visit to buy corn, ordered his steward to hide his silver cup in Benjamin's sack, and afterwards sent him after them, ordering him to claim it, thus: “[Is] not this [it] in which my lord drinketh, and whereby indeed he divineth?” (Gen 44:5). The meaning of the latter clause has been contested, Gesenius translating “he could surely foresee it” (ap. Barrett, Synopsis, ad loc.), but the other rendering seems far more probable, especially as we read that Joseph afterwards said to his brethren, “Wot ye not that such a man as I can certainly divine?” (Gen 44:15)-the same word being used. If so, the reference would probably be to the use of the cup in divining, and we should have to infer that here Joseph was acting on his own judgment, SEE JOSEPH, divination being not alone doubtless a forbidden act, but one of which he, when called before Pharaoh, had distinctly disclaimed the practice. Two uses of cups or the like for magical purposes have obtained in the East from ancient times. In one use either the cup itself bears engraved inscriptions, supposed to have a magical influence (see D'Herbelot, Bibliotheque Orientale, s.v. (Gam), or it is plain, and such inscriptions are written on its inner surface in ink. In both cases water poured into the cup is drunk by those wishing to derive benefit, as, for instance, the cure of diseases, from the inscriptions, which, if written, are dissolved (Lane, Mod. E9. ch. 11).

This use, in both its forms, obtains among the Arabs in the present day, and cups bearing Chaldaean inscriptions in ink have been discovered by Mr. Layard, and probably show that this practice existed among the Jews in Babylonia in about the 7th century of the Christian aera (Nineveh and Babylon, p. 509, etc. There is an excellent paper on these bowls by Dr. Levy, of Breslau, in the Zeifschrift der Deutsch. Morgenländ. Gesellschaft, 9:465, etc.). In the other use the cup or bowl was of very secondary importance. It was merely  the receptacle for water, in which, after the performance of magical rites, a boy looked to see what the magician desired. This is precisely the same as the practice of the modern Egyptian magicians, where the difference that ink is employed and is poured into the palm of the boy's hand is merely accidental. A Gnostic papyrus in Greek, written in Egypt in the earlier centuries of the Christian aera, now preserved in the British Museum, describes the practice of the boy with a bowl, and alleges results strikingly similar to the alleged results of the well-known modern Egyptian magician, whose divination would seem, therefore, to be a relic of the famous magic of ancient Egypt. (See Lane, Mod. Egyptians, ch. 12, for an account of the performances of this magician, and Mr. Lane's opinion as to the causes of their occasional apparent success.) As this latter use only is of the nature of divination, it is probable that to it Joseph referred. The practice may have been prevalent in his time, and hieroglyphic inscriptions upon the bowl may have given color to the idea that it had magical properties, and perhaps even that it had thus led to the discovery of its place of concealment, a discovery which must have struck Joseph's brethren with the utmost astonishment. SEE CUP.

3. The magicians of Egypt are spoken of as a class in the histories of Joseph and Moses. When Pharaoh's officers were troubled by their dreams, being in prison they were at a loss for an interpreter. Before Joseph explained the dreams he disclaimed the power of interpreting save by the divine aid, saying, “[Do] not interpretations [belong] to God? tell me [them], I pray you” (Gen 40:8). In like manner, when Pharaoh had his two dreams, we find that he had recourse to those who professed to interpret dreams. We read: “He sent and called for all the scribes of Egypt, and all the wise men thereof: and Pharaoh told them his dream; but [there was] none that could interpret them unto Pharaoh” (Gen 41:8; comp. 40:24). Joseph, being sent for on the report of the chief of the cup-bearers, was told by Pharaoh that he had heard that he could interpret a dream. Joseph said, ‘ [It is] not in me: God shall give Pharaoh an answer of peace” (Gen 40:16). Thus, from the expectations of the Egyptians and Joseph's disavowals, we see that the interpretation of dreams was a branch of the knowledge to which the ancient Egyptian magicians pretended. The failure of the Egyptians in the case of Pharaoh's dreams must probably be regarded as the result of their inability to give a satisfactory explanation, for it is unlikely that they refused to attempt to interpret. The two words used to  designate the interpreters sent for by Pharaoh are חִרְטֻמּים, “scribes” (?) and חֲכָמַים“wise men.”

We again hear of the magicians of Egypt in the narrative of the events before the exodus. They were summoned by Pharaoh to oppose Moses. The account of what they effected requires to be carefully examined, from its bearing on the question whether magic be an imposture. We read: “And the Lord spake unto Moses and unto Aaron, saying, When Pharaoh shall speak unto you, saying, Show a miracle for you: then thou shalt say unto Aaron, Take thy rod, and cast [it] before Pharaoh, [and] it shall become a serpent.” It is then related that Aaron did thus, and afterwards: “Then Pharaoh also called the wise men ad t the enchanters: now they, the scribes of Egypt, did so by their secret arts: for they cast down every man his rod, and they became serpents, but Aaron's rod swallowed up their rods” (Exo 7:8-12).

The rods were probably long staves like those represented on the Egyptian monuments, not much less than the height of a man. If the word used mean here a serpent, the Egyptian magicians may have feigned a change: if it signify a crocodile, they could scarcely have done so. The names by which the magicians are designated are to be noted. That which we render “scribes” seems here to have a general signification, including wise men and enchanters. The last term is more definite in its meaning, denoting users of incantations. On the occasion of the first plague, the turning of the rivers and waters of Egypt into blood, the opposition of the magicians again occurs. “And the scribes of Egypt did so by their secret arts” (Exo 7:22). When the second plague, that of frogs, as sent, the magicians again made the same opposition (Exo 8:7). Once more they appear in the history. The plague of lice came, and we read that when Aaron had worked the wonder the magicians opposed him: “And the scribes did so by their secret arts to bring forth the lice, but they could not: so there were lice upon man and upon beast. And the scribes said unto Pharaoh, This [is] the finger of God: but Pharaoh's heart was hardened, and he hearkened not unto them, as the Lord had said” (8:18, 19 [Hebrews 14,15]). After this we hear no more of the magicians. All we can gather from the narrative is that the appearances produced by them were sufficient to deceive Pharaoh on three occasions. It is nowhere declared that they actually produced wonders, since the expression “the scribes did so by their secret arts” is used on the occasion of their complete failure. Nor is their statement that in the wonders wrought by Aaron they saw the finger of God any proof that they recognized a power superior to  the native objects of worship they invoked, for we find that the Egyptians frequently spoke of a supreme being as God. It seems rather as if they had said, “Our juggles are of no avail against the work of a divinity.” There is one later mention of these transactions, which adds to our information, but does not decide the main question. St. Paul mentions Jannes and Jambres as having “withstood Moses,” and says that their folly in doing so became manifest (2Ti 3:8-9). The Egyptian character of these names, the first of which is, in our opinion, found in hieroglyphics, is not inconsistent with the opinion that the apostle cited a prevalent tradition of the Jews. SEE JANNES AND JAMBRES.

We turn to the Egyptian illustrations of this part of the subject. Magic, as we have before remarked, was inherent in the ancient Egyptian religion. The Ritual is a system of incantations and directions for making amulets, with the object of securing the future happiness of the disembodied soul. However obscure the belief of the Egyptians as to the actual character of the state of the soul after death may be to us, it cannot be doubted that the knowledge and use of the magical amulets and incantations treated of in the Ritual was held to be necessary for future happiness, although it was not believed that they alone could insure it, since to have done good works, or, more strictly, not to have committed certain sins, was an essential condition of the acquittal of the soul in the great trial in Hades. The thoroughly magical character of the Ritual is most strikingly evident in the minute directions given for making amulets (Todtenbuch, ch. 100, 119, 134), and the secrecy enjoined in one case on those thus occupied (ch. 133). The later chapters of the Ritual (163-165), held to have been added after the compilation or composition of the rest, which theory, as M. Chabas has well remarked, does not prove their much more modern date (Le Papyrus Magique Harris, p. 162), contain mystical names not bearing an Egyptian etymology. These names have been thought to be Ethiopian; they either have no signification, and are mere magical gibberish, or else they are, mainly at least, of foreign origin. Besides the Ritual the ancient Egyptians had books of a purely magical character, such as that which M. Chabas has edited in his work referred to above.

The main source of their belief in the efficacy of magic appears to have been the idea that the souls of the dead, whether justified or condemned, had the power of revisiting the earth and taking various forms. This belief is abundantly used in the moral tale of “The Two Brothers,” of which the text has recently been published by the trustees of the British Museum (Select Papyri, part 2),  and we learn from this ancient papyrus the age and source of much of the machinery of mediaeval fictions, both Eastern and Western. A likeness that strikes us at once in the case of a fiction is not less true of the Ritual; and the perils encountered by the soul in Hades are the first rude indications of the adventures of the heroes of Arab and German romance. The regions of terror traversed, the mystic portals that open alone to magical words, and the monsters whom magic alone can deprive of their power to injure, are here already in the book that in part was found in the reign of king Mencheres, four thousand years ago. Bearing in mind the Nigritian nature of Egyptian magic, we may look for the source of these ideas in primitive Africa. There we find the realities of which the ideal form is not greatly distorted, though greatly intensified. The forests that clothe the southern slopes of snowy Atlas, full of fierce beasts; the vast desert, untenanted save by harmful reptiles, swept by sand-storms, and ever burning under an unchanging sun; the marshes of the south, teeming with brutes of vast size and strength, are the several zones of the Egyptian Hades. The creatures of the desert and the plains and slopes, the crocodile, the pachydermata, the lion, perchance the gorilla. are the genii that hold this land of fear. In what dread must the first scanty population have held dangers and enemies still feared by their swarming posterity. No wonder, then, that the imaginative Nigritians were struck with a superstitious fear which certain conditions of external nature always produce with races of a low type, where a higher feeling would only be touched by the analogies of life and death, of time and eternity. No wonder that, so struck, the primitive race imagined the evils of the unseen world to be the recurrence of those against which they struggled while on earth. That there is some ground for our theory, besides the generalization which led us to it, is shown by a usual Egyptian name of Hades, “the West;” and that the wild regions west of Egypt might directly give birth to such fancies as form the common ground of the machinery, not the general belief, of the Ritual, as well as of the machinery of mediaeval fiction, is shown by the fables that the rude Arabs of our own day tell of the wonders they have seen.

Like all nations who have practiced magic generally, the Egyptians separated it into a lawful kind and an unlawful. M. Chabas has proved this from a papyrus which he finds to contain an account of the prosecution, in the reign of Rameses III (B.C. cir. 1220), of an official for unlawfully acquiring and using magical books, the king's property. The culprit was convicted and punished with death (p. 169 sq.).  A belief in unlucky and lucky days, in actions to be avoided or done on certain days, and in the fortune attending birth on certain days, was extremely strong, as we learn from a remarkable ancient calendar (Select Papyri, part 1) and the evidence of writers of antiquity. A religious prejudice, or the occurrence of some great calamity, probably lay at the root of this observance of days. Of the former the birthday of Typhon, the fifth of the Epagomenae, is an instance. Astrology was also held in high honor, as the calendars of certain of the tombs of the kings, stating the positions of the stars and their influence on different parts of the body, show us; but it seems doubtful whether this branch of magical arts is older than the 18th dynasty, although certain stars were held in reverence in the time of the 4th dynasty. The belief in omens probably did not hold an important place in Egyptian magic, if we may judge from the absence of direct mention of them. The superstition as to “the evil eye” appears to have been known, but there is nothing else that we can class with phenomena of the nature of animal magnetism. Two classes of learned men had the charge of the magical books: one of these, the name of which has not been read phonetically, would seem to correspond to the “scribes,” as we render the word, spoken of in the history of Joseph; whereas the other has the general sense of “wise men,” like the other class there mentioned.

There are no representations on the monuments that: can be held to relate directly to the practice of this art, but the secret passages in the thickness of the wall, lately opened in the great temple of Denderah, seem to have been intended for some purpose of imposture.

4. The Mosaic law contains very distinct prohibitions of all magical arts. Besides several passages condemning them, in one place there is a specification which is so full that it seems evident that its object is to include every kind of magical art. The reference is to the practices of Canaan, not to those of Egypt, which indeed do not seem to have been brought away by the Israelites, who, it may be remarked, apparently did not adopt Egyptian idolatry, but only that of foreigners settled in. Egypt. SEE REMPHAN.

The Israelites are commanded in the place referred to not to learn the abominations of the peoples of the Promised Land. Then follows this prohibition: “There shall not be found with thee one who offereth his son. or his daughter by fire, a practicer of divinations (קְסָמַים קֹסֵם), a worker of hidden arts (מְעוֹנֵן), an augurer(מְנִחֵשׁ), an enchanter (מְכִשֵׁ), or a  fabricator of charms (חֹבֵר חֶבֶי), or an inquirer by a familiar spirit(שׂאה אוֹב), or a wizard (יַדְּעֹנַי), or a consulter of thedead (דֹרֵשׁ אֶלאּהִמֵּתַים).” It is added that these are, abominations, and that on account of their practice the nations of Canaan were to be driven out (Deu 18:9-14, esp. 10, 11). It is remarkable that the offering of children should be mentioned ill connection with magical arts. The passage in Micah, which has been supposed to preserve a question of Balak and an answer of Balaam, when the soothsayer was sent for to curse Israel, should be here noticed, for the questioner asks, after speaking of sacrifices of usual kinds, “Shall I give my first-born [for] my transgression, the fruit of my body [for] the sin of my soul?” (6:5-8). Perhaps, however, child-sacrifice is specified on account of its atrocity, which would connect it with secret arts, such as we know were frequently, in later times, the causes of cruelty. The terms which follow appear to refer properly to eight different kinds of magic, but some of them are elsewhere used in a general sense.

1. קֹסֵם קְסָמַים is literally “a diviner of divinations.” The verb קָסִםis used of false prophets, but also in a general sense for divining, as in the narrative of Saul's consultation of the witch of Endor, where the king says “divine unto me (קְסוֹמַיאּנָא לַי בָּאוֹב), I pray thee, by the familiar spirit” (1Sa 28:8).

2. מְעוֹנֵןconveys the idea of “one who acts covertly,” and so “a worker of hidden arts.” The meaning of the root עָנִןis covering, and the supposed connection with fascination by the eyes, like the notion of “the evil eve,” as though the original root were “the eye” (עִיַו), seems untenable. The ancient Egyptians seem to have held the superstition of the evil eye, for an eye is the determinative of a word which appears to signify some kind of magic (Chabas, Papyrus Magique Harris, p. 170 and note 4).

3. מְנִחֵש which we render “an augurer,” is from נָחִשׁ, which is literally “he or it hissed or whispered,” and in Piel is applied to the practice of enchantments, but also to divining generally, as in the case of Joseph's cup, and where, evidently referring to it, he tells his brethren that he could divine, although in both places it has been read more vaguely with the sense to foresee or make trial (Gen 44:5; Gen 44:15). We therefore render it by a term which seems appropriate, but not too  definite. The supposed connection of נָחִשׁwith נָחָשׁ, “a serpent,” as though meaning serpent-divination, must be rejected, the latter word rather coming from the former, with the signification “a hisser.” The name Nahshon (נִחְשׁוֹ)ִ, of a prince of Judah in the second year after the exodus (Num 1:7; Exo 6:23; Rth 4:20, etc.), means “enchanter:” it was probably used as a proper name in a vague sense.

4. מְכִשֵׁ signifies “an enchanter:” the original meaning of the verb was probably “he prayed,” and the strict sense of this word “one who uses incantations.”

5. חֹבֵר הֶבֶרseems to mean “a fabricator of material charms or amulets,” if חָבִר, when ,used of practicing sorcery, means to bind magical knots, and not to bind a person by spells.

6. שֹׁאֵל אוֹבis “an inquirer by a familiar spirit.” The second term signifies a bottle, a familiar spirit consulted by a soothsayer, and a soothsayer having a familiar spirit. The Sept. usually render the plural אֹבוֹתby ἐγγαστριμύθοι, which has been rashly translated ventriloquists, for it may not signify what we understand by the latter, but refer to the mode in which soothsayers of this kind gave out their responses: to this subject we shall recur later. The consulting of familiar spirits may mean no more than invoking them; but in the Acts we read of a damsel possessed with a spirit of divination (Act 16:16-18) in very distinct terms. This kind of sorcery — divination by a familiar spirit — was practiced by the witch of Endor.

7. יַדּעֹנַי, which we render “a wizard,” is properly “a wise man,” but is always applied to wizards and false prophets. Gesenius (Thesaur. s.v.) supposes that in Lev 20:21 it is used of a familiar spirit, but surely the reading “a wizard” is there more probable.

8. The last term, דֹרֵשׁ אֶלאּהִמֵּתַים, is very explicit, meaning “a consulter of the dead:” necromancer is an exact translation if the original signification of the latter is retained, instead of the more general one it now usually bears. In the law it was commanded that a man or woman who had a familiar spirit, or a wizard, should be stoned (Lev 20:27). An “enchantress” (מְכִשֵׁפָה) was not to live  (Exo 22:18 [Hebrews 17]). Using augury and hidden arts was also forbidden (Lev 19:26). SEE DIVINATION.

5. The history of Balaam shows the belief of some ancient nations in the powers of soothsayers. When the Israelites had begun to conquer the Land of Promise, Balak. the king of Moab, and the elders of Midian, resorting to Pharaoh's expedient, sent by messengers with “the rewards of divination (?

קְסָמַים) in their hands” (Num 22:7) for Balaam the diviner (הֵקּוֹסֵם, Jos 13:22), whose fame was known to them, though he dwelt in Aram. Balak's message shows what he believed Balaam's powers to be: “Behold, there is a people come out from Egypt: behold, they cover the face of the earth, and they abide over against me: come now therefore, I pray thee, curse me this people; for they [are] too mighty for me: peradventure I shall prevail, [that] we may smite them, and [that] I may drive them out of the land: for I wot that he whom thou blessest [is] blessed; and he whom thou cursest is cursed” (Num 22:5-6). We are told, however, that Balaam, warned of God, first said that he could not speak of himself, and then by inspiration blessed those whom he had been sent for to curse. He appears to have received inspiration in a vision or a trance. In one place it is said. “And Balaam saw that it was good in the eyes of the Lord to bless Israel, and he went not, now as before, to the meeting of enchantments (נְחָשַׁים), but he set his face to the wilderness” (Num 24:1). From this it would seem that it was his wont to use enchantments, and that when on the occasions he went away after the sacrifices had been offered, he hoped that he could prevail to obtain the wish of those who had sent for him, but was constantly defeated. The building of new altars of the mystic number of seven, and the offering of seven oxen and seven rams, seem to show that Balaam had some such idea; and the marked manner in which he declared “there is no enchantment (נִחִשׁ) against Jacob, and no divination (קֶסֵם) against Israel” (Num 23:23), proves that he had come in the hope that they would have availed, the diviner here being made to declare his own powerlessness while be blessed those whom he was sent for to curse. The case is a very difficult one, since it shows a man who was used as all instrument for declaring God's will trusting in practices that could only have incurred his displeasure. The simplest explanation seems to be that Balaam was never a true prophet but on this occasion, when the enemies of Israel were to be signally confounded. This history affords a  notable instance of the failure of magicians in attempting to resist the divine will. SEE BALAAM.

6. The account of Saul's consulting the witch of Endor is the foremost place in Scripture of those which refer to magic. The supernatural terror of which it is full cannot, however, be proved to be due to this art, for it has always been held by sober critics that the appearing of Samuel was permitted for the purpose of declaring the doom of Saul, and not that it was caused by the incantations of a sorceress. As, however, the narrative is allowed to be very difficult, we may look for a moment at the evidence of its authenticity. The details are strictly in accordance with the age: there is a simplicity in the manners described that is foreign to a later time. The circumstances are agreeable with the rest of the history, and especially with all we know of Saul's character. Here, as ever, he is seen resolved to gain his ends without caring what wrong he does: he wishes to consult a prophet. and asks a witch to call up his shade.

Most of all, the vigor of the narrative, showing us the scene in a few words, proves its antiquity and genuineness. We can see no reason whatever for supposing that it is an interpolation.

“Now Samuel was dead, and all Israel had lamented him, and buried him in Ramah, even in his own city. And Saul had put away those that had familiar spirits, and the wizards, out of the land. And the Philistines gathered themselves together, and came and pitched in Shunem; and Saul gathered all Israel together, and they pitched in Gilboa.” That the Philistines should have advanced so far, spreading in the plain of Esdraelon, the garden of the Holy Land, shows the straits to which Saul had come. Here, in times of faith, Sisera was defeated by Barak, and the Midianites were smitten by (ideon, some of the army of the former perishing at En-dor itself (Psa 83:9-10). “And when Saul saw the host of the Philistines, he was afraid, and his heart greatly trembled. And when Saul inquired of the Lord, the Lord answered him not, neither by dreams, nor by Urim, nor by prophets. Then said Saul unto his servants, Seek me a woman that hath a familiar spirit, that I may go to her, and inquire of her. And his servants said to him, Behold, [there is] a woman that hath a familiar spirit at En-dor. And Saul disguised himself, and put on other raiment, and he went, and two men with him, and they came to the woman by night.” En-dor lay in the territory of Issachar, about seven or eight miles to the northward of Mount Gilboa. Its name, the “fountain of  Dor,” may connect it with the Phoenician city Dor, which was on the coast to the westward. If so, it may have retained its stranger-population, and been therefore chosen by the witch as a place where she might with less danger than elsewhere practice her arts. It has been noticed that the mountain on whose slope the modern village stands is hollowed into rock- hewn caverns, in one of which the witch may probably have dwelt. SEE EN-DOR.

Saul's disguise, and his journeying by night, seem to have been taken that he might not alarm the woman, rather than because he may have passed through a part of the Philistine force. The Philistines held the plain, having their camp at Shunem, whither they had pushed on from Aphek: the Israelites were at first encamped by a fountain at Jezreel, but when their enemies had advanced to Jezreel they appear to have retired to the slopes of Gilboa, whence there was a way of retreat either into the mountains to the south, or across Jordan. The latter seems to have been the line of flight, as, though Saul was slain on Mount Gilboa, his body was fastened to the wall of Bethshan. Thus Saul could scarcely have reached Endor without passing at least very near the army of the Philistines. “And he said, divine unto me, I pray thee, by the familiar spirit, and bring me [him] up whom I shall name unto thee.” It is noticeable that here witchcraft, the inquiring by a familiar spirit, and necromancy, are all connected as though but a single art, which favors the idea that the prohibition in Deuteronomy specifies every name by which magical arts were known, rather than so many different kinds of arts, in order that no one should attempt to evade the condemnation of such practices by any subterfuge. It is evident that Saul thought he might be able to call up Samuel by the aid of the witch, but this does not prove what was his own general conviction, or the prevalent conviction of the Israelites on the subject. He was in a great extremity; his kingdom in danger; himself forsaken of God: he was weary with a night- journey, perhaps of risk, perhaps of great length to avoid the enemy, and faint with a day's fasting: he was conscious of wrong as, probably for the first time, he commanded unholy rites and heard in the gloom unholy incantations.

In such a strait no man's judgment is steady, and Saul may have asked to see Samuel in a moment of sudden desperation, when he had only meant to demand an oracular answer. It may even be thought that, yearning for the counsel of Samuel, and longing to learn if the net that he felt closing about him were one from which he should never escape, Saul had that keener sense that some say comes in the last hours of life, and so; conscious that the prophet's shade was near, or was about to come, at once sought to see and speak with it, though this had not before been  purposed. Strange things we know occur at the moment when man feels he is about to die, and if there be any time when the unseen world is felt while yet unentered, it is when the soul first comes within the chill of its long- projected shadow. “And the woman said unto him, Behold, thou knowest what Saul hath done, how he hath cut off those that have familiar spirits, and the wizards, out of the land: wherefore, then, layest thou a snare for my life, to cause me to die? And Saul sware to her by the Lord, saying, [As] the Lord liveth, there shall no punishment happen to thee for this thing.” Nothing shows Saul's desperate resolution more than his thus swearing when engaged in a most unholy act, a terrible profanity that makes the horror of the scene complete. Everything being prepared, the final act takes place. “Then said the woman, Whom shall I bring up unto thee? And he said, Bring me up Samuel. And when the woman saw Samuel, she cried with a loud voice: and the woman spake to Saul, saying, Why hast thou deceived me? for thou [art] Saul. And the king said unto her, Be not afraid: for what sawest thou? And the woman said unto Saul, I saw gods ascending out of the earth. And he said unto her, What [is] his form? And she said, An old man cometh up; and he [is] covered with a mantle. And Saul perceived that it [was] Samuel, and he stooped with his face to the ground, and bowed himself. And Samuel said to Saul, Why hast thou disquieted [or “disturbed”] me, to bring me up? And Saul answered, I am sore distressed; for the Philistines make war against me, and God is departed from me, and answereth me no more, neither by prophets, nor by dreams; therefore I have called thee, that thou mayest make known unto me what I shall do. Then said Samuel, Wherefore, then, dost thou ask of me, seeing the Lord is departed from thee, and is become thine enemy? And the Lord hath done to him as he spake by me, for the Lord hath rent the kingdom out of thine hand, and given it to thy neighbor, [even] to David: because thou obeyedst not the voice of the Lord, nor executedst his fierce wrath upon Amalek, therefore hath the Lord done this thing unto thee this day. Moreover, the Lord will also deliver Israel with thee into the hand of the Philistines; and to-morrow [shalt] thou and thy sons [be] with me: the Lord also shall deliver the host of Israel into the hand of the Philistines. Then Saul fell straightway all along on the earth, and was sore afraid, because of the words of Samuel: and there was no strength in him; for he had eaten no bread all the day, nor all the night” (1Sa 28:3-20).

The woman clearly was terrified by an unexpected apparition when she saw Samuel. She must, therefore, either have been a mere juggler, or one who had no power of working magical wonders at will. The sight of  Samuel at once showed her who had come to consult her. The prophet's shade seems to have been preceded by some majestic shapes which the witch called gods. Saul, as it seems interrupting her, asked his form, and she described the prophet as he was in his last days on earth, an old man, covered either with a mantle, such as the prophets used to wear, or wrapped in his winding-sheet. Then Saul knew it was Samuel, and bowed to the ground from respect or fear. It seems that the woman saw the appearances, and that Saul only knew of them through her, perhaps not daring to look, else why should he have asked what form Samuel had? The prophet's complaint we cannot understand, in our ignorance as to the separate state: thus much we know, that state is always described as one of perfect rest or sleep. That the woman should have been able to call him up cannot be hence inferred; her astonishment shows the contrary; and it would be explanation enough to suppose that he was sent to give Saul the last warning, or that the earnestness of the king's wish had been permitted to disquiet him in his resting-place. Although the word “disquieted” need not be pushed to an extreme sense, and seems to mean the interruption of a state of rest, our translators wisely, we think, preferring this rendering to “disturbed,” it cannot be denied that, if we hold that Samuel appeared, this is a great difficulty.

If, however, we suppose that the prophet's coming was ordered, it is not unsurmountable. The declaration of Saul's doom agrees with what Samuel had said before, and was fulfilled the next day, when the king and his sons fell on Mount Gilboa. It may, however, be asked, Was the apparition Samuel himself, or a supernatural messenger in his stead? Some may even object to our holding it to have been aught but a phantom of a sick brain; but, if so, what can we make of the woman's conviction that it was Samuel, and the king's horror at the words he heard, or, as these would say, that he thought he heard? It was not only the hearing his doom, but the hearing it in a voice from the other world that stretched the faithless strong man on the ground. He must have felt the presence of the dead, and heard the sound of a sepulchral voice. How else could the doom have come true, and not the king alone, but his sons, have gone to the place of disembodied souls on the morrow? for to be with the dead concerned the soul, not the body: it is no difficulty that the king's corpse was unburied till the generous men of Jabesh-gilead, mindful of his old kindness, rescued it from the wall of Bethshan. If, then, the apparition was real, should we suppose it Samuel's? A reasonable criticism would say it seems to have been so; for the supposition that a messenger came in his stead must be rejected, as it would make the speech a mixture of truth and  untruth; and if asked what sufficient cause there was for such a sending forth of the prophet from his rest, we may reply that we know not the reason for such warnings as abound in the Bible, and that, perhaps, even at the eleventh hour, the door of repentance was not closed against the king, and his impiety might have been pardoned had he repented. Instead, he went forth in despair, and, when his sons had fallen and his army was put to the rout, sore wounded, he fell on his own sword.

From the beginning to the end of this strange history we have no warrant for attributing supernatural power to magicians. Viewed reasonably, it refers to the question of apparitions of the dead as to which other places in the Bible leave no doubt. The connection with magic seems purely accidental. The witch is no more than a by-stander after the first: she sees Samuel, and that is all. The apparition may have been a terrible fulfillment of Saul's desire, but this does not prove that the measures he used were of any power. We have examined the narrative very carefully, from its detail and its remarkable character: the result leaves the main question unanswered. SEE INCANTATION.

7. In the later days of the two kingdoms magical practices of many kinds prevailed among the Hebrews, as we especially learn from the condemnation of them by the prophets. Every form of idolatry which the people had adopted in succession doubtless brought with it its magic, which seems always to have remained with a strange tenacity that probably made it outlive the false worship with which it was connected. Thus the use of teraphim, dating from the patriarchal age, was not abandoned when the worship of the Canaanitish. Phoenician, and Syrian idols had been successively adopted. In the historical books of Scripture there is little notice of magic, except that wherever the false prophets are mentioned we have, no doubt, an indication of the prevalence of magical practices. We are especially told of Josiah that he put away the workers with familiar spirits, the wizards, and the teraphim, as well as the idols and the other abominations of Judah and Jerusalem, in performance of the commands of the book of the law which had been found (2Ki 23:24). But in the prophets we find several notices of the magic of the Hebrews in their times, and some of tie magic of foreign nations. Isaiah says that the people had become workers of hidden arts (עֹנְנַים) like the Philistines, and apparently alludes in the same place to the practice of magic by the Bene-Kedem (2:6). The nation had not only abandoned true religion, but had become generally addicted to magic in the manner of the Philistines, whose  Egyptian origin, SEE CAPHTOR, is consistent with such a condition. The origin of the Bene-Kedem is doubtful, but it seems certain that as late as the time of the Egyptian wars in Syria, under the 19th dynasty, B.C. cir. 1300, a race, partly at least Mongolian, inhabited the valley of the Orontes, among whom, therefore, we should again expect a national practice of magic, and its prevalence with their neighbors. Balaam, too, dwelt with the Bene-Kedem, though he may not have been of their race. In another place the prophet reproves the people for seeking “unto them that have familiar spirits, and unto the wizards that chirp, and that mutter” (8:19). The practices of one class of magicians are still more distinctly described where it thus said of Jerusalem: “And I will camp against thee round about, and will lay siege against thee with a mount, and I will raise forts against thee. And thou shalt be brought down, [and] shalt speak out of the ground, and thy speech shall be low out of the dust, and thy voice shall be, as of one that hath a familiar spirit, out of the ground, and thy speech shall whisper out of the dust” (29:3, 4). Isaiah alludes to the magic of the Egyptians when he says that in their calamity “they shall seek to the idols, and to the charmers [ אַטַּים], and to them that have familiar spirits, and to the wizards” (Isa 19:3). And in the same manner he thus taunts Babylon: ‘Stand now with thy charms, and with the multitude of thine enchantments, wherein thou hast labored from thy youth; if so be thou shalt be able to profit, if so be thou mayest prevail. Thou art wearied in the multitude of thy counsels. Let now the viewers of the heavens [or astrologers], the stargazers, the monthly prognosticators, stand up and save thee from [these things] that shall come upon thee” (Isa 47:12-13). The magic of Babylon is here characterized by the prominence given to astrology, no magicians being mentioned excepting practicers of this art; unlike the case of the Egyptians, with whom astrology seems always to have held a lower place than with the Chaldaean nation. In both instances the folly of those who seek the aid of magic is shown.

Micah, declaring the judgments coming for the crimes of his time, speaks of the prevalence of divination among prophets who most probably were such pretended prophets as the opponents of Jeremiah, not avowed prophets of idols, as Ahab's seem to have been. Concerning these prophets it is said, “Night [shall be] unto you, that ye shall not have a vision; and it shall be dark unto you, that ye shall not divine; and the sun shall go down over the prophets, and the day shall be dark over them. Then shall the seers be ashamed, and the diviners confounded; yea, they shall all cover their lip;  for [there is] no answer of God” (Isa 3:6-7). Later it is said as to Jerusalem, “The heads thereofjudge for reward, and the priests thereof teach for hire, and the prophets thereof divine for money; yet will they lean upon the Lord, and say, [Is] not the Lord among us? none evil can come upon us” (Isa 3:11). These prophets seem to have practiced unlawful arts, and yet to have expected revelations.

Jeremiah was constantly opposed by false prophets, who pretended to speak in the name of the Lord, saying that they had dreamed, when they told false visions, and who practiced various magical arts (Jer 14:14; Jer 23:25, ad fin.; Jer 27:9-10 -where the several designations applied to those who counseled the people not to serve the king of Babylon may be used in contempt of the false prophets — Jer 29:8-9).

Ezekiel, as we should have expected, affords some remarkable details of the magic of his time, in the clear and forcible descriptions of his visions. From him we learn that fetishism was among the idolatries which the Hebrews, in the latest days of the kingdom of Judah, had adopted from their neighbors, like the Romans in the age of general corruption that caused the decline of their empire. In a vision, in which the prophet saw the abominations of Jerusalem, he entered the chambers of imagery in the Temple itself: “I went in and saw; and behold, every form of creeping things, and abominable beasts, and all the idols of the house of Israel, portrayed upon the wall round about.” Here seventy elders were offering incense in the dark (Eze 8:7-12). This idolatry was probably borrowed from Egypt, for the description perfectly answers to that of the dark sanctuaries of Egyptian temples, with the sacred animals portrayed upon their walls, and does not accord with the character of the Assyrian sculptures, where creeping things are not represented as objects of worship. With this low form of idolatry an equally low kind of magic obtained, practiced by prophetesses who for small rewards made amulets by which the people were deceived (Eze 13:17, ad fin.).

The passage must be allowed to be very difficult, but it can scarcely be doubted that amulets are referred to which were made and sold by these women, and perhaps also worn by them. We may probably read: “Woe to the [women] that sew pillows upon all joints of the hands [elbows or armholes'?], and make kerchiefs upon the head of every stature to hunt souls!” (Eze 13:18). If so, we have a practice analogous to that of the modern Egyptians, who hang amulets of the kind called hegab upon the right side, and of the Nubians, who hang them on the upper part of the  arm. We cannot, in any case, see how the passage call be explained as simply referring to the luxurious dress of the women of that time, since the prophet distinctly alludes to pretended visions and to divinations (Eze 13:23), using almost the same expressions that he applies in another place to the practices of the false prophets (Eze 22:28). The notice of Nebuchadnezzar's divination by arrows, where it is said “he shuffled arrows” (Eze 21:21), must refer to a practice the same or similar to the kind of divination by arrows called El-Meysar, in use among the pagan Arabs, and forbidden in the Koran. SEE AMULET.

8. The references to magic in the book of Daniel relate wholly to that of Babylon, and not so much to the art as to those who used it. Daniel, when taken captive, was instructed in the learning of the Chaldaeans, and placed among the wise men of Babylon (Dan 2:18), by whom we are to understand the magi (חִכַּימֵי בָבֶל), for the term is used as including magicians (חִרְטֻמַּים), sorcerers (אִשָּׁפַים), enchanters (מְכִשַּׁפים), astrologers (גָּזְרַין), and Chaldaeans, the last being apparently the most important class (Dan 2:2; Dan 2:4-5; Dan 2:10; Dan 2:12; Dan 2:14; Dan 2:18; Dan 2:24; Dan 2:27; comp. Dan 1:20). As in other cases, the true prophet was put to the test with the magicians, and he succeeded where they utterly failed. The case resembled Pharaoh's, excepting that Nebuchadnezzar asked a harder thing of the wise men. Having forgotten his dream, he not only required of them an interpretation, but that they should make known the dream itself. They were perfectly ready to tell the interpretation if only they heard the dream. The king at once saw that they were impostors. and that if they truly had supernatural powers they could as well tell him his dream as its meaning. Therefore he decreed the death of all the wise men of Babylon; but Daniel, praying that he and his fellows might escape this destruction, had a vision in which the matter was revealed to him. He was accordingly brought before the king. Like Joseph, he disavowed any knowledge of his own. “The secret which the king hath demanded, the wise men, the sorcerers, the magicians, the astrologers, cannot show unto the king; but there is a God in heaven that revealeth secrets” (Dan 2:27-28). “But as for me, this secret is not revealed to me for [any] wisdom that I have more than any living” (Dan 2:30). He then related the dream and its interpretation, and was set over the province as well as over all the wise men of Babylon. Again the king dreamed; and, though he told them the dream, the wise men could not interpret it, and Daniel again showed the meaning (Dan 4:4 sq.). In the relation of this event we read that the king called him “chief of the scribes,” the second part of the  title being the same as that applied to the Egyptian magicians (Dan 4:9 [Chald. 6]). A third time, when Belshazzar saw the writing on the wall, the wise men were sent for, and, on their failing, Daniel was brought before the king and the interpretation given (chap. 5). These events are perfectly consistent with what always occurred in all other cases recorded in Scripture when the practicers of magic were placed in opposition to true prophets. It may be asked by some how Daniel could take the post of chief of the wise men when he had himself proved their imposture. If, however, as we cannot doubt, the class were one of the learned generally, among whom some practiced magical arts, the case is very different from what it would have been had these wise men been magicians only. Besides, it seems almost certain that Daniel was providentially thus placed that, like another Joseph, he might further the welfare and ultimate return of his people. SEE MAGI.

9. After the Captivity, it is probable that the Jews gradually abandoned the practice of magic. Zechariah speaks indeed of the. deceit of teraphim and diviners (Zec 10:2), and foretells a time when the very names of idols should be forgotten, and false prophets have virtually ceased (Zec 13:1-4), yet in neither case does it seem certain that he is alluding to the usages of his own day.

10. In the Apocrypha we find indications that in the later centuries preceding the Christian aera magic was no longer practiced by the educated Jews. In the Wisdom of Solomon, the writer, speaking of the Egyptian magicians, treats their art as an imposture (Wis 17:7). The book of Tobit is an exceptional case. If we hold that it was written in Persia or a neighboring country, and, with Ewald, date its composition not long after the fall of the Persian empire, it is obvious that it relates to a different state of society from that of the Jews of Egypt and Palestine. If, however, it was written in Palestine about the time of the Maccabees, as others suppose, we must still recollect that it refers rather to the superstitions of the common people than to those of the learned. In either case its pretensions make it unsafe to follow as indicating the opinions of the time at which it was written. It professes to relate to a period of which its writer could have known little, and borrows its idea of supernatural agency from Scripture, adding as much as was judged safe of current superstition.

11. In the N. Test. we read very little of magic. The coming of magi to worship Christ is indeed related (Mat 2:1-12), but we have no warrant for supposing that they were magicians from their name, which the  A. V. not unreasonably renders “wise men.” SEE MAGI.

Our Lord is not said to have been opposed by magicians, and the apostles and other early teachers of the Gospel seem to have rarely encountered them. Philip the deacon, when he preached at Samaria, found there Simon, a famous magician, commonly known as Simon Magus, who had had great power over the people; but he is not said to have been able to work wonders, nor, had it been so, is it likely that he would have soon been admitted into the Church (Act 8:9-24). When Barnabas and Paul were at Paphos, as they preached to the proconsul Sergius Paulus, Elymas, a Jewish sorcerer and false prophet (τινὰ ἄνδρα μάγον ψσευδοπροφήτην) withstood them, and was struck blind for a time at the word of Paul (Act 13:6-12). At Ephesus, certain Jewish exorcists signally failing, both Jews and Greeks were afraid, and abandoned their practice of magical arts. “And many that believed came, and confessed, and showed their deeds. Many of them also which used curious arts brought their books together, and burned them before all: and they counted the price of them, and found [it] fifty thousand [pieces] of silver” (Act 19:18-19). Here both Jews and Greeks seem to have been greatly addicted to magic, even after they had nominally joined the Church. SEE EPHESUS.

In all these cases it appears that though the practicers were generally or always Jews, the field of their success was with Gentiles, showing that among the Jews in general, or the educated class, the art had fallen into disrepute. Here, as before, there is no evidence of any real effect produced by the magicians. We have already noticed the remarkable case of the “damsel having a spirit of divination” (ἔχουσαν πνεῦμα πύθωνα) “which brought her masters much gain by foretelling” (μαντευομένη), from whom Paul cast out the spirit of divination (Act 16:16-18). This is a matter belonging to another subject than that of magic. SEE PROPHECY.

Our examination of the various notices of magic in the Bible gives us this general result: They do not, as far as we can understand, once state positively that any but illusive results were produced by magical rites. They therefore afford no evidence that man can gain supernatural powers to use at his will. This consequence goes some way towards showing that we may conclude that there is no such thing as real magic; for, although it is dangerous to reason on negative evidence, yet in a case of this kind it is especially strong. Had any but illusions been worked by magicians, surely the Scriptures would not have passed over a fact of so much importance, and one which would have rendered the prohibition of these arts far more  necessary. The general belief of mankind in magic, or things akin to it, is of no worth, since the holding of such current superstition in some of its branches, if we push it to its legitimate consequences, would lead to the rejection of faith in God's government of the world, and the adoption of a creed far below that of Plato.

From the conclusion at which we have arrived, that there is no evidence in the Bible of real results having been worked by supernatural agency used by magicians, we may draw this important inference that the absence of any proof of the same in profane literature, ancient or modern, in no way militates against the credibility of the miracles recorded in Scripture.

III. During the Middle Ages, and down almost to the 18th century, magic was greatly studied in Europe, and could boast of distinguished names, who attempted to treat it as a grand and mysterious science, by means of which the secrets of nature could be discovered, and a certain godlike power acquired over the “spirits” (or, as we should now say, the “forces”) of the elements. The principal students and professors of magic during the period referred to were pope Sylvester II, Albertus Magnus, Roger Bacon, Raymond Lully, Pico della Mirandola, Paracelsus, Cornelius Agrippa, Trithemius, Van Helmont, and Jerome Cardan. See Horst's Von der Alten und Neuen Msgie, Ursprung, Idee, Umnfang und Geschichte (Mentz, 1820), and Ennemoser's Geschichte der Mayie (2d edit. Leips. 1844; transl. into English by W. Howitt, 2 vols. Lond. 1854). For an interesting account of the discipline and ceremonies of the “art,” consult the Doqge et Rituel de la Haute Magie (2 vols. Paris. 1856), by Eliphas Levi, one of its latest adherents. For monographs on the general subject, see Volbeding, Index Progranmmatum, p. 160. Many curious notices have been collected by Thomson in his Philosophy of Magic (translated from the French of Salverte, Lond. 1846, 2 vols.). See also Maury, La Meagie et l'Astrologie (Paris, 1860). The Arabian Nights' Entertainments is well known as a classical text-book on Oriental views of magic. For other literature, compare SEE NECROMANCER; SEE SORCRERER. For the legendary wonder-working, which seems to have been the basis of the traditionary fame of free-masonry, SEE SOLOMON. Alchemy and astrology (q.v.) have likewise furnished their quota of interest to the subject. For the mediaeval thaumaturgic practices, SEE ROSICRUCIANS; for the later superstitions, SEE WITCHCRAFT; for the modern, SEE SPIRITUALISM.

## Magician[[@Headword:Magician]]

             (Chald. חִרְטֹם, chartom'; Heb. plural חִרְטֻמַּים, chartumminm', thought by Gesenius, Thesaurp. 520, to be of Heb. origin, signifying “sacred scribe”), a title “applied to the ‘wise men' of Egypt (Gen 41:8; Gen 41:22; Exo 7:11; Exo 8:7; Exo 8:18-19; Exo 9:11) and of Babylon (Dan 1:20; Dan 2:2). The word ‘magicians' is not in either case properly applied, as the magi proper are usually assigned to Persia rather than to Babylon or Egypt, and should be altogether avoided in such application, seeing that it has acquired a sense different from that which it once bore. The term rather denotes ‘wise men,' as they called themselves and were called by others; but, as we should call them, ‘men eminent in learning and science,' their exclusive possession of which in their several countries enabled them occasionally to produce effects which were accounted supernatural by the people. Pythagoras, who was acquainted with Egypt and the East, and who was not unaware of the unfathomable depths of ignorance which lie under the highest attainable conditions of human knowledge, thought the modest title of philosopher (φιλόσοφος), ‘lover of wisdom,' more becoming, and accordingly he brought it into use; but that of ‘wise men' still retained its hold in the East. It is thought that the Egyptian chartumninz were those of the Egyptian priests who had charge of the sacred records. There can be little doubt that they belonged to some branch of the priesthood, seeing that the more recondite departments of learning and science were cultivated exclusively in that powerful caste.” SEE MAGI. See Jablonski, Proleg. in Panth. AEgypt. p. 91 sq.; Creuzer, Mythologie und Symbolik, 1:245; Wilkinson, Anc. Egyptians, 2:316 sq.; Kenrick, Egypt under the Pharaohs, 1:382. SEE MAGIC.

## Magicians[[@Headword:Magicians]]

             The early Christians were derided by this name. Celsus and others pretended that our Savior, because he wrought miracles, practiced magic, which he had learned in Egypt. Augustine speaks of a popular belief among the enemies of the Christian faith that our Savior had written books on magic, which he delivered to Peter and Paul for the use of his disciples. One of the Roman historians calls the Christians genus hominum superstitionis malificae, which may be understood to mean “men of the magical superstitions.” In the martyrdom of Agnes, the people cried out, “Away with the sorceress! Away with the enchantress!”

## Magiddo[[@Headword:Magiddo]]

             (Μαγεδδώ, 1Es 1:29). SEE MEGIDDO.

## Magie, David, D.D[[@Headword:Magie, David, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister of note, was born in Elizabeth, N. J., March 13, 1795; became a subject of renewing grace at the age of eighteen; two years after united with the Presbyterian Church; soon after entered Princeton College, and, subsequent to his graduation from the theological seminary, was for two years tutor in the college. In 1821 he was installed pastor of the Second Presbyterian Church of Elizabeth, “to which he was bound as by a golden chain, giving them the services of his life, till, with bleeding and grateful hearts, they yielded him, at the call of God, to enter his eternal joy,” May 10, 1865. Dr. Magie declined many calls to other stations of responsibility and eminence, believing the pastoral relation too sacred to be dissolved but at the unquestionable bidding of the great Master. “He was indeed ‘a model pastor.'... Combining temperance, charity, humility, prudence, sound judgment, simplicity, and earnestness, he was a faithful, persevering, successful laborer in the vineyard committed to his charge. He preached and prayed with a power and unction which sank deep into the hearts of his hearers. None went from any sermon without having had the way of salvation by Christ affectionately and clearly presented to them.” He was a trustee of the College of New Jersey; a pillar in the Theological Seminary; a member of the American Board of Foreign Missions, also of the Publishing Committee of the American Tract Society, etc. Besides several able published discourses, Dr. Magie was the author of The Spring- time of Life (an excellent volume of 350 pages, published by the American Tract Society, N. York, 1852, 16mo; 1855, 16mo), “in which his own character, and especially his care and counsels for the young, are happily perpetuated.” See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1866, p. 128.

## Magill, Charles Beatty[[@Headword:Magill, Charles Beatty]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Wellsville, Ohio, Oct. 3, 1840; graduated at Miami University, Oxford, Ohio, in 1858; studied divinity at the Western Theological Seminary, Allegheny City, Pa., and was licensed to preach in April, 1861. The winter of 1862-63 he spent at Princeton, N. J.; subsequently he preached in Virginia and Illinois; and was finally ordained and installed pastor of the Presbyterian Church of Birmingham, Iowa. He afterwards spent a short time in the service of the Christian  Commission in Georgia, where he contracted the illness of which he died, Aug. 28. 1864. Mr. Magill was thoroughly educated and devoutly pious. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1865, p. 98.

## Magill, Seagrove William, D.D[[@Headword:Magill, Seagrove William, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at St. Mary's, Georgia, September 27, 1810. He graduated from Yale College in 1831, and from Princeton Theological Seminary in 1834; preached in various Presbyterian and Congregational churches of Virginia, Georgia, Ohio, Vermont, and Connecticut, with several intermissions as agent of educational institutions, and died at Amherst, Massachusetts, January 20, 1884. See Cong. Year- book, 1885, page 26; Necrol. Report of Princeton Theol. Sem. 1885, page 28.

## Maginnis, John Sharp, D.D[[@Headword:Maginnis, John Sharp, D.D]]

             a Baptist minister, was born in Butler Co., Pa., June 13, 1805; was licensed to preach May 25, 1827; studied afterwards at Waterville College, Me., Brown University, and the theological seminary in Newton, Mass.; was ordained pastor of the First Baptist Church of Portland, Me., in Oct. 1832, and there remained until ill health compelled him to remove. In the winter of 1837-38 he was pastor of the Pine Street Church of Providence, R. I.; later he became professor of Biblical theology in the literary and theological institution at Hamilton, N. Y. (now Madison University); in 1850, professor of Biblical and pastoral theology in the new theological school connected with the Rochester University, and also professor of intellectual and moral philosophy in the university. He was made M.A. by Waterville College while at Hamilton, and D.D. by Brown University in 1844. Failing health finally compelled him to resign his professorship in the University, but he continued his labors in the theological school until his death, Oct. 15, 1852. Dr. Maginnis published only a few detached articles, among them one on the philosophy of Cousin (published in the Christian Review), which attracted much attention. See Sprague, Annals, 6:766; Christian Rev. vol. 18 (Jan.).

## Magister Disciplinae[[@Headword:Magister Disciplinae]]

             (master of discipline) was the title of a certain ecclesiastical officer in the ancient Church. It was a custom in Spain, in the time of the Gothic kings, about the end of the 5th century, for parents to dedicate t heir young children to the service of the Church. They were taken for this purpose into a bishop's family, and educated, under his supervision, by a discreet and grave person, who was generally a presbyter, and was called magister disciplinae. The second and fourth councils of Toledo prescribed the duties of this master, the chief of which were, that he should vigilantly watch over the moral character and behavior of the young, and instruct them in the rules and discipline of the Church.

## Magister Sacri Palatii[[@Headword:Magister Sacri Palatii]]

             (master of the sacred palace). This office was created in 1218 by pope Honorius III, and was first held by St. Dominic. The latter, during his residence at Rome, had noticed that the persons employed by the cardinals and authorities made a bad use of their unemployed time. He therefore had commenced, with the consent of the pope, to give them religious instruction during their leisure time, and was rewarded by Honorius with the above office. The task assigned was like that which Dominic had previously chosen for himself, but the pope increased it by directing that the employees of the papal household should also attend these instructions. The office was made perpetual to the Dominicans. Many privileges were gradually attached to it. Thus a bull of pope Eugenius IV, of 1436, ordered that in the papal chapel the Magister s. palatii should be placed next to the dean of the Auditore della Rota; no one was to preach in the chapel without his permission; and on his being temporarily absent from Rome, he was to invest his substitute with the same privileges. These prerogatives were confirmed by Calixtus III in 1456, who gave also the right to the Magister s. palatii of reproving the preacher in the papal chapel, even in the presence of the pope. Leo X, — in 1515, decided that nothing should be printed in the diocese of Rome without the consent of that official and of the cardinal-vicar. In 1625 Urban VIII went further, and forbade the reprinting of works published in the States of the Church without this authorization. Pius V, in 1570, connected with the office a canonicate of St. Peter, which was, however, taken from it in 1586 by Sixtus V. Finally, Alexander VII gave the Magister s. palatii the precedence before all the other clergy composing the Roman cabinet. These privileges, however, were gradually taken back, and the censorship of books now alone remains to the Magister s. palatii. See Musson, Pragm. Geschichte d. Mönchsorden, 8:33; Helyot, Gesch. d. geistl. Klöster- u. Ritteirorden (Leipzig, 1754), 3:252; Schröckh, K. G. 33:95; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 8:685.

## Magistrate[[@Headword:Magistrate]]

             (the representative in the Auth. Vers. of several Heb. and Gr. words, as below), a public civil officer invested with authority. Among the Hebrews, Greeks, and Romans, the corresponding terms had a much wider signification than the term magistrate has with us. The Hebrew שֹׁטְטַים, shophetimn', or judges, were a kind of magistrates (Deu 1:16-17; Ezr 7:25). See JUDGE. The phrase in Jdg 18:7, “And there was no magistrate in the land, that might put them to shame in any thing,” ought to be rendered, “And there were none to harm (כָּלִם) at all in the land; and they were possessed (יוֹרֵשׁ, yoresh') of wealth.” So, also, the terms שָׁפְטַין וְדִיָּנַין, shaphetin' ve-dayanin', rendered “magistrates and judges” (Ezr 7:25), would be better rendered “judges and rulers.” The

סְגָנַים, seganim', rendered “rulers,” properly nobles, were Babylonian magistrates, prefects of provinces (Jer 51:23; Jer 51:28; Jer 51:57; Eze 23:6). The same name was borne by the Jewish magistrates in the time of Ezra and Nehemiah (Ezr 9:2; Neh 2:16; Neh 4:14; Neh 13:11). The word ἄρχων, archon, rendered magistrate (Luk 11:53; Tit 3:1)? properly signifies one first in power, authority; hence “a prince” (Mat 20:25; 1Co 2:6; 1Co 2:8); “a ruler” (Act 4:26; Rom 13:3). The term is also used of the Messiah as “the prince of the kings of the earth” (Rev 1:5); and of Moses as the judge and leader of the Hebrews (Act 7:27; Act 7:35). It is spoken of magistrates of any kind, e.g. the high-priest (Act 23:5); of civil judges (Luk 12:58; Act 16:19); also of a ruler of the synagogue (Luk 8:41; Mat 9:18; Mat 9:23; Mar 5:22): and of persons of weight and influence among the Pharisees and other sects at Jerusalem, who also were members of the Sanhedrim (Luk 14:1; Luk 18:18; Luk 23:13; Luk 23:35; Luk 24:20; Joh 3:1; Joh 7:26; Joh 7:48; Joh 12:42; Act 3:17; Act 4:5; Act 4:8; Act 13:27; Act 14:5). The term is also used of Satan, the prince or chief of the fallen angels (Mat 9:34; Mat 12:24; Mar 3:22; Luk 11:15; Joh 12:31; Joh 14:30; Joh 16:11; Eph 2:2). So likewise the kindred ἀρχη (Luk 12:11; Tit 3:1). The word στρατηγός, rendered “magistrate,” properly signifies leader of an army, commander, general.

So of the ten Athenian commanders, with whom the poleamarch was joined. Afterwards only one or two were sent abroad with the army, as circumstances required, and the others had charge of military affairs at home, i. q. war-minister. In other Greek cities the στρατηγός was the chief magistrate, praefect. The term is also used of Roman officers, the consul and the praetor. In Roman colonies and municipal towns, the chief magistrates were usually two in number, called duumviri; occasionally four or six, quatuorviri, seviri, who also were sometimes styledprmetors, the same as the Greek στρατηγοί. Hence, in the New Testament, this term is used for the Roman dueumviri, praetors, magistrates of Philippi, which was a Roman colony (Act 16:20; Act 16:22; Act 16:35-36; Act 16:38). The word ἐξουσίαι is also used collectively for  those invested with power, as in English we might say “the powers” for rulers, magistrates (Luk 12:11; Rom 13:2-3; Tit 3:1). The “higher powers” (Rom 13:1) are “the ruling authorities” — the magistrates in office — all invested with civil power, from the emperor or king, as supreme, to the lowest civil officer-all who are employed in making and executing the laws. The Roman emperor and some of the subordinate magistrates wore a small sword or dagger, the symbol of punishment, as a part of their official costume. SEE GOVERNOR.

In the earliest periods of Jewish history the magistrates were the hereditary chieftains, but afterwards the judicial office became elective. In the time of Moses, the larger collections of families were fifty-nine in number, and the heads of these families, together with the twelve princes of the tribes, composed a council of seventy-one members; but the subdivisions afterwards were more numerous, and the number of heads of families greater, for we find no less than two hundred and fifty chiefs of this rank included in the rebellion of Koralh, Dathan, and Abiram. The שׁוֹטְרַים, shoterim', or genealogists, are mentioned in connection with the eldersthat is, the princes of tribes and heads of families. SEE OFFICER.

They kept the genealogical tables. Under Joshua, they communicated the orders of the general to the soldiers; and in the time of the Kings, the chief shoter had a certain control over the army, although he was not a military commander. The shoterims, who were superintended by this chief, were distributed into every city, and performed the duties of their office for it and the surrounding district. As they kept the genealogical tables, they had an accurate list of the people, and were acquainted with the age, ability, and domestic circumstances of each individual; but they are not to be confounded with another officer who kept the muster-rolls, and whose name had a similar etymology. Moses added a new class of magistrates for the administration of justice, which, he informs us, was not of divine appointment, but was suggested by his father-in-law Jethro. He divided the people into tens, fifties, hundreds, and thousands, and placed wise and prudent judges over each of these divisions. They were selected, for the most part, from the heads of families, genealogists, or other people of rank (Exo 18:13; Exo 18:26). Difficult questions were brought before Moses himself, and, after his death. before the chief magistrate of the nation. These judges Moses included among the rulers, and Joshua summoned them to the general assemblies; and they are mentioned, in one instance, before the genealogists (Deu 31:28; Jos 8:33). When  the magistrates of all the cities belonging to any one tribe were collected, they formed the supreme court, or legislative assembly of the tribe; and when the magistrates of all the tribes were convened together, they formed the general council of the nation, and could legislate conjointly for all the tribes they represented. After the settlement in Canaan, although the chief magistrate of the Jewish state was, in reality, Jehovah, the invisible King, a supreme ruler for the whole community could be legally chosen when the necessities of the state required it, who was denominated a judge, or governor. SEE JUDGE.

In the book of Deu 17:14-15 we find Jehovah telling the Hebrews that if, when they arrived in the Promised Land, they wished to have a king like the other nations round about them, they were to receive one whom he would appoint, and not a stranger. Josephus and others have correctly understood this passage not to mean that God commanded the Israelites to desire a king when they were settled in Canaan, but that, if they would have a king, he was to be appointed by God, and that he should invariably be a Hebrew, and not a Gentile. SEE KING.

Judges, genealogists, the heads of families or clans, and those who, from the relation they sustained to the common class of people, may be called the princes of the tribes, retained their authority after as well as before the introduction of a monarchical form of government, and acted the part of a legislative assembly to the respective cities in or near which they resided (1Ki 12:1-24; 1Ch 23:4; 1Ch 26:29). The headship of the tribes and families was hereditary, though probably subject to the royal approbation: but the judges and genealogists were appointed by the king. Besides these, we read of certain great officers, as “the royal counsellors” (1Ki 12:6-12; 1Ch 27:32; Isa 3:3), among whom the prophets were included by pious kings (2Sa 7:2; 1Ki 22:7-8; 2Ki 19:2-20); while others of a different character imitated the example of heathen princes, and called in to their aid soothsayers and false prophets (1Ki 18:22; 1Ki 22:6; Dan 1:20). The secretary or “scribe” (2Sa 8:16; 2Sa 20:24; 1Ki 4:3) committed to writing not only the edicts and sayings of the king, but everything of a public nature that related to the kingdom; and it was likewise his business to present to the king in writing an account of the state of affairs. The high-priest may be also reckoned among those who had access to the king in the character of counselors (2Sa 8:17; 1Ch 18:16). SEE COUNSELLOR.

During the Captivity and after that period the Hebrews continued among them that class of officers denominated heads of families, and perhaps likewise the princes of the  tribes, who, under the direction of the royal governors, ruled their respective tribes (Ezr 1:5; Ezr 4:3; Ezr 4:5; Neh 2:16; Neh 6:17-18; Eze 14:1); but it is most probable that Jehoiachin,an and afterwards Shealtiel and Zerubbabel, held the first rank among them, or, in other words, were their princes. After their return to their native country the Hebrews obeyed their פָחָה, pachoh', or president. Such were Zerubbabel, Ezra, and Nehemiah, who were invested with ample powers for the purposes of government (Ezr 7:25). When, from any cause, there was no person authorized by the civil government to act as president, the high- priest commonly undertook the government of the. state. This state of things continued while the Jews were under the Persians and Creeks, until the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, in whose reign they appealed to arms, shook off the yoke of foreign subjugation, and, having obtained their freedom, made their high-priests princes, and at length kings. The Jews, likewise, who were scattered abroad, and had taken up their residence in countries at a distance from Palestine, had rulers of their own. The person who sustained the highest office among those who dwelt in Egypt was denominated alabcarch (q.v.); the magistrate at the head of the Syriafi Jews was denominated archon. SEE RULER.

While the Jews were under the Roman government they enjoyed the privilege of referring litigated questions to referees, whose decisions in reference to them the Roman praetor was bound to see put in execution.

After the subjugation of the Jews by the Romans, certain provinces of Judaea were governed by that class of magistrates denominated tetrarchs, an office said to have originated among the Gauls; and this appellation, although originally applied to the chief magistrate of the fourth part of a tribe, subject to the authority of the king, was afterwards extended in its application, and applied to any governors, subject to some king or emperor, without reference to the fact whether they ruled or not precisely the fourth part of a tribe of people. SEE TETRARCH.

Herod Antipas, accordingly, and Philip, although they did not rule so much as a fourth part of Judaea, were denominated tetrarchs (Mat 14:1; Luk 9:7; Act 13:1). Although this class of rulers were dependent upon Caesar, that is, the Roman emperor, they nevertheless governed the people who were committed to their immediate jurisdiction as much according to their own choice and discretion as if they had not been thus dependent. They were inferior, however, in point of rank, to the ethnarchs, who, although they did not publicly assume the name of king, were addressed with that  title by their subjects, as was the case with respect to Archelaus (Mat 2:22). A class of magistrates well known among the Romans, termed procurators, are denominated in the New Testament ἡγεμόνες, but it appears that they are called by Josephus ἐπίτροποι. Judaea, after the termination of the ethnarchate of Archelaus, was governed by rulers of this description, and likewise during the period which immediately succeeded the reign of Herod Agrippa.

Augustus made a new partition of the provinces of the Roman empire into provinciae senatoriae, which were left under the nominal care of the senate, and provinciae imperatoriae vel Caesarum, which were under the direct control of the emperor. To their provinces the senate sent officers for one year, called proconsuls, with only a civil power, and neither military command nor authority over the taxes: those sent to command in the imperial provinces were called legati Cetessris pro consule, etc., and had much greater powers. In each of these provinces, of both kinds, there was, besides the president, an officer called procurator Caesaris, who had the charge of the revenue, and who sometimes discharged the office of a governor or president, especially in a small province, or in a portion of a large one where the president could not reside; as did Pilate, who was procurator of Judaea, which was annexed to the provincia imperatoria of Syria; hence he had the power of punishing capitally, which the procurators did not usually possess; so also Felix, Festus, and the other procurators of Judaea. Some of the procurators were dependent on the nearest proconsul or president; for instance, those of Judaea were dependent on the proconsul, governor, or president of Syria. They enjoyed, however, great authority, and possessed the power of life and death. The only privilege, in respect to the officers of government, that was granted by the procurators of Judaea to the nation was the appointment from among them of persons to manage and collect the taxes. In all other things they administered the government themselves, except that they frequently had recourse to the counsel of other persons (Act 23:24-35; Act 25:23). SEE PROVINCE.

The military force that was granted to the procurators of Judaea consisted of six cohorts, of which five were stationed at Cesarea, where the procurator usually resided, and one at Jerusalem, in the tower of Antonia, which was so situated as to command the Temple (Act 10:1; Act 21:32). It was the duty of the military cohorts to execute the procurator's commands and to repress seditions (Mat 8:5; Mat 27:27; Mar 15:16; Joh 19:23). On the return of the great festivals, when there were vast crowds  of people at Jerusalem, the procurators themselves went from Caesarea to that city in order to be at hand to suppress any commotions which might arise (Mat 27:2-65; Joh 18:29; Joh 19:38). SEE GOVERNMENT.

## Magistrates[[@Headword:Magistrates]]

             In the early Church, magistrates, whatever the grade of their office, were under the spiritual jurisdiction of the clergy; and if they were impious or profane, they were subject to censure and excommunication. The Council of Aries, called by Constantine, ratified this ecclesiastical power. Synesius, bishop of Ptolemais, excommunicated Andronicus, the governor, for his blasphemies and cruelties, and with him all his accomplices. Athanasius pronounced a similar sentence on the governor of Libya. Ambrose denied the communion to the emperor Theodosius. But such a spiritual sentence did not deprive the magistrate of his lawful civil authority. The Church rendered allegiance to the rightful governor, whether heathen or heretic; but she had a perfect right to exclude from her fellowship any magistrate of erroneous creed or depraved life. She did not attempt to interfere with a magistrate's authority while she refused him ecclesiastical fellowship. The Roman Catholic Church has sought, in this practice of the early Church, an authority for her interference in temporal affairs. SEE KEYS, POWER OF THE; SEE TEMPORAL POWER OF THE POPE.

In Protestant Churches that are united with the state, these Romish views are manifest, though in a somewhat different form. The state controlling the Church, the magistrate is clothed with authority even in matters really pertaining to the domain of the ecclesiastic. Thus in Scotland the Westminster Confession gives to the magistrate extraordinary power in or about sacred things. The earlier Scottish Reformers went still further, as in the first Confession. The Books of Discipline are no less explicit. The First Book says, “We dare not prescribe unto you what penalties shall be required of such; but this we feare not to affirme, that the one and the other deserve death; for if he who doth falsifie the seale, subscription, or coine of a king, is judged worthy of death, what shall we think of him who plainly doth falsifie the seales of Christ Jesus, Prince of the kings of the earth? If Darius pronounced that a balk should be taken from the house of that man, and he himselfe hanged upon it, that durst attempt to hinder the re-edifying of the materiall temple, what shall we say of those that contemptuously blaspheme God, and manifestly hinder the temple of God, which is the soules and bodies of the elect, to be purged by the true preaching of Christ Jesus from the superstition and damnable idolatry in which they have bene long plunged  and holden captive? If ye, as God forbid, declare your selves carelesse over the true religion, God will not suffer your negligence unpunished; and therefore more earnestly we require that strait lawes may be made against the stubborne contemners of Christ Jesus, and against such as dare presume to minister his sacraments not orderly called to that office, least while that there be none found to gainstand impiety, the wrath of God be kindled against the whole.”

Nay, blasphemy was to be tried by the civil judge, but false weights and measures by the kirk. The Scottish Parliament, in 1560, enacted not only that the power and jurisdiction of the pope should cease in Scotland, but that all who either assisted or were present at mass should be punished, for the first offense, by confiscation of goods; for the second, by banishment; for the third, by death. It was believed that the magistrate had the same power in regard to the first table as to the second, a theory which, restoring the Jewish theocracy, would justify persecution, and put an end to toleration. For example, the Scottish Parliament in 1579 passed an act ordaining every householder worth three hundred merks of yearly rent, and every burgess or yeoman worth £500 stock, to have a Bible and psalm-book in their houses, under a penalty of £10.

## Magistris, Simone De[[@Headword:Magistris, Simone De]]

             a noted Italian Orientalist, was born at Serra di Scopamene (Corse), Feb. 28, 1728; went to Rome while yet a youth, entered the congregation of the Oratory of St. Philippe of Neri, and soon made a name for himself by his unusual proficiency in the ancient languages. Popes Clement XIV and Pius VI employed him in the research of ecclesiastical antiquities; he was made bishop of Cyrene, in partibus, and secretary of the congregation for the correction of works by the Oriental Church. In this last position his vast erudition displayed itself to the advantage of the Church of Rome. He died Oct. 6,1802. He wrote Daniel secundum Septuaginta ex tetraplis Origenis, nunc primum editus (Greek and Latin, Rome, 1772, fol.). This text of Daniel, after the Sept., had been given up for lost. Magistris, finding it in the library of the prince of Chigi, added to it the Greek interpretation of Theodotius; also a part of the book of Esther in Chaldee, and five dissertations: — Acta Martyrum ad Ostia Tiberina, ex. codice regiae bibliotheae- Taurinensis (Rome, 1795, fol.): — S. Dyonisii Alexandrisii episcopi, coognomento Magni. Opera quae supersunt (Rome, 1776, fol.): — Gli Alti di cinque Martiri nelle Corea, coll origine dellc fide in quel reqno (Rome, 1801, 8vo). — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Gen. 32:706.

## Magnanimity[[@Headword:Magnanimity]]

             greatness of soul, a disposition of mind exerted in contemning dangers and difficulties, in scorning temptations, and despising earthly pomp and splendor. — Cicero, De Offic. lect. 1, ch. 20; Grove, Moral Philosophy, 2:268; Steele, Christian Hero; Watts, Selfmur-der; Buck, Theological Dictionary, s.v. SEE COURAGE; SEE FORTITUDE.

## Magnentius, Flavius Magnus[[@Headword:Magnentius, Flavius Magnus]]

             a Roman general, for a short period emperor of the West, was born in Gaul about A.D. 300. Partly by courage and partly by flattery, he gained the confidence of the emperor Constans, and was entrusted with the command of the imperial guards, the famous Jovian and Herculean battalions. He afterwards, together with Marcellinus, chancellor of the imperial exchequer, conspired against Constans and caused himself to be elected emperor by the soldiers in 350. He was recognized as such by Italy, Spain, Brittany, and Africa, but the Illyrian legions elected Vetranio, who was soon joined by Constantius, brother of the late emperor. The war between Magnentius and Constantius ended in the defeat of the former at Mursa, Sept. 28, 352. As Magnentius saw that his soldiers would deliver him up to his enemies, he committed suicide at Lyons about the middle of August, 353. Zosimus, 2:54, represents him as overbearing in his prosperity, and weak and irresolute in adversity. He is shown to have been a Christian by the cross being stamped on his coins. The only part he took in ecclesiastical affairs was to prevent, for two years, Constantius from favoring Arianism. As for himself, he looked upon religion from a political stand-point; in order to conciliate the West, he gave more freedom to the heathen worship. He had relied on Athanasius to win over Egypt to his side, but in this he was mistaken, as Athanasius upheld the rights of the legitimate successor of Constans. — Herzog, Real-Encykl. 8:686; Smith, Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog. and Mythol. 2:900.

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

             a Swedish prelate, was born at Wexioe in 1583; traveled extensively on the Continent, especially in Germany, and on his return home became professor of history at his alma mater, the University of Upsala. Queen Christina, who succeeded her noble husband, Gustavus Adolphus, the great defender of the Protestant faith, in the government of Sweden (1632), frequently availed herself of the counsels of John Magri, and created him  bishop of Skara. He died in 1651, three years previous to Christina's abdication of the throne. SEE SWEDEN. Magni took a great interest in the educational affairs of Sweden, and did much to afford his countrymen far superior advantages than they had enjoyed previous to his day. His writings are of a secular nature. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 32:718; Biographie Universelle, s.v.

## Magni, Valerian[[@Headword:Magni, Valerian]]

             a celebrated Italian ecclesiastic, was born in Milan, Italy, in 1586; was appointed by pope Urban VIII apostolical missionary to the Northern kingdoms; influenced the pope to imprison the Jesuitesses in 1631; was himself imprisoned in Vienna some time afterwards, through the influence of the Jesuits, for having said that the pope's primacy and infallibility were founded on tradition and not on Scripture, but regained his liberty through the favor of the emperor Ferdinand III, after having written warmly against the Jesuits. He died at Saltzburg in 1661. Magni was celebrated as a controversial writer against the Protestants; also for his philosophical works in favor of Des Cartes and against Aristotle. One of his apologetical letters may be found in the collection called Tuba Magna, vol. ii. — Hook, Eccles. Biog. 7:209.

## Magnificat[[@Headword:Magnificat]]

             a song in praise of the Virgin used in the evening service of the Roman Catholic, the Lutheran, and Anglican churches. Its name Magnificat it obtained from its first words in the Vulgate, “My soul doth magnify the Lord,” etc. It was introduced into the public worship of the Church about the year 506. In the 6th century it was chanted in the French churches. In the English Church it is to be said or sung after the first, lesson, at every prayer, unless the 98th Psalm, called “Cantate Domino,” is sung. — Farrar, Eccles. Dict. s.v.; Eadie, Eccles. Cyclop. s.v.

## Magnus[[@Headword:Magnus]]

             The Roman Catholic Church commemorates several saints of this name.

1. ST. MAGNUS, Magnoald, Maginald, Mangold, of whom we possess two biographical notices, one by Perth, ii, according to which he was an Alleman by birth, and became the pupil, companion, and successor of St. Gall in the convent of that name. The other, to be found in the Bollandists,  Sept. 3:700 sq., states that he was a native of Ireland, built the convent of Fissen after the destruction of St. Gall, converted the inhabitants of Augsburg and surrounding parts, and finally died about 655. He is commemorated Sept. 6. See Koch-Stermfeld, Der h. Mangold in Oberschwaben (Passau, 1825); F. B. Tafrathshofer, Der h. Magnus (Kempten, 1842); F. W. Rettberg, Kirchengesch. Deutschlands, 2:148 sq.; Friedrich, Kirchengesch. Deutschlands (Bamb. 1868), ii (see Index); J. H. Kurtz, Handbuch d. allg. K. Gesch. 2:1, p. 115 sq.

2. ST. MAGNUS, the apostle of the Orkneys. The inhabitants of these islands possessed a large goblet which he is said to have drained: it was offered at once to every new bishop as he arrived, and it was considered a happy omen if he emptied it.

3. ST. MAGNUS, of Altinum, in Venicia, became bishop of Odessa about 638; transmitted his episcopal charge to Heraclea, and died about 660. He is commemorated Oct. 6.

4. ST. MAGNUS flourished in the early half of the 6th century, as bishop of Milan (522-529). He is commemorated Nov. 5. — Herzog, Real- Encyklop. 8:687; Pierer, Univ. Lex. 10:718. (J. N. P.)

## Magnus, John Or Jonas[[@Headword:Magnus, John Or Jonas]]

             a noted Swedish prelate, was born at Linkopinig March 19, 1488, of noble parentage. When only eighteen years old he obtained a canonicate at his native place; later he continued his theological studies at Louvain, afterwards in several universities of Germany and Italy, and resided several years at Rome, where he gained the favor of the papal court. In 1520 Perusa honored him with the doctorate of theology. A short time after, probably in 1523 (the year of Vasa's ascension to the throne), he was dispatched to his native country by pope Adrian VI to stem the inroads of the reformed doctrines in that northern country. Gustavus Vasa received Magnus kindly, and elevated him to the archbishopric of Upsal; but later, when Gustavus Vasa himself inclined towards Protestantism, Magnus made himself unpopular, and was finally obliged to quit the country, after Lutheranism and religious liberty had been established in Sweden (1527). Several later attempts to stem the progress of the reformed doctrines proved unsuccessful, and he returned disheartened to Rome in 1541. He died at Rome March 22, 1544. One of his works deserves our notice, Historia Metropolitana seu episcoporum et archiepiscoporum  Upsaliensium (Rome, 1557,1560, fol.). See Niceron, Memoires, 35, s.v.; Chauffepid, Diction. Hist. s.v.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 32:732.

## Magnus, Olaus[[@Headword:Magnus, Olaus]]

             a Swedish prelate, brother of the preceding, was born at Linkoping, near the close of the 15th century; was provost of the church at Stregnes when Gustavus I sent him to Rome to secure the papal confirmation to the appointment of his brother John to the archiepiscopal see of Upsal. It is not exactly known when Olaus returned to Sweden, but it is certain that after 1527 he was constantly with his brother as his secretary. After John's decease Olaus was appointed by the pope to succeed to the archbishopric of Upsal, but the Reformation had in the meanwhile changed the ecclesiastical relations in Sweden, and he never filled the archiepiscopal chair. He attended the Council of Trent by order of pope Paul III. Hence the mistake on the part of some writers of making John Magnus a member of the “ridentine gatherings, hich took place two years after his decease (1544). Olaus returned to Rome from Trent, and died there in 1568. His works, which are of minor interest, are given in Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 32:734.

## Magog[[@Headword:Magog]]

             (Heb. Magog', מָגוֹג, region of Gog [see below]; Sept. Μαγώγ, Vulg. Magog), the second son of Japhet (Gen 10:2; 1Ch 1:5). B.C. post 2514. “Various etymologies of the name have been suggested. Knobel (Vilke: t. p. 63) proposes the Sanscrit mah or malha, ‘great,' and a Persian word signifying ‘ mountain,' in which case the reference would be to the Caucasian range. The terms ghogh and noghef are still applied to some of the heights of that range. This etymology is supported by Von Bohlen (Introd. to Genesis 2:211). On the other hand, Hitzig (Comm. in Ez.) connects the first syllable with the Coptic ma, ‘place,' or the Sanscrit maha, ‘land,' and the second with a Persian root, koka, ‘ the moon,' as though the term had reference to moon-worshippers.” In Ezekiel (38:2; 39:6) it occurs as the name of a nation, and, from the associated names in all the passages where it occurs, it is supposed to represent certain Scythian or Tartar tribes descended from the son of Japhet. SEE ETHNOLOGY.

Thus, in Genesis, it is coupled with Gomer (the Cimmerians) and Madai (the Medes), among the Japhetites, while Ezekiel joins it with Meshech and Jubal (נָשַׂיא ראֹשׁ, “chief prince,” should be  prince of Rosh), as the name of a great and powerful people, dwelling in the extreme recesses of the north, who are to invade the Holy Land at a future time. Their king is there called Gog. The people of Magog further appear as having a force of cavalry (Eze 38:15), and as armed with the bow (Eze 39:3). The oldest versions give the word unchanged; but Josephus (Ant. 1:6, 3) interprets it by Scythians (Σκύθαι), and so Jerome; but Suidas renders it Persians. “Michaelis (Suppl. ad Lex. Heb. 1471), Rosenmuiller (Scholia in Gen 10:2), and Gesenius (Thesaurus, s.v.) adopt the view that the Scythians generally are intended. Bochart (Phaleg, 3:19) suggests that the name Gog appears in Ι᾿ωγαρηνή, the name of a district near to that through which the Araxes flows (Strabo, p. 528); and this falls in with the supposition that the Magogites were Scythians, for the traditions of the latter represent their nation as coming originally from the vicinity of the Araxes (Diod. Sic. 2:43). Since Bochart's time the general consent of scholars has been in favor of regarding the eastern Scythians as the Magog of Genesis; but Kiepert associates the name with Macija, or MAaka. and applies it to Scvthian nomad tribes which forceds themselves in between the Arian or Arianized Medes, Kurds, and Armenians' (Keil and Delitzsch, Bibl. Comment. on the O.T. [Clark], 1:163); while Bunsen places Magog in Armenia; though in the map accompanying his Bibelwerk it is placed to the north of the Emuxine. Knobel also places Magog there, and connects the Scythian tribes thus named with those which spread into Europe, and were allied to the Sarmatians, who gave their name ultimately to the whole north-east of Europe, and are the ancestors of the Slavic nations now existing” (Kitto). It is certain that the term Scythian was a collective title of the remote savage tribes of the north in a similar manner to the use of Magcog (Cellarii Notit. 2:753 sq.). SEE SCYTHIAN.

There appears to have been from the earliest times a legend that the enemies of religion and civilization lived in that quarter (Haxthausen's Tribes of the Caucasus, p. 55). From the accounts found among the Arabians, Persians, and Syrians. some of which are embellished with various fables. we learn that they comprehended under the designation Yajuj and Majuj all the less known barbarous people of the north-east and north-west of Asia. (See the Koran, 18:94-99; 21:96; Assemani, Bibl. Orient. IlI, 2:1, 17, 20; Hylander, Spec. op. cnsmog. pt. 20-22 [Lond. 1803]; Klaproth, Asiat. Magaz. 1:138 sq.; Herbelot, Biblioth. Orient. 2:281 sq.; Flügel, in the Halle Encycl. II, 14:78 sq.) Yet, though the Gog and Magog of the Hebrews may have had an equally vague acceptation, it nevertheless seems to have pointed more  precisely to the northern tribes of the Caucasus, between the Euxine and the Caspian Seas. The people of that region, it seems, were a terror to middle Asia; and they have often been named the Scythians of the East. Jerome says of Magog that it means “Scythian nations, fierce and innumerable, who live beyond the Caucasus and the lake Maeotis, and near the Caspian Sea, and spread out even onward to India.” The people dwelling among the Caucasian Mountains have preserved their original character down to the present hour, as is evident from their recent long- continued contests with the Russians. The famous Caucasian wall, probably erected by some of the successors of Alexander the Great, as a defense against the incursions of the northern barbarians, and which extended from Derbend, on the western shore of the Caspian, to near the Euxine or Black Sea, is still called “the wall of Gog and Magog.” (See Reinegg, Beschr. d. Caucasus, 2:79.)

The traveler Gmelin visited this wall in 1770, in the course of the scientific mission upon which he was sent by the Russian government. From Derbend. on the Caspian Sea, the head- quarters of the Russian military guard in that country, Gmelin directed his course westward, towards the Euxine, and he soon met with some ruins of the ancient wall, which he describes as in some places thirty feet high, and for large distances nearly entire, and in other places partially or wholly fallen down. There are watch-towers along the wall at signal distances; two of these he ascended, and from their tops he could descry the snowy ridges of Caucasus. This wall seems to have been built in almost a straight line from the Caspian to the Euxine, and the watch-towers and fortresses were probably erected as a means of keeping up communication between Derbend, the garrison at the eastern extremity, and the fastnesses in the mountains. (See Bayer, De Muro Caucasio, in Acta Acad. Scientiar. Petropsol. 1:425; Ker Porter, Travels, 2:520; Ritter, Erdik. 2:834 sq.) In Rev 20:7; Rev 20:9, the terms Gog and Magog are evidently used tropically, as names of the enemies of Christianity, who will endeavor to extirpate it from the earth, but will thereby bring upon themselves signal destruction. But that Ezekiel, in his prophecy, meant to be understood as predicting the invasion of Palestine by Gog and Magog in the literal sense, is hardly credible. He uses these names to designate distant and savage nations;. and in the same way John employs them. Just in the same manner we now employ the word barbarians. That both writers should employ these two names in a tropical way is no more strange than that we should employ the words Scythian, Tartar, Indian, etc., in the same manner. Nothing could be more natural than for Ezekiel, who lived in  Mesopotamia, to speak of Gog and Magog, since they were the formidable enemies of all that region; and that John, writing on the same subject, should retain the same names, was equally natural. (See Stuart's Comment. on the Apoc. ad loc.) SEE GOG.

## Magoon, Elias Lyman, D.D[[@Headword:Magoon, Elias Lyman, D.D]]

             a Baptist minister, was born at Lebanon, N.H., October 20, 1810. He graduated from Waterville College, Maine, in 1836, and from Newton  Theological Seminary in 1839; was settled over a church at Richmond, Virginia, for six years, until the division of his church on the question of slavery led him to resign. He next served a church in Cincinati, Ohio, until 1849, when he took charge of a church in New York city. In 1857-67 he was pastor of a church in Albany, in 1867-84 pastor of the Broad Street Church, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. He retired from the pulpit in 1884, and died, November 20, 1886. Dr. Magoon published, Eloquence of the Colonial Times (1847): — Orators of the American Revolution (1848): — Proverbs for the People (eod.): — Living Orators in America (1849): — Republican Christianity (eod.): — Westward Empire (1856).

## Magor-missabib[[@Headword:Magor-missabib]]

             (Hebrew, lMagor' mis-sabib', מָגוֹד מַסָּבַיב, terror from around about; Sept. Μέτοικος κυκλόθεν, Vulg. Pavor undiquae), an epithet applied at the divine instance by Jeremiah to the persecuting: Pashur (q.v.), emblematical of his signal fate, as explained in the context (Jer 20:3). “It is remarkable that the same phrase occurs in several other passages of Jeremiah (6:25; 20:10; 46:5; 49:29; Lam 2:22), and is only found besides in Psa 31:13” (Smith).

## Magpiash[[@Headword:Magpiash]]

             (Heb. Magpiash', מִגְפַּיעָשׁ, perhaps for מִגְּפַיעָשׁ, moth-killer; Sept. Μαγαφής v. r. Μεγαφής, Vulg. Megphias), one of the chief Israelites who joined. in the sacred covenant instituted on the return from Babylon (Neh 10:20). B.C. cir. 410. Some suppose the name, however, to be the same as MAGBISH SEE MAGBISH (q.v.) of Ezr 2:30.

## Magraw, James, D.D[[@Headword:Magraw, James, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Bart Township, Lancaster County, Pennsylvania, January 1, 1775. He graduated from Franklin College, Lancaster, about 1799. After studying theology, he was licensed, December 16, 1801, by the Presbytery of Middletown; preached as a missionary for a year or two; and was ordained April 4, 1804, pastor of the Church in West Nottingham, Cecil County, Maryland. Here he remained till 1810, when a church was formed in Upper West Nottingham, which he also served till 1821. In 1822 he organized a church at Charlestown, of which he was pastor till his death, October 20, 1835. Besides preaching, Dr. Magraw was engaged for many years in teaching. (J.C.S.),

## Magri (Lat. Macer), Dominico[[@Headword:Magri (Lat. Macer), Dominico]]

             a Roman Catholic prelate, was born March 28, 1604, and died March 4, 1672, at Viterbo. He is the author of Notitia de' Vocaboli Ecclesiastici (Rome, 1650; Lat. transl. by himself and his brother Carold, Hierolexicon, etc., 3d ed. 1677 fol.; latest edition, Venice, 1712). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:608. (B.P.)

## Magyar Version[[@Headword:Magyar Version]]

             SEE HUNGARIAN VERSION.

## Magyars[[@Headword:Magyars]]

             SEE HUNGARY.

## Maha-Kala[[@Headword:Maha-Kala]]

             is another name of the Hindu divinity SIVA (q.v.).

## Maha-Kali[[@Headword:Maha-Kali]]

             SEE KALI

## Maha-Pralya[[@Headword:Maha-Pralya]]

             (i.e. the “great end” or “great destruction”), a term applied by the Hindus to the final consummation of all things, which they suppose will take place after a hundred years of Brahma have elapsed (each Brahmanic day, with its night, is reckoned as 8640 millions of our years). At the time referred to, all the gods, including Brahma, as well as all creatures, will be annihilated; Brahm, the eternal, self-existent Spirit, will alone remain. See Moor, Hindoo Pantheon; Thomas, Dict. of Biog. and Mythol. s.v.

## Maha-Rudra[[@Headword:Maha-Rudra]]

             is another name of SIVA SEE SIVA (q.v.). SEE RUDRA.

## Maha-bharata[[@Headword:Maha-bharata]]

             (from the Sans. mahat — changed to mahâ — great, and Bhârata, a famous Hindu prince) is the name of a great epic poem of ancient India. As its main story relates to the contest between two rival families. both descendants of a king, Bharata, the title probably implies “the great history of the descendants of Bharata.” In its present shape the poem consists of upwards of 100,000 verses, each containing 32 syllables. and is divided into 18 parvans or books. That this huge composition was not the work of one single individual, but a production of successive ages, clearly appears from the multifariousness of its contents, from the difference of style which characterizes its various parts, and even from the contradictions which disturb its harmony. Hindu tradition ascribes it to Vsyasa; but as Vyvsa means “the distributer or arranger,” and as the same individual is also the  reputed compiler of the Vedas, Puranas, and several other works, it is obvious that no historical value can be assigned to this generic name.

The contents of the poem may be distinguished into the leading story and the episodical matter connected with it. The former is probably founded on real events in the oldest history of India, though in the epic narrative it will be difficult to disentangle the reality from the fiction. The story (which covers about one fourth of the whole poem) comprises the contest of the celebrated families called the Kauravas and Pandavas, ending in the victory of the latter, and in the establishment of their rule over the northern part of India. Of course no unimportant part is assigned in the contest to the deities, and, consequently, Hindu mythology is pretty extensively interwoven with these events of semi-historical Hindu antiquity. This episodical matter, as it were, incidentally linked with the main story, may be distributed under three principal heads. One category of such episodes comprises narratives relating to the ancient or mythical history of India, as, for instance, the episodes of Nala and Sakuntala; a second is more strictly mythological, comprising cosmogony and theogony; a third is didactic or dogmatic — it refers to law, religion, morals, and philosophy, as in the case of the celebrated Bhagavadgits, and the principal portions of the 12th and 13th books. By means of this episodical matter, which at various periods, and often without regard to consistency, was superadded to the original structure of the work, the Mahabharata gradually became a collection of all that was needed to be known by an educated Hindu; in fact, it became the encyclopaedia of India, notwithstanding that the Brahmanic authors themselves intended it mainly for the Kshattriya, or military caste, whose history, interests, religion, and deities it specially dwells upon. The text of the Mahabharata has been published at Calcutta (5 vols. 4to, 1834-1839. Vol. 5 is a table of contents). Two other editions are in course of publication at Bombay. The best researches on it are those by Lassen, in his Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Moagenlandes (1837 sq.), and in his Indische Altermthumskunde. A sort of analysis of the leading story of the Mahabharata (not of the episodes) has lately been given by F. G. Eichhoff (Poesie Heroique des Indiens, Paris, 1860), and by Professor Monier Williams (Indian Epic Poetry, London, 1863). See also Schack, Stimmen von Ganges (Berl. 1856); Chambers, Cyclop. s.v.

## Maha-deva[[@Headword:Maha-deva]]

             (i.e. “the great god”) is one of the names by which the Hindu god Siva is called. In Buddlhistic history, Mahadeva, who lived 200 years after the death of the Buddha Sakvamuni, or 343, is a renowned teacher who caused a schism in the Buddhistic Church. His adversaries accuse him of every possible crime; but, as he is ranked among the Arhats, his eminence cannot be matter of doubt. The school founded by him is called Parvas, stila. See W. Wassiljew, Der Buddhismus, etc. (St. Petersburg, 1860).

## Maha-kasyapa[[@Headword:Maha-kasyapa]]

             is the name of one of the most renowned disciples of the Buddha Saikyanvni (q.v.). He arranged metaphysically the portion of the sacred writings of the Buddhists called Abhidharma; and tradition ascribes to him also the origin of the Sthavira division of the Vaibhashika school of Buddhistic philosophy. Many legends are connected with his life. See E. Burnouf, Introduction a l'Histoire du Buddhisme Indien (Paris, 1844), and his posthumous work, Le Lotus de la Bonne Loi (Paris, 1852).

## Maha-maya[[@Headword:Maha-maya]]

             is the name of the mother of BUDDHA. SEE GAUTAMA.

## Maha-sanghika[[@Headword:Maha-sanghika]]

             is the name of one of the two great divisions of the Buddhistic Church which arose about two hundred years after the death of the Buddha Sakyamuni, or about 343. SEE STHAVIRA. Out of this school arose, in the course of the next centuries, numerous sects. For the tenets common to all, and for those peculiar to each of these sects, the special student of the Buddhist religion will at present most advantageously consult the work of Prof. W. Wassiljew, Der Buddhismus, seine Dogmen, Geschichte und Literatur (St. Petersburg, 1860).

## Maha-vansa[[@Headword:Maha-vansa]]

             is the title of two celebrated works written in Pali, and relating to the early history of Ceylon (q.v.). The older work was probably composed by the monks of the convent Uttaravihâra at Anuradhapura, the capital of Ceylon. Its date is uncertain, but it apparently preceded the reign of Dhatusena (459-477), as that monarch ordered it to be read in public, a circumstance which seems to prove the celebrity it already enjoyed in his time. The later work of the same name is an improved edition and continuation of the former. Its author, Mahânâma, was the son of an aunt of the king  Dhatusena, and he brings down the history of Ceylon, like his predecessor, to the death of Mahasena. A first volume of the text of the latter Work, “in Roman characters, with a translation subjoined, and an introductory essay on Pali Buddhistic literature,” was published by the Hon. George Turnour (Ceylon, 1837). See also Lassen, Indische Alterthumskunde, 2:15 sq. (Bonn, 1852).

## Maha-vira[[@Headword:Maha-vira]]

             (literally “the great hero”), also called Vira and Vardhamalna, is the twenty-fourth or last Jina, or deified saint, of the Jainas (q.v.), described as of a golden complexion, and having a lion for his symbol. His legendary history is given in the Kalpa-Sutru (q.v.) and the Mahaviram-Charitra. According to these, Mahavira's birth occurred at a period infinitely remote; it was as Nayasara, the head man of a village, that he first appeared in the country of Vijaya, subject to Satrumardana. He was next born as Marichi, the grandson of the first Jaina saint Rishabha; he then came to the world of Brahmic, was reborn as a worldly-minded Brahmana, and after several other births-each being separated from the other by an interval passed in one of the Jaina heavens, and each period of life extending to many hundreds of thousands of years — he quitted the state of a deity to obtain immortality as a saint, and was incarnate towards the close of the fourth age (now past), when seventy-five years and eight and a half months of it remained. After he was thirty years of age he renounced worldly pursuits, and departed, amid the applause of gods and men, to practice austerities. Finally, he became an Arhat or Jina; and at the age of seventy-two years, the period of his liberation having arrived, “he resigned his breath,” and his body was burned by Indra and other deities, who erected a splendid monument on the spot, and then returned to their respective heavens. At what period these events occurred is not stated, but, judging from some of the circumstances narrated, the last Jina expired about five hundred years before the Christian sera. Other authorities make the date of this event about a century and a half earlier.

The works above referred to state, with considerable detail, the conversions worked by Mahavira. Among the pupils were Indrabhuti (also called Gautama, and for this reason, but erroneously, considered as the same with the founder of the Buddhist religion), Agnibhuti, Vayubhuti — all three sons of Vasubhuti, a Braihmana of the Gotama tribe, and others. These converts to Jaina principles are mostly made in the same manner:  each comes to the saint prepared to overwhelm him with shame, when he salutes them mildly, and, as the Jainas hold, solves their metaphysical or religious doubts. Thus Indrabhuti doubts whether there be a living principle or not; Vayubhuti doubts if life be not body; Mandita has not made up his mind on the subjects of bondage and liberation; Aehalabhratri is skeptical as to the distinction between vice and virtue, and so on. Mahavira removes all their difficulties, and, by teaching them the Jaina truth, converts them to the doctrine of his sect. For a summary account of the life of this saint, see H. T. Colelbroke's Miscellaneous Essays, 2:213 sq.; H. H. Wilson's Works, 1:291 sq.

## Mahadi or Mehdi[[@Headword:Mahadi or Mehdi]]

             (Arab. director, sovereign, or pontiff) is the surname, by way of excellence, of the twelfth and last imam (q.v.) of the race of Ali. This Mahadi, who bore the same name with the false prophet, being called Abulcassem Mohammed, was born in the year of the Hegira 255, and, according to Persian tradition, when nine years old, was shut up in a cave or cistern by his mother. and is there kept till he shall appear at the end of the world, and Jesus Christ shall destroy Antichrist, and make of the two laws, the Mussulman and Christian, but one. Some among them believe that this imam was twice hidden; the first time from his birth to the age of 74 years, during which interval he secretly conversed with his disciples without being seen by others, because most of the imams who preceded him had been poisoned by the caliphs, who knew their pretensions, and feared a revolt in their favor. The second retreat of this imam is from the time his death was made known to the time which Providence has appointed for his manifestation. The disciples of this Mahadi give him the title of Motebatthen, the secret or concealed. There is in Chaldaea, in a little province called by the Arabians Ahvaz, a castle named Hesn Mahadi, where all the waters of that country join and form a marsh, which runs into the sea. It is here, according to the Shiites, that Mahadi will make his appearance. See D'Herbelot, Bibl. Orient. s.v.; Broughton, Bibl. Hist. Sac. vol. 2, s.v.; Malcolm, Hist. of Persia, 2:345, note.

## Mahalah[[@Headword:Mahalah]]

             (1Ch 7:18). SEE MAHLAH.

## Mahalaleel[[@Headword:Mahalaleel]]

             (Heb. Mahalel', מִהֲלִלְאֵל, praise of God; Sept. and N.T. Μαλελεήλ), the name of two men.

1. The son of the antediluvian patriarch Cainan, of the line of Seth, born when his father was seventy years old; he became the father of Jared at sixty-five years of age, and lived to the age of eight hundred and; sixty-five years (Gen 5:12-17; 1Ch 1:2; Luk 3:37 in which last passage the name is Anglicized “Maleleël”). B.C. 3777-2881. “Ewald recognizes in Mahalaleel the sun-god, or Apollo of the antediluvian mythology, and in his son Jared the god of water, the Indian Varuna (Gesch. 1:357), but, his assertions are perfectly arbitrary.”

2. A Judiate of the family of Pharez, father of Shephatiah, and ancestor of one Athaiall, who resided at Jerusalem after the exile (Neh 11:4). . B.C. much ante 536.

## Mahalath[[@Headword:Mahalath]]

             (Heb. Machcalath', מִהֲלִת, a lute, otherwise the title of a song) the name of two women. See below.

1. (Sept. Μαελέθ,Vulg. Maheleth.) The daughter of Ishmael, and third wife of Esau (Gen 28:9); elsewhere called BASHEMATH (Gen 36:3); but the Samar. Pent. has Mahalath in both passages. SEE ESAU.

2. (Septuag. Μολάθ v. r. Μοολάθ, Vulg. Malhalath.) The daughter of Jerimoth. granddaughter of David. and wife of Kehoboam (2 Chronicles xi.  18). B.C. 973. “She was thus her husband's cousin, being the daughter of king David's son. who was probably the child of a concubine, and not one of his regular family. Josephus, without naming Mahalath, speaks of her as ‘a kinswoman' (συγγενῆ τινα, A nt. 8:10, 1). No children are attributed to the marriage. nor is she again named. The ancient Hebrew text (K-ethib) in this passage has ‘son' instead of daughter.' The latter, however, is the correction of the Keri, and is adopted by the Sept., Vulg, and Targum, as well as by the A. V.”

## Mahalath Maschil[[@Headword:Mahalath Maschil]]

             occurs in the title of Psalms 53, and MA'HALATH LEAN'NOTH MAS'CHIL in the title of Psalms 88. For these latter names, see each in its alphabetical order. The term MAHALATH (Heb. Machalath', מִחֲלִת, Sept. Μαελέθ,Vulg. Maeleth, Maheleth) is thought by Gesenius (Thesaur. Heb. p. 476) to be for מִחֲלָה, from חָלָה, to be sweet, spoken of musical sounds; hence signifying a stringed instrument, e.g. a lute or yuitar, accompanied by the voice. Furst however, denies (Heb. Lex. s.v.) that it denotes an instrument at all, and maintains that it was the title of an old air to which the psalms in question were to be sung. Ludolph (p. 272) compares the equivalent AEthiopic, signifying a song or hymn. The use of Leannoth in the same connection would perhaps favor the reference to some kind of instrument; but the versions render no assistance as to the meaning of either word, and most interpreters resort either to vague conjecture or mystical allusions. The use of the particle עִל, “s upon,” before “Mahalath,” in each case, seems to indicate some kind of instrument. SEE PSALMS.

## Mahali[[@Headword:Mahali]]

             (Exo 6:19). SEE MAHLI.

## Mahan, Asa, D.D., LL.D[[@Headword:Mahan, Asa, D.D., LL.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born in Verilon, N.Y., November 9, 1799; graduated from Hamilton College in 1824, and from Andover Theological Seminary, in 1827, was a pastor until 1835, when he became president of Oberlin College (1835-50); president and professor of mental and moral philosophy in Cleveland University, 1850-54; was pastor again in 1865-61; thereafter president and professor of mental and moral philosophy in Adrian College until 1871; after that date without charge; and after the year 1874 resided in England until his death, April 4, 1889. Dr. Mahan edited for many years, a monthly entitled the Divine Life. He published several works on Philosophy: —Doctrine of the Will: — Lectures on Romans 9 : — A Critical History of the Late American War: — and several works on the higher life.

## Mahan, Milo, D.D[[@Headword:Mahan, Milo, D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal clergyman, was born at Suffolk, Virginia, May 24, 1819. He was educated at St. Paul's College, Flushing, N.Y.; entered the ministry in 1845; in 1851 became professor of ecclesiastical history in the General Theological Seminary, New York city; in 1864 removed to Baltimore, Md., as rector of St. Paul's Church, and in this parish continued to serve until his death, September 3, 1870. He published several religious works, including Palmoni, a curious chronological treatise, which were collected, with a memoir, by Reverend J.H. Hopkins, Jr. (N.Y. 1872-75, 3 volumes). See Prot. Episc. Almanac, 1871, page 118.

## Mahanaim[[@Headword:Mahanaim]]

             (Hebrew Machana'yin, מִחֲנִיַם, two camps, as often, and explained in Gen 32:2 as meaning the heavenly army of God; where the Sept. has Παρεμβολαί,Vulg. Mahanaim, id est Castra; elsewhere ΜαανάÞμ or  Μααναϊvμ, once Μαναέμ, sometimes παρεμβολαί; Vulg. Manaim, but usually castra), a place beyond the Jordan, north of the river Jabbok, which derived its name from Jacob's having been there met by the angels (Josephus, Θεοῦ στρατόπεδον, Ant. 1:20, 1) on his return from Padan- aram (Gen 32:2). SEE JACOB.

The name was eventually extended to the town which then existed, or which afterwards arose in the neighborhood. This town was on the confines of the tribes of Gad and Manasseh, as well as on the southern boundary of Bashan (Jos 13:26; Jos 13:30), and was a city of the Levites (Jos 21:38; 1Ch 6:80). It was in this city that Ishbosheth, the son of Saul, reigned (2Sa 2:8; 2Sa 2:12) during David's reign at Hebron, and here he was assassinated (ch. 4). The choice of this place was probably because he found the influence of David's name less strong on the east than on the west of the Jordan; at least, it seems to show that Mahanaim was then an important and strong place (comp. 2Sa 2:29; 2Sa 19:32). Hence, many years after, David himself repaired to Mahanaim, where he was entertained by Barzillai, the aged sheik of that district, when he sought refuge beyond the Jordan from his son Absalom (2Sa 17:24; 2Sa 17:27; 1Ki 2:8). In this vicinity also appears to have been fought the decisive battle in the wood of Ephraim, between the royal troops and the rebels (2 Samuel 18). SEE DAVID.

We only read of Mahanaim again as the station of one of the twelve officers who had charge, in monthly rotation, of raising the provisions for the royal establishment under Solomon (1Ki 4:14). Some find a allusion to the place in Son 6:13 (“companies of two armies,” lit. dance of Mahanaim), but this is doubtful. “On the monument of Sheshonk (Shishak) at Karnak, in the 22d cartouchone of those which are believed to contain the names of Israelitish cities conquered by that king — a name appears which is read as Ma-ha-n-m -a, that is, Mahanaim. The adjoining cartouches contain names which are read as Bethshean, Shunerm, Megiddo, Beth-boron, Gibeon, and other Israelitish names (Brugsch, Geogr. der nachbarländer AEgyptens, p. 61). If this interpretation may be relied on, it shows that the invasion of Shishak was more extensive than we should gather from the records of the Bible (2 Chronicles 13), which are occupied mainly with occurrences at the metropolis. Possibly the army entered by the plains of Philistia and Sharon, ravaged Esdraelon and some towns like Mahanaim just beyond Jordan, and then returned, either by the same route of by the Jordan valley, to Jerusalem, attacking it last. This would account for Rehoboam's non- resistance, and also for the fact, of which special mention is made, that  many of the chief men of the country had taken refuge in the city. It should, however, be remarked that the names occur in most promiscuous order, and that none has been found resembling Jerusalem.” In Dr. Eli Smith's Arabic list of names of places in Jebel Ajlh.n (Robinson's Bib. Researches, 3, Append. p. 166), we find a ruined site under the name of Mahneh, which is probably that of Mahanaim (comp. Schwarz, Palest. p. 231; Keil's Comment. on Jos 13:26). The same identification was pointed out by the Jewish traveler Hap-Parchi, according to whom it lies about half a day's journey due east of Bethshan (Zunz, in Asher's edit. of Benj. of Tudela, p. 40), the same direction as in Kiepert's Map, but only half as far. Its distance from the Jabbok is a considerable but not fatal objection. Tristram visited the place which he defends at length as the site of Mahanaim, and describes it as well situated for a large town, with considerable remains and a fine pond (Land of Israel, p. 483).

## Mahaneh-dan[[@Headword:Mahaneh-dan]]

             (Heb. Machaneh'-Dan, מִחֲנְהאּדָן, camp of Dan; Septuag. Παρεμβολὴ Δάν, Vulg. Casitre Dan), a name given to a spot west of Kirjath-jearim, in consequence of its having been the encampment of the party of Danites on their way to capture Laish (Jdg 18:12). Mr. Williams suggests a site called Beit Mahanem, on the north side of wady Ismail. and N.N.E. of Deir el Howa (Holy City, 1:12, note); but the name appears on no map, and occurs in no other traveler.

## Maharai[[@Headword:Maharai]]

             (Hebrew Maharay', מִהֲרִי, hasty; Sept. Μαχαραϊv and Μοοραί v. r. Μαραϊv and Μεηρά), a Netophathite, and one of David's chief warriors (2Sa 23:28; 1Ch 11:30); being a descendant of Zerah,  and the tenth captain of a contingent of 24,000 men (1Ch 27:13). B.C. 1014.

## Mahath[[@Headword:Mahath]]

             (Heb. fMam'chath, מִחִת, prob. for מִחְתֶּה, grasping; Sept. Μαάθ), the name of two Levites.

1. A Kohathite, son of Amasai and father of Elkanah (1Ch 6:35); apparently the same elsewhere (1Ch 6:25) called AHIMOTH SEE AHIMOTH (q.v.). B.C. cir. 1375. SEE SAMUEL.

2. Another Kohathite, one of those who cleansed the Temple in the reformation instituted by Hezekiah (2Ch 29:12), and was appointed by that king one of the subordinate overseers of the sacred revenues (2 31:13). B.C. 726.

## Mahavite[[@Headword:Mahavite]]

             (Hebrew only in the plur. Machavim', מִחֲיַים, reviving; Sept. Μαωείν v. r. Μαωϊv,Vulg. Mahumites, Auth.Vers. “Mahavite;” probably by erroneous transcription for the sing. מִחֲוַי), apparently a patrial attribute of Eliel, one of David's body-guard (1Ch 11:46); but no place or person Mahavah or Mahavai is anywhere else alluded to from which the title could have been derived. There is doubtless some corruption in the text. “The Targum has דְמַן מִחֲוָוא, ‘from Machavua.' Kennicott (Dissert. p.231) conjectures that originally the Hebrew may have stood מהחוים, ‘from the Hivites.' Others have proposed to insert an N and read ‘ the Mahanaimite' (Furst, Handwb. p. 721 a; Bertheau, Chronik. p. 136).”

## Mahazioth[[@Headword:Mahazioth]]

             (Heb. Machazioth', מִחֲזַיאוֹת, visions; Sept. Μααζιώθ v. r. Μεαζώθ), the last named of the fourteen sons of Heman the Levite (1Ch 25:4), and leader under him of the twenty-third division of the Temple musicians as arranged by David (1Ch 25:30). B.C. 1014.

## Maher-shalal-hash-baz[[@Headword:Maher-shalal-hash-baz]]

             (Heb. Maher'-Shalal'-Chash-Baz, מִהֵר שָׁלָל חָשׁ בִּז, speeding for booty he hastes to the spoil; Sept. ὀξέως προνομὴν ποιῆσαι σκύλων and Ταχέως σκύλευσον, ὀξέως προνόμευσον,Vulg. Velociter spolia detsrahe, cito praemdare and Accelera spolia detrahere, festiia pracedsci; for the grammatical construction, see Gesenius, Comment. ad loc.), words which the prophet Isaiah was first commanded to write in large characters upon a tablet, n and afterwards to give as a symbolical name to a son that  was to be born to him (Isa 8:1; Isa 8:3). as prognostic of the sudden attack of Damascus and Syria by the Assyrian army (see Henderson's Comment. ad loc.). The child in question was evidently the prophet's son by “the prophetess” whom he espoused in pursuance of the divine mandate, and appears to have been the same with the one whose birth under the more Messianic title of IMMANUEL was at once a token to Ahaz of the coming defeat of his enemies (Isa 7:14-16), and an illustrious type of Gospel deliverance. B.C. 739.

## Mahes(H)A And Meheswara[[@Headword:Mahes(H)A And Meheswara]]

             are names by which Siva is sometimes called. SEE SIVA.

## Mahlah[[@Headword:Mahlah]]

             (Heb. Machlah', מִחְלָה, another form for מִחֲלָה, disease, as in Exo 15:26, etc.), the name of two persons.

1. (Sept. Μοολά v. r. Μαελά, Vulg. Mohola, Auth. Vers. “Mahalah.”) Apparently a son (but perhaps a daughter) of Hamoleketh, a female descendant of Manasseh; the father's name is not given, but two brothers are mentioned (1Ch 7:18). B.C. prob. cir. 1658.

2. (Sept. Μααλά,Vulg. Melcha.) The first named of the five daughters and heiresses of Zelophehad, of the tribe of Manasseh west, who married among their kindred (Num 26:33; Num 27:1; Num 36:11; Jos 17:13). B.C. 1618.

## Mahli[[@Headword:Mahli]]

             (Heb. Machli', מִחְלַי, sick; Sept. Μοολί, Vulg. Moholi; but in Exo 6:19, Μοολεί, Auth. Vers. “Mahali;” SEE MAHLITE ), the name of two Levites.

1. A son of Merari, and grandson of Levi (Exo 6:19; Num 3:20; 1Ch 6:19; 1Ch 23:21; 1Ch 24:26; 1Ch 24:28; Ezr 8:18). Among his sons was one named Libni (1Ch 6:29). His descendants were named after him (Num 3:33; Num 26:58). B.C. post 1856.

2. A son of Mushi, and nephew of the preceding (1Ch 23:23; 1Ch 24:30). He had a son named Shamer (1Ch 6:47). B.C. ante 1658.

## Mahlite[[@Headword:Mahlite]]

             (Heb. only in the singular collectivelv, Machli', מִחַלַי, patronymic of the same form from MAHLI; Sept. Μοολί, Vulg. Moholitae; but in Num 26:58, Sept. omits, Vulg. Moaholi; A. Vers. constantly “Mahlites”), the descendants of Mahli, the son of Merari (Num 3:33; Num 26:58).

## Mahlon[[@Headword:Mahlon]]

             (Hebrew Alachlon', מִחְלוֹן, sickly; Sept. Μααλών, Vulg. Mahalon), the elder of the two sons of Elimelech the Bethlehemite by Naomi; they removed with him to Moab, where this one married Ruth, and died childless (Rth 1:2; Rth 1:5; Rth 4:9-10). B.C. cir. 1360. SEE RUTH. “It is uncertain which was the elder of the two. In the narrative (Rth 1:2; Rth 1:5) Mahlon is mentioned first, but in his formal address to the elders in the gate (Rth 4:9), Boaz says ‘Chilion and Mahlon.' Like his brother, Mahlon died in the land of Moab without offspring, which in the Targum on Ruth (Rth 1:5) is explained to have been a judgment for their transgression of the law in marrying a Moabitess. In the Targum on 1Ch 4:22, Mahlon is identified with Joash, possibly on account of the double meaning of the Hebrew word which follows, and which signifies both ‘had dominion' and ‘married.'

## Mahmiud[[@Headword:Mahmiud]]

             ABUL-KASIU YEMIN ED-DOWLAH, one of the most celebrated of the Mohammedan sovereigns, the founder of the Gaznevide dynasty, and the first who established a permanent Moslem empire in India, was born at Gazna (or Ghizni) in A.D. 967. His father was originally a Turkish slave, but having become governor, under the sovereign of Persia, of the province of Kandahar, he finally secured for his own possession the whole of the Punjab (q.v.), besides the Afghan dominions. Mahmid came to the throne A.D. 997. Already, during the reign of his father, Mahmiud had distinguished himself by superior warlike qualities. Ill treated by Mansir, the Samanide sovereign of Persia, he made war against him, resulting in the overthrow of the Samanide dynasty, and the establishment of Mahmud himself as the most powerful monarch in Asia. A devout Mussulman, he aspired to the character of an apostle of his religion. “His chief ambition was to extend his religion throughout the rich provinces of India, a task to  which he was stimulated by a belief, cherished from his early boyhood, that he was intrusted with a divine mission to extirpate idolatry from the land of the Hindus.”

In twelve successive expeditions into India, during a reign of thirty-five years, he carried fire and sword among the idolaters, dethroned and slew several princes, plundered and burned their cities, stormed the forts, massacred the garrisons, ravaged the fielas, and carried away so many natives into captivity, that the price of a slave was reduced at (Gazna to a couple of rupees; and all this notwithstanding that all India regarded the contest with Mahms id in the light of a holy war, and that no sacrifice of money or men was spared to defend the religion of their forefathers (compare Moore's poem Paradise and the Peri). Mahmuid extended his conquests not only over the whole of the Punjab, but penetrated as far as Bundelcund on the east, and Guzerat on the south. It has frequently been charged that these incursions to India were made. by Mahmid rather for the sake of spoil than to extend the Mussulman faith (comp. Trevor, India, p. 72), but there is every evidence, both in the fact that his arms were constantly directed against the religion rather than the people, and in his lavish expenditure at Gazna of the treasures brought from India, and in the encouragement he gave to learning, that Mahmud believed in his divine mission. He founded a university in Gazna, with a vast collection of curious books, in various languages, and a museum of natural curiosities. He appropriated a large sum for the maintenance of this establishment. He also set aside £10,000 a year for pensions to learned men. He died in 1030. The great Mussulman poet Firdfisi flourished at this time. See Ferishta, History of the Rise of the Mohamnmedan Power in India (translated by general Briggs); Wilken, Historia Ghatsnevidarum; History of British India, vol. 1 (Harper's Family Library); Von Hammer, Gemahdesaal grosse ioslemischer Herrscher Trevor, India, p. 69 sq.; India, Pictorial, Descript. and Hist. (London, Bohn, 1854, 12mo), p. 54 sq.; D'Herbelot, Biblioth. Orientale, p. 544 sq.; and the excellent article in Thomas, Dict. of Biog. and AMythol s.v. (J. H. W.)

## Mahn, Ernst August Philipp[[@Headword:Mahn, Ernst August Philipp]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born October 18, 1787. In 1818 he was professor of Oriental literature at Rostock, and died in 1827. He is the author of, Berichtigungen zu den vorhandenen Worterbuchern and  Commentaren uber die hebraischen Schriffen (Gottingen, 1817): — Bemerkungen und Erklarungen zu schwierigen Stellen des Alten Testaments (ibid. eod.): — Ueber die Modalitdt des orientalischen Studiunms (Sulzbach, 1821): — Observationes Exegeticae ad Diffiliora Qucedam Vet. Test. (Gittingen, 1812): — Darstellung der Lexicographie (Rudolstadt, 1817): — Comm. in qua Ducibus Quartuor Evangelistarumn Apostolorumque Scriptis Distinguuntur Tempora (Gottingen, 1811). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:120, 123, 564; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 2:286. (B.P.)

## Mahnenschmidt, John Peter[[@Headword:Mahnenschmidt, John Peter]]

             a pioneer of the (German Reformed Church in Ohio, was born probably in Somerset or in Westmoreland Co., Pa., in 1783; first taught school for a number of years, and was finally, in 1812, licensed to preach, and soon after removed to Ohio where he performed missionary labors in the counties of Columbiana and Trumbull. He laid the foundations of numerous congregations, which he lived to see grow and prosper. He died  in Canfield, Mahoning Co., Ohio, July 11,1857. Mahnenschmidt was a modest, childlike, and earnest man. See Harbaugh, Fathers of the German Ref. Ch. (Lancaster, Pa., 1872, 12mo), 3:207 sq.

## Mahol[[@Headword:Mahol]]

             (Heb. Machol', מָחוֹל, a sacred dance, as in Psalm 20:12, etc.; Sept. Μαχώλ; Josephus ᾿Ημαών, Ant. 8:2, 5), a person apparently named as the father of the famous wise men Ethan, Heman, Chalcol, and Darda (or at least of the last two), prior to the time of Solomon (1Ki 4:31); but if these be the same with those enumerated as sons of Zerah (1Ch 2:6), the word must be taken as elsewhere to denote simply their pursuit, as musical composers (see Keil's Comment. ad loc. Kings), an art with which dancing has ever been intimately connected. SEE ETHAN.

## Mahomet[[@Headword:Mahomet]]

             SEE MOHAMMED.

## Mahratta Version[[@Headword:Mahratta Version]]

             SEE MARATHI.

## Mahrattas[[@Headword:Mahrattas]]

             a people of Central India, south of the River Ganges, inhabiting the mountains from Gwalior to Goa, and by many supposed to be the descendants of a Persian or North Indian people who had been driven southwards by the Mongols. They are a vigorous and active race, and though, like many Eastern nations, diminutive and ill formed, are distinguished for their courage. Most of the Mahrattas are Hindus in religious belief, but, unlike the devout followers of Brahma, they do not adhere to the distinction of caste very closely. Mohammedanism and Parseeism also have many followers among this people, and Judaism counts a few adherents, though so distorted by heathen practices that some ethnologists have identified the Beni Israel of the Mahratta land with the Pattans (q.v.).

History. — The Mahrattas are first mentioned in history about the middle of the 17th century. They then inhabited a narrow strip of territory on the west side of the peninsula, extending from 15° to 21° N. lat., and are spoken of as for three centuries the subjects of Mohammedanism. The founder of the Mahratta power was Sevaji (died in 1680), a freebooter or adventurer, whose father was an officer in the service of the last king of Bejapir. By  policy or by force, he eventually succeeded in compelling the several independent chiefs to acknowledge him as their leader, and, with a large army at his command, overran and subdued a vast portion of the emperor of Delhi's territory. He was crowned as king in 1674. his son and successor, Sambaji, after vigorously following out his father's policy, was taken prisoner by Aurungzebe in 1689, and put to death. The incapacity of the subsequent rulers who reigned under the title of Ramrjah (“great king”), tempted the two chief officers of state, the Peishzwa, or prime minister, and the paymaster-general, to divide, about 1749, the empire between them, the former fixing his residence at Pfuna, and retaining a nominal supremacy over the whole nation, while the latter made Nagpur his capital, and founded the empire of the Berar Mahrattas. Later, however, the Mahratta kingdom was divided into a great number of states, more or less powerful and independent, chief among which were, besides the two above mentioned, Gwalior, ruled by the Rao Scindiah; Indore, by the Rao Holkar; and Baroda, by the Guicowar. Intestine wars followed this subdivision, and ultimately the East India Company was compelled to interfere. After many long and bloody contests with the British and their allies, the Mahrattas were reduced to a state of dependence. The only exception was Scinldiah, a powerful chief; who had raised a powerful army, officered by Frenchmen, and disciplined after the European method. He continued the contest until 1843. The dignity of peishwa was abolished in 1818, and his territories were occupied by the British. Nagpdir and Sattara subsequently also came to the British, but the other chiefs still possess extensive dominions under British protection.

Missions. — The earliest missions of the Christian Church in India date with the settlement of the Portuguese in Goa, where the Roman Catholics established the first bishopric in 1534. The second important hold the Romish Church secured at the two Salsettes, the peninsula and island near Bombay. From these the work was gradually pressed through the Mahratta-land. At Goa there are claimed to be 312,000, and at Bombay 20,300 Roman Catholics. SEE INDIA.

The first Prottestant mission was commenced in the Mahratta-land by the American Board in 1811. For about twenty years it was confined to the territory this side of the Ghauts. Mahim, Tannah, and Chowul (Choule) were occupied for a time, but abandoned in 1826. In 1836, however, the work began to show signs of vigor and promise. At this time a mission was established on the high lands of Ahmednuggur, a city of 30,000 inhabitants, and by 1842 it became an  independent mission center. For the success of this work and its present status, see the article INDIA, vol. 4, p. 555, Colossians 2. The Anglican Church first began missionary labors in Bombay in 1820, and gradually gained a hold at Tannah, Bandora, and Bassein. In 1832, Nasik, the most celebrated center of Brahminism in all Deccan, was secured; in 1846 the work was extended to the station Junir, and in 1848 to Malligaum. The attempt made a few years ago, at Yeolat, to Christianize exclusively by the aid of native helpers failed completely. Neither did the effort among the Illanmgs, in the neighborhood of Aurangabad (stations Buldana, etc.), prove successful. In Bombay and vicinity the Church Missionary Society sustains many schools, and Christian influences are molding the character of the rising generation. A special missionary for the Mohammedans is sustained here. See BOMBAY. The Scotch Mission commenced at Konkan in 1823;. the first stations were Bankot and Suvarndrug, but these were abandoned when the laborers were needed at Bombay. Here both the “Established Church” and the “Free Church” sustain schools. The Scotch Mission at Poonah, which originated in 1839, belongs to the Free Church. Of late years the Free Church has established missions among the Waralies (aborigines) near Daman. The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel has labored in this field since 1840, but confined mainly to Bombay. Very lately the Medical Missionary Society has established an institute which will prove of valuable service to the mission work. See Sprengel, Geschichte der Maratten (Halle, 1786); Duth, History of the Mahrattas (London, 1826, 3 vols. 8vo); Grundemann, Missionsatlas, No. 12; Chambers, Cyclopaedia, s.v.

## Mai, Angelo[[@Headword:Mai, Angelo]]

             a noted Roman Catholic prelate, and one of the most distinguished scholars of the 19th century, was born at Schilpario (province of Bergamo), Italy, March 7, 1782. As a youth he arrested the attention of his instructor, the ex-Jesuit father Lewis Mozzi de' Caspitani, by the unusual taste and capacity which he displayed for classical learning. The father, determined to lead Angelo's inclination towards the service of the Church, finally induced him to enter, in 1799, the novitiate of the Society of Jesus, which, although elsewhere suppressed, the Duke of Parma, with the sanction of Pius VI, was just re-establishing at Colorno, a small city of his duchy. In this community Mai resided till the provisional restoration of the society in Naples (1804), whither he was sent as Professor of Greek and Latin literature. About the end of 1805 he was transferred to Rome for the completion of his theological studies, and soon afterwards to Orvieto, and  was there admitted to priest's orders. It was at this place that he acquired great familiarity with the Hebrews language, his accurate knowledge of palaeography, and his skill in deciphering ancient manuscripts. He returned to Rome in 1808, just about the time when the contest of Pius VII with Napoleon was reaching the crisis; an order issued by the viceroy, commanding all subjects of the kingdom of Italy to return to their respective provinces, had compelled him to change his residence once again. Happily for the interests of literature, he settled at Milan. The Ambrosian Library of that city had long been known as rich in manuscripts of the highest interest — the remnant of the treasures of the old monastic libraries, especially those of Bobbio and Lucca, and of some of the suppressed Benedictine convents of the Protestant cantons of Switzerland. Many of its best treasures had been made public by Muratori, Mabillon, and the Benedictine editors; but there yet remained a department entirely unexplored, which Mai soon appropriated to himself, and which has since come to be regarded as exclusively his own-that of palimpsest or re-written manuscripts, in which the original writing has been effaced in order to make room for a later work written over it. Mai was admitted an associate, and eventually a doctor of this celebrated library, and labored in this novel editorial career with a zeal and success not unworthy of the traditional glories of his country.

From the Society of Jesus, to which he had not yet avowed himself, he now withdrew, with the consent and approval of the authorities at Rome. His first essay as an author was a Latin translation (with a commentary) of Isocrates, De Permutatione (1813), the original of which had been published by a Greek named Andrew Mustoxidi in the previous year; but this was only the prelude of his far more remarkable successes in the decipherment and publication of palimpsest manuscripts. Up to this period, with the exception of Küster and Wetstein's readings of the Old and New Testament from the Codex Ephremi. Knittel's portions of the Gothic Bible of Ulphilas, Peter Bruns's fragment of the ninety-first book of Livy, and Barrett's palimpsest of the Gospels, palimpsest literature was entirely untried. Within a few years Mai deciphered and published from palimpsest sources writings of several classical authors, besides two works then supposed to be by Philo Judaeus, but afterwards recognized as the productions of Georgius Gemistus. In 1819 Mai was called to Rome as chief keeper of the Vatican Library, canon of the Church of St. Peter's, and domestic prelate of the pope, Pius VII. Here he continued the publication of palimpsest manuscripts, and in 1820 brought out the work by which he is best known out of Italy — a large and interesting portion of the long lost  De Republica of Cicero, the fragments of which he arranged with consummate skill in their respective order, and interwove with all the known extracts of the work which had been preserved in the collections of ancient authors. The whole text he illustrated by a critical commentary of exceeding interest, which at once established his reputation as one of the first scholars of the age.

From these comparatively desultory labors he turned to a project not unworthy of the palmiest days of Italian editorship. Selecting from the vast and till then imperfectly explored manuscript treasures of the Vatican, he prepared his Scriptorum veterum Nova Collectio e Vaticcanis Codicibus edita (Rome, 1825, and later, 10 vols. 4to), on the plan of the various Anecdota, published under different titles by Mabillon, Pez, Montfaucon, Muratori, and others. It is a work of immense labor and research, and of a most miscellaneous character — Greek and Latin, sacred and profane, theological, historical, patristical, and philosophical. Next, he published Classici Scriptores ex Codicibus Vaticanis editi (completed in 1838, in 10 vols. 8vo), which included some of the author's earlier publications (especially the De Republica); although, with the exception of about two volumes, its contents were entirely new Scarcely was this collection finished when he entered upon the preparation of the Spicilegium Romanum (1839-44, 10 vols. 8vo), equally interesting and various in its contents, and a fourth collection entitled Nova Patrum Bibliotheca (1845- 53, 6 vols. 4to), thus completing a series unparalleled since the days of Muratori, and, indeed, far more extraordinary than the older collections, from the circumstance that it was compiled from the mere gleanings which had escaped the research of the earlier generations of editors and collectors. In addition to all these labors, and while they were still on his hands, he commenced an edition of the well-known Codex Vaticanus of the Old and New Testament, with various readings and prolegomena, which, however, he never entirely completed; or if he did, as some suppose, he destroyed a greater part of his manuscript on the Old Testament, lest it should ever see the light of day in an incomplete and imperfect state.

The text of the New Testament was published in 1858, and in a thoroughly revised form in 1859, under the title Nov. Test. ex vetustissimo codice Vat., secundis cursis editumn studio Angeli AMaii; but even in a revised form the work does not deserve the name of Mai on its titlepage. Comp. Kitto, Journ. Sac. Lit. 1859 (Oct.), p. 166 sq.  While engaged in these vast literary enterprises Mai held the laborious and responsible post of secretary of the Propaganda, to which he had been appointed in 1833; and it was observed with wonder that his other engagements were never suffered to interfere with the duties of the secretaryship. In 1838 he was rewarded for his great services to the Church with the cardinal's hat, at the same time with his friend and successor in the Vatican Library, Mezzofanti; and soon afterwards was appointed to several important and confidential offices in the Roman court, chiefly of a literary character. He was named successively prefect of the Congregation for the Supervision of the Oriental Press; prefect of the Congregation of the Index; and prefect of the Congregation of the Council of Trent. In 1853 he was appointed to the still more congenial post of librarian of the Roman Church. He died September 9, 1854.

“Cardinal Mai's abilities as an editor,” says his biographer in the English Cyclopaedia, “were of the very highest order. While his collections comprise an infinite variety of authors of every age, of every country, of every variety of style, and in every department of literature, he appears in all equally the master. Whether the subject be theology, or history, or law, or languages, or general literature, his learning is never at fault, and his critical sagacity never fails. In the many delicate and difficult questions which so often arise — in assigning an anonymous manuscript to its true author, in collecting fragments of the same work and dovetailing them together into intelligible order, in selecting from a heap of unknown materials all that is unpublished, and deciding upon the question of its genuineness or its intrinsic value — in a word, in all the thousand investigations which fall to the lot of a critical editor treading upon untried ground, he possessed a skill and acuteness which can hardly be described as other than instinctive, and which, taking into account the vast variety of subjects which engaged him, must be regarded as little short of marvelous. The private character of Cardinal Mai has been well described as the very ideal of a Christian scholar. Earnestly devoted to the duties of his sacred calling, he yet loved literature for its own sake also, and he was ever foremost in every project for its advancement. He was a member of all the leading literary societies of Italy, and not unfrequently read papers in those of Rome and Milan. His charities were at all times liberal, and, indeed, munificent; and at his death he bequeathed the proceeds of the sale of his noble library to the poor of his native village of Schilpario. A monument has been erected to his memory in the church of St. Anastasia, from which  he derived his title as cardinal.” See Mutti, Elogio di Angelo Mali (1828); Rabbe, Biog. Univ. des Contemporains; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 32:857 sq.; English Cyclop. s.v.; Wetzer und Welte, Kirchen-Lexikon, vol. 12, s.v.

## Maianeas[[@Headword:Maianeas]]

             (Μαιάννας,. Vulg. omits), given (1Es 9:48) in place of the MAASIAS (q.v.) of the Heb. text (Neh 8:7).

## Maichel, Daniel[[@Headword:Maichel, Daniel]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born August 14, 1693, at Stuttgart. He studied at Tubingen, and travelled through Switzerland, France, England, Holland, and Germany. In 1724 he was appointed professor at Tubingen, and in 1730 was made doctor of divinity. He died January 20, 1752. He wrote, De Foedere Legali clum Adamo Inito (Tubingen, 1719): — De Praecipuis Bibliothecis Parisiensibus (Cambridge, 1720; Leipsic, 1721): — De Recta Theologiam Naturalem Tradendi Ratione (Tubingen, 1730): — De Fide Hcereticis Servanda (ibid. 1741-42): — In Locum Ecc 3:19-21 (ibid. 1743). See Ddring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlnands, s.v. (B.P.)

## Maid[[@Headword:Maid]]

             or MAIDEN (prop. נִעֲרָה, παιδίσκη, a girl. as corresponding to נִעִר, παῖς, a young man; also בְּתוּלָה, κορασίον, a virgin; for which the usual term is עִלְמָה; but אָמָהand שַׁפְחָה, like δούλη, are a maid-servant). SEE HANDMAID; SEE VIRGIN.

## Maignan, Emanuel[[@Headword:Maignan, Emanuel]]

             a Roman Catholic ecclesiastic, noted as a philosopher, was born at Toulouse, in France, in 1601; was educated at the College of the Jesuits in that place, where he evinced extraordinary ability as a mathematician and philosopher. A strong inclination to a religious life led him to seek the monastery for his retreat. In 1636, however, he was called to fill a professor's chair of mathematics in Rome; returned from Rome to Toulouse in 1650, and was created by his countrymen provincial in the same year. He died in 1676. Maignan published De Perspectiva Horaria (Toulouse, 1648), and a Course of Philosophy (Toulouse, 1652, 4 vols. 8vo; 2d edit. 1673, folio), enlarged by two Treatises on the same subject in 1673. He opposed Des Cartes in his theory of the Creation, and to refute it the more completely, he invented a machine “which showed by its movements that Des Cartes's supposition concerning the manner in which the universe was formed, or might have been formed, and concerning the. centrifugal force, was entirely without foundation.” See Gen. Biog. Dict. 9, I, s.v.; Thomas, Dict. Biog. and Mythol. s.v.

## Maigrot, Charles[[@Headword:Maigrot, Charles]]

             a French Jesuit and missionary, was born at Paris in 1652; entered the order and prepared for missionary labors in foreign parts. In 1681 he was sent to Siam, and in 1683 he was placed in charge of the missions of China.  In 1698 pope Innocent XII created him, for his zeal in propagating Christianity among the inhabitants of the “Middle Kingdom,” bishop in partibus of Conon. In 1699 he was visited with the displeasure of his order for his opposition to the peculiar manner in which the Jesuits sought to advance the interests of Christianity among the Chinese. He was even at one time in danger of his life. Supported by the Dominicans, he appealed to pope Clement XI, who, June 20, 1702, gave his approval to the attitude of the bishop of Conon; and, to make known his will, dispatched cardinal De Tournon to the emperor of China, who. as we have seen in the article on China, was greatly displeased with the conduct of the Christian missionaries, and issued an edict ordering them all from his domains. Maigrot at first refused to obey the imperial command, and only quitted the country when his life was imperilled. He went to Rome by way of Ireland, and died in the Eternal City Feb. 18, 1730. He only wrote one work, and that is still in MS. form; it is entitled De Sinica Religione (4 vols. fol.). See Le Gobien, Hist. de l'Edit de emnpereur de Chine en fitveur de la religion Chretienne (Paris, 1698, 12mo); Berault-Bercastel, Hist. de l'eglise (Paris, 1698, 12mo); Mailla, Hist. Generat de ae Chine, vol. ix; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 32:867.

## Mail[[@Headword:Mail]]

             (קִשְׂקֶשֶׂת, koaske'seth, a “scale,” as of fish, Lev 11:9, etc.), spoken of as a cuirass composed of plates of metal attached to a bodice like scales, so as to be impervious to the sword (1Sa 17:5). Another term, rendered “coat of mail,” is שַׁרְיוֹן,' shiryon', which signifies the corselet or garment thus encased (1Sa 17:38). At other times metallic rings were employed instead of scales (see Kitto, Pict. Dict. note at 1 Samuel 17). SEE ARMOR.

## Mailduff[[@Headword:Mailduff]]

             an Irish monk, who flourished about the middle of the 7th century, established a monastery in Wiltshire, England, A.D. 650, long called Mailduffburgh, now known as Malmesbury. It was richly endowed by Athelstan and other kings of England, and became the alma mater of some of the first educated Saxons in England in either Church or State. Among them was Aldhelm, bishop of Sherborne, who acknowledged “that  Mailduff had thoroughly instructed him in Latin and Greek.” Camden says that Aldhelm was the first Saxon who wrote in Latin, or who made Latin verses; his style, however, was pedantic, and full of alliterations. William of Malmesbury, the first Saxon historian, received his education in this school, the first one among the twelve which Montalembert says the Irish monks established in England (Monks of the West, 1864). The period from the 7th to the 10th century was a very dark one in England. Alfred the Great, speaking of his own times (A.D. 870), said, “There were few churchmen on this side of the Humber who could understand their dayly prayer in English, or who could translate a letter in Latin” (Turner's History of the Anglo-Saxons, book 5). And William of Malmesbury said “that, a few years before the Norman invasion, a clergyman who understood grammar was considered a prodigy” (ibid.). During this dark period, a large number of Irish scholars, impelled by a devotion to literature, or, as some say, driven out by the Danes, went over to England and established a great many schools, and, among others, that also of Glastonbury. It was often called “Glastonbury of St. Patrick” merely because the disciples of that saint had founded it and for a long time sustained it. In this school were educated many of the most distinguished English divines, scholars, and statesmen of that period. The noted and eccentric Dunstan was educated in it. William of Malmesbury, who wrote his life, says, “Under the discipline of these Hibernians, he [Dunstan] partook of the very marrow of scriptural learning, as well as the knowledge of arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and music.” Mailduff wrote, according to Bale, De Paschae Observationibus, Regulus Artium Diversarum, besides hymns, dialogues, and epistles. He died A.D. 675, and was interred in his own monastery. See Illustrious Men of Ireland, 1:137; Moore's History of Ireland; Pict. Hist. of England, 1:277 sq. (D. D.)

## Maillard, Olivier[[@Headword:Maillard, Olivier]]

             a celebrated French pulpit orator, was born in Bretagne in the 15th century. His early history is somewhat obscure. He became a doctor of the Sorbonne, professor of theology in the order of the “Minor Brethren,” and court preacher to Louis XI and to the duke of Burgundy. In 1501 he was entrusted by the papal legate with the reform of the Paris convents of the order of “Gray Friars,” and he discharged this task so energetically and independently that he incurred the displeasure of the “Gray Friars.” His reputation, however, rests mainly on the wonderful power of oratory and independence of thought he displayed in his pulpit utterances. In many  respects he may be likened to Bossuet, but in one he even excelled him-in dealing out truth, in criticizing the faults and failings of his hearers. It is related of him that his royal master, Louis XI, having one day been subjected by him to unusual severity, sent word that if Olivier Maillard would suffer himself to speak thus severely a second time, he should do it at the loss of his life. But, Olivier was ready to return a prompt reply even to the royal messenger. ‘Tell the king that I will thus only arrive sooner in Paradise, and make the way for the king so much the harder.” Louis XI never again molested Maillard, though he continued in his former course unabated. If only a moderate part of the picture Maillard has drawn of his contemporaries be true, the French of the 15th century have never had their equals in moral corruption. He died near Toulouse, according to some, June 13, 1502; but his death must have occurred much later, if it be true that he preached at Paris in 1508, as is reported. His principal works are Sermones de Adventu declamati Parisiis in ecclesia S. Johannis in Gravia anno 1493 (Paris, 1498, 4to; 1511,8vo): — Quadragesimale Opus (Paris, 1498, 4to; 1512, 8vo): — Sermones doninicales et alii (1515, 8vo): — Sermuones de sanctis (1513, 8vo): — La Recolation de la tres-pieuse Passion des Notre-Seigneur, representee par les Saints et sacres mysteres de la Messe (also under the title Le Mysteie de la Mnesse, etc.): — L'Exemplaire de Confession avec la Confession generale (Rouen and Cayen, 4to; Lyons, 1524, 8vo): — Traiti envoyse a plusieurs reliqieuses pour les instruire et exhorter a se bien gouverner (8vo): — Contemplatio ad salutationem. angeliclam (1607). See Niceron, Memoires, vol. 23, s.v.; Le Bas, Dict.-Encyclop. de la France, s.v.; Gerusey, Essai d'hist. litter.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 32:871 sq.

## Maillat, Joseph Anne Marie De Moyrta De[[@Headword:Maillat, Joseph Anne Marie De Moyrta De]]

             a French Jesuit and missionary, was born in 1679, at the ancestral castle near Nantua. He entered the order quite young. In 1701 he was appointed to take a part in the mission to China, and embarked in 1703 for Maeao, and thence for China. He quickly mastered the Chinese language, and as readily familiarized himself with the institutions of China, so that he became of great service to the Celestial empire. In 1708 a map of China and Tartary was prepared for the Chinese government under his superintendence, and he secured not only approval for his services, but was actually invited to take office at court. He died June 28,1748, at Pekin. His studies were mainly in the history and archaeology of China, and his works are of the same department. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 32:877.

## Maille De Breze, Simon De[[@Headword:Maille De Breze, Simon De]]

             a French prelate, was born in 1515; became a religious of the order of Citeaux, was made abbot of Loroux, then bishop of Viviers, and in 1554 archbishop of Tours. He was a member of the Council of Trent, and took decided ground against the Reformers, who had given him no little trouble in his archiepiscopal dominions. He was at one time obliged to quit his see, in all probability because the Calvinists had made a strong case of immorality against him. He died Jan. 11,1597. He published a Latin translation of several homilies of St. Basil (Paris, 1558, 4to), and Discours au peuple de Touraine (ibid. 1574, 16mo). — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 32:878.

## Mailly, Francois DE[[@Headword:Mailly, Francois DE]]

             a French prelate, was born at Paris, March 4, 1658. In 1698 he was appointed archbishop of Aries, and in 1710 he succeeded the famous Le Tellier in the archbishopric of Rheims. Mailly distinguished himself by his ardent zeal for the Roman see. When the bull Unigenitus was promulgated, he forced it upon his clergy. His pastoral epistles were often suppressed by the parliament. Pope Clement XI, in consideration of his great services, made Mailly cardinal without consulting first the court of France, and the latter forbade the archbishop to wear the insignia of his new dignity. But these prohibitory measures were not always carried out, and Louis XV allowed him to wear the cardinal's hat. Mailly died in the abbey of St. Thierry, September 13, 1721. See Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Maim[[@Headword:Maim]]

             SEE ABEL-MAIMI; SEE MISREPHIOTH-MAIM.

## Maimbourg, Louis[[@Headword:Maimbourg, Louis]]

             a celebrated French ecclesiastic and defender of Gallican liberty, was born at Nancy in 1620; entered the “Society of Jesus” in 1636; was by them sent to Rome to study theology; was, on his return to France, for six years professor of rhetoric in the College of Rouen; then began preaching, and soon attained great eminence. Having, however, in his Traite Historique de l'glise de Rome (Paris, 1685; new ed., Nevers. 1831) come out boldly in favor of the liberty of the Gallican Church, he was expelled from the Order of the Jesuits. The king took sides with Maimbourg and indemnified him by a pension. He retired to the Abbey of St. Victor, in Paris, where he wrote the history of schism of England, and died Aug. 13,1686. He had entirely disconnected himself from the Jesuits, and did not spare them much in his writings; yet in his Histoire du Calviaiisme (Paris, 1682, 4to), dedicated to the king, one can readily distinguish the influence of his former associations when he called Calvinism “the most rabid and dangerous of all the enemies France ever had to contend against.” Bossuet's interpretation of the doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church, SEE BOSSUET, Maimbourg pronounced against. (Compare Schrockh, Kirchengesch. s. d Ref 7:280 sq.; Smith's Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctrines, 2:200 [15].) As a historian Maimbourg is inaccurate and untrustworthy, receiving all the calumnies of the Jesuits against Protestantism as facts, and giving them as such. The ephemeral success of his works is to be attributed only to a pleasing and ornate style and to their romantic garb. His first collection of sermons is  uninteresting and insipid, and his controversial works have long been forgotten. His historical works, consisting of Histoire de l'Arianisme (1682, 2 vols. 4to); Des Iconoclastes (16741679, 4to); Du Schisme des Grecs (1677, 4to); Des Croisades (1675, 2 vols. 4to); De la Decadence de l'Empire, depuis Charlemagne (1679, 4to); Du Grand Schisme de l'Occident (1677, 4to); Du Luthdlanisme (1680, 4to, and 2 vols. 8vo); Du Calvinissme (1682, 4to); De la Ligne (1683. 4to; 1684, 2 vols. 12mo); Du Pontificat de St. Gregoire le Grand (1686, 4to); Du Pontificat de St. Leon (1687, 4to)-the two latter of which are considered the best have been collected and published in 14 vols. 4to (Paris, 1686). See Herzog, Real- Encykl. s.v.; Dupin, Biblioth. Eccles. s.v.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 32:891 sq.; Wetzer und Welte, Kirchen-Lexikon, 6:758 sq.; Bayle, Hist. Dict. s.v.

## Maimbourg, Theodore[[@Headword:Maimbourg, Theodore]]

             a relative of the distinguished Louis Maimboarg (q.v.), flourished about the middle of the 17th century. He embraced the Reformed doctrine, and in 1659 published a letter addressed to Louis justifying his course. In 1664 he returned to the Romish Church, and subsequently left it again. He then retired to England, and died at London in 1693.Herzog, Real-Encykl. 8:390.

## Maimon, Solomon[[@Headword:Maimon, Solomon]]

             a Jewish rabbi and philosopher, one of the ablest expounders of the Kantian school, was born in Lithuania in 1753. He was of very humble parentage, and in his youth was confined in his educational advantages to the study of Hebrew. Yet his talent for speculation manifested itself at a very early age, when still confined to the expounding of Talmudic lore. In his very youth, Moses Maimonides's Moreh Nebuchim fell into his hands; but while to Moses Mendelssohn it became the guide to truth, it became to Maimon a guide to a labyrinth of speculation from which no open-sesame gave him an outlet until, in advanced life, he fell in with the writings of Kant, to become one of his most ardent students and ablest expounders. In the despair which the Moreh Nebuchim prepared for him, he turned to the Cabala for relief, determined to become a Jewish Faust. Plagued by the disadvantages of Russo-Jewish society, he finally quitted his native land and went to Germany to study medicine and thus gain a livelihood. He was 25 years old when he arrived at Konigsbereg, in West Prussia. His  condition in this, the old capital of Prussia, the seat of a university at that time in the very zenith of her glory, was much like that of a man who, after having suffered starvation for days, is suddenly placed at a table filled with the daintiest food. Partaking too greedily of the food set before him, he became a great sufferer mentally — i.e. he was lost in wild speculation.

In 1779 he went to Berlin, and became an intimate associate of the German Jewish savant, Moses Mendelssohn. It was not, however, until years had been passed in a roving life that he finally, in 1788, on his return to Berlin, gave himself to the study of Kantian philosophy, was recommended to Kant, and soon made a great name for himself. Both Schiller and Goethe, it is said, sought his society; the latter, we are told, desired Maimon to take up his residence near his side (Aaimoniana, p. 197; Varnhagen's Nachlass, Briefwechsel zwischen Rahel u. David Veit, 1:243 sq., 247 et al.; 2:23). In his last years count Kalkreuth gave Maimon a home on one of his estates in Silesia. He died in 1800. From an admirer of Kant, Maimon finally changed to a decided opponent, and, to make good his claims, presented the world with a new system of philosophy, which was written in the interests of skepticism. According to Maimon, there is no knowledge strictly objective except pure mathematics, and all empirical knowledge is only an illusion. He traces all the forms of thought, categories, and judgments to a general and unique principle, that of determinability, of reality, of substance; but he contends that we have no right to suppose that our thought has for its object a thing without ourselves, existing independently of the thought, which determines it. “He admits, with Kant,” says Wilson (Hist. of German Philosophy, 2:186), “that there are conceptions and principles a priori, a pure knowledge which applies itself to an object of thought in general, and to objects of knowledge a priori; but he denies that this very pure knowledge absolutely applies itself to experience.

The philosophy of the Kritik admits this application as a fact of conscience. This fact, according to Maimon, is simply an illusion, and he declares that the categories are destined only to apply to objects of pure mathematics. Maimon's objections were not without influence on the ulterior development of general philosophy, and Fichte paid much regard to them; but the great objection, the one which bears upon the application of category to reality, Fichte destroyed in one word when he said that the right of this application cannot be deducted until it is absolute” (compare Ueberweg, History of Philosophy, vol. 2). Among his best works are, besides his numerous essays and treatises on various philosophical themes in the “Berliner Monatsschrift” and the “Magazin” from 1789 to 1800, in themselves a  small library, and besides ten books on all departments of philosophy, published between 1790 and 1797, the Gilbath ha-Moreh, a Hebrew commentary and a remarkable introduction to the three volumes of Maimonides's Moreh Nebuchim (Berlin, 1791), in which he proved himself master of the philosophical field; also Versuch über die Transcendentalphilosophie (Berlin, 1790, 8vo); Versuch einer neuen Logik, oder Theorie des Denkens, etc. (Berlin, 1794, 8vo); and Kritische Untersuchungen iuber den menschlichen Geist (1797), and a memoir of his own life entitled “Lebensgeschichte” (2 vols. 1792-93). See Wolf, “Rhapsodien zur Characteristik S. Maimons” (1813); Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden. 11:142 sq. (Leipzig, 1870, 8vo); Tennemann, Manual ofPhilosophy, p. 411 sq.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale. vol. 32, s.v.; Dr. Wise in the Israelite (Cincinnati, Ohio), Jan. 1871. (J. H. W.)

## Maimonides[[@Headword:Maimonides]]

             (i.e. son of Maimon), Moses, also called by the Jews Rambam, from the initial letters רמ בם= ר משה בן מיםון, R. Moses b. Maimun, and by the Arabians Abu Arnraman Musa b. — Maimun Obeid A hah, one of the greatest of the Jews since the exile the great luminary, the glory of Israel, the second Moses, the reformer of Judaism, as he is called, was born at Cordova, March 30, 1135. As a youth, he received his instruction in the Heb. Scriptures, the Talmud, and Jewish literature from his father, R. Maimon, who held the dignity of judge of the Jews, as also his forefathers had held it for some centuries previous, and was himself renowned as a scholar and author of a commentary on Esther, a work on the laws of the Jewish prayers and festivals, a commentary on the Talmud, etc., etc. But for instruction in the Arabic, then the predominant language of Spain, as the country was in the hands of the Mohammedans, and mathematics, a and astronomy, Moses was handed over to the care of the renowned Arabian philosophers Averroes and Ibn-Thofeil (compare Jost, Gesch. d. Israeliten, 6:168).

Spain, in which the Jews had found an early- home (some say as early as the days of Solomon; compare Rule, Karaites, p. 146 sq.; Lindo, Hist. of the Jews of Spain and Portugal, p. 1 sq.; Da Costa, Israel and the Gentiles, p. 211), is by Milman (History of the Jews, 3:155) spoken of as the country in which “the golden age of the Jews shone with the brightest and most enduring splendor.” In the early days of Christianity we find the Jew alluded to by Church councils [see ELVIRA], and legislation enacted in his behalf; but, to the shame of Christiainity be it said,  the Jew enjoyed his greatest privileges in the Iberian peninsula under Mussulman rule, and from the conquest by the Moors till towards the end of the 10th century, when, while Christian Europe lay in darkness, Mohammedan Cordova might be considered the center of civilization of arts, and of letters,... the Jews, under the enjoyments of equal rights and privileges, rivaled their masters, or, rather, their compatriots, in their advancement to wealth, splendor, and cultivation” (Milman). In Spain alone, and only under Mussulman reign, the Jews in the Middle Ages enjoyed religious liberty and the privilege of their own jurisdiction, and it was in Spain alone that the Jews, since their Babylonian exile, developed a nobility which to this day is considered the aristocracy of the dispersed people of Israel (compare Da Costa, Israel and the Gentiles, p. 204). Need we wonder that under such very favorable conditions, which became endangered only now and then, the Spanish Jews developed a very active spiritual life, and a desire for culture and science which produced noteworthy fruits? “The Jews in the Arabic provinces,” says Da Costa (p. 223), in speaking of the Saracen rule in Spain, “were rarely bankers, but merchants, trading on a large scale to different parts of the East. They acted as treasurers to the califs, but more frequently as physicians, philosophers, poets, theologians — in a word, as savans and men of letters.”

Especially worthy to be called the golden age of Spanish Judaism was the age that gave birth to Moses Maimonides. While the Jews, who at that time lived under less favorable circumstances in France and Germany, were disinclined to all scientific endeavors, and all their spiritual activity became absorbed in the study of the ‘Talmud, the Spanish Jews vied in all sciences-in philosophy, mathematics, astronomy, medicine, and in poetry, with the flower of the Arabian genius. Formerly the Jews of the Iberian peninsula had derived their learning of the Biblical writings and their commentators from the famous schools of Babylon and Persia, whither the young were sent for theological instruction; but when, by sheer accident, a noted Eastern rabbi of the 10th century found a home in these Western coasts (see Rabbi Moses, “clad in sackcloth:” compare Milman, 3:156, and other histories of the Jews), and “the light of learning, which, by the rapid progress of the iron age of Judaism in Babylonia, by the extinction of the authority of the prince of the captivity, the dispersion of the illustrious teachers, and the final closing of the great schools, seemed to have set forever, it suddenly rose again in the West in renewed and undismayed splendor.” From this time (A.D. 990) the schools of the Spanish Rabbanim (at Cordova, Toledo. Barcelona, and Granada) not only became the center  of Jewish civilization and learning, but the auxiliaries of the Arabian philosophers in their endeavor to keep alive the flame of learning during the deep darkness of the Middle Ages, and the Jews became the communicators of Arabian philosophy to the Christian world, or, as Tennemann (Manual of Philosophy. transl. by Morell, p. 231) has it,” the interpreters between the Saracens and the Western nations.” It was at such a time — when the heaven of Spanish Judaism was resplendent with stars of its greatest magnitude — Solomon Ibn-Gebirol (1021-1070), Jehudah Halevi (10861142), Aben-Ezra (1092-1167), David Kimchi (11601240), a galaxy of great and learned men of which any nation might well be proud that Moses Maimonides lived, wrote, and flourished as the brightest ornament of them all.

As we noticed above, Moses was born in 1135. The Almoravides — i.e. men devoted to the service of God who were then the masters of Mohammedan Spain, SEE MOHAMMEDANS, like the Ommiades, were tolerant and kind to the Jews. But just at this time the power of the Almoravides was fast declining, and by the middle of the 12th century the Almohades, a fanatical Mohammedan sect, SEE IBN-TUMART, landing in Southern Spain, soon gained the upper hand, and superseded the Almoravides altogether. With the accession of these Almohades to power in Southern Spain begins a new chapter in the history of the Jews. On the Seine, on the Rhine, on the Danube, and in the steppes of Africa and Southern Spain, ‘ as if by previous arrangement, a bloody chase was now inaugurated, in the name of religion, against the Hebrew tribe both by Mohammedans and Christians, quite unmindful of the fact that whatever of the good and Godlike had found a place in their confession had been derived from the teachings of this very tribe. Hitherto persecutions of the Jew had been only occasional; with the year 1146 they begin to be more frequent, usual, consequent, and severe, as if to make the period in which the light of intelligence began to dawn among men surpass in inhumanity the days of dark barbarism” (Grätz, 6:175). In that part of Spain controlled by the Almohades no other religion than that of the Crescent was to be tolerated, and Jew and Christian alike were obliged either to abjure the faith of their fathers or to quit the country within a month.

To remain and yet to adhere faithfully to the teachings of the Old or New Testament was to incur the penalty of death. Maimonides's family, like many others to whom emigration was well-nigh impossible, embraced the Mohammedan faith, or rather, for the time being, renounced the public profession of  Judaism, all the while, however, remaining faithful to it in secret, and keeping up a close communication with their co-religionists abroad (compare Carmoly, Annalen, 1839, p. 395 sq.; Munk, Archives Israelites, 1851, p. 319 sq.). For more than sixteen years Maimonides thus lived, together with his family, under the assumed character of Mohammedans; but when the death of the reigning sovereign brought no change in the system of religious intolerance, they, with the greater part of the Jewish community, resolved to emigrate and travel about, as he himself tells us, “by land and by sea,” without finding a resting-place for the sole of his foot. Their first landing-place was Acco, in Palestine; from thence they went via Jerusalem to Cairo; then to Hebron, and next into Egypt, stopping first a short time at Alexandria, but finally settling at Fostat (compare Israelif. Annal. en, 1840, p. 45 sq.). On their journey Maimonides had lost his father (at Cairo), and, to earn a livelihood for his father's household, he engaged with his younger brother in the jewelry trade; the care of the business mainly falling to David, while Moses devoted most of his time to literary pursuits and to the study of medicine, which he afterwards practiced, and in which profession he attained to great eminence.

Life and Labors. — During his boyhood, Moses Maimonides is said to have manifested anything but a promise of those great abilities which were unfolded in his manhood. He was indolent, and so disinclined to study that his father sent him, at a very early ages from his paternal roof. During his absence from home, however, an earnest desire for knowledge was manifested by him, and, by study and intercourse with learned co- religionists and Arabians, he acquired a great treasure of knowledge in the different provinces of science, which his clear, penetrating, and methodical mind mastered with a marvelous power. An elegant oration, delivered by him at fourteen, reconciled father and son. Acquainted with all the writings of ancient philosophers, he became the most eminent of his age. He was an able mathematician and metaphysician.

When only 23 years old (1158), he proved the possession of extraordinary powers of comprehension and elucidation in a treatise on the Jewish calendar, based on astronomical principles (השבון חעבור), which he composed for a friend. In the same year also, whilst wandering about from place to place, and deprived of the aid of a library, he yet began his stupendous Commentary on the Mishna (פירוש המשניות). At this time also (about 1160) he composed the Letter on Religious Persecution (אגרת השמד), or A Treatise on Glorifying God (מאמר קידוש השם) — i.e. by suffering martyrdom — a most ingenious  plea for those who have not the courage to lay down life for their religion, and who, having outwardly renounced their faith, continue secretly to practice it — which was provoked by the attack of a zealous co-religionist against Moses's public profession of Mohammedanism and private devotion to Judaism. (It was published by Geiger, Moses ben-Maimon, part 1 [Bresl. 1850].)

The sudden loss of his brother David and of their possessions threw upon Moses the responsibility of providing alone for his own, his father's, and his brother's family. Without means to continue in mercantile life, he now entered the medical profession; at the same time he also delivered lectures on philosophy. But his mind was mainly upon the work in which he had engaged years ago. Neither misfortune, nor bodily infirmities, nor even misinterpretation, could turn Moses Maimonides from the goal he was striving to reach. He had assigned to himself the task of harmonizing religion with science, Judaism with philosophy; to exhibit Judaism in such a light that it might become not only endeared to its thinking adherents, but that it might claim the respect also of other religionists. and even of philosophers; and though the wants of so many dependent upon him obliged him to labor assiduously as a physician, he yet found time for the completion of his commentary on the Mishna, and, in 1168, finally brought it before the public under the title The Book of Light (Arabic כתאב אלסראג, Hebrew המאור ספר). This remarkable production, which he wrote in Arabic (for editions, see below), is designed to simplify the study of the exposition of the Law or Pentateuch, handed down by tradition, rendered exceedingly difficult by the super- commentaries and discussions which had accumulated thereon since the close of the Mishna to the days of Maimonides. It is preceded by a general elaborate introduction, in which he discourses on the true nature of prophecy, shows its relationship to the law given on Sinai, treats of the figurative language occurring in the Pentateuch and the Prophets, etc. In the special introduction to the Tract Sanhedrim he, for the first time, defined and formally laid down the Jewish creed (see our article JUDAISM, in vol. 4, p. 1057). In consequence of this work — which has now for more than 500 years been deemed so essential a part of the Talmud itself that no edition of the latter is considered complete without it — Maimonides gradually became the great oracle in all matters of religion. He was appealed to (in 1175) by the Jews from different parts of the world for his opinion on difficulties connected with the law, and in 1177 was called to the rabbiship of Raheia.  Though constantly beset by crowds who came to consult him on all questions, philosophical, medical, and religious, yet, by intruding on the night for his profounder studies, he was able, after ten years' further labor (1170-80), to complete (Nov. 7, 1180) another work, of even greater magnitude than the foregoing, which he called Deuteronomy, Second Law (משנה תורה), or Jad Hachezaka = The Mighty Hand (יד החזקה, in allusion to Deu 34:12, and because the work consists of fourteen books, יד=14), which created a new epoch in Judaism. The fourteen books, subdivided into eighty-two Tractates (הלכות), of which the work consists, form a cyclopaedia comprising every department of Biblical and Judaistic literature.

When it is added that Maimonides has given in every article a lucid abstract of the ancient traditional expositions of those who were regarded as the oracles in their respective departments, the immense importance of this remarkable production to the Biblical student can hardly be overrated. It is written in very clear and easy Hebrew, as Maimonides was anxious that it should be accessible to the Jewish people generally. Within a few years after its appearance the work was copied and circulated most extensively in Arabia, Palestine, Africa, Southern France, and Italy, and throughout the world wherever Jews resided. It soon became the text-book of the Jewish religion, and was regarded as a new Bible or Talmud. A detailed account of its contents is given by Wolf, Bibliotheca Heb. 1:840 sq. Most of the young Israelites of his days were spending their best time in acquiring a mediocre knowledge of the sixty books of the Talmud, to the neglect and exclusion of all secular science and philosophy. To obviate this, Maimonides wrote these systematical works, comprising the main contents of the whole Talmud. “If the Talmud,” says Gritz (6:339),” may be likened to a Dsedalic structure, in which one can scarcely find his way even with the aid of an Ariadne thread, Maimonides has transformed it into a well-regulated edifice, with side-wings, halls, apartments, chambers, and closets, in which the stranger, led by the fitting superscriptions and numbers, may make his way without a guide, and gain a view of all the contents of the Talmud... One might almost say that Maimonides created a new Talmud. It is true these are the old elements; we know their origin, their rise, their original connection; but in his hands it looks like another work; the mist is removed; the disfiguring addenda done away with; it appears remolded, smoother, fresher, and newer. The Mishna, the foundation-structure of the Talmud, opens by propounding the question on the law: ‘At what time of the night is the  chapter Shema to be read?' and closes with the discussion, when this or that thing becomes levitically unclean. Maimonides, on the other hand, thus opens his Talmoudical codex: ‘The foundation of foundations, and the pillar of wisdom, is to know that there exists a first Being which called all other beings into existence, and that all things existing in heaven or on earth, and whatever is between them, exist only through the medium of this first Being,' and closes with the words, ‘The earth will one day be covered with knowledge as the ocean's ground is by water.'

The whole work is permeated by a peculiar savor; it breathes the spirit of complete wisdom, cool reflection, and deep morality. Maimonides, so to speak, has Talmudized philosophy and metaphysicized the Talmud. He has admitted philosophy within the precincts of the religious codex, and there conceded her a citizenship of equality beside the Halacha. Though philosophy had, previous to his day, been cultivated by Jewish thinkers (here comp. Sachs, Religiose Poesie der Juden in Spanien, p. 185 sq.), and applied to Judaism from Philo down to Abraham Ibn-David, SEE CHAYUG, she had always been regarded as something outside of the Jewish camp as a something which had nothing in common with practical Judaism as exercised daily and hourly. Maimonides, however, introduced her into the very holiest of Judaism, and, so to speak, gave Aristotle a place by the side of the sages of the Talmud.” “The master-mind of Maimonides only,” says Dr. Wise (Israelite, Dec. 1, 1871), “could accomplish such a gigantic task, and codify that immense mass of laws and customs as systematically and linguistically exact as he did. Nobody before or even after him has been able to do it so well and completely as he has done it. He alone has brought the rabbinical law within a compass, to be mastered in a few years, and under a system to find particular laws or customs without roaming over a mass of rabbinical sources. thereby affording students an opportunity to master the rabbinical laws, and to save time for other studies.” His fame now became world-wide. Not only, however, as a law-giver in Judah did he advance to the first place among the great and learned; as a physician also he excelled his colleagues, and for his attainments in this field of labor his name was carried to many foreign lands. Richard Coeur de Lion, learning of his medical skill, anxiously sought to secure the services of this noted Jew as his court physician. Maimonides, however, preferred to remain in the land of his adoption, and declined the proffered honor (compare Weil, Chalifen, 3:423 sq.). It was about this time that the vizier of Saladin, the Kadhi al-Fadhel, who had taken Maimonides under his protection, appointed Moses chief (Reis, נגיד) of all the congregations in  Egypt (about 1187): The numerous and onerous duties now put upon him as the spiritual head of Judaism, and the constant demand for his great medical skill, were, however, alike unable to overcome the powers of his intellect, which he had consecrated to the elucidation of the Bible and the traditional law, and to the harmonizing of revelation with philosophy, and in the midst of all his engagements Maimonides entered upon the preparation of a third religio-philosophical work, which became, of all his productions, the most valued and important. Its object was to reclaim one of his disciples, Ibn-Aknin (q.v.), from the prevailing skepticism about a future world, the destiny of man, sin, retribution, revelation, etc.

The design of the work is explained by Maimonides himself in the following terms: “I have composed this work, not for the common people, neither for beginners, nor for those who occupy themselves only with the law as it is handed down without contemplating its principle. The design of my work is rather to promote the true understanding of the real spirit of the law, to guide those religious persons who, adhering to the truth of the Torah have studied philosophy, and are embarrassed by the contradictions between the teachings of philosophy and the liberal sense of the Torah.” The work, consisting of three parts in 204 sections, and entitled in Arabic דלאלת אל חאירין, in Heb. מורה הנבוכים, Moreh Nebuchim (The Guide of the Perplexed), in allusion to Exo 14:3, and, according to Gratz (6:363), “constituting the summit of the Maimonical mind and the justification of his inmost convictions,” created a new epoch in the philosophy of the Middle Ages. “Ce livre,” says Frank (Etudes Orientales, p. 360), “inspire egalement le respect par les puissantes facultes de l'auteur, la prodigieuse souplesse de son esprit, la variete de ses connaissances, l'elevation de son spiritualisme enfin par la lumiere quil repand sur quelques-uns des points les plus obscurs de l'histoire de l'esprit humain.” Not only did Mohammedans write commentaries upon it, but the Christian schoolmen learned from it how to harmonize the conflicts between religion and philosophy (compare Joel, Eiiflsuss d. .uid. Philos. auf die christl. Scholastik, in Frankel's Monatsschrift [Bresl. 1860, p. 210 sq.]; Munk, Melanges, p. 486). The contents of this great and noble work, which has become for Jewish thinkers, as it were, a “touchstone of philosophy,” are, in the three parts into which it is divided, as follows: The first part is especially devoted to the explanation of all sensual expressions which are made use of in the Bible in regard to God; this is really but a mere detailed explication of what Maimonides had already laid down in the first book of his aforementioned code, namely, that such expressions must  be taken only in a spiritual and figurative sense; this part contains also the rational arguments by which philosophy proves the existence, the unity, and spirituality of God. The second part treats, first, of natural religion and its deficiencies; secondly, of the creation of the world and the different graduations of the world's system; and, thirdly, of revelation, prophecy, and of the excellence and perfectness of the divine law. The third part, after giving an explanation of the first vision of the prophet Ezekiel, treats of the opposition of good and evil in the world, of God's providence and omniscience, and their relation to the free will of man; a number of chapters of this last part are taken up in explaining the general design of the Mosaic law, and the reason for each separate law.

But while, on the one hand, the Moreh Nebuchim contributed more than any other work to the progress of rational development in Judaism, it, on the other hand, also provoked a long and bitter strife between orthodoxy and science — carrying out, as it did, to its last consequences the broad principle that “the Bible must be explained metaphorically by established fundamental truths in accordance with rational conclusions.” So bitter, indeed, was the contest which broke out between the subsequent spiritualistic Maimonidian and the “literal Talmudistic” schools, that the fierce invectives were speedily followed by anathemas and counter- anathemas issued by both camps; and, finally, about the middle of the 13th century, the decision was transferred into the hands of the Christian authorities, who commenced by burning Maimonides's books, continued by bringing to the stake all Hebrew books on which they could lay their hands, and followed this decision up by a wholesale slaughter of thousands upon thousands of Jewsmen, women, and children — irrespective of their philosophical views. Under these circumstances, the antagonistic parties, chiefly through the influence of David Kimchi and others, came to their senses, and gladly enough withdrew their mutual anathemas; they even went so far as to send a deputation (in 1232) to Maimonides's grave at Saphet “to ask pardon of his ashes” (Lindo, p. 65); and, as time wore on, the name of Moses Maimonides became the pride and glory of the nation. Moses, himself, however, never witnessed the end of the conflict into which he had the mortification to see his nation plunged, caused by his own labors, which had been intended solely for their good. In the midst of the conflict (the opposition begun by Samuel ben-All, the gaon of Bagdad, was particularly strong in Southern France and Spain, see Gritz, Gesch. d. Juden, vol. 7, chap. 2), “the Great Luminary” of the Jewish nation was  extinguished Dec. 13,1204. Both Jews and Mohammedans of Fostat had public mourning for three days. At Jerusalem the Jews proclaimed a day of extraordinary humiliation, reading publicly the threatenings of the law (Deuteronomy 28) and the history of the capture of the ark by the Philistines (1 Samuel 4, etc.), for they regarded Maimonides as the ark containing the law. His remains, in accordance with a personal request before his decease, were conveyed to Tiberias; and the reverence which the Jewish nation still cherish for his memory is expressed by the well-known saying, לא קם כמשה ממשה ועד משה, “From Moses, the lawgiver, to Moses (Maimonides), no one hath arisen like Moses,” in allusion to Deu 34:10. “No man since Ezra had exercised so deep, universal, and lasting an influence on Jews and Judaism as Moses Maimonides. His theologico-philosophical works gained an authority among the progressive thinkers equal to his Mishna-Torah among rabbinical students. All Jewish thinkers up to date Baruch Spinoza, Moses Mendelssohn, and the writers of the 19th century included-are more or less the disciples of Maimonides; so that no Jewish theologico-philosophical book, from and after A.D. 1200, can be picked up in which the ideas of Maimonides form not a prominent part” (Dr. Wise).

Maimonides as a Jewish Theologian and Philosopher. — His importance for the religion and science of Judaism, and his influence upon their development, is so great that he truly deserves to be placed second only to Moses, the great lawgiver, himself. Maimonides first of all brought order into those almost boundless receptacles of tradition, and the discussions and decisions to which they had given rise, which, without the remotest attempt at system or method, lie scattered up and down the works of Haggada and Halacha-Midrash, Mishna, Talmuds. Imbued with the spirit of lucid Greek speculation, and the precision of logical thought of the Arabic Peripatetics, aided by an enormous knowledge, he became the founder of rational scriptural exegesis. The Bible, and all its written as well as implied precepts, he endeavored to explain by the light of reason, with which, as the highest divine gift in man, nothing really divine could, according to his theory stand in real contradiction. The fundamental idea in his works is that the law was given to the Jews, not merely to train them to obedience, but also as a revelation of the highest truths, and that, therefore, fidelity to the law in action is by no means sufficient, but that the knowledge of the truth is also a religious duty. By this teaching he offered a powerful incitement to speculation in religious philosophy, yet he also  contributed by his enunciation of definite articles of faith to a narrow determination of Jewish dogmas, although his own investigations bear throughout a rationalizing character.

Maimonides is no friend to astrological mysticisms. We are only to believe that which is either attested by the senses, or strictly demonstrated by the understanding, or transmitted to us by prophets and godly men. In the province of Science he regards Aristotle as the most trustworthy leader, and only differs from him when the dogma requires it, as, especially, in the doctrine of the creation and providential guidance of the world. Maimonides holds firmly to the belief (without which, in his opinion, the doctrines of inspiration and of miracles, as suspensions of natural laws, could not be maintained) that God called into existence out of nothing not only the form but also the matter of the world, the philosophical proofs to the contrary not appearing to him conclusive. If these proofs possessed mathematical certainty, it would be necessary to interpret those passages in the Bible which appear to oppose them allegorically, which is now not admissible. Accordingly Maimonides condemns the hypothesis of the eternity of the world in the Aristotelian sense, or the doctrine that matter is eternal ab inzitio, and has always been the substratum of an order or form arising from the tendency of all things to become like the eternal and divine Spirit; “the Bible,” he says, “teaches the temporal origin of the world.” Less discordant with the teachings of the Bible, according to Maaimonides, is the Platonic theory, which he interprets with the exactest strictness according to the literal sense of the dialogue Timoeus. He understands the theory as assuming that matter is eternal, but that the divinely-caused order, by the addition of which to matter the world was formed, had a beginning in time. Yet he does not himself accept this theory, but adheres to the belief that matter was created by God. In Ethics, Maimonides, holding reason in man — if properly developed and tutored by divine revelation — to be the great touchstone for the right or wrong of individual deeds, fully allows the freedom of will, and, while he urges the necessity, nay, the merit of listening, to a certain degree, to the promptings of nature, rigorously condemns a life of idle asceticism, and dreamy, albeit pious contemplation. No less is it, according to him, right and praiseworthy to pay the utmost attention to the healthy and vigorous development of the body, and the care of its preservation by the closest application to hygienic rules. Providence, he argues, reigns in a certain — broad — manner over humanity, and holds the sway over the destinies of nations; but he utterly denies its working in the single event that may befall the individual, who, subject above all to the great physical  laws, must learn to understand and obey them, and to shape his mode of life and action in accordance with existing conditions and circumstances — the study of natural science and medicine being therefore a thing almost of necessity to everybody. The soul, and the soul only, is immortal, and the reward of virtue consists in its — strictly unbodily — bliss in a world to come; while the punishment of vice is the “loss of the soul.” “Do not,” says Maimonides, “allow thyself to be persuaded by fools that God predetermines who shall be righteous and who wicked. He who sins has only himself to blame for it, and he can do nothing better than speedily to change his course. God's omnipotence has bestowed freedom on man, and his omniscience foreknows man's choice without guiding it. We should not choose the good, like children and ignorant people, from motives of reward or punishment, but we should do good for its own sake, and from love to God; still retribution does await the immortal soul in the future world.” The resurrection of the body is treated by Maimonides as being simply an article of faith, which is not to be opposed, but which cannot be explained.

Exception continues to be taken to Maimonides's theologico-philosophical views even in our day, by many who recognize his ability and the importance of his labors. The great Italian Jewish theologian, the late David Luzatto (q.v.), is quite decided in his opposition Maimonides, he holds, brought trouble with all his philosophy. What the Talmud left indefinite, he fastened by irons. His creed is an invention, of which the ancients had no idea. With more of a Mohammedan than a Jewish and Talmudic despotism, he constructed a codex, in order that all articles of faith and practices of the least consequence should be regulated and decided upon by its decisions (see Israelitische Annalen, 1839, p. 6, 405). No less decided is Isaac Reggio (q.v.), who approves of Luzatto's critique, and demands the removal of the yoke which Maimonides put upon the Israelites, and which robs of all freedom in thinking (ibid, p. 22). As unjust as these criticisms must appear to a careful and unprejudiced student of Maimonides, they are not the most weighty charges brought against him. There are some who even charge him with extreme Rationalism. Says Da Costa (p. 273, 274), “The system of Maimonides, by its arbitrary explanations and inventions attacked the authority, not of tradition only, but also of Holy Scripture... Learned Jews have not hesitated to suspect Maimonides of a design to weaken the basis of the two fundamental doctrines of the Jewish religion-the resurrection of the dead, and the  expectation of a Messiah.” Not only is this statement refuted by the fact that Maimonides inserted these dogmas in the thirteen articles of his Creed [see JUDAISM], but when, in his later productions, he has occasion to treat of them, he does so with great consideration of his relation to the synagogue, as we have seen above.

Editions and Translations of the principal Works of Maimonides —

(1) His כתאב אלסראגwas translated into Hebrew from the original Arabic by a number of contemporary literati, and is now printed with the text of the Mishna (ed. Naples, 1492; Venice, 1546; Sabionetta, 1559; Mantua, 1561-62, etc.), and the Talmud (ed. Soncino, 1484; Vienna, 1520- 30, 1540-50; Basle, 1578-80; Cracow, 1603-1606; Lublin, 1617-28; Amsterdam, 1644 -47, etc.). Milman incorrectly states that this “great work on the Mishna, the Porta Mosis, was translated by Pococke” (History of the Jews [3d edit. Lend. 1863], 3:150). This celebrated Orientalist only translated portions of it, chiefly consisting of the introductions to the different Tractates (Theological Works [ed. Twells, London, 1740], vol. i). The Arabic original of these portions is given for the first time with this translation. Surenhusius has given an abridged version of the whole commentary in his edition of the Mishna (Amsterdam, 1678). There are also extant Spanish versions of the whole, and German translations of various parts of this work.

(2) The Sefer Hammiz-woth, or Book of the Precepts, in Arabic (translated into Hebrew by Abr. Ibn-Chasdai, and, from the author's second edition, by Moses Ibn-Tibbon), which contains an enumeration of the 613 traditional laws of the Halacha, together with fourteen canons on the principle of numbering them, chiefly directed against the authors of certain liturgical pieces called Asharoth (Warnings); besides thirteen articles of belief, and a psychological fragment. This book is to be considered chiefly as an introduction to the Mishna Torah.

(3) The Mishna Torah or Jad Hachazaka. The first edition of the text appeared in Italy, in the printing-office of Solomon b. — Jehuda and Obadja b. — Moses, about 1480, two vols. folio; then in Soncino, 1499; the text, with different commentaries, Constantinople, 1509; Venice, 1524, 1550-51, 1574-75; with an alphabetical index and many plates, 4 vols. folio, Amsterdam, 1702. It is to this edition that the references in this Cyclopaedia are made. Translations of portions of this work in Latin have  been published, and also two in English; one by H. H. Bernard, Main Principles of the Creed and Ethics of the Jews exhibited in Selections from the Yad-Hachazakah of Maimonides (Cambr. 1832, 8vo).

(4) The Moreh Nebuchim. or The Guide of the Perplexed, was, till lately, read in the Hebrew translation of Ibn-Tibbon, first published about 1480; then in Venice, 1551; Sabionetta, 1553; Berlin, 1791-96; Sulzbach, 1828, etc.

It was translated into Latin by Justinian, bishop of Nebio, R. Mossei AEgyptii Dux sive Director dubitantium (Paris, 1520); then again by Buxtorf jun., Doctor Perplexorumn (Basle, 1629). The first part was translated into German by Furstenthal (Krotoschin, 1839); the second by M. E. Stein (Vienna, 1864); and the third by Scheyer (Frankfort-on-the- Main, 1838). Part 3:26-49, has been translated into English by Dr. Townley, The Reasons of the Laws of Moses (Lond. 1827). The original Arabic, with a French translation and elaborate notes, was published by Munk (Paris, 1856-66, 3 vols. 8vo). Commentaries on Moreh Nebuchim. or parts of it, have been written, in particular, by Ibn-Falaguera (1280; Pressburg, 1837); Ibn-Caspi (about 1300; Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1848); Moses b. — Josua of Norbonne (1355-62; edited by Goldenthal, Vienna, 1852); and Isaiah Abrabanel (15th century; edited by Landau, Leips. 1863). Of his smaller works, we may enumerate, in conclusion, a translation of Avicenna's Canon; an extract from Galen; several medical, mathematical, logical, and other treatises, spoken of with the highest praise by Arabic writers; legal decisions, theological disquisitions, etc., for which see Fürst, Biblioth. Judaica, s.v.

Literature. — Besides the authorities already quoted, see O. Celsius, De olaimonide (1727); Revue Orientate (Brux. 1841); Beer, Leben und Wirken des Maimonides (Prag. 1844); Lebrecht, in Magazinz J: d. Liter. d. Auslandes, 1844, No. 45, p. 62 sq.; Scheyer, Psychol. Syst. des Maimonides (Franktfrt, 1845); Stein, M. Maimonides (1846); R. M. Maimonides, LifJ, etc., of A. Maimnonides (Lond. 1837); Edelmann, Cheruda Genusa; Joel, Religions-philosophie d. Maimonides, in the Programme of the Jewish theol. sem. at Breslau (1859); Jarac-Zewsky, in Zeitschr. f. Philos. u.philos. Kritik, new ser. 46 (Halle, 1865), p. 5 sq.; Franck, Dict. des Sciences Philosoph.iv. 31 sq.; Grätz, Gesch. d. -ud. 6, ch. 10 and 11; 7, ch. 1 and 2; Jost, Gesch. d. Judenth. u. s. Sekten, 2:428 sq.; ibid. in Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.; Ueberweg, Hist. Philos.  (translated by Prof. Morris), 1:97; Dr. Milziener, in the Jewish Times (N.Y. 1872), p. 765 sq.; Kitto, Bibl. Cyclopaedia, s.v.; Chambers, Cyclopaedia, s.v.

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

             moderator of the Free Church General Assembly of Scotland, was ordained pastor of the High Church in Edinburgh in 1839, which position he held until his death, May 23, 1881. In 1880 he was a delegate from the Free Church Assembly to the General Council of the Presbyterian Church held in Philadelphia. He possessed fine talents as a preacher, and proved himself a successful pastor.

## Main-sail[[@Headword:Main-sail]]

             is the rendering in the Auth. Version of the nautical term ἀρτέμων (from caprew, to suspend or “hoist”), which occurs only in this sense in Act 27:40. It is explained by some critics, the largest sail of the poop, answering to our “mizzen-sail,” and even yet called by the Venetians artinmone. Some regard it as the “top-sail,” Lat. supparum. Others understand by it a small sail or “jib” near the prow, called by the Romans the dolon. The term may thus be understood to signify properly the fore- sail, which, in the opinion of those qualified to judge, would be most useful in bringing a ship to head to the wind under the circumstances narrated by Luke (see Hackett's Comment. ad loc.). The vessels of that time had one, two, or three masts; the largest was in the stern (Smith's Dict. of Ant. s.v. Malus). Hence, if Paul's ship had but one, the sail in question would have been that now called thejib, being fastened to a “boom” or spar projecting from the bowsprit; but if, as is more probable from its size, it had at least two masts, this sail would be the one attached to the front mast, that is, the “fore-sail.” “A sailor will at once see that the fore-sail was the best possible sail that could be set under the circumstances” (Smith, Shipwreck of St. Paul, 3d edit. p. 139, note). SEE SHIP.

## Maine De Biran, Marie Francois Pierre Gouthier[[@Headword:Maine De Biran, Marie Francois Pierre Gouthier]]

             one of the most eminent French philosophers of our age, “the modern Malebranche,” as he has been aptly termed, was born near Bergerac Nov. 29, 1766. Upon the completion of his collegiate studies he entered the army, and was engaged in the stormy days of the first French Revolution. Later he devoted himself to politics, and in 1795 became a member of the department of Dordogne, from which, in 1797, he was deputed to the Council of the Five Hundred. From 1809 to 1814 he was a member of the legislative body; after the Restoration of 1816 he became a moderate royalist, and represented the people as such. All this time he was deeply engaged also in philosophical studies. In 1800 the National Institute offered a prize for the best essay “On the Influence of Habit upon the Faculty of Thinking;” he wrote for it, and secured the prize. In 1803 he bore off another prize for an essay “On the Decomposition of the Faculty  of Thinking;” and in 1807 he was awarded a third prize, this time from the Berlin Academy of Science, for a memoir on the question “Whether there is in man an inordinate internal intuition. and in what it differs from the perception of the senses.” Further honors he gained shortly after from Copenhagen, for an exposition of “The Mutual Relation of Man's Moral and Physical Constitution.” In these different contributions to philosophical literature, Maine de Biran had gradually brought a new philosophy to maturity. To give his system to the public in a more completed form, he published a short work entitled L'Examen de la Philosophie de Laromiguiere; and finally crowned his philosophical labors by his magnificent article on Leibnitz, in the Biographie Universelle; and died, “too soon for the interest of philosophy,” in 1824, leaving behind, however, many traces of extraordinary philosophical genius, not only in France, but in various parts of Europe besides.

His Philosophy. — The principal point in M. Maine de Biran's philosophy was the distinguishing of the will, as a faculty, from the emotions. He argues that “the soul is a cause, a force, an active principle,” and that “the phenomena of consciousness can never be explained until we clearly apprehend the voluntary nature of its thoughts and impulses.” “In order,” says Morell, “to unfold the fact and expound the nature of man's natural activity (the hinge upon which the entire system turns), M. Maine de Biran analyzes the whole of what is contained or implied in a given action; for example, a movement of the arm. When I move my arm there are three things to be observed:

1. The consciousness of a voluntary effort;

2. The consciousness of a movement produced; and,

3. A fixed relation between the effort, on the one hand, and the movement, on the other.

Now the source or cause of the whole movement is the will and this term will we now use as virtually synonymous with self. Whether we say, I moved my arm, or my will moved it, the sentimentis exactly identical. Hence the notions of cause, of will, of self we find to be fundamentally the same; and several truths are by this means brought to light of great importance in metaphysical science (Preface to the Nouvelles Considerations [a posthumous work of Maine de Biran], p. 10). First, it becomes evident that we possess a natural activity, the seat of which is in  the will, so that whether we regard man as a thinking or an acting being, yet it is the will which alike presides over and regulates the flow of our thoughts or the course of our actions. Secondly, we infer that the will is the foundation of personality; that my will is virtually myself. And, thirdly, we infer that to will is to cause, and that from the inward consciousness of volition, viewed in connection with the effect produced, we gain our first notion of causality. These three points, as Cousin has shown us, embrace in a small compass the whole philosophy of Maine de Biran. He first seizes, with admirable sagacity, the principle of all human activity as resident in the power of the will, exemplifying it even in the case of those muscular movements which may appear to the unreflecting to be simply the result of nervous excitement. Having established the principle of activity, as residing in the will, he proceeds to identify the will with our very personality itself, showing that the soul is in its nature a force, the very essence of which is not to be acted upon, but to act. Finally, he proves that we gain our first notion of causality from the consciousness of our own personal effort, and that having once observed the conjunction of power exerted and effect produced in this particular case, we transfer the notion of cause thus originated into the objective world, and conclude by analogy the necessity of a sufficient power existing for every given effect” (Hist. of Mod. Philippians p. 639, 640; compare the memoire De la Decomposition de la Pensee; preferable even, Nouvelles Considerations, part i, sec. 1, and part 2, sec. 1 and 3; also the Examen des Leyons de Philosophie, sec. 8 and 9). “In the whole of the process by which our author had gradually advanced from the ideology of Cabanis to the absolute dynamical spiritualism of Leibnitz, he had relied simply upon his own power of reflection. Disciple of none, he had philosophized simply within the region of his own consciousness; so that whatever merit some may deny him, there are none, assuredly, who can reject the claim to that of complete originality” (Morell, p. 638-9). “Of all the masters of France,” says Cousin, “Maine de Biran, if not the greatest, is unquestionably the most original. M. Laromiguiere only continued the philosophy of Condillac, modifying it in a few important points. M. Royer-Collard came from the Scottish philosophy, which, with the vigor and natural power of his reason, he would have infallibly surpassed, had he completely followed out the labors which form only the least solid part of his glory. As for ,myself, I come at the same time from the Scottish and German school. M. Maine de Biran alone comes from himself, and from his own meditations” (Preface to the Fragmens Philosophiques). See, besides the authorities already quoted, Ernest  Naville, Alaine de Biran, sa vie et ses Pensees (1857); Damiron, Essai sur l'histoire de la Philosophie en France au dix-neuvieme Siecle; Brit. Qu. Rev. 1866 (Oct.); Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. GCnerale, vol. 32, s.v.; The Academy (Lond.), Sept. 15, 1872 (. (H. W.)

## Maintaenon[[@Headword:Maintaenon]]

             Madame de, a very noted character in the history of France, both in secular and ecclesiastic affairs, was born of a noble Protestant family in the prison at Niort, France, Nov. 27, 1635; came with her parents to this country, but returned to France in 1646; married the poet Scarron in 1651, and after his death (1660) was about to remove to Portugal, when she was secured by Madame Montespan, the favorite of Louis XIV, as governess of the duke of Maine, the illegitimate son of the king. The large estate of Maintenon was presented to her, until now Francoise D'Aubigne, and hereafter she assumed the name of the estate. Later she became a formidable rival of Madame Montespan. It was by the influence of Madame de Maintenon that Louis XIV revoked the Edict of Nantes, and that he established the educational institution in the abbey of St. Cyr. In the last-named place she spent her days after the death of the king. She died April 15,1719. It is difficult to describe Madame de Maintenon's relation to Louis XIV. She was married to him some eighteen months after the death of the queen. She is never believed to have been the king's mistress, in the ordinary sense of the term, but her association with him was surely of a very intimate character long before they were joined in wedlock. She certainly exercised an uncommon influence over him. She had a passion to be regarded as “a mother of the Church;” but while she confessed the strength of her desire to Romanize the Huguenots, she earnestly denied that she approved of the detestable dragonnades. Her pretended Memoirs are spurious, but her Letters (Amst. 1759, 9 vols.; best edit. by Lavallec, Paris, 1865 sq.) are genuine. See Noailles, Histoire de Mad. de Maintenon (1858-59, 4 vols. 8vo); Sainte-Beuve, Causeries du Lundi, 4; Blackwood's Magazine, 1.850 (Feb.); Fraser's Magazine, 1849 (March). See Louis XIV.

## Mair Hugh, D.D[[@Headword:Mair Hugh, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at New Mylus, Ayrshire, Scotland, July 16, 1797; graduated at the college in Glasgow in 1817; studied theology in Edinburgh; was licensed in 1822; was employed for some time as a missionary in the Orkneys, and other parts of Scotland; came to America in  1828, and was ordained and installed pastor of the churches at Fort Miller and Northumberland, N. Y.; in 1830 became pastor of the Church at Johnstown; resigned in 1843, and went to Brockport, where he officiated, as a stated supply, for several months; subsequently supplied at Warsaw for a year, and in 1847 went to Upper Canada, and became pastor at Fergus, in connection with the Church of Scotland, and there continued till the close of life, Nov. 1, 1854. Mair published Four Miscellaneous Sermons. A Memoir, with a selection from his MS. sermons, was published in 1856 by A. Dingwall Fordyce.Sprague, Annals, 4:744.

## Mairs, George[[@Headword:Mairs, George]]

             an Irish minister, was born at Drumbeg, Monaghan County, Ireland, in 1761; received his classical education at the University of Glasgow; next studied theology; was licensed to preach by an associate presbytery in Ireland, and, after laboring as a probationer for eighteen months, was ordained and installed pastor of the congregation of Cootehill, Cavan Co. Interested in the work of evangelizing in America, he left Ireland in May, 1793, and arrived in New York in August of the same year. Soon after his arrival he was installed pastor of the churches in the towns of Hebron and Argyle; six years after he confined his labors to the Church in Argyle alone, and held this position until old age interrupted his active labors. He died in 1841. — Sprague, Annals of the American Pulpit, vol. 9.

## Maison, Johann Georg[[@Headword:Maison, Johann Georg]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Neustadt-on-the-Aisch, May 24, 1730. He studied at Erlangen and Halle, and acted for some time as teacher at different schools. In 1779 he was appointed to the pastorate at Dottenheim, and died January 28, 1784. He wrote, Explicatio Psalmi Secundi (Culmbach, 1771): — Super Mat 16:18 (ibid. 1772): — De Miraculis (ibid. 1774): — De Loco Rom 9:18 (ibid. 1776): — De Immortalitate (ibid. 1779): — In Php 4:13 (ibid. eod.). See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v. (B.P.)

## Maistre de Sacy[[@Headword:Maistre de Sacy]]

             SEE SACY.

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

             (count) de, an eminent French Roman Catholic writer, the greatest advocate of Ultramontanism in the 19th century, was born at Chambery April 1, 1753. His father was president of the senate of Savoy, and he became himself a member of that body in 1787. When the French armies invaded Savoy in 1792 he retired to Piedmont, where he wrote his Considerations sur la France (1796, 8vo; three editions in one year). Charles Emanuel IV called De Maistre to Turin, where he remained until the downfall of that prince, Nov. 19, 1798; he then retired to Venice, and lived there one year in great poverty. In 1799 he was created grand chancellor of Sardinia, and in September, 1802, was sent by that country as ambassador to Russia. While there he published (in 1810) his Essai sur le  principe regnebateur des constitutions politiques, a full exposition of his political views, advocating the principle of divine right, and declaring the rights of the people derived from the sovereign — withal a sort of theocratic form of government more adapted to the Middle Ages than to the 19th century. “M. de Maistre,” in this work, “represents men as connected with God by a chain which binds them to his throne, and holds them without enslaving them. To the full extent of this chain we are at liberty to move; we are slaves indeed, but we are freely slaves (librement esclaves); we must necessarily work out the purposes of the Supreme Being, and yet the actions by which we work out these purposes are always free. So far so good; but here come the peculiarities of our author's system.

He does not consider men as individually responsible before God; he takes them as nations. and the nation, for M. de Maistre, is made up of the king and the aristocracy. Even considering each order separately, he asserts that all the members of the same order are indissolubly bound together, each bearing a share of the mutual and joint responsibility which weighs on the whole order. Now let us suppose the case of a revolution. In those terrible events which follow the disregard of all the laws of right and wrong, although the persons who fall victims to the fury of the multitude may sometimes be those whose very crimes have called down the divine vengeance, yet very often, nay, in most cases, the individually innocent suffer most. But, then, although individually innocent, they must come in for the share of the solidarity which belongs to the whole order. This results from the fact that the doctrine of atonement is the principle on which rests the constitution of society; the sins of the guilty are visited on the innocent, and the blood of the innocent, in its turn, atones for the guilty. Here is to be found the key-stone of count De Maistre's theory; the Savoyard publicist develops it with all the resources of logic and erudition.” It has been well remarked that a system such as this is fatalism of the very worst description. Not only does it take away the free agency of men considered as individuals, but it effectually proclaims the validity of the maxim that might is right. “Wishing to transform all earthly governments into one homogeneous theocracy, he proposed, as a control over absolutism, an absolutism of a much more dangerous character. M. de Maistre's leading idea is a good one: he swishes to appeal from the passions and depraved will of man to the Deity itself as to the eternal source of right and good; but not being, of course, able to receive immediately from God the counsel and the laws he wishes to reduce into practice for the good of society, he traces them to the pope, as the  vicegerent of Heaven! — an error common to all reactionary movements from the fear of allowing anything like vagueness to exist in the minds of men respecting their connection with the Almighty. He is not satisfied with anything short of what is really tangible, visible, perceptible to the senses, thus forgetting the character of the true Mediator. Failing to understand that both divinity and humanity have met together only in the man Christ Jesus, he would fain make us believe that the pope is ‘God made manifest in the flesh.' With such views, he could not but condemn severely the charter of 1814, which introduced new institutions into France, and he turned his face towards Russia with a view of making it his home. By a ukase of December, 1815, Russia expelled the Jesuits. To them De Maistre and his family were much attached, and being on this account himself suspected of proselytism, he quitted the country and returned to Savoy in 1817, and became minister of state. He died Feb. 26,1821.

Among the principal works of De Maistre, our special consideration is claimed also by his Du Pape (Lyons, 1819, 2 vols. 8vo; second and improved edition, 1821, 2 vols. 8vo), in which he treats of the papacy, 1, in its relation to the Romish Church; 2, to the temporal powers; 3, to civilization;, and, 4, to the dissenting churches. It is a daring apology of the spiritual and temporal power of the pope. He starts from the principle that modern nations need a guarantee against the abuses of sovereign power. Such guarantee, he claims, is not to be found either in written charters, which are always useless, nor in assemblies, which are powerless when they are not anarchic. He can find it only in a sovereignty superior to all others, at once independent and disinterested, and interfering to promote the cause of justice, which has been entrusted to it by God himself. The Savoyard publicist's beau ideal of government is the constitution of the Middle Ages.

He describes it in exulting language, and crowds his margins with quotations from Bellarmine, Baronius, and the Tridentine fathers, never suspecting that, after all, he has only been painting a tableau de fantaisie, a piece of historical inaccuracy which will match the dreamy theories of Boulainvilliers and Dubos. We are invited, seriously, to return to those happy times when royalty, while it retained its full volition, and was endowed with an independent patrimony, was restrained in the exercise of legislative power by the clergy, the nobility, and the commons, each resting on its own foundation, and acting within its allotted sphere, while above was the papacy, which, by its sublime umpirage, maintained, in cases of collision, the harmonious cooperation of the members of all the  body politic. We are told to admire the noble, temperate monarchy which had grown up under the shelter of the Christian Church, and which, though never brought to perfection (this is, at least, a candid acknowledgment), had yet secured to the mediaeval nations so long a career of happiness and freedom, prosperity and glory. It would be a task both useless and unprofitable to point out all the misstatements which occur in the description just given. The futility of his scheme was demonstrated by the conduct of De Maistre himself. In 1804 pope Pius VII crowned Napoleon emperor. This, according to the theory of the work Du Pope, was one of those judgments by which the papal infallibility settled political difficulties. Yet De Maistre speaks of this decision in the following disrespectful terms: “The pope's journey and the coronation are for the present the great subject of conversation... All in the French Revolution is wonderfully bad, but this is the ne plus ultra. The crimes of an Alexander VI are less frightful than this hideous apostasy of his weak-minded successor... I wish with all my heart that the unfortunate pontiff would go to St. Domingo to crown Dessalines.

When once a man of his rank and character so far forgets both, all that is to be hoped for is that he may completely degrade himself until he becomes but an insignificant puppet” (Corresp. diplom. p. 138, 139). It was thus the great ultramontane writer respected papal infallibility when not in accordance with his own views or his passions. De l'Eglise Gallicane dans ses rapports avec le souverainponfide (Paris, 1821, 8vo; Lyons, 1822) is a sort of continuation of the preceding work. It attacks the privileges of semi-independence claimed by the Church of France. This book, in which Bossuet and Fleury are somewhat roughly handled, was not well received at first by the French clergy. Abbe Baston published an answer to it under the title Reclamations pour l'Eglise de France, et pour la verite, contre M. de Maistre (1821, 1824, 2 vols. 8vo); still, in the course of time, it was greatly instrumental in causing the triumph of the ultramontane doctrine. Les soires de St. Petersbourg, ou Entretiens, etc. (Paris, 1821, 2 vols. 8vo), “the best known and certainly the most readable work of the author,” treats of retribution, both here and hereafter. We cannot give here the details of De Maistre's theory, but its most important features may be summed up thus: the thorough badness of human nature, the necessity of atonement, the reversion of the merits of the innocent paying for the guilty, and salvation through blood. These views, in which excellent Christians have found a daring perversion of the most holy Christian principles, led De Maistre to justify the Inquisition. His apology, entitled Lettres a uns gentilhomme Russe sur I'Inquisition Espagnole  (Paris, 1822, 8vo), is, however, but a very lame defense of that atrocious institution. His violent attack against Bacon, Examen de la Philosophie de Bacon (Paris, 1836, 2 vols. 8vo) is not much better. His works are very original, but more in the form than in the ideas. Carrying often a true principle to its fullest extent, he arrives at a paradox which he then proclaims as evident. “As a pamphlet writer,” says Dr. M'Clintock (in the Meth. Quart. Rev. 1856, p. 218), “De Maistre may be compared, in some respects, to Paul Louis Courier; he had the same point, the same finesse, the same elegance of style, and an apparent simplicity, which only set off with greater effect the home-truths he addressed to his readers; but finished as these minor works decidedly were, true both as to sentiment and language, they were merely suggested by the events of the times, and, as such, were likely to lose most of their point as the course of things moved in a new direction. The Considerations, on the contrary, will ever retain their interest, for they discuss principles; they belong to the philosophy of history. Whatever view we may take of the conclusions adopted by De Maistre, we cannot but admire both the extent of his learning and the depth of his thoughts; the work fully deserves to be placed by the student on the same shelf as Bossuet's Discourse on Universal History.”

Here we would notice also one or two peculiarities in the method of count De Maistre. which mark out his originality amid all the writers of his age. The first is that continual reference to God and to the providential superintendence of man's life here below, of which we have before spoken. From this point of view he is admirably placed to discuss the most serious questions and he does so with a power and an eloquence to which everything must yield (compare Foulkes, Christendom's Divisions, 1:200). Another remarkable point is the soundness of his judgment and the sagacity with which he assigns, both to events and to men, their proper influence over the whole course of contemporary history. Many views, many principles now generally admitted, may be traced back to the Considerations, and have been borrowed from that extraordinary book, often without any acknowledgment. See Raymond, Eloge du. comte Jos. de Maistre (Chambery, 1827, 8vo); Rodolphe de Maistre, Notice biog. sur le comte Joseph de Maistre (in the preface to J. de M.'s Correspondence et Opuscules (Par. 1851, 2 vols. 8vo; 1853, 2 vols. 12mo); Sainte-Beuve, Causeries du Lanzdi, vol. iv, and his Portraits Contemporains, vol. 2; Villeneuve-Arifat, Eloge du comte Jos. de Maistre (1853); Damiron, Essai sur l'Histoire de la Philosophie en France au 19e siecle; Taine, Les Philosophes Franfais du xixe siecle; Edinburgh Review, Oct. 1852; Albert Blanc, Introduction i la a Correspondance diplomatique de Joseph de Maistre; Migne, Nouv. Encyclopedie Theologique, 2:1326; Edinb. Review, April, 1849; Lond. Quart. Rev. 1857, art. 7; and especially the article by Dr. M'Clintock in the Meth. Quart. Rev. April, 1856, art. 3:(J. H. W.)

## Maith[[@Headword:Maith]]

             (Μαάθ, of unknown, but prob. Heb. origin), a person named as the son of Mattathias and father of Nagge (Neariah), in Christ's maternal ancestry (Luk 3:26); but, as no such name occurs in the pedigree in the O.T., and as it would here unduly extend the time of the lineage, we may reasonably conjecture this name has been accidentally interpolated from the Matthat of Luk 3:24. (See Dr. Barrett, in Clarke's Comment. ad loc.)

## Maitland, Samuel Roffey[[@Headword:Maitland, Samuel Roffey]]

             D.D., an English divine of some note, was born in London in 1792; was educated at Trinity College, Cambridge; entered the law profession in 1816, but shortly after turned towards the ministry; was ordained deacon and priest in 1821; perpetual curate of Christ Church, Gloucester, in 1823- 29; keeper of the Lambeth MSS., and librarian to the archbishop of Canterbury, in 1837. He died at Lambeth Palace, London, Jan. 19, 1866. His principal theological publications are as follows: An Inquiry into the Grounds on which the Prophetic Period of Daniel and St. John has been supposed to consist of 1260 Years (Lond. 1826, 8vo): —A Second Inquiry, etc. (1829, 8vo): — An Attempt to elucidate the Prophecies concerning Antichrist (1830, 8vo): —Tracts aend Documents illustrative of the History, Doctrine, and Rites of the Ancient Albigenses and Waldenses (1832, 8vo): — The Dark Ages; a series of Essays intended to illustrate the state of Religion and Literature in the Ninth, Tenth, Eleventh, and Tweslth Centuries (reprinted from the British Magazine, with corrections and some additions, 1844, 8vo; 2d edit. 1845, 8vo): — Essays on the Subjects connected with the Reformation in England (reprinted, with additions, from the British Magazine, 1849, 8vo; see Londons Athenceum, 1849, p. 834, 835):Illustrations and Inquiries relating to Mlesnmerism.. parts 1-6 (1849, 8vo): — Eruvin, or Miscellaneous Essays on Subjects connected with the Nature, History , and Destiny of Man (2d edit. 1850, sm. 8vo): — An Essay on the Mystical Interpretation of Scripture: — Strictures on Milner's Church History (London, 1834, 8vo): — Review of Fox's History of the Waldenses. — Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Thomas, Dict. of Biography and Mythology, s.v.; English Cyclopaedia, s.v.

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

             a noted Scotch politician of the Reformation period, better known as “Secretary Lethington,” was born about 1525, and was educated both at St. Andrews and on the Continent. He had great influence as a political  leader, and though he became a convert to the Reformed doctrines about 1555, he was in 1558 appointed secretary of state by Mary of Guise. In the following year, however, he openly joined the lords of the Congregation, and was one of the Scotch commissioners who met the duke of Norfolk at Berwick, to arrange the conditions on which queen Elizabeth would give them assistance. In 1561, after the arrival of queen Mary from France, he was made an extraordinary lord of Session. He strongly objected to the ratification of Knox's Book of Discipline, and in 1563 conducted the prosecution raised against Knox for treason. From this time he appears to have lost his influence with the reformers. In 1564 he held a long debate with Knox on the claims of the Reformed Church to be independent of the state. In 1566 he took part in the conspiracy against Rizzio, after whose assassination he was proscribed, and obliged to seek shelter for some months in obscurity. After queen Mary's imprisonment (1567) in England he played a most unenviable part, pretending to Elizabeth to be one of her admirers, but really seeking all the while to protect the cause of Mary, and it is evident that he really never deserted her, although he was present at the coronation of king James VI, and although he fought on the side of her opponents on the field of Langside. He took part in 1568 in the conference held at York, and there displayed such unmistakable sympathy for Mary that the Scottish lords marked him as a dangerous enemy to the commonwealth, and in 1569 he was arrested at Stirling, but was liberated shortly after by an artifice of Kirkaldy of Grange. In 1570 he openly declared for Mary, and became the soul of the queen's party, in consequence of which he was declared a rebel, deprived of his offices and lands by the regent Morton, and besieged, along with Kirkaldy, in Edsinburgh Castle. After a long resistance, the castle surrendered, and he was imprisoned in Leith, where he died (in 1573), “some,” says Melville, “supposing he took a drink and died as the auld Romans were wont to do.” Buchanan has drawn his character with a severe pen in his Scottish tract entitled The Chameleon. Froude (10:474) believes that Maitland died a natural death. Burton (Hist. of Maitland iv. 55-57) says of Maitland that “his name was a byword for subtlety and statecraft. Yet... if we look at his life and doings, we do not find he was one of those who have left the mark of their influence upon their age.... He had great abilities, but they were rather those of the wit and rhetorician than of the practical man.” In the estimation of Knox, Maitland had greatly lowered himself by his unkindness and vacillation, and the great reformer, in his dying hours even. was called upon to pronounce against the wary Scotch politician: “I have  na warrant that ever he shall be well,” alluding to Maitland's state in the hereafter. See Froude, Hist. of England, vol. 10. ch. 19 and 23; Robertson, Hist. of Scotland (see Index).

## Maitreya[[@Headword:Maitreya]]

             a Buddhistic divinity, according to the Buddhists was a disciple of the Buddha Sakyamuni, and a Bodhisattwa, or a mall of pre-eminent virtue and sanctity. He is classed among the gods called Tushitas, or “the happy,” and has generally the, epithet Ajlia, or unconquered. The Buddhists believe that he will become incarnate, and succeed Gotama (q.v.) as their future Buddha. In Tibetan he is called Jampa. A faithful representation of this Buddha, surrounded by the (Tibetan) goddesses Dolma, the Mantas or Buddhas of medicine, two ancient priests, and various saints, will be found in the atlas of Emil Schlagintweit's Buddhism in Tibet (London and Leipzig, 1863), where an interesting sketch is given (p. 207 sq.) of the characteristic types of Buddha images, and of the measurements of Buddha statues made by his brothers in India and Tibet. See also Hardy, Annual of Buddhism (Index, s.v. Maitri).

## Majal, Mathieu[[@Headword:Majal, Mathieu]]

             (called Desuhas, from his birth-place), a young Huguenot minister, "the martyr of Vernoux," was a pastor at Vivanais, who, having attended the national synod of Bas-Languedoc, August 18, 1744, was arrested for treason February 1 following, and despite the entreaties of his parishioners, was executed February 2, 1746, on the esplanade of Montpellier, at the age of twenty-six years. See Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v.

## Majolists[[@Headword:Majolists]]

             SEE SOMASKER.

## Majolus [[@Headword:Majolus ]]

             SEE CLUGNY.

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

             a German theologian, was born at Nuremberg. April 25, 1502. He studied theology under Luther and Melancthon, and was successively rector at Magdeburg (1529), superintendent at Eisleben (1536), and professor of theology and court-preacher at Wittenberg (1539). In 1544 he was made doctor of divinity, and two years later he was one of the representatives (with Bucer and Brenz) of the Protestants at the colloquy at Regensburg. On the breaking out of the Smalcald war, Major left Wittenberg, and received (1547) the appointment of superintendent and court-preacher at Merseburg; but, on the close of the war, next year, he returned to Wittenberg. After rejecting the offer of prominent positions, made by the king of Denmark and the duke of Holstein, he became, in 1552, superintendent of the Mansfeld churches. In the mean time he had been  active in supporting the Leipzic Interim, which asserted that good works are necessary to salvation, and had thus excited the suspicion of the strict Lutherans, who denied that proposition. Towards the close of 1551 Amsdorf assailed Major on these grounds, and the clergy of the district soon joined him in opposing the new superintendent, as having corrupted the doctrine of justification by faith. Major replied to the charge of Amsdorf in 1552, denying its truth, and asserting his acceptance of the doctrine of the Church; but, as he still insisted on the necessity of good works, the controversy continued to rage, and, as the count of Mansfeld held with the orthodox party, Major finally removed to Wittenberg. He then sought to give an unobjectionable form to his views by teaching that while faith alone is essential to salvation, good works are necessary as a consequent on saving faith. But, despite every effort at reconciliation, his opponents persisted, and even went to the length of asserting that good works are detrimental to salvation. The doctrines advocated by Major were finally branded as heretical in the Corpus doctrinae Prutenicnum, and were rejected by the compilers of the Formula Concordiae. Towards the close of his life he became involved in the Crypto-calvinistic controversy (q.v.), and, together with the Wittenberg and Leipzic theologians, was compelled to subscribe to the Torgau articles (q.v.). He died at Wittenberg, Nov. 28,1574, before the Majoristic controversy was concluded. A portion of his works, comprising homilies and commentaries on the Gospels and on the Pauline epistles was published at Wittenberg in 1569, in three folio volumes. See Schröckh, Kirchengeschichte seit der Reformation, 4:547 sq.; Planck, Gesch. des Prot. Lehrbegriffs, 4:468 sq.; Aschbach, Kirchen-Lexikon, vol. 4, s.v.; Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen- Lexikon, vol. 6; Krauth, Conservative Ref. p. 147 et passim; Kurtz, Manual Ch. Hist. 2:135; Smith's Gieseler, Eccles. History, vol. 4, § 37; T'homasius, Confess. der Evang. Luth. Kirche (Nuremb. 1848), p. 100 sq. (G. M.)

## Major, Johann[[@Headword:Major, Johann]]

             a humanistic poet at Wittenberg during the latter half of the 16th century, deserves a place here as the greatest satirist among the Philippists, as the followers of Melancthon were called. He was born in 1533 at Joachimsthal, where Johann Mathesius (q.v.) became his tutor and friend. At the age of sixteen he went to Wittenberg, and formed a most intimate connection with Melancthon. To the influence of this association may doubtless be attributed his future course. After attaining to the degree of M.A. he  removed to Wtirzburg, with a view to succor the university at that place. Towards the close of 1557 the degree of D.D. was conferred on him, and in the following year he was honored with the title of crown poet. Returning to Wittenberg, he was, in 1560, admitted to the philosophical faculty of that university, and, besides lecturing on poetry and the interpretation of Latin poets, he wrote occasional poems. In 1574 the Philippist party was overthrown in Electoral Saxony, and its heads imprisoned. It is certain that Major suffered in this reverse, and he is said to have been three times imprisoned — at one time (from 1579 to 1581) was under sentence of death, although his opponents charge this, not to his connection with the Philippists, but to his conviction for criminal offenses.

The prominence with which Andreai at this time advocated the Formula Concordiae opened a new and wide field to the vexation and sarcastic power of Major. He had not subscribed to the Formula, and made it and its originators the subject of his spleen. When he ventured to do this in an official address, he was, at the beginning of 1587, expelled from the university; but when the elector Christian I ascended the throne, the Philippist party was restored to favor, and Major was soon recalled. He did not refrain from venting his satirical humor on his opponents, but when, in 1591, the elector (died, and a new policy was initiated, our poet, with many others, was again imprisoned. So bitter was the feeling against him that a Wittenberg mob pelted him with stones and dirt, and even children railed at him as a “Calvinistic rogue.” He was released in 1593, and spent the remainder of his life in a private station, writing only an occasional poem. He died in the Calvinistic faith at Zerbst, March 16, 1600. Major's contemporaries were united in their estimate of his poetic talent and of the worth of his writings. His ideal as a poet was Virgil. He introduced Christian thought, under Virgilian forms, into his non-controversial poems, while his satire, after the manner of the Praeceptor Germanise, often degenerated into ridicule of the and Philippists that was even cruel. See Frank, Johann Major, der Wittenberger Poet (Halle, 1863); and the same in Herzog, Real-Encyklopädie, 20:75 sq. (G. M.)

## Major, Johann Tobias[[@Headword:Major, Johann Tobias]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Jena, February 2, 1615. After completing his studies at Leipsic and Jena, he travelled through Holland, France, and Italy, was made in 1645 doctor of theology, and elected professor at Jena in 1646. He died. April 25, 1655. Major wrote, Commentationes in Epoistolam ad Hebraeos: — De Naturaet Cultu Angelorum: — De Oratione pro Defunctis: — Disputationes de Potestate Clavium. See Witte, Diarium Biographicum; Jocher, Algemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:427. (B.P.)

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

             a Scottish historian and theologian, was born at Gleghorn, East Lothian, Scotland, in 1469.; was educated at Oxford, Cambridge, and Paris. After teaching a number of years in Paris, as professor of scholastic philosophy, he became professor of divinity, and subsequently provost at St. Andrews,  in Scotland. He died in 1547. He published Commentaries on the Scriptures, besides works of a secular character. — Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Thomas, Dict. of Biog. and Mythol. s.v.

## Majores[[@Headword:Majores]]

             a name given to Jewish ministers in the Theodosian Code, and also by Augustine and others to a party called Coelicolae, made up of Jewish apostates. The laws were specially severe against them, three statutes of Honorius being aimed at them.

## Majorinus[[@Headword:Majorinus]]

             SEE DONATISTS.

## Majoristic Controversy[[@Headword:Majoristic Controversy]]

             named after Georg Major — his followers holding that good works are essential to salvation; his opponent, Amsdorf, reprobating them as prejudicial to it. SEE MAJOR, GEORG.

## Majorists[[@Headword:Majorists]]

             SEE MAJOR, GEORG.

## Majoritas[[@Headword:Majoritas]]

             (Precedence) is the form in ecclesiastical law to denote the preference of the clergy over the laity, as well as the rank of the Church officers. In the Roman Catholic Church the distinction between the clergy and the laity is greater than in the Protestant churches. In the former there is also greater distinction in the ranks of the clergy itself. Thus an older ordination has precedence over a more recent ordination, and a higher over a lower order (c. 1:15, X, De maj. et obed. 1:33), excepting only an ordination conferred by the pope himself, as his act takes precedence in any case (c. vii, X, eod). In ordinations equal in rank the secular clergy precede the regulars; and again, among the secular clergy, the canons of the chapter-house those of the collegiate; among the orders, the regular canons the monks, and all other orders the mendicants; and among the latter the Dominicans precede all others (compare Benedict XIV, De Syn. disc. lib. iii, c. x). This term expresses also the official authority, the legal power of the Church office. Persons who are invested with such offices are denominated in the  Protestant churches officials (q.v.). In the Roman Catholic Church they are called Church superiors (superiores ecclesiastici), and as a body they make up the hierarchical rank (status hierarchicus). The Romish Church authority requires obedience not only of its subjects, i.e. non-officials, but also of its officials, who, on entering upon their office, vow submission and obedience to their superiors by a formal oath. Hence arose the dispute whether the pope should be accepted as the highest authority, or whether even he was subject to a council. SEE INFALLIBILITY; SEE PAPACY.

## Majuma[[@Headword:Majuma]]

             a little town on the sea-shore of Palestine, seven stadia from Gaza, and considered as its seaport (Strabo, 16:759); now represented by the little village en-Nesleh (Van de Velde, Narrative, 2:186).

## Majus[[@Headword:Majus]]

             SEE MAY

Makkedah "El-Mfughar ('the Cave'), the site which captain Warren proposes for Makkedah, is a remarkable place, and one of the most conspicuous sites in the plain. A promontory of brown sandy rock juts out southwards, and at the end is the village, climbing up the hillside. The huts are of mud, and stand in many cases in front of caves; there are also small excavations on the north-east, and remains of an old Jewish tomb, with Kokim. From the caves the modern name is derived, and it is worthy of notice that this is the only village in the Philistine plain at which we found such caves. The proximity of Gederoth (Katrah) and Naaamah (Na'aneh) to El-Mughar also increases the probability that captain Warren's identification of El-Mughar with Makkedah is correct, for those places were near Makkedah (Jos 15:41), (Conder, Tent Work, 2:174). This position is defended at length by the same writer in the Quar. Statement of the "Pal. Explor. Soc." 1875, page 165. The place is situated nine miles north-east of Ashdod, and is briefly described in the Memoirs accompanying the Ordnance Survey, 2:411, and its antiquities, ibid. page 427.

## Makarij[[@Headword:Makarij]]

             a noted Russian prelate, was born in the Moscovite province near the end of the 15th century. He early entered the monastic state; became archimandrite (abbot) of the Lus-hezkian monastery at Mos-haisk; in 1526, archbishop of Novgorod Veiikiz; and in 1542, finally, metropolitan of all Russia. He died at Moscow Dec. 31, 1564. By reason of his talents, scholarship, ecclesiastic authorship, eloquence, zeal for Christian missions among the heathen, extensive activity and influence, and patriotism, and by reason of the sincerity of his character, Makarij figures prominently in Russian history. When yet archbishop, he converted the Ishudian tribes in the north of the empire, and is justly styled the “apostle of the Ishuds.” When a metropolitan, he gathered around himself numerous scholars from Russia as well as from abroad, with whose aid he compiled many books. His celebrated “Book of Legends” went through more than a dozen editions, and was translated into German. — Wagner, Staats and Gesellsch. Lex. vol. xii, s.v.

## Makaz[[@Headword:Makaz]]

             (Heb. Ma'kats, מָקִוֹ, boundary; Septuag. Μακές v. r. Μαχυᾶς), a place first named among those designating the district of Ben-Dekar, one of Solomon's purveyors (1Ki 4:9). The associated names, Shaalbim, Beth-shemesh, and Elon-beth-hanan, would seem to indicate a locality in the tribe of Dan, perhaps in the plain east of Ekron.

## Maked[[@Headword:Maked]]

             (Μακέδ v. r. Μακέβ; Syr. Mokor; Vulg. Mageth), one of the “strong and great cities” of Gilead Josephus says Galilee, but this must be an error-into which the Jews were driven by the Ammonites under Timotheus, and from which they were delivered by Judas Maccabaeus (1Ma 5:26; 1Ma 5:36; in  the latter passage the name is given in the A. V. as MAGED). By Josephus (Ant. 12:8, 3) it is not mentioned. Some of the other cities named in this narrative have been identified, but no name corresponding to Maked has yet been discovered, and the conjecture of Schwarz (p. 230), that it is a corruption of MINNITHS ( מגתfor מנּת), though ingenious, can hardly be accepted without further proof.

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

             a distinguished Presbyterian minister, was born near Rathmelton, Donegal Co., Ireland, about the middle of the 17th century. After completing his academical and theological course, he was licensed by the presbytery of Laggan in 1681. He undertook a mission to Barbadoes soon after, and was ordained sine titulo, with a view to coming to America. From Barbadoes he went to Somerset Md., Ind., where he is supposed to have founded the Church in Snow Hill, and from thence he removed to Virginia. In 1699 he obtained a formal license to preach agreeably to the requisitions of the Toleration Act, and was very successful in his labors. He went to London in 1704, to make arrangements for the supply of his Church, and returned wish two ministers from Ireland. In 1705 he obtained with difficulty the certificates required for the exercise of his ministry, and aided, in 1706, in the formation of the Philadelphia presbytery, of which he was moderator. He died in 1708. Makemie published A Catechism (1691): — An Answer to George Keith, etc. (1692): — Truths in a New Life, etc. (1699): — A plain and loving Persuasive to the Inhabitants of Indiana asnd Virginia, etc. (1704): — A Letter to Lord Cornbury (Boston, 1707): — An Account of his Imprisonment and Trial (N. Y. 1755, and since). See Sprague, A nnals, 3:1.

## Makheloth[[@Headword:Makheloth]]

             (Heb. Makheloth', מִקְהֵלֹת, — assemblies, as in Psa 68:27; Sept. Μακηλώθ), the twentysixth station of the Israelites in the desert. between Haradah and Tahath (Num 33:25-26); probably situated on the summit north-west of Jebel el-Mukrah. SEE EXODE.

## Makkedah[[@Headword:Makkedah]]

             (Heb. Alakkedah', מִקֵּדָה, herdsman's place; Sept. Μακηδά, Josephus Μακχιδά, Ant. 5:1, 17), a royal city of the ancient Canaanites (Jos 12:16), in the neighborhood of which was the cave where the five kings who confederated against Israel took refuge after their defeat (Jos 10:10-29). It afterwards belonged to Judah (Jos 15:41). Makkedah is placed by Eusebius and Jerome eight Roman miles to the east of Eleutheropolis (Onomast. s.v. Maceda), which would bring it among the mountains, as Keil observes, who therefore locates it to the west (Comment. on Jos 10:10), since it was situated in the plain of Judah (Jos 15:41), north of Libnah (Jos 10:29; Jos 10:31) and west of Azekah (Jos 10:10). De Saulcy (Narrat. 1:438) is disposed to fix its site at a place which he names el-Merked; on the way from Hebron to the Dead Sea, a little east of Jenbeh; but this is at least twenty-five miles from Eleutheropolis, and the spot itself was not heard of by Dr. Robinson, who passed along the same route. Porter suggests a ruin bearing the slightly similar name el-Klediah, on the northern slope of wady el-Surnib, about eight miles north-east of Eleutheropolis, with large caves adjacent (Handbook, p. 224, 251); but Van de Velde's selection (Memoir, p. 332) of Sumeil, a village on a hillock in the plain, about two and a half hours north-west of Beit-Jibrin (Robinson, Researches, 2:368), seems more probable, as it has ancient remains, especially a cavern (Van de Velde, Nartrat. 2:173), although somewhat remote from Beth-horon, where Joshua's battle was fought. SEE JOSHUA. The suggestion of captain Warren (Quarterly Statement of the “Palestine Exploration Fund,” April, 1871, p. 91), that Makkedah is the present “village of El-Mughar (the cave)” (meaning, doubtless, the Moyharah of Van de Velde's Map, though Robinson writes it Mughar, in Researches, 3:22, note), is quite too far north for the narrative in Joshua, as well as for the associated names, his proposed identification of which would place some, at least, of them (e.g. Beth-dagon, at Beit-Dejan) clearly within the tribe of Dan.

## Makkoth[[@Headword:Makkoth]]

             SEE TALMUD.

## Makos[[@Headword:Makos]]

             a god of the ancient Slavonians, who was represented partly as a man and partly as a fish. At a later period he presided over rain, and was invoked when the fields were in want of water.

## Makowski[[@Headword:Makowski]]

             SEE MACCOVIUS.

## Makrina[[@Headword:Makrina]]

             The Roman Catholic Church recognizes two saints by this name.  1. A Cappadocian lady, grandmother of Gregory of Nyssa, who suffered persecution under the reign of Maximian, and wandered for a long time through the woods, together with her husband. She is commemorated on the 14th of January.

2. The sister of St. Basil and of St. Gregory of Nyssa; after the death of her father she withdrew into solitude, and afterwards induced her mother to establish a convent in Pontus, into which she retired. She died in 379, after performing a great number of miracles, etc. Her life was written by her brother, St. Gregory. She is commemorated on the 19th of July. — Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 8:746; Pierer, Universal-Lexikon, 10:764; Migne, Nouv. Encyclopedie Theologique, 2:1298.

## Maktesh[[@Headword:Maktesh]]

             (Heb. Maktesh', מִכְתֵּשׁ[but with the art.], a mortar, as in Pro 27:12, or the sockets of a tooth, as in Jdg 15:19; Sept. renders κατακεκομμένη, Vulg. Pila), a place in or near Jerusalem, mentioned as inhabited. apparently by silver-merchants (Zep 1:11). Gesenius regards it as the name of a valley, so called from its mortar-like shape (Thesaurus, p. 725). The rabbins understand the Kedron and other less likely places to be meant. Ewald conjectures (Propheten, p. 364) that it was the “Phoenician quarter” of the city, in which the traders of that nation-the Canaanites (A. Vers. “merchants”), who in this passage are associated with Maktesh — resided, after the custom in Oriental towns. Dr. Barclay (City of the Great King, p. 100,157, 173) ingeniously suggests that it may have been a quarter devoted to minting operations, and therefore situated near the goldsmith's bazaar, which was doubtless located somewhere in Acra or the lower city, but whether in the Tyropceon adjoining the Temple, where he places it, is uncertain.

## Malabar[[@Headword:Malabar]]

             a tract of country extending along the western coast of India, from Cape Comorin to the River Chandragri, in N. lat. 120 30'. Frequently the name Malabar, however, is erroneously applied to the whole country from Bombay to the southern extremity. British Malabar is situated between the 10th and 13th degrees of N. lat., belongs to the presidency of Madras, and has a population of 2,261,250. By far the most extensive portion of Malabar lies in the vicinity of the Ghaut Mountains, and consists of low hills, separated by narrow but fertile valleys. The upland is barren, and the  cultivation much neglected; and it is in the valleys, and extensive ravines, and upon the banks of the rivers that the inhabitants chiefly reside. Until a recent period slavery existed in Malabar, but in 1843 a legislative enactment was passed by the British government, by the provisions of which slavery has been abolished throughout the whole extent of the British possessions in the East. The country is distinguished by the neatness of its villages, which are superior to any in India, being built of mud, neatly smoothed, and either whitewashed or painted; their picturesque effect is heightened by the beauty and elegant dresses of the Brahmin girls. The villages, as well as the bazaars, are the work of foreigners, the aboriginal natives of Malabar living in detached houses surrounded with gardens. The higher ranks use little clothing, but are remarkably clean in their persons, and all ranks are free from cutaneous distempers excepting the very lowest castes.

History. — It is supposed that Malabar was, at a very early period, conquered by a king from above the Ghauts. The Nairs may have been established at the same time by the conqueror, or called in by the Brahmins, as a military body to support the government. In process of time they obtained settlements in the land, and the chiefs, taking every opportunity to aggrandize themselves, became rajahs, and from a remote period continued to govern Malabar like independent princes. In 1760 the Mohammedans first effected an entry here under Hyder All, who subdued the country in 1761, and expelled all the rajahs except such as conciliated him by immediate submission. Disturbances were occasioned by these proceedings, but he succeeded in establishing his authority, and in 1782 appointed a deputy, who made still further progress in subduing and settling the country. In 1788 Tippoo Sahib, his son, attempted forcibly to supersede Hinduism by his own faith, Mohammedanism. This produced a serious rebellion, which, however, was soon quelled by his vigorous administration, but in the mean time the country was laid waste by his tyrannical proceedings. On the breaking out of the war between T'ippoo and the British in 1790, the refractory rajahs and Nairs joined the British, and Tippoo was driven from the country; Malabar he came a portion of the British possessions of India, and, with slight disturbances, has since remained in the hands of the English. Under the management of the British the country is said to be advancing in prosperity.

Religion. — The original manners and peculiar customs of the Hindus have been preserved in Malabar in much greater purity than in other parts of  India. Besides the Hindus, who form the greater proportion of the inhabitants, the population consists of Moplays or Mohammedans, Christians, and Jews. The Hindus are divided into the following castes, namely, Namburies, or Brahmins; the Nairs of various denominations; the Leers, or Liars, who are cultivators of the land. and freemen; and, lastly, the Patiars, who were slaves or bondmen. Of these castes the most remarkable are the Nairs, the pure Sudras of Malabar, who all lay claim to be born soldiers, though they are of various ranks and professions. There are altogether eleven ranks of Nairs, who form the militia of Malabar, under the Brahmins and rajahs. They are proud and arrogant to their inferiors, and in former times a Nair was expected instantly to cut down a cultivator or fisherman who presumed to defile him by touching his person, or a Patiar who did not turn out of his road as a Nair passed. It is a remarkable custom among this class that a Nair never cohabits with the person whom he calls his wife; he gives her all proper allowances of clothing and food, but she remains in her mother's or brother's house, and cohabits with any person or persons she chooses of equal rank; so that no Nair knows his own father, and the children all belong to the mother, whose claim to them admits of no doubt. This state of manners also prevails in neighboring countries. The native Mussulmans (Moplays') form about one fourth of the population; they are descended from Hindu mothers by Arab fathers, who settled in Malabar about the 7th or 8th century.

Christianity appears at a very early period to have made considerable progress on the Malabar coast, and there is a greater proportion of persons professing that religion in this country than in any other part of India. The accommodation theory of the Jesuits was practiced here in the 17th century by Pater Nobili. See INDIA. Three ecclesiastical chiefs — two appointed by the Portuguese Church at Goa, and one by the see of Rome — rule over this establishment, besides the Babylonish bishops, who preside over the Nestorian community. The last-named Christians consider themselves descendants of converts made by the apostle Thomas in the 1st century. At the landing of Vasco de Gama, the native Christians are said to have numbered 200,000 souls. Dr. Buchanan, in his Journey from Madras, etc., however, computes them to number now only 40,000, with 44 churches. The total number of Christians on the Malabar coast, including the Syrians, or Nestorians, is estimated at 200,000; 90,000 of them are settled at  Travancore. There are also some 30,000 Jews in Malabar. See Cyclop. Britannica, s.v. SEE MADRAS.

## Malacca[[@Headword:Malacca]]

             an extensive region, situate in Southern India, consisting of a large peninsula connected by the isthmus of Kraw, extends from the 1st to the 12th degrees of N. lat., and from the 98th to the 104th degrees of E. long., and is 775 miles in length by 125 in average breadth. The country is a long, narrow strip of land, traversed by a chain of lofty mountains, and covered with extensive forests and marshes, so that it is very difficult to penetrate into the interior. A range of extremely bleak mountains, running through it from one extremity to the other, gives rise to innumerable streams. the courses of which, from the proximity of the mountains to the sea, are short, and are so obstructed at the mouths by bars and sand-banks that they can not be ascended by vessels of any size. At the southern extremity of the continent are the islands of Bintang, Batang, and Singapore, with many others, so thickly clustered together that they are only separated from the continent by narrow straits, and seem to be a prolongation of the land. On the west coast also there are numerous islands.

History. — The political state of Malacca has been subject to many revolutions, having been occasionally dependent on Siam when that monarchy was in the height of its power, and when its supremacy was owned by the whole peninsula. But, since the Siamese have yielded to the increasing power of the Burmans, all the southern portion of the peninsula has shaken off the yoke, and the northern states pay only a moderate tribute. The whole of the sea-coast from that latitude to Port Romania is still possessed by the Malays, who are mixed in some places with the burgesses from Celebes, and who have a small settlement at Salengore. The northern and inland parts of the peninsula are inhabited by the Patany people, who appear to be a mixture of the Siamese and Malays, and who occupy independent villages. The negro race is found in the interior among the aboriginal natives. The great majority of the inhabitants are, however, of the Malay race, who are well known and widely diffused among all the eastern islands. The origin of this remarkable race is not distinctly known; they are understood, however, not to be natives of this country, but to have come originally from the district of Palembang, in the interior of Sumatra, situate on the banks of the River Malaya. Having crossed over about the end of the 12th century to the opposite continent, they, in 1252,  founded the city of Malacca. Sultan Mohammed Shah, who ascended the throne in the 13th century, was the first Mussulman prince who extended his rule over Malacca. During part of the 15th century Malacca was under Siamese sovereigns. In 1509 sultan Mahmud repelled the aggression of the king of Siam, but in 1511 he was conquered by the Portuguese under Albuquerque. In 1642 it became the possession of the Dutch, and in 1824 it was finally transferred to the British among the cessions made by the king of Netherlands in exchange for the British possessions on the island of Sumatra, E. long. 1000, N. lat. 5° (comp. Cyclop. Brit. s.v.).

Religion. — Until the inroads of the Mohammedans in the 13th century, the inhabitants of Malacca were pagans or followed some corrupt form of Hindu idolatry. With the Mussulman reign the religion of the Crescent became the predominating belief. Christianity was introduced in the 16th century by the Portuguese. One of the earliest laborers here was the renowned Spanish Jesuit, Francis Xavier (q.v.). Unfortunately, however, for the success of the Gospel truth, the conduct of the Romish priesthood and of the Portuguese authorities was very unkind toward the natives. Not much better was the influence of the Dutch. Though Protestantism, with their entrance, superseded Romanism in a measure, the government hesitated to encourage the Christian missions, and gave great liberty to Mohammedans, lest the latter should be tempted to insurrection, and Holland be deprived of these valuable possessions. To this day the Mussulmen continue to make converts in Malacca. The Romanists maintain a suffragan bishop at the capital (of like name as the country). For further details on the success of Christianity in Malacca at present, see the articles SEE INDIA; SEE MALAYS. See also Grundemann, Missionsatas, No. 7, 21, and 24; Cameron, Our Trop. Possess. in Malayan India (Lond. 1865).

## Malachi[[@Headword:Malachi]]

             (Heb. Malaki', מִלְאָכַי, nmessenger; Sept. in the title Μαλαχαίς, but in ch. 1, it renders ἄγγελος αὐτοῦ, Vulg. Malachias), the last of the minor prophets, and the latest writer in the canon of the O.T. (comp. Mal 4:4-6). What is known of him is so intimately connected with his prophecies that it will be most convenient to consider the whole subject together. In doing so we will, at the same time, treat any doubtful questions involved.  I. Personal Account. — The name Malachi is rendered by some my angel, but it is usually regarded as contracted from Malachijah, “messenger of Jehovah,” like Abi (2Ki 18:2) from Abijah (2Ch 29:1). The traditionists regard the name as having been given to the prophet on account of the beauty of his person and his unblemished life. The name means an angel, angels being, in fact, the messengers of God; and, as the prophets are often styled angels or messengers of Jehovah, it is supposed by some that “Malachi” is merely a general title descriptive of this character, and not a proper name. So Hengstenberg, Christol. 3:372 sq.

Of his personal history nothing is known (see Dr. Davidson in Horne's Introd. new ed. 2:894 sq.). A tradition preserved in Pseudo-Epiphanius (De Vitis Proph.) relates that Malachi was of the tribe of Zebulun, and born after the captivity at Sopha (Σοφᾶ,? Saphir) in the territory of that tribe. According to the same apocryphal story he died young, and was buried with his fathers in his own country. Jerome, in the preface to his Commentary on Malachi, mentions a belief which was current among the Jews, that Malachi was identical with Ezra the priest, because the circumstances recorded in the narrative of the latter are also mentioned by the prophet. The Targum of Jonathan ben-Uzziel, on the words “by the hand of Malachi” (Mal 1:1), gives the gloss “whose name is called Ezra the scribe.” With equal probability Malachi has been identified with Mordecai, Nehemiah, and Zerubbabel. The Sept., as above noted renders “by Malachi” (Mal 1:1), “by the hand of his angel;” and this translation appears to have given rise to the idea that Malachi, as well as Haggai and John the Baptist, was an angel in human shape (comp. Mal 3:1; 2Es 1:40; Jerome, Comm. in Mag. 1:13). Cyril alludes to this belief only to express his disapprobation, and characterizes those who hold it as romancers (ο‰μάτην ἐῤῥαψῳδήκασιν, κ. τ. λ.). The current opinion of the Jews is that of the Talmud, in which this question is mooted, and which decides, it seems to us rightly, that this prophet is not the same with Mordecai, or Ezra, or Zerubbabel, or Nehemiah, whose claims had all been advocated by different parties, but a distinct person named Malachi (Bab. Megillah, 15:1). Another Hebrew tradition associates Malachi with Haggai and Zechariah as the companions of Daniel when he saw the vision recorded in Dan 10:7 (Smith's Select Discourses, p. 214; A.D. 1660), and as among the first members of the Great Synagogue, which consisted of 120 elders (Isidore, De Vita et Morte Sanct. ch. li). For a notice of prophecy of the succession of the Roman pontiffs attributed to him, see the Studien u. Kritiken, 1857, p. 555 sq.). SEE MALACHY, ST.

II. Date of his Prophecies. — Although there has been a faint disposition to regard Zechariah as the last of the prophets (Lactant. De Velra Sapent. 4:5), the received opinion decides for Malachi. Accordingly Aben-Ezra calls him “‘ the end of the prophets;” Kimchi, “the last of them;” and not seldom he is distinguished by the rabbins as “the seal of the prophets.” Cyril makes him contemporary with Haggai and Zechariah, or a little later. Syncellus (p. 240 B) places these three prophets under Joshua the son of Josedec. That Malachi was contemporary with Nehemiah is rendered probable by a comparison of Mal 2:8 with Neh 13:15; Neh 2:10-16 with Neh 13:23, etc.; and Mal 3:7-12 with Neh 13:10, etc. That he prophesied after the times of Haggai and Zechariah is inferred from his omitting to mention the restoration of the Temple, and from no allusion being made to him by Ezra. The captivity was already a thing of the long past, and is not referred to. The existence of the Temple-service is presupposed in 1:10; 3:1, 10. The Jewish nation had still a political chief (Mal 1:8), distinguished by the same title as that borne by Nehemiah (Neh 12:26), to which Gesenius assigns a Persian origin. Hence Vitringa concludes that Malachi delivered his prophecies after the second return of Nehemiah from Persia (Neh 13:6), and subsequently to the thirty-second year of Artaxerxes Longimanus (B.C. cir. 420), which is the date adopted by Kennicott and Hales, and approved by Davidson (Introd. p. 985). The date B.C. 410 cannot be far from correct.

It may be mentioned that in the Seder Olam Rabba (p. 55, ed. Meyer) the date of Malachi's prophecy is assigned, with that of Haggai and Zechariah, to the second year of Darius; and his death in the Seder Olam Zuta (p. 105) is placed, with that of the same two prophets, in the fifty-second year of the Medes and Persians. The principal reasons adduced by Vitringa, and which appear conclusively to fix the time of Malachi's prophecy as contemporary with Nehemiah, are the following: The offenses denounced by Malachi as prevailing among the people, and especially the corruption of the priests by marrying foreign wives, correspond with the actual abuses with which Nehemiah had to contend in his efforts to bring about a reformation (comp. Mal 2:8 with Neh 13:29). The alliance of the high-priest's family with Tobiah the Ammonite (Neh 13:4; Neh 13:28) and Sanballat the Horonite had introduced neglect of the customary Temple-service, and the offerings and tithes due to the Levites and priests, in consequence of which the Temple was forsaken (Neh 13:4-13) and the Sabbath openly profaned (Neh 13:15-21). The short interval of Nehemiah's absence from Jerusalem had  been sufficient for the growth of these corruptions, and on his return he found it necessary to put them down with a strong hand, and to do over again the work that Ezra had done a few years before. From the striking parallelism between the state of things indicated in Malachi's prophecies and that actually existing on Nehemiah's return from the court of Artaxerxes, it is on all accounts highly probable that the efforts of the secular governor were on this occasion seconded by the preaching of “Jehovah's messenger,” and that Malachi occupied the same position with regard to the reformation under Nehemiah as Isaiah held in the time of Hezekiah, and Jeremiah in that of Josiah. The last chapter of canonical Jewish history is the key to the last chapter of its prophecy. See Noel Alexander, De Malachia Propheta, in his Hist. Eccles. 3:642 sq.; Vitringa, idem, in his Observationes Sociae, vol. 2; Hebenstreit, Disp. in Malachi (Lips. 1731 sq.).

III. Contents of the Book. — The prophecies of Malachi are comprised in four chapters in our version, as in the Sept., Vulgate, and Peshito-Syriac. In the Hebrew the 3d and 4th form but one chapter. The whole prophecy naturally divides itself into three sections, in the first of which Jehovah is represented as the loving father and ruler of his people (Mal 1:2 to Mal 2:9); in the second, as the supreme God and father of all (Mal 2:10-16); and in the third, as their righteous and final judge (Mal 2:17 - end). These may be again subdivided into smaller sections, each of which follows a certain order: first, a short sentence; then the skeptical questions which might be raised by the people; and, finally, their full and triumphant refutation. The formal and almost scholastic manner of the prophecy seemed to Ewald to indicate that it was rather delivered in writing than spoken publicly. But though this may be true of the prophecy in its present shape, which probably presents the substance of oral discourses, there is no reason for supposing that it was not also pronounced orally in public, like the warnings and denunciations of the older prophets, however it may differ from them in vigor of conception and high poetic diction.

1. The first section of the prophet's message consists of two parts; the first (Mal 1:1-8) addressed to the people generally, in which Jehovah, by his messenger, asserts his love for them, and proves it, in answer to their reply, ‘“Wherein hast thou loved us?” by referring to the punishment of Edom as an example. The second part (Mal 1:6 to Mal 2:9) is addressed especially to the priests, who had despised the name of Jehovah, and had been the chief movers of the defection from his worship and covenant.  They are rebuked for the worthlessness of their sacrifices and offerings, and their profanation of the Temple thereby (Mal 1:7-14). The denunciation of their offense is followed by the threat of punishment for future neglect (Mal 2:1-3), and the character of the true priest is drawn as the companion picture to their own (Mal 2:5-9).

2. In the second section (Mal 2:10-16) the prophet reproves the people for their intermarriages with the idolatrous heathen, and the divorces by which they separated themselves from their legitimate wives, who wept at the altar of Jehovah, in violation of the great law of marriage which God the father of all, established at the beginning.

3. The judgment, which the people lightly regard, is announced with all solemnity, ushered in by the advent of the Messiah. The Lord, preceded by his messenger shall come to his Temple suddenly, to purify the land from its iniquity, and to execute swift judgment upon those who violate their duty to God and their neighbor. The first part (Mal 2:17 to Mal 3:5) of the section terminates with the threatened punishment; in the second (Mal 3:6-12) the faithfulness of God to his promises is vindicated, and the people are exhorted to repentance, with its attendant blessings; in the third (Mal 3:13 to Mal 4:6) they are reproved for their want of confidence in God, and for confusing good and evil. The final severance between the righteous and the wicked is then set forth, and the great day of judgment is depicted, to be announced by the coming of Elijah, or John the Baptist, the forerunner of Christ (Mat 11:14; Mat 17:10-13).

IV. Style. — The diction of Malachi offers few, if any, distinguishing characteristics. His language is suitable to the manner of his prophecy. Smooth and easy to a remarkable degree, it is the style of the reasoner rather than of the poet. The rhythm and imagery of his writings are substantially those of the old prophets, but they possess no remarkable vigor or beauty. We miss the fiery prophetic eloquence of Isaiah, and have in its stead the calm and almost artificial discourse of the practiced orator, carefully modeled upon those of the ancient prophets. His phraseology is accounted for by his living during that decline of Hebrew poetry which we trace more or less in all the sacred writings posterior to the captivity. In general the language is concise, clear, and polished, and the manner of introducing a new line of argument or a new range of thought is most striking. Here the peculiarity is to be noticed, that there is no longer the ancient dramatic manner displayed, but a kind of dialogue has taken its  place, which is carried on between God and the people or the priests, whose half-mocking questions are enlarged upon and finally answered with scorn by the mouth of the messenger. He seems fully aware of being the last of the sacred bards (Mal 3:1), and the epoch of transition from the glowing energetic fullness of the inspired seer, who speaks to the people as the highest power suddenly and forcibly moves him, to the carefully studied and methodically constructed written discourse, becomes strangely apparent in him. We find both the ancient prophetic improvised original exhortation, with its repetitions and apparent incongruities, and the artificially composed address, with its borrowed ideas well arranged and its euphonious words well selected. This circumstance has probably also given rise to the notion that we have only in his book a summary of his orations: a work containing, as it were, the substance only of his addresses, written out by himself from his recollections an opinion which we do not share. Of peculiarities of phraseology we may notice the occurrence of passages like ונשא אתכם אליו(Mal 2:3), כסה חמס עלאּלבושו(Mal 2:16), etc.

V. Canonicity and Integrity. — The claim of the book of Malachi to its place in the canon of the Old Testament has never been disputed, and its authority is established by the references to it in the New Testament (Mat 11:10; Mat 17:12; Mar 1:2; Mar 9:11-12; Luk 1:17; Rom 9:13). Philo, Josephus, Melito, Jerome, and other ancient authorities, mention it, and quote from it as in accordance with our present copies. Nor is there anything, either in its language or the circumstances of its time, the manners and customs touched upon, or its topographical and geographical allusions, that could give rise to the slightest critical suspicion.

Its text is one of the purest and best preserved, and no glosses to it are to be found in the Codd., such as had to be added to correct the corruptions of other books. The differences in the various ancient versions arise only from the differences of the vowels assumed or found by the translators in their copies. The few variants which occur in the different texts are so unimportant that they do not call for any detailed remark.

VI. Commentaries. — Special exegetical helps on the whole book are as follows, a few of the most important of which we designate by an asterisk prefixed: Ephraem Syrus, Explanation (in Syriac, in his Opp. v. 312); Rupertus Tuitiensis, In Malachi (in his Opp. 1:520); D. Kimchi and S.  Jarchi's commentaries, tr. into Latin by De Muis (Paris, 1618, 4to); Aben- Ezra's and other Jewish commentaries, tr. into Latin by Hebenstreet (Lips. 1746, 4to); D. Kimchi's and Aben-Ezra's commentaries, in Latin by Bohle (Rost. 1637, 4to); Kimchi's alone, by Carpzov (Lips. 1679, 8vo), by Miinster (Basil. 1530, 8vo); Aben-Ezra's alone, by Mitnster (ib. 1530, 8vo), by Borgwall (Upsal. 1707, 8vo); Abrabanel's, by Meyer (Hammon. 1685, 4to); Luther, Commentarius (in Opp., Wittenb. edit., 4:520; in German, by Agricola, 1555); Melancthon, Explicationes (Vitemb. 1553; also in Opp. 2:541); Draconis, Explanaciones (Lips. 1564, folio); Chytreus, Explicatio (Rost. 1568, 8vo; also in Opp. 2:455); Moller, Expositio (Vitemb. 1569, 8vo); Brocardus, interpretatio [including Cant., Hag., and Zech.] (L. B. 1580, 8vo); Gryneus, Hlypomnnemata (Genesis 1582, 8vo; Basil. 1583, 1612, 4to); Polanus, Analysis (Basil- 1597, 1606, 8vo); Baldwin, Commentarius [includ. Hag. and Zech.] (Vitemb. 1610, 8vo); De Quiros, Commentarii [includ. Nah.] (Hispal. 1622; Lugd. 1623, fol.); Tarnow, Commentarius (iost. 1624, 4to); Stock and Torshell, Commentary (Lond. 1641,fol.); Acosta, Commentarius [including Ruth, etc.] (Lugd. 1641,fol.); Sclater, Commentary (Lon.don, 1650, 4to); Ursinus, Commentarius (Francof. 1652, 8vo); Martinus, Observationes (Gronimg. 1647,4to; 1658, 8vo); Varenius, Trifolium [including Hag. and Zech.] (Rost. 1662, 4to); Pocock, Commentary (Oxf. 1677, fol.; also in Works, 119); Van Til, Commentarius (L.B. 1701, 4to); Kippen, Observationes (Gryph. 1708, 4to); Wessel. Enucleatio (Lub. 1729, 4to); \*Venema, Commentsarius (Leon. 1759, 4to); Fischer, Prolusio (Lips. 1759, etc.); Bahrat, Commnentatrius (Lips. 1768, 8vo); \*Faber, Comment(atio (Onold. 1779, 4to); Rosenmüller, Scholia (Lips. 1828. 8vo); \*Reinke, Commentar (Giessen, 1856, 8vo); \*Moore, Com, mentary [including Hag. and Zech.] (N. Y. 1856, 8vo); Kohler, Er'kl run'g (Erlang. 1865, 8vo). SEE PROPHETS, MINOR.

## Malachy[[@Headword:Malachy]]

             (Vulg. Malsachias), a familiar form (2Es 1:40) of the name of the prophet MALACHI.

## Malachy, St.[[@Headword:Malachy, St.]]

             archbishop of Armagh, one of the most noted characters in Irish Church History, was born of a noble family at Armagh about 1195. While vet a youth he retired from the world to subject himself to a most rigid  asceticism under the abbot Imar of Armagh. His humility and fervor soon gained him a great reputation for sanctity, and. quite contrary to the canonical rule, he was ordained priest when only twenty-five years old, by Celsus, then archbishop of Armagh, who took a special interest in Malachy, and favored him in many ways. He also employed Malachy as assistant in the discharge of the archiepiscopal office, Celsus intending thus gradually to introduce Malachy to the archiepiscopal duties, with a view of securing him as successor. Of these opportunities Malachy availed himself for the furtherance of a plan he had long cherished, that of bringing the Irish Church, which since the conquest of the south-western provinces by the Normans had remained independent of Rome, into subjectivity to the papal chair. Malachy gradually introduced the Roman method of reciting the hours, and also established the rites of confession, confirmation, ecclesiastical marriage, etc., in the several convents. Then, in order to become better acquainted with the details of the Roman Catholic ritual, he resided for some years with bishop Malchus of Lismore, also a native of Ireland, but who had been a monk of Winchester, England, and had there become thoroughly acquainted with the practices of Rome. Upon his return to his native land, Malachy was engaged by his friends for the restoration of the Bangor monastery, which had remained in ruins since its destruction by the Danes, and which was now the possession of Malachy's uncle. Assisted by ten monastic associates, he erected an oratory and a small house for their accommodation, and, as their superior, remained there until about 1225, when he was called away to preside over the see of Connereth (Connor), where, by unwearied exertions, he built up the cause of Christianity.

About 1129 he was further promoted by a call to the archbishopric of Armagh, the place for which Celsus had long intended him. Malachy accepted the position, however, only upon condition that he should be permitted to resign it “as soon as it was rescued from its present unbecoming situation.” Hitherto, by custom, the archiepiscopacy had been hereditary, and in consequence, though Celsus had himself nominated Malachy, the latter had not undisputed possession of the primatial see until about 1135, when he at once applied himself most earnestly and zealously to perfecting the reforms he had inaugurated while yet with Celsus. Previous to Malachy's accession to the arch-see there never had been a hierarchy or a legalized support for religion in the Irish Church. The ministry had been sustained by voluntary offerings, and in some instances by the donation of Tremon, or free lands, the rents of which were to be appropriated annually to the bishop and the poor. These lands, however,  were neither large nor numerous. During the commotions of the 10th and 11th centuries those which had been given to Armagh were again claimed by the lineal descendants of the original donors as their rightful inheritance. At this time they had been thus held for eight successive generations. Malachy's great endeavor was to do away with this abuse. SEE IMPROPRIATION. But he failed to accomplish this object, and in consequence resigned the primatial office and retired to the bishopric of Down, hitherto a part of his former see of Connor.

Malachy untiringly devoted himself to the one great object likely to be successfully accomplished — the Romanizing of the Irish Church. To accomplish this object — the greatest task which could have been undertaken by any person in his day, and which in consequence has made the name of Malachy one of the most prominent connected with the ecclesiastical annals of Ireland — he first traveled extensively in his own country, and then all the way to the Imperial City, where he was affectionately received by the pope (Innocent II), bishops, and cardinals, all vying with each other in their attentions to him. The pallium, or pontifical investure, however, for which he had come, the pope refused to grant until a request for union with Rome should come from one of the Irish synods. Malachy received, however, a sure proof of the pleasure of his holiness with the proposed scheme in his appointment to the legateship for all Ireland, and returned to his native land expectant of the immediate realization of his life-long dream.

On his way homeward he became intimately acquainted with Bernard of St. Clairvaux, whom he had already visited on his way towards the Eternal City, and so charmed was he with the order and rule of the Cistercian monastery that he determined to establish the order also in his country, and in 1142 opened the first Cistercian monastery in Ireland. In the mean time, however, Malachy busily employed himself, his legative power also, in behalf of union, and in 1148 at last succeeded in moving a synod to make the request which Rome demanded previous to the bestowal of the pallium on the Irish clergy. It is, however, not a little remarkable that the synod from which this very important request emanated was not one convened in any province or principal city. It was held in Inis Padrig (Patrick's Island), a small, inconsiderable island near the Sherries, in the northern channel of Ireland (Haverty's History of Ireland [New York, 1866], p. 161). Could no more conspicuous place be found? From this and other internal evidences there is abundant reason to infer that the Irish clergy were not then in favor of  union with Rome. The request, however, was issued, and St. Malachy set off immediately with it, expecting to meet the pope (now Eugene III) at Clairvaux; but, having been long delayed in England by the jealousy of king Stephen, Malachy, to his sore disappointment, did not reach there till the pope had left. Shortly afterwards he was taken ill, and died (1148) in the arms of his friend and future biographer, St. Bernard. Although Malachy did not personally obtain the cherished wish of his heart, he yet inaugurated and put in train the measures which brought the pallium a few years later.

St. Malachy was by far the most prominent and powerful native ecclesiastic of Ireland in her early days. “His personal influence,” says Todd (Irish Ch. p. 116), “was so great tat t he was able to direct the minds of his countrymen as he saw fit;” and for this he was admirably fitted by his descent, his learning, his eloquence, and his fascinating address. In A.D. 1152 St. Bernard wrote his Life in elegant mediaeval Latin. Previous to an acquaintance with the Irish saint, Bernard had written many hard things against the Irish, calling them “a stiff-necked, intractable, and ungovernable race;” but, in reference to Malachy, he declared that he could not find words to express his admiration of the saint.

A curious Prophecy concerning the Future Roman Pontiff is extant under the name of Malachy. It designates, by a few brief phrases, the leading characteristics of each successive reign, and in some instances these descriptive characteristics have proved so curiously appropriate as to lead to some discussion. The characteristic of Pio None, Crux de Cruce (cross after cross), was the subject of much speculation. That the prophecy really dates from the time of St. Malachy no scholar now supposes; it was unknown not only to his biographer, St. Bernard (Liber de vita S. JMl.), but neither does any other author allude to this work until the beginning of the 17th century. It may be a sufficient indication of its worth to state that neither Baronius nor any of his continuators deemed it deserving of attention. It is now supposed to have been prepared in the conclave of 1590 by the friends of cardinal Simoncelli, who is clearly described in the work (comp. Dollinger, Fables respecting the Popes of the Middle Ages, edited by Prof. H. B. Smith [Dodd and Mead, N.Y., 1872, 12mo] , p. 150 sq.). See Menestrier, Traite sur les propheties attribusees at saint Malachie; John Germano, Vita gesti e predizioni del padre san Malachia (Naples, 1670, 2 vols. 4to); Brenal, Eccles. Hist. of Ireland, p. 267 sq.; Todd, Hist. Anc. Ch. in Ireland, p. 106-117; Inett, Origines Anglicanae (see Index); Jahrb. deutsch. Theol. 1871, p. 564. (J. H. W.)

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

             Malagasi is the language spoken on the island of Madagascar (q.v.). The gospel was not proclaimed to the people of this isle till 1818, when the Reverend Messrs. Jones and Beaven were sent to labor among them by the Church Missionary Society. The translation of the Bible occupied the greater part of the time of the missionaries during eleven years. The New  Test. was completed in 1825, and, after having been revised twice, was printed in 1830. Parts of the Old Test. was printed in 1832 and 1835, and about the latter year the whole of the Old Test. was printed at Madagascar. The persecution, well known in history, commenced about this time, and lasted till 1851. The Reverend Messrs. Freeman and Jones (formerly missionaries in Madagascar) had, in anticipation of the day when they might be enabled to resume their labors, employed themselves since their return to England in the complete revision of the Malagasi Scriptures. This revision has been accomplished, and, in the immediate prospect of the island becoming again open to the efforts of the Christian ministry, the British and Foreign Bible Society determined to print an edition of five thousand copies of the Malagasi Bible from the revised MS.

This work was accordingly commenced, under the editorial care of the Reverend Mr. Griffiths (formerly a missionary on the island), with the aid of the Reverend T.W. Meller; but, after advancing as far as the completion of the New Test., with the Old Test. as far as the 10th chapter of Judges, it had been deemed advisable to suspend further progress. The revision of the text had advanced as far as the end of Job. The work given up in 1858 was again resumed, and the completion of the unfinished parts of the Old Test., left by the late Reverend Mr. Griffiths, together with a profusion of MS. corrections, very difficult to decipher, was happily brought to an end in 1864, through the able assistance of Mr. Sauerwein and the editorial superintendent of the British and Foreign Bible Society. A revised edition of the Malagasi New Test., with marginal references, was printed at London in 1869, under the care of the Reverend R.G. Hartley, of the London Missionary Society, while the Old Test., under the editorship of the Reverend R. Toy, was published in 1871. For a long time the need of a thorough revision of the entire Bible in the Malagasi had been felt. From the report for 1873 we learn that a joint board, representing all the missions on the island, has been formed for the purpose of securing, as far as possible, a thoroughly accurate and idiomatic standard version of the Bible in the Malagasi tongue. This board has ever since been at work, and from the report for 1885 we learn that the preliminary revision of the Bible was completed September 15, 1884. See Bible of Every Land, page 386. For linguistic purposes, see Parker, A Concise Grammar of the Malagasy Language (London, 1883). (B.P.)

## Malagrida, Gabriele[[@Headword:Malagrida, Gabriele]]

             an Italian theologian and preacher, who flourished in Portugal in the first half of the 18th century, was born in the Milanese in 1689. He entered the Order of the Jesuits, removed to Portugal, and became popular as a pulpit orator and a theological writer. In 1758, when an attempt at assassination was made on Joseph I, the then reigning monarch of Portugal, the Jesuits were charged with the crime (they were shortly after expelled from the kingdom); Malagrida was suspected of complicity, and arrested forthwith. Freed from this charge, he was accused of spreading heretic doctrines, and suffered death at the stake in 1761. A list of his writings is given in Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, vol. 32, s.v. See Platel, Relazione della Condemna ed Esecuzione del Gesuita G. Malagrida (1761).

## Malakans[[@Headword:Malakans]]

             or MILK-EATERS (Russian Molocani. i.e. those who, contrary to the rule of the Eastern Church, take milk on fast-days), is the name of a religious sect in the Russo-Greek Church. The name Malakans is a term of contempt applied to these religionists, and originated. as the word Shaker, Methodist, etc., among those who did not approve of the movement. They themselves like to be called Gospel-Men. They were first brought into notice by the zeal of a Prussian prisoner of war, about the middle of. last century. He settled in a village of southern Russia, and spent his life in explaining the Scriptures to the villagers, and in visiting from house to house. After his death they acknowledged him as the founder of their new religious belief. The Malakans acknowledge the Bible as the Word of God, and the Trinity of the Godhead. They admit the fall of Adam, and the resurrection of Christ. They teach that Adam's soul only, and not his body, was made after God's image. The Ten Commandments are received among them. Idolatry and the worship of images are forbidden. It is considered sinful to take an oath, and the observance of the Sabbath is strictly enjoined; so much so that, like many of the Oriental sects, they devote Saturday evening to preparation for the Sabbath. They are firm believers in the Millennium, and are improperly described as followers of the fanatic Terenti Beloreff, who was, in fact, a member of their body. He announced in 1833 the coming of the Lord within two years and a half. Many Malakans, in consequence, abandoned their callings, and waited the event in prayer and fasting. Beloreff persuaded himself that, like Elijah, he should ascend to heaven on a certain day in a chariot of fire. Thousands of the  Milk-eaters came from all parts of Russia to witness this miracle. Beloreff appeared, majestically seated in a chariot, ordered the multitude to prostrate themselves, and then, opening his arms like an eagle spreading his wings, he leapt into the air, but, dropping down on the heads of the gaping multitude, was instantly seized and dragged off to prison as an imposter. He died soon after, no doubt in a state of insanity, declaring himself to be the prophet of God.

But many of the Malakans still believe in his divine mission. A considerable number of his followers afterwards emigrated to Georgia, and settled in sight of Mount Ararat, expecting the Millennium. They spend whole days and nights in prayer, and have all their goods in common. SEE MILLENARIANS in Russia. These milk-people deny the sanctity and use of fasts, holding that men who have to work require good food, to be eaten in moderation all the year round-no day stinted, no day in excess. They prefer to live by the laws of nature, asking and giving a reason for everything they do. They set their faces against monks and popes. In Russia they suffered sore persecution under the late emperor Nicholas. Sixteen thousand men and women were seized by the police, arranged in gangs, and driven with rods and thongs across the dreary steppes and yet more dreary mountain crests into the Caucasus. In that fearful day a great many of the Milkeaters fled across the Pruth into Turkey, where the Sultan gave them a village called Tulcha for their residence. The Methodist mission at that place, under the leadership of Mr. Flocken, labored among them for some time; at present, however (1872), the mission is discontinued. See Dixon, Free Russia, p. 138 sq.; Marsden, History of Christian Churches and Sects, 2:234; Le Raskol, Essai historique et critique sur les sectes riselqiuses de la Russe (Paris, 1854, 8vo). SEE RUSSIA. (J. H. W.)

## Malan, Abraham Henri Caesar, D.D.[[@Headword:Malan, Abraham Henri Caesar, D.D.]]

             one of the most noted of Swiss Protestant divines of our day, was born at Geneva July 7, 1787. When but an infant of three years Malan exhibited great powers of intellectual superiority, and the hopes which he awaken(d while yet an inmate of the cradle by securing a prize for reading at the Geneva Academy were more than realized in his manhood and hoary age. The poverty of his parents induced him to turn aside from an intellectual career to which he so much inclined, and to enter the mercantile profession at eighteen, but he soon returned again to his former mode of life, and decided upon the ministry. In 1810 he was consecrated for this sacred work by the Venerable Compagnie, or Presbytery of Geneva, and he at  once made a name for himself as a pulpit orator of unusual eloquence.

He was appointed preacher at the Geneva cathedral, and from the pulplit whence formerly the immortal Calvin had thundered forth the unalterable decrees of the Holy One. Malan now taught the Word of God in a most brilliant oratory. Unfortunately, however, the spiritual life built up by Calvin and his successors in the hearts of their forefathers had been suffered to die out, and in the hearts of the hearers of Malan, as well as in the heart of the preacher himself, there was a luke-warmness, aye a coldness, to all religion — rationalism sat enthroned in the pulpit and the pew of Geneva, the forms of the Church founded by Calvin remained, but the spiritual life had departed. The young preacher endeavored to infuse the vitality of his own fervid spirit into the lifeless forms and the latitudinarian creed of the “Venerable Compagnie,” but in vain; both the preacher and the auditor lacked that most essential element of a Christian life, the possession of the truly orthodox belief and trust in a divine Savior. In the midst of his despair Malan was brought under the influence of those noble-hearted Scotchmen, the Haldane brothers, and by them and our late Dr. John M. Mason (q.v.), and Matthias Bruen, was led to see the error of a faith built on a human Savior, and brought to acknowledge the divinity of Jesus the Christ. From this time forward Malan became a champion of the orthodox faith. The first opportunity to display his ability as a polemic he found against the Venerable Compagnie itself. This body had issued for circulation among the masses an edition of the N.T. in which all passages bearing on the divinity of Christ were so altered as to favor the Socinian belief; this translation Malan denounced with the most vehement eloquence, and from his pulpit expounded these self-same passages in the spirit of their intended declaration to the multitudes who crowded around him. (For a review of the Church at Geneva, see Hurst, Rationalism, chap. 18.)

By 1818 the rupture between him and the Church authorities of Geneva had become so great that reconciliation was an impossibility, and Malan was consequently dismissed from the Established Church. Besides his relation to the cathedral, Malan had been regent of the academy; in this post also he was now superseded by a divine of Socinian tendency. Not in the least daunted, he now followed the example of the Haldane brothers, and preached the truth wherever an opportunity would offer to address the multitudes and press forward the interests of Christ his master. No church accessible to him, he preached in his own house, for preach he would. The most eminent of Geneva's inhabitants gathered regularly, and by 1820 he was enabled to rear a church upon his own ground. He named it “The  Testimonial Chapel” (“La Chapelle du Timoignage”). But not only was his tongue active in building up Christ's kingdom among men, to his pen also he gave no rest; now busy in the defense of Christ's divinity or the sovereignty of divine grace, tomorrow exposing and attacking Romish error, and next rushing forth in print to reach the masses by religious tracts, clear, simple, and practical. With these manifold duties upon him, he was yet far from content. He organized a school of theology, and himself became one of the instructors; founded a tract society, and a Magdalen asylum or penitentiary. He has also the honor to have been the first to introduce the Sabbath-school into Switzerland. Not even all this toil could prevent him in the least from fostering also a joy in the development of aesthetical talents which he possessed. As a sacred poet he will live as long as the language in which he wrote shall be known. He has been pronounced the French Dr. Watts. As a composer he likewise displayed unusual endowments, and as a painter and saulptor masters of art delighted to enjoy his friendship and counsel. Thorwaldsen was his intimate friend, and more than once entrusted him with the completion of his choicest groups. Surely a master mind was that of Malan's. With untiring industry maintaining his position in the pulpit almost to the last, he died at his native place, May 8,1864.

No better comment on such a life can be given than that by E. de Pressense: “Caesar Malan a ete un homme d'indomptable conviction; il a toujours suivi les impulsions de sa conscience sans hesitation” (Revue Chretienne, Aug. 5, 1869, p. 502). His appearance at the age of fifty is thus described by an American divine who had the pleasure of being his guest: “His personnel was noble and imposing; a little above the medium height, stout built, and, having something of a military bearing, he was still natural and easy in his manners. His broad shoulders supported a superb head; his open and lofty brow gave one an idea of his mental power; his eyes were full of intellect and fire, and at the same time his loving look won your heart; his fine mouth indicated an iron will, combined with great tenderness; a profusion of white hair fell upon his shoulders” (The Observer [N. Y.], April 22, 1869). The degree of D.D. was conferred on Malan by the University of Edinburgh. Of his works, many of which have appeared also in an English dress both in England and in the United States, the following deserve special mention, The Ch. of Rome (N.Y. 1844): — Les Momiers sontils invisibles? (1828); his followers were called Memoirs: —Les Chants de Sion (1826,12mo, and often), a collection of his hymns: — Le Temoiqnage de Dieu (1833,8vo). See, besides the excellent article in the New Amer. Cyclop. 1864, p. 495,  and Bost, Memoires du Reveil rel. des eglises protest. de la Suisse et de la France (see Index); the Life, Labors, and Writings of Caesar Malan, by one of his sors (1869, post 8vo). (J. H.W.)

## Malay Archipelago[[@Headword:Malay Archipelago]]

             also called the INDIAN or EASTERN ARCHIPELAGO and MALAISIA, by far the largest, if not the most important island group, or rather system of island groups in the world, of which the principal are the Sunda Islands (embracing Sumatra, Java, etc.), the Philippines, and the Moluccas, or Spice Islands. They are treated severally under the respective names of the different islands. SEE JAVA; SEE MACASSAR; SEE MALACCA; SEE MOLUCCAS; SEE PHILIPPINES; SEE SUMATRA, etc. “The whole of these islands together, comprising an area of 170,000 square miles, contain about 20,000,000 of human beings of all grades of color and stature. The most ancient appear to be the Papoos, who are the only inhabitants of the Andaman Islands, but who are found farther eastward as a people driven into the forests, mountains, and defiles, and are not found again as a leading population till we reach New Guinea. They are among the most degenerate of the human race.

They were supplanted more immediately by the Malays, who, having many centuries ago emigrated from India beyond the Ganges, have become a mysteriously heterogeneous people by mixture with Papoos, Hindus, Arabs, Chinese, Siamese, and even with Europeans. The shores have of late years been more and more covered with Chinese emigrants, who threaten the same fate to the Malays which they have- inflicted upon the Papoos. The religions are as various as the nations, and tribes, and languages. Here we may still meet with aboriginal sorcery, together with the divine worship paid to mountains, rocks, woods, storms, volcanoes; then with Brahminism and Buddhism, the Chinese worship of ancestors exalted into demigods, the Mohammedan delusions, and the saint worship of the Romish communion. The worship of God in spirit and in truth has hitherto been to those wretched natives a thing unknown, and what has been attempted for these forty or fifty years past by about seventy or eighty missionaries is as yet but little more than a beginning of what remains to be done.” See Newcomb, Cyclop. of Missions, p. 479; Grundemann, Missions atlas, No. 17. SEE MALAYS.

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

             The Scriptures, either in whole or in part, were translated into Malayan several times. The first translation was made by John Van Hasel, a director of the East India Company, formed in 1602. When he had completed a version of the gospel according to Matthew, he handed over the MS. to Peter de Carpentier, the general of the company, and soon after, in 1612, another version, prepared by Albert Cornelisson Ruyl, was delivered to the same individual, in order that the two versions might be compared. Ruyl's was preferred, and he now devoted himself to the completion of the New Test.; but only lived to translate as far as the close of the gospel of Mark. His MSS. were sent to Holland, and were printed with the Dutch version at Enkhuysen in 1629, and again at Amsterdam in 1638. Van Hasel, far from being discouraged at the preference with which Ruyl's version was regarded, persevered with his translation, and completed a version of the four gospels, of which Luke and John were published at Amsterdam in 1646. Van Hasel also translated the Psalms, in concert with Justus Heurn, who, for fifteen years, presided over the Dutch Church in India.

The first portion of this version was printed at Amsterdam in 1648, and the entire Psalter appeared in 1689. Heurn likewise translated the Acts of the Apostles into Malayan, and revised the gospels of Van Hasel and Ruyl, according to the Greek, or rather, perhaps, conformed them to the Low or Belgic version of 1637. This revision, together with the Acts, and the Dutch version in the margin, was printed at Amsterdam in 1651. This was reprinted at Oxford in 1677, at the expense of the Hon. Robert Boyle, and under the superintendence of Dr. Hyde, keeper of the Bodleian Library. A second impression of the same work, in every respect similar to the first, was printed at Oxford in 1704, and the copies were sent to the East for distribution. These, and all the editions above mentioned, were printed in Roman characters. At length, in 1668, the entire New Test. was printed at Amsterdam in Roman letters, translated by Daniel Brower. He lived and died in the East; he also prepared a version of the book of Genesis, which was printed in 1662, and again in 1687, at Amsterdam. A standard Malay version of the Old and New Test. Scriptures was commenced by Dr. M. Leidekker, a Dutch minister of Batavia in 1685. He translated most of the books of the Old Test. twice; and in the New Test. had advanced as far as the 6th verse of the 6th chapter of the epistle to the Ephesians, when he was called away in 1701. After his decease Petrus Van der Vorm was appointed to complete the work, which he did before the close of the year,  In 1722 the Dutch government appointed four ministers to examine and correct the work. Besides Van der Vorm, there were Arnaldus Brandts, Cornelius Ninaher, and George Hendrick Werndly. The work was completed in 1728. Two copies appear to have been made, one in Roman, and the other in Arabic characters. The former was printed at Amsterdam (1731-33), under the care of the Reverend G.H. Werndly and Dr. Serruns, aided by two Malay chaplains.

The latter was published at Batavia in 1758, under the direction of the Dutch governor, Jacob Mosselo In 1813 George Livett, Esq., a resident at Amboyna, addressed the Calcutta Bible Society in behalf of the Amboynese Christians, who were almost destitute of Bibles. The society had three thousand copies of the Malayan New Test. printed at Serampore in 1814, the text being that of 1731. This edition was in Roman characters. But as there were Malavan districts where the Arabic was still in use, the same society determined upon printing two editions of the Scriptures, one in Roman, the other in Arabic letters.

The former was completed in 1817, when the entire Bible from the text of 1731-33 left the press; the latter was not published until 1822, the text of 1758 having been carefully revised and corrected for that purpose by the Rev. Mr. Hutchings and major McInnes. While these editions were published further supplies of the Malayan Scriptures were prepared in London, at the earnest request of the Auxiliary Bible Society at Amboyna. In 1819 the New Test. in the Roman character, from the text of 1733, was printed by the British and' Foreign Bible Society, under the care of professor Lee, and in 1822 the entire Bible from the same text was issued. In 1820 the Netherlands Bible Society supplied the Malays with the New Test. which was printed at Haarlem, and in 1824 the whole Bible was published for the Malays by the same society, in an edition of five thousand copies. These editions were printed in Arabic characters from the edition of 1758, under the superintendence of professor Wilmet. In 1822 the same society printed an edition of New Tests. and Bibles in the Roman character from the text of 1733. In 1830 the Calcutta Society printed, at Singapore, an edition of two thousand five hundred copies of Matthew's gospel, in Arabic characters, as the first step towards giving a fresh edition of the entire Newo Test. This measure was adopted in consequence of the desire manifested among the Western Malays themselves to read the Scriptures — a circumstance never known before, for the Bible had previously been urged upon them rather than freely accepted, and their Mohammedan prejudices had been deemed impregnable.

In consequence of their increased demand for the "Englishman's Koran," the Calcutta Society published, in 1833, a revised  edition of one thousand' copies of the Gospels and the Acts, and one thousand five hundred copies of the entire New Test. from the edition corrected by Mr. Hutchings. The printing was carried on at Singapore, under the care of the Reverend Messrs. Thomson and Burn, of the London Missionary Society. Another version of the New Test., less literal and more idiomatic than former translations, was executed by the agents of the London Missionary Society and of the American Bible Society, at Singapore. Editions in both the Arabic and Roman characters were printed in 1856, under the care of the Reverend B. P. Keasberry. The latter had also undertaken a translation of the Old Test., of which he had already prepared a considerable part, when his death, in 1875, put a stop to the work. Since 1814 the Java Auxiliary Bible Society has contemplated the plan of publishing the New Test. in Low Malay, which is spoken in the lower parts of Java. An edition of the New Test. in the Low Malay, which was commenced by Mr. Robinson, a Baptist missionary, and completed by Dr. Medhurst, left the press at Singapore in 1833. Some Christians at Sourabaya prepared a translation of the Psalms, which was printed at Amsterdam in 1847, under the care of professor Vetti, by the Netherlands Bible Society. In 1877 the British and Foreign Bible Society published the translation of the book of Exodus of Mr. J.L. Marten, which the Reverend E. W. King, who brought it to England from Java, superintended. See Bible of Every Land, page 360.

Linguistic Helps. — Dennys, A Handbook of Malay Colloquial, as Spoken in Singapore; Maxwell, A Manual of the Malay Language (1882); Swettenham, Vocabulary of the English and Malay Languages (Singapore, 1881, 2 volumes); Favre, Grammaire de la Langue Malaise (Paris, 1876); Dictionnaire Malais-Frangais (1875, 2 volumes); Dictionnaire Francais-Malais (1880, 2 volumes). (B.P.)

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

             The Malayalim is spoken along the western coast of Peninsular India, from cape Comorin to the borders of Canara, and from the sea to the western Ghauts. This region, sometimes distinguished by the general name of Malayala, comprises the British district of Malabar, under the Madras presidency, and the territories of the several rajahs of Travancore, Cochin, and Coorg. The natives in general are Hindus. When Dr. Buchanan, at the beginning of the present century, visited the Syrian Christians at Malayala, he found that several attempts had been made by them at different times,  though without success, to effect a translation of the Scriptures into Malaysalim, their vernacular language. At the suggestion of Dr. Buchanan the design was carried into execution, and the bishop, Mar Dionysius, engaged to superintend the translation. On his second visit to Travancore, in 1807, Dr. Buchanan found that the translation of the four gospels had been completed by Timapah Pillay and Rembar, a catanar or priest of the Syrian Church.

The translation had been made from the Tamul version of Fabricius, and an edition of five thousand copies of these gospels was printed at Bombay at the expense of the British and Foreign Bible Society. Timapah Pillay was subsequently placed under the superintendence of the Reverend Mr. Thompson, at Madras, in order to complete the translation of the New Test., which was accomplished in 1813. This version, however, did not prove satisfactory, and Mr. Spring, chaplain at Tellicherry, proposed to enter upon a complete revision of Timapah Pillay's version, so as to render it acceptable to the natives of Malabar; while Mr. Bailey, who was stationed at Cottayam, engaged to execute a new translation for the benefit of the inhabitants of Travancore.

Both these translations were completed in 1819, and on examination Mr. Bailey's version was preferred by the Madras Bible Society, at whose expense the New Test. was published at Cottayam, in 1830. The translation of the Old Test. was likewise completed by Mr. Bailey the same year, and this work was submitted to a sub-committee, formed in 1832, in connection with the Madras Society, for the publication of a Malavyalim version of the Old Test. In 1834 some parts of the New Test. were printed in London, under the care of Mr. Bailey, who had been compelled to visit England on account of his health. The remainder of the New Test. was printed by him at the mission-press in Cottayam. Complete editions of both the Old and New Tests. in Malayalim have since been issued from the Cottayam press. The version previously in current use was, however, admitted to stand in need of further revision, and a publishing committee was appointed for the purpose. In the report for 1856 we read that the revision of the New Test. has been completed, together with that of the first three books of the Pentateuch.

In 1858 the revision had proceeded as far as the end of the second book of Samuel, while in 1863 we are told that the Old Test. had been reprinted, with a few corrections. In 1871 we read that "the New Test., in this southern Indian language, is about to be revised, but the plan of operations has not vet been fully decided upon. The bishops and pastors in the Syrian Church of Malabar have undertaken to aid the English and German missionaries in the work." The meeting of delegates appointed for  that purpose took place, according to the report of 1872, July 26, 1871, at Calnanore. The delegates present were the Reverend Messrs. Baker and Justus Joseph, of the Church Missionary Society, and Fritz and Miller, of the German Basle Mission. The work of the delegates progressed very slowly.

In the report for 1877 we read that the revision of the New Test. was carried on as far as Hebrews 5, and, said the Reverend H. Baker, convener of the delegates, "I trust in a few months to see the end of the New Test., and shall hope to praise God for enabling me to do the little I have done towards this edition." His wish, however, has not been fulfilled, for to use the words of the report for 1879, "the Malayalim Revision Committee has lost its senior member, the Reverend H. Baker, of the Church Missionary Society, Cottayam. This, together with the dialectical differences in the language as spoken in North and South Malabar, has made the task very difficult. The revision has been carried on, however, in the New Test. to the end of James, the first two gospels having undergone a second revision." From the report for 1883 we learn that the revision of the New Test. had been brought to a close in 1882, and that an edition of eight thousand copies has been printed. The Old Test. is now in the course of revision. See Bible of Every Land, page 145. For linguistic purposes, see Gundert, A Malayalim and English Dictionary. (B.P.)

## Malays[[@Headword:Malays]]

             (properly Malayus, a Malay word, the derivation of which has not yet been satisfactorily ascertained) is the name given to a great branch of the human family dwelling in the Malay peninsula, in the islands, large and small, of the Indian Archipelago, in Madagascar, and in the numerous islands of the Pacific. In the fivefold division of mankind laid down by Blumenbach, the Malays are treated as a distinct race, while in the threefold division of Latham they are regarded as a branch of the Mongolidae. Prichard, however, subdivides the various representatives of the Malay family into three branches, viz:

(1.) the Indo-Malayan, comprehending the Malays proper of Malacca, and the inhabitants of Sumatra, Java, Celebes, the Moluccas, and the Philippines, with whom, perhaps, may be associated the natives of the Caroline Islands and the Ladrones;

(2.) the Polynesians; and

(3.) the Madecasses, or people of Madagascar. Following Latham, we shall here confine ourselves to the Malays proper, the natives of Madagascar having been already noticed under that heading, and reserving the Polynesians generally and the Maori in particular for distinct articles. In physical appearance the Malays are a brown-complexioned race, rather darker than the Chinese, but not so swarthy as the Hindus; they have long, black, shining, but coarse hair; little or no beard; a large mouth; eyes large and dark; nose generally short and flat; lips rather thicker than those of Europeans; and cheek-bones high. In stature, the Indo-Malays are for the most part below the middle height, while the Polynesians generally exceed it; the Indo-Malays have also slight, well-formed limbs, and are particularly small about the wrists and ankles. “The profile,” according to Dr. Pickering, “is usually more vertical than in the white race, but this may be owing in part to the mode of carriage, for the skull does not show a superior facial angle.” This people must, however, be classified, as there is a great distinction among them from a civilized stand-point. There is a class of Malays who have a written language (the spoken language is essentially the same with all the Malays), and who have made some progress in the arts of life; then there are the sea-people, orang-laut, literally “men of the sea,” a kind of sea-gipsies or robbers; and there are also the orang banua  or orang utan, “wild men” or “savages,” dwelling in the woods or forests, and supposed to be the aborigines of the peninsula and islands.

Origin and Language. — The name of Malaya seems to have been first used about the middle of the 12th century. The first settlement is by themselves stated to have been Menanglabo, in the island of Sumatra, rather than the peninsula itself. Even the Malays of Borneo claim to have come from Menangkabo. Palembang, however, also in Sumatra, has been mentioned as the original seat of Malay civilization; while others, again, point to Java as the source from which both Menangkabo and Palembang received their first settlers. “‘The Javanese,” says Crawfurd, “would seem to have been even the founders of Malacca. Monuments have been discovered which prove the presence of this people in the country of the Malays. Thus Sir Stamford Raffles, when he visited Menangkabo, found there inscriptions on stone in the ancient character of Java, such as are frequent in that island; and he was supported in his conclusion by the learned natives of Java who accompanied him in his journey. The settlement of the Javanese in several parts of Sumatra is, indeed, sufficiently attested. In Palembang they have been immemorially the ruling people; and, although the Malay language is the popular one, the Javanese, in its peculiar written character, is still that of the court.”

According to Wallace the Malays are found in Malacca, Sumatra, Borneo, Tidore, Temata, Macian, and Obi. The northern peninsula of Gilolo and the island Ceram are inhabited by Alfuri; Timor and the neighboring isles as far to the west as Flores and Sandalwood, and as far to the east as Timorlant, are inhabited by a people more akin to the Papoos than to the Malays, the Timorese being strictly distinguished from both; the inhabitants of the island Buru are partly Malays, partly Alfuri; while the Papoos inhabit New Guinea, the Kay and Aru isles, Meisol, Salwatty, and Weigim, and all the country eastward as far as the Fiji Isles. (Comp. F. Muller, Lingus-istische Ethnogqraphie, in Behm, Geograph. Jahrbuch [Gotha], 1868, vol. ii.) The Malay language is simple and easy in its construction, harmonious in its pronunciation, and easily acquired by Europeans. It is the lingua Franca of the Eastern Archipelago. Of its numerous dialects, the Javanese is the most refined, a superiority which it owes to the influence upon it of Sanscrit literature. From the Arabians (who gave the Malays Mohammedanism) their characters are borrowed, andl many Arabic words have also been incorporated with the Malay language, by means of which the Javanese are able to supply the deficiency of scientific terms in their own tongue.  Religion. — The civilized Malays are generally Mohammedans in religious belief; they embraced the faith of the Crescent in the 13th or 14th century.

The tribes in the interior and the “men of the sea” have either no religion at all, or only the most debased superstition. In the years 1805-38 a sect of wild fanatics, the Padris-Priests, also called Orang-Patih, white men (after their dress), sought to re-establish their superstitious creed by fire and sword. They did much mischief until the Hollanders found that their own safety as rulers was threatened, and, after a short war, subdued the Padris and broke their power most substantially. The moral character of the Indo- Malays generally is not high; they are passionate, treacherous, and revengeful. But it must be said that the cruelty and persecution which the Malays suffered at the hands of the Portuguese, who became their conquerors in the 16th century, and afterwards under the sway of the Hollanders, greatly molded the present character of this people. Little is done, even in our day, to ameliorate the forlorn condition of this unfortunate people. Polygamy is practiced only among the affluent and in the large towns. Marriage can be effected in three ways: either by purchase of the woman, who, upon the decease of her husband becomes the property of his nearest blood-relation; by entering upon a life of servitude with the proposed father-in-law, a custom reminding us of the patriarchal days of the Bible; by an equal tax borne by both contracting parties. They practice the right of circumcision upon the male child between the ages of 6 and 10. The N. Testament was translated into the Malay language as early as the middle of the 17th century (1668), by Brower; the O.T. only three fourths of a century later (1735); the whole Bible was published at Batavia in 1758 in 5 vols., and often since, e.g. by Willmet (1824, 3 vols. 8vo). Comp. Dulaurier, Memoires, lettres et rapports relatifs du cours de langues Malae et Javanaise (Par. 1843); Grey and Bleek, Handbook of African, Australian, and Polynesian Theology (Cape City, 1858 sq., 3 vols. 8vo). See Waitz, Anthropologie der Natusrvlker (Leipsic, 1869, 5 vols.); Wallace, Studies of Man and Nature (London, 1869, 2 vols. 8vo); Chambers, Cyclop. s.v. SEE MALAY ARCHIPELAGO.

## Malbin, Meier Leibisch[[@Headword:Malbin, Meier Leibisch]]

             a Jewish author and rabbi, was born in Russia in 1810. In his early youth his intellectual powers roused the utmost admiration; in his sixteenth year his fluency in the Talmud was extraordinary, his memory enabling him to repeat folio after folio. When eighteen years of age he became rabbi at Wreschen, in the province of Posen. From Wreschen he was called to Kempen, and after a long residence there, to Bucharest. Being obliged to leave Roumania on account of his opposition to the Jewish Reform party, he returned to Russia. After a short residence there he went to Konigsberg, in Prussia. Malbin died September 8, 1879, at Kiev, on his way to a new position at Esenstockau, in Russia. He wrote commentaries on the- Pentateuch, the five Megilloth, and Isaiah, for which see Lippe, Bibliographisches Lexikon (Vienna, 1881), s.v. In his expositions he proved himself not only an elegant Hebrew writer, but also a deep thinker. (B.P.)

## Malcham[[@Headword:Malcham]]

             (Heb. Malkam', מִלְכָּם, their king, as often [and as it should be rendered in Zep 1:5, instead of the Auth.Vers. “Malcham,” i.e. MOROCH]; Septuag. Μελχάμ v. r. Μελχάς,Vullg. Molchom), the fourth-named of the  seven sons of Shaharaim by his wife Hodesh (1Ch 8:9). B.C. prob. 1612. SEE MILCOM.

## Malchi-shua[[@Headword:Malchi-shua]]

             (Heb. Malki-Shlu'a, מִלְכַּיאּשׁוּע, king of help, twice as one word, מִלְכַּישׁוּעִ, 1Sa 14:49; 1Sa 31:2; where the Auth. Vers. Anglicizes “Melchi-shua;” Septuag. and Vulg. everywhere Μαλχισουέ, Melchisua), the second or third named of the four sons of king Saul (1Ch 8:33; 1Ch 9:39), apparently by Ahinoam (1Sa 14:49); he perished in the battle at Gilboa with his father (1Sa 31:2; 1Ch 10:2). B.C. 1053. “In the fact that the name of Saul's eldest son was Jehovistic in form (Jehovah hath given), whereas no such peculiarity is found in the names of the other sons, some writers (e.g. Mr. F. Newman) have seen a trace of Saul's gradual apostasy. Josephus only mentions Malchishuah once, after his brothers (Μελχισός, Ant. 6:14, 7).'

## Malchiah[[@Headword:Malchiah]]

             (Heb. Malkiyah'. מִלְכַּיָּה, and [Jer 38:6] Malkiya'hu, מִלְכַּיָּהוּ, king of Jehovah; Sept. Μελχία or Μελχίας, but in Nehemiah v. r. Μελχεία or Μελχείας; Auth. Version “Malchijah,” in 1Ch 9:12; 1Ch 24:9; Neh 3:11; Neh 10:3; Neh 12:42; Ezr 10:25, last occurrence; “Melchiah” in Jer 21:1), the name of at least ten persons near the time of the Babylonian exile.

1. The son of Ethni, and father of Baaseiah. Levites of the family of Gershom (1Ch 6:40). B.C. much ante 1014.

2. The head of the fifth division of the sacerdotal order in the distribution appointed by David (1Ch 24:9). B.C. 1014.

3. A priest, the father of Pashur (1Ch 9:12; Neh 11:12),which latter was one of those who proposed to execute the prophet Jeremiah on a charge of treason (Jer 38:1), although he had but unfavorably answered his inquiry respecting the fate of the city (Jer 21:1). B.C. ante 589. He is very possibly the same with the son of Hammelech (lit. the king's son), and owner or constructor of the private dungeon into which Jeremiah was cruelly thrown (Jer 38:6). SEE JEREMIAH. “The title ben-ham-Melek is applied to Jerahmel (Jer 36:26), who was among those commissioned by the king to take prisoners Jeremiah and Baruch; to Joash, who appears to have held an office inferior to that of the governor of the city, and to whose custody Micaiah was committed by Ahab (1Ki 22:26); and to Maaseiah, who was slain by Zichri, the Ephraimite, in the invasion of Judah by Pekah, in the reign of Ahaz (2Ch 28:7). It would seem from these passages that the title ‘king's son' was official, like that of ‘king's mother,' and applied to one of the royal family, who exercised functions somewhat similar to those of Potiphar in the court of Pharaohs”

4. One of the Israelites, former residents (or descendants) of Parosh, who divorced his Gentile wife after the exile (Ezr 10:25). B.C. 459.

5. Another Israelite of the same place (or parentage) who did likewise (Ezr 10:25). B.C. 459. In the Sept. (ad loc. and 1Es 9:26) his name appears as Α᾿συβίας.  6. One of the former residents (or descendants) of Harim, who assisted in reconstructing the wall of Jerusalem after the return from Babylon (Neh 3:11). B.C. 446. He was one of the Israelites who had previously divorced his (Gentile wife (Ezr 10:31). B.C. 459.

7. Son of Rechab, and ruler of part of Beth-haccerem, who repaired the dung-gate of Jerusalem after the captivity (Neh 3:14). B.C. 446.

8. The son of a “goldsmith,” and the repairer of part of the wall of Jerusalem opposite Ophel (Neh 3:31). B.C. 446.

9. One of the priests appointed as musicians, apparently vocal, to celebrate the completion of the walls of Jerusalem after the exile (Neh 12:42). B.C. 446.

10. One of those who supported Ezra on the left hand while reading the law to the people assembled at Jerusalem (Neh 8:4); probably the same with one of the priests who subscribed the sacred covenant entered into on the same occasion (Neh 10:3). B.C. cir. 410.

## Malchiel[[@Headword:Malchiel]]

             (Heb. Malkiel', מִלְכַּיאֵל, king of God; Sept. Μελχιήλ), the second of the two sons of Beriah, son of Asher (Gen 46:17); he became the “father” (? founder) of Birzavith (1Ch 7:31), and his descendants bore his name (Num 26:45). B.C. 1856. ‘“Josephus (Ant. 2:7, 4) reckons him with Heber among the six sons of Asher, thus making up the number of Jacob's children and grandchildren to seventy, without reckoning great-grandchildren.”

## Malchielite[[@Headword:Malchielite]]

             (Heb. Malkieli', מִלְכַּיאֵלַי, patronymic from Maslchiel, used collectively; Sept. Μαλχιηλί, Auth. Vers. “Malchielites”), a descendant of MALCHIEL (Num 26:45).

## Malchijah[[@Headword:Malchijah]]

             (in several passages, for different men). SEE MALCHIAH.

## Malchiram[[@Headword:Malchiram]]

             (Heb. Jalkiram', מִלְכַּירָם, king of height; Sept. Μελχιράμ), the second son of king Jehoiachin, born to him (according to Jewish tradition, by Susannah) during his captivity (1Ch 3:18), and apparently himself without issue (see Strong's Harmony and Expos. of the Gosp. p. 17). B.C. post 598.

## Malchus[[@Headword:Malchus]]

             (Μάλχος, from the Heb. מֶלֶךְ, king, or מִלּוּךְ, counsellor), a slave of the high-priest Caiaphas, and the individual among the party sent to arrest Jesus whose right ear was cut off by Peter in the garden of Gethsemane (Joh 18:10), but which was cured by a touch from Christ (Luk 22:51). He had a kinsman another slave of the same master (Joh 18:26). A.D. 29. The name of Malchus was not unfrequent among the Greeks (see Wetstein, ad loc.; Gesenius, Monzum. Phoen. p. 409), but it was usually applied to persons of Oriental countries, as to an Arab chieftain (Josephus, Ast. 13:5 1; 14:14,1; 15:6, 2). This Malchus “was the personal servant (δοῦλος) of the high-priest, and not one of the bailiffs or apparitors (ὑπηοέτης) of the Sanhedrim. The high-priest intended is Caiaphas, no doubt (though Annas is called ἀρχιερεύς, in the same connection), for John, who was personally known to the former (Joh 18:15), is the only one of the evangelists who gives the name of Malchus.

This servant was probably stepping forward at the moment, with others, to handcuff or pinion Jesus, when the zealous Peter struck at him with his  sword. The blow was undoubtedly meant to be more effective, but reached only the ear. It may be, as Stier remarks (Reden Jesu, 6:268), that the man, seeing the danger, threw his head or body to the left, so as to expose the right ear more than the other. The allegation that the writers are inconsistent with each other, because Matthew, Mark, and John say either ὠτίον or ὠτάριον (as if that meant the lappet or tip of the ear), while Luke says οàς, is groundless. The Greek of the New Testament age, like the modern Romaic, often made no distinction between the primitive and diminutive. In fact, Luke himself exchanges the one term for the other in this very narrative. The Savior, as his pursuers were about to seize him, asked to be left free for a moment longer (ἐᾶτε ἕως τούτου), and that moment he used in restoring the wounded man to soundness. The ἁψάμενος τοῦ ὠτίου may indicate (which is not forbidden by ἀφεῖλεν, ἀπεκοψεν) that the ear still adhered slightly to its place. It is noticeable that Luke, the physician, is the only one of the writers who mentions the act of healing” (Smith). “Some think Peter's name was omitted by the synoptists, lest the publication of it in his lifetime should expose him to the revenge of the unbelieving Jews, but, as the gospels were not published, this seems improbable.”

## Malcolm[[@Headword:Malcolm]]

             a Scotch prelate, was bishop of Caithness at the time of the parliament in Scone, April 3, 1373. He died in 1421. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 213.

## Malcom, Howard, D.D., LL.D[[@Headword:Malcom, Howard, D.D., LL.D]]

             a Baptist minister, was born in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, January 19, 1799. He graduated from Dickinson College in 1813; entered Princeton Theological Seminary in 1818, and remained two years; was licensed to preach by Sampson Street Church, in Philadelphia, June 8 of the same year; became pastor in Hudson, N.Y., May 14, 1819; first general secretary of the American Sunday-school Union, and travelled widely in its service, but resigned this position, July 5, 1827. He soon after became pastor of Federal Street Church, Boston, Massacusetts In 1835 he went abroad as a deputy of the Baptist Triennial Convention, to visit its foreign mission stations in India, China, Siam, and Burmah, and on his return published, in two volumes, an account of his travels.

Next, he was pastor of Sampson Street Baptist Church, Philadelphia, November 25, 1849. He was president respectively of Georgetown College, Kentucky, and the University of Lewisburg, Pennsylvania, which latter position he left, August 5, 1857. On account of an affection of the throat the later years of his life were devoted to the Baptist Historical Society. He died March 25, 1879. Dr. Malcom was president of the American Peace Society, and vice-president of the American Foreign Bible Society. Among his published volumes are, Bible Dictionary (1828, 1853): — Travels in South-eastern Asia (1839): — Extent of the Atonement (1830): — Theological Index (1870). He also edited many volumes. See Necrol. Report of Princeton Theol. Sem. 1879, page 13.

## Maldive Islands[[@Headword:Maldive Islands]]

             a chain of low coral islands in the Indian Ocean, about 400 miles west- south-west of Ceylon, some 500 miles in length by 45 in average breadth, consist of 17 groups or atolls, each atoll surrounded by a coral reef. The entire number, including the islets, is estimated at about 50,000. Mali, the largest of the chain, seven miles in circumference, with a population of 2000, is the residence of the native prince, “the sultan of the Twelve Thousand Islands,” who is a tributary prince to the governor of Ceylon. The population of all the islands is estimated at 150,000. The larger and inhabited islands are clad with palm, fig, citron, and bread-fruit trees. Grain is also abundantly produced. Wild-fowl breed in prodigious numbers; fish, rice (imported from Hindustan), and cocoa-nuts, constitute the food of the inhabitants. These people are strict Mohammedans in their religion.

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

             The Maldivian language is a very mixed one, containing more Cingalese, Hindustani, Sanscrit, and Arabic words than the Malay. The natives have two alphabets of their own, one very peculiar, the other resembling the Persian.

The four gospels were translated into Maldivian by Dr. Leyden, for the Calcutta Bible Society, but for various reasons it had not been printed up to 1860. See Bible of Every Land, page 150.

## Maldonatus, Joannes[[@Headword:Maldonatus, Joannes]]

             (1), a celebrated Spanish Jesuit, was born at Las Casas-de-la-Reina, in Estremadura, in 1534; studied at the University of Salamanca, and afterwards taught Greek, philosophy, and theology with great success; the  lecture-rooms of the college were often too small to accommodate his numerous pupils. He subsequently removed to Poitiers. France, from whence the cardinal of Lorraine brought him to the University of Pont-a- Mousson. Later he came to Paris, and there created an unprecedented enthusiasm. His exegetical lectures were attended not only by Romanists, but even by Protestants, and the renown of his teaching reminds one of the history of Abelard. His brilliant course was checkered by accusations against him of having induced the president, Montbrun, to will away all his fortune to the Order of the Jesuits, and of teaching false doctrines touching the dogma of the Immaculate Conception.

He was acquitted, however, on both charges, but left Paris, and retired to Bourges, where he devoted himself to exegetical studies, and prepared several of the works (see list below) which have made his name celebrated. He was called to Rome by pope Gregory XIII, to take a part in the publication of the Greek Septuagint. He (died in that city in 1583. His principal works are Commentarii in praecipuos Sacrae Scripturet libros Veteris Testamenti (Paris, 1643, fol.): — Commentarii in quatuor Evanzgelistas, etc. (Lugd. 1615; Mayence, 1841-45, 5 vols. 8vo). “‘ Though condemned by some, and procuring for its author the title of ‘virulentissimus et maledicentissimus,' this work has received from Catholic and Protestant writers a just meed of praise (see Bayle, Richard Simon, Schlichtingius, M. Poole, and Jackson). In this work Maldonatus collates the opinions of the fathers with great ability, and does not hesitate to differ even from Augustine, when sound exegesis demands it. He shows acquaintance with the Vatican MS. of the N.T., and with the Sept. version of the O.T., and with the original Hebrew.” The critical Simon (Hist. crit. des princip. conmmentateurs du N.T. p. 618 sq.) says he succeeded better than any one else in explaining the literal sense of the sacred writers. He also wrote Traite des Sacrements (Lyon. 1614, 4to): — Traite de la grace, etc. (Paris, 1677, fol.): — Traite des anyes et des demons (Paris, 1617): — Tractatus de cceremoniis (Bibliotheca ritualis, Rome, 1781, 4to). Summula casuum conscientice has been, we believe, unjustly accredited to Maldonatus. It is a work of doubtful morality, and very unlike the productions of Maldonatus. See Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 8, s.v.; Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lex. vi, s.v.; Kitto, Cyclop. Bibl. Lit. s.v.; Prat, Maldonat et l'Universite de Paris (1857); Theol. Quarterly, 1860 (4), p. 682.

## Maldonatus, Joannes (2)[[@Headword:Maldonatus, Joannes (2)]]

             (2), a Spanish Jesuit, who, according to Aubertus Miraeus, was a priest of Burgos, and is stated by Zeller to have ordered the lessons of the Roman Breviary, flourished about the middle of the 16th century. In 1549 he published a treatise, De Senectute Christiana, and an elegant abridgment of the lives of the saints. — Kitto, Cyclop. Bibl. Lit. vol. 3, s.v.

## Male[[@Headword:Male]]

             (Heb. זָכָר, zakar', Gen 1:27; Gen 6:19; Gen 34:25), applied to the male of either man or beasts. The superior estimation in which male children were held among the Hebrews is testified by numerous passages of Scripture, and we find the same feeling, expressed almost in the same words, still existing in Eastern countries (see Job 3:3; and comp. Roberts, Observ. ad loc.). SEE CHILD.

## Malebranche, Nicholas[[@Headword:Malebranche, Nicholas]]

             a French Jesuit, distinguished for his peculiar philosophical views, and for the brilliancy and fascination of the style in which they were expounded. He was one of the most illustrious of the Cartesians, aiming by his speculations to correct the dangerous tendencies of Des Cartes's philosophy, SEE SPINOZA, and occupies an eminent, though not a controlling, position in the history of the higher philosophy. Some knowledge of his system is required for the just estimation of the doctrines both of Locke and of Leibnitz, and for the illustration of the views of Berkeley.

Life. — Malebranche was born of respectable parents in Paris, Aug. 6,1638. Feeble and sickly from his birth, and deformed by a curvature of the spine, he was reared with the tenderest care, and was educated mainly at home. His ill health and his deformity confirmed the natural shyness of his disposition. He avoided the companionship of robust, sanguine, and active playmates, and spent most of his time in solitary meditation. He found his world within himself. Eager for seclusion from the turmoil of life, he sought a refuge in the Society of Jesuits, and joined the Congregation of the Oratory in the twenty-second year of his age. His studies were at first ecclesiastical history and antiquities, but these he soon abandoned in consequence of the weakness of his memory. He was next induced by the learned Richard Simon to prosecute sacred criticism and the Oriental  languages. They had few attractions for him. In this wavering mood he picked up the then recently published treatise of Des Cartes On Man. To this newly-acquired treasure he devoted himself assiduously, and sought the mastery of the Cartesian doctrines and of philosophical problems. Thus he busied himself for the next ten years of his life, and became one of the most earnest and eminent of the Cartesians. His perspicacity discerned the weak point of the Cartesian system; and he was too honest and too independent to be “addictus jurare in verba magistri.” He meditated intently closing the windows of his room that he might not be distracted by the light and noise of the outer world; and he revolved in silence and solitude the arduous questions which presented themselves for solution. He read little, thinking the knowledge of man, of mind, and of God the all-sufficient realm of speculation; and considering that such knowledge was to be attained only by diligence, introspection, and abstract reasoning.

Fortified and enriched by such silent and solitary labors, Malebranche proposed his modifications of Cartesianism in a work entitled Reche-che de la Verite, the first volume of which appeared at Paris in 1673; the second and third were published in the course of the ensuing year. An improved and enlarged edition was brought out, towards the close of his life, in 1712. This is his principal work; it is that which determines his position in the history of philosophic opinion. Besides other interesting topics discussed, it, in a manner less open to objection, propounded his celebrated doctrine of Seeing all things in God. The treatise itself was an examination of the nature and characteristics of knowledge, of the origin of ideas, of the mode of avoiding error and arriving at truth, of the precautions required to guard against delusions of various kinds, and especially the fallacies which arise from the senses and from prejudice. Malebranche has been accused of unacknowledged obligations to Bacon. In this he only imitated the example of his illustrious master Des Cartes. Nor did he deviate from his exemplar in the attention bestowed upon the literary execution of the book. The style was so exquisite that it exercised an irresistible fascination over all its readers. Many who rejected his principles and deductions were charmed by their exposition; and many were beguiled into the acceptance of his reveries by the plausiblity of their presentation, and by the beauty of their expression. His ornate style disguised his dogmas even to himself. His language wanted philosophical precision, and offered many salient points for attack. His system was assailed by Foucher, by Antoine Arnauld, and by Locke. The Jesuit Du Tertre, at the instigation of his order, reluctantly impugned it. Hardouin, in his Atheists Unmasked, accused it of atheistic  characteristics. Leibnitz, in defending it against such charges, admitted that the looseness of the brilliant presentation rendered it liable to misapprehension and misrepresentation, but maintained that the real opinions of the author were very different from those attributed to him by his opponents (Lettre a M. Remond, Nov. 4, 1715). The whole system of Malebranche, so far as it is a departure from Cartesianism, is centered in the doctrine of his “Vision in God,” and this doctrine led by a logical development to those views of free will and grace which resulted in the controversy with Arnauld (1680). His inquiries were, however, actuated throughout by an earnest religious desire for the purification and elevation of his fellow-men, and were not confined to metaphysical speculation, but were extended to practical topics. With this design he composed his Consolations Chretiennes (1676), and his Traite de la Morale (1684). The latter is one of the landmarks in ethical philosophy, and has merited the high commendation of Sir James Mackintosh. Besides these noted treatises, Malebranche was the author of several essays, on various scientific topics, published in the Journal of the Academy of Sciences. Whatever opposition was excited by the peculiarity, or the extravagance, or the apparent peril of his metaphysical speculations, he was always held in the highest esteem for his amiability, his intelligence, his simple goodness, and his unaffected piety.

The life of a valetudinarian so retired, and bound by the restraints of a rigid religious order, offers few incidents for curious investigation. The calm and equable tenor of Malebranche's frail existence was prolonged till he had entered his seventy-eighth year, when, in another form of existence, he may be believed to have entered upon that “vision of all things in God” which, with pious enthusiasm, he had endeavored to anticipate on earth. He died in Paris Oct. 13,1715, a year and a month before his great contemporary Leibnitz.

Philosophy. — The cardinal tenet of the philosophy of Malebranche, which contradistinguishes it from that of Des Cartes, of Spinoza, of Leibnitz, etc., of the reforming and of the acquiescing acolytes of the Cartesian school, is the doctrine of seeing all things in God, to which such frequent reference has already been made. The motive, the meaning, the genesis of this doctrine, and its relation to antecedent, contemporary, and subsequent speculation, are unintelligible, unless it is contemplated in connection with the dogmas of Des Cartes and their development. Des Cartes (q.v.)  recognized only two essences in the universe, thought and extension, which with him were the equivalents of mind and matter.

The mystery, the enigma, which presents itself in such endless forms, and which inevitably returns with all the Protean changes of metaphysical speculationwhich cannot be evaded in the study of that strange microcosm, Man, in which body and soul are so intimately, and, apparently, so everlastingly united — which cannot be overlooked in ascertaining the interaction of the mens sana or insane, and the corpus sanurn or insanum, or in determining the. grounds of moral obligation — the wondrous riddle is, how can mind act upon matter, or matter act upon mind, and the one regulate or affect the other. The diversity of the unsatisfactory solutions will be seen by comparing the explanations propounded by Des Cartes, Leibnitz, Spinoza, and Herbert Spencer. Des Cartes, recognizing the impossibility of any solution in the relations of the transitory creation, as he had arbitrarily conceived it, and with the absolute divorce of the two existences postulated by him, introduced a Deus ex machina, and imagined a divine interposition to effect concurrent action on every occasion where the joint operation of intellectual and physical nature was manifested. To this hypothesis has been given the name of the doctrine of Assistancy. This scheme is assuredly obnoxious to the sharp censure of Aristotle on some of his precursers, and renders the active intelligence of the human race a mere collection of intrusive episodes, like a miserable tragedy (Metaph. 11, 10- 13, 3). The explanation was soon discovered to be not merely a presumption, but utterly inefficacious, and of most pernicious tendency. Obviously, it made the creating and sustaining God the direct agent in man's actions in all cases where inward contemplation proceeded to outward act, and it made the universe a complicated piece of puppetry, whose motions were communicated by a hidden personage constantly jerking at the strings. The logical inconsistency of maintaining an entire separation between the grand constituents of human nature, and of requiring divine intervention for all effective manifestation of human thought, offended the acute perspicacity of Spinoza. He sought to restore harmony and congruity to the philosophical interpretation of the intelligible world, by considering thought and action, mind and matter, as only effluences, phenomenal coruscations, from the one, sole, independent, self- sustaining, eternal, all-embracing Existence, which did not so much support and regulate, as constitute and contain alike the whole creation and the Creator. This, of course, pushed Cartesianism to the absurdity of its logical  extreme, but annihilated all moral responsibility, all distinctions of nature, annulled all individual existence, establishing, in short, a pure Pantheism. But Pantheism, whether Stoic, Platonic. Spinozistic, or Schellingistic, is the negation of a personal God, of all separable existence, and of all the duties, the hopes, and the fears that spring from human obligations to a heavenly Father, and to a divine Creator and beneficent Governor of the universe.

About the same time that Spinoza was secretly engaged in transmuting Cartesianism into Pantheism, and probably independently of any impulse from his investigations, Malebranche endeavored to uphold and enforce the obligations which were nullified by the Spinozistic system, to preserve all the dogmas of revealed religion, to fortify the sense of religious duty, to escape the hazards and aberrations of the Cartesian theory, are yet to uphold the Cartesian doctrine in its essential characteristics, by correcting its excesses, and by indicating the means of conciliation between the two widely separated constituents of his creation. The Cartesian fantasy of assistancy he supplanted by his own celebrated hypothesis of Occasional Causes. Instead of supposing all material motion, in accordance with the movements of the apparently moving mind, to be due to a mechanical impulse of the Divinity, disconnected from human intelligence, he imagined that all such phenomena were provoked by images of change reflected from the divine mind, and that human knowledge and action proceeded exclusively from seeing all things in God.

A half-truth is the most dangerous, because it is the most seductive form of delusion. The moiety of truth which is present usually precludes the suspicion of deception. Such a half-truth was Malebranche's devout imagination of the vision of the universe in the divine mind. It was, however unwittingly to himself, the Pantheism of Spinoza, contemplated from a different point of view, and disguised by. a brilliant but very translucent veil. It is an indubitable, because it is a revealed truth, that “in God we live, and move, and have our being;” that “there is a spirit in man, and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth them understanding;” that “the Lord giveth wisdom, out of his mouth cometh knowledge and understanding;” but how this quickening and illuminating power of the Almighty is so exercised as not to infringe upon the independent action of the human mind, and the free agency of the human will, is one of the most bewildering problems of transcendental speculation. Our finite capacities can attain a definite solution only by a violent severance of the Gordian knot, and mutilation of the truth. We may throw aside one half, and accept  the other half as complete and exclusive, thus welcoming Fatalism on the one side, and Pantheism, in all the various shades of idealistic subtlety, on the other. That every moment of our continuous existence must be ascribed to the unintermittent support of the original creating power; that all our thoughts and actions, and our capacity for thought and action, require the same upholding agency; that this is the divine action of grace on our will and conscience; the divine guidance and providence in shaping our ends and the issues of our conduct; the divine impulse and irradiation in our best decisions, and in our intuitive apprehensions of recondite truths-these are positions earnestly entertained and asserted by the clearest and strongest thinkers, of all schools and vocations, in every age.

A cloud of witnesses to these conclusions might be summoned, more numerous than those convoked by Sir William Hamilton in support of the doctrine of common- sense, and rendering much less questionable testimony. “Omnis sapientia a Domino Deo est;” “a Deo projecta et sapientia” (Sir 1:1; Sir 15:10). “Mihi autem Deus dedit dicere ex sententia, et prnesumere digna horum quae mihi dantur: quoniam ipse sapientiae dux est et sapientiam emendatur. In manu enim illius et nos et sermones nostri, et omnis sapientia, et operum scientia, et disciplina. Ipse enim dedit mihi horum qua sunt scientiam veram” (Wisdom of Solomon 7:15-17). “Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights.” “Nemo vir magnus sine aliquo afflatu divino umquam fuit” (Cicero, De Nat. Deor. 2, 66, § 167). This tenet may have been borrowed by Cicero from Plato, or even from Homer, but it has been recently approved by Whewell, Blackie, and Dallas. “Sacer intra nos spiritus sedet; malorum bonorumque nostrorum observator et custos. His, prout a nobis tractatus est, ita nos ipse tractat. Bonus vero vir sine deo nemo est; an potuit aliquis supra fortunam nisi ab illo adjustus exsurgere? Ille dat consilia magnifica et erecta. In unoquoque virorum bonorum, quis deus incertum est, habitat deus” (Seneca, Epist. Mol. 4, 12 [42], § 2). Similar declarations are to be found in Thales, Democritus, Plato, Proclus, Plotinus, and a very remarkable one in Clemens Alexandrinus (Stromat. v. 14). S. Augustin says,” Initium ergo ejus figmentum est Dei: non enim est ulla natura etiam in extremis infimisque vestiolis, quam non ille constituit, a quo est omnis modus, omnis species, omnis ordo; sine quibus nihil rerum inveniri vel cogitari potest” (De Civ. Dei, 11, 15). The thesis has been amply commented upon, elucidated and expanded, by S. Thomas Aquinas, Henry of Ghent, Roger Bacon, Duns Scotus, and the better half of the schoolmen. It is confirmed by lord Bacon, John Millis, bishop Berkeley, and many of  the most distinguished moderns, out of Germany as well as in that land of golden mists. “In this, at once most comprehensive and most appropriate acceptation of the word, reason is pre-eminently spiritual, and a spirit, even our spirit, through an effluence of the same grace by which we are privileged to say, Our Father” (Coleridge, Aids to Reflection); and the same author cites with approval sa still stronger utterance to the like effect from that easily distinguishable personage. John Smith, 1660.

Leibnitz might well say that Malebranche's doctrine was no novelty. It was, indeed, both very old and very generally accredited, but in a form and with an application widely different from what was contemplated by him in its new presentation. The long citation of the evidences of its general acceptance — and not the tenth part accessible has been given — may be pardoned as being necessary to exhibit its familiarity to the greatest intellects, and its inclusion of actual and important truth. The doctrine is true, but it is most perilous. It must be received with habitual caution, and with most circumspect limitations. It runs along a sharp crest, with precipices on either hand stretching sheer down into unfathomable abysses. On this narrow path, at this giddy elevation, Malebranche was unable to preserve his balance, however pure and lofty was his design. His speculation topples over into the yawning gulf of Pantheism, and is distinguished from Spinozism rather by its motive and spirit than by its tendency or result. “The vision of all things in God” becomes a new because a changed doctrine in the hands of the philosophical Jesuit. He is carried away from all safe landmarks by his own noble but misguiding enthusiasm, and justifies the censure of Brucker, “non multum ab enthusiasmo, vel etiam a Quackerorum illuminatione immediata abesse videtur.”

In the theory of Malebranche, body and spirit, being totally disjoined from each other, and incapable of intercommunication, can be brought into harmonious — and, indeed, into possible — co-operation only by the intervention of a higher nature. As knowledge, according to the postulate of Des Cartes, is the substance and the evidence of intelligible existence, supreme knowledge or omniscience must be the attribute and exclusive property of the only Absolute Existence. All things, therefore, primarily exist in the Divine Mind and in the Divine Contemplation; and their genuine, as well as their original, reality is as the archetypal idea of the Divine Intelligence. Temporal existences, with their alterations and combinations, proceed from the divine aspiration. All their forms, modes,  habits, changes separately, and in the intricate dance of spiritual and material mutations and complications — are presented and revealed to the gaze of other intelligences only in the mirror of God's mind. This is not very remote from the Pre-established Harmony of Leibnitz, but it is much nearer to the infinite effluxes of the Godhead in Spinoza. It is only in their divine types that we contemplate the marvels of sublunary change, receive impressions from without, and regulate our actions accordingly. We see all things in God-and all material motions concurrent with our will are produced, as on the Cartesian system, by divine intervention. All our perceptions and sensations, apparently excited by extrinsic stimulations, are due to divine action. The extrinsic object is perceived, not in itself, nor even in its sensible image; but the sensible image is only the reflection of the idea abiding in the mind of God. Thus man, and man's sensibilities, are not the cause, the immediate cause at least, of his perceptions or of his actions; but they are only the occasion of God's revealing that perception through the idea subsisting in himself, or of his impelling to the action which may ensue from the conception, but without actual dependence upon it. “Non sentement les hemmes ne sont point les veritables causes des mouvements qu'ils produisent dans leurs corps; il semble meme qu'il y ait contradiction qu'ils puissent l'etre. . . Il n'y a que Dieu qui soit veritable cause, et qui est veritablement la puissance de mouvoir les corps” (Traite de Morale, 54, 6, ptie 2, ch. 3).

The cardinal doctrine of Malebranche is all that preserves enduring interest, and that needs concern us here. It gained only a very limited and temporary acceptance. Its invalidity was almost immediately and intuitively recognised, and it was soon supplanted by other schemes of like character and of like frailty, or was hustled out of consideration by wholly contradictory doctrines. It may again return unexpectedly in other forms, but in its own Cartesian garb it has passed away forever. Its applications and developments, ingenious as they are, and animated as they are with a spirit of pure and deep devotion, have few special claims to attention. Many valuable counsels, many stimulating and comforting exhortations, many precious exhortations for the guidance of our investigations, our feelings, and our conduct, are presented in the graceful and perspicuous expositions of the serene-tempered and heavenly-minded philosopher, whose heart saw all things in God, if his metaphysics failed to prove that vision of the divinity to be the sole possible mode of finite thought and action. His moral system was directly founded on his cardinal tenet, and fell  with it. He referred all virtue to the recognition and love of the universal order as it exists eternally in the Divine Reason, where every created reason contemplates it. There is some analogy between this view and the ennobling reflections of Donoso Cortes; but it is open to the objections made by Sir James Mackintosh, and to others which he has not made. Malebranche, however, merits the praise of the same just and discriminating critic, that “he is perhaps the first philosopher who has precisely laid down and rigidly adhered to the principle that virtue ‘consists in pure intentions and dispositions of mind, without which actions, however conformable to rules, are not truly moral' “-a thesis developed, and perhaps degraded, by Paley.

The further criticism of Malebranche's writings is unnecessary, though they merited a formal refutation by Locke, a rectification and a partial acceptance by Leibnitz. “Quod ad controversiam attinet,utrum omnia videamus in Deo (quae utique vetus est sententia, et, si sano sensu intelligatur, non omnino spernenda), an vero proprias ideas habeamus, sciendum est, et si omnia in Deo videamus, necesse tamen est ut habemusus et ideas proprias”...(Meditationes, 1684; Operac Ed. Dutens. tom. ii, ps i, p. 12; comp. Lettre a M. Montmort, Nov. 4, 1715; ibid. p. 217).

Thus Malebranche is admitted into honorable and lasting conjunction with the illustrious names of Spinoza, Locke, and Leibnitz; and, sharing in the light in which they lived, he participated in molding the influences which formed the succeeding generation of bold and curious metaphysical inquirers, and left behind the memory and the example of an earnest, sincere, and irreproachable existence. The other productions of Malebranche were partly controversial and partly religious. Of the latter we may mention the Elntretiens d'un Piilosophe Chretien et d'un Philosophe Chinois sur la Nature de Dieu (Paris, 1708): — De la Nature et de la Grace (Amsterdam, 1680): — Entretiens sur elt Metaphysique et sur la Religion (Rotterd. 1688; of a mystical character, blending religion with metaphysics). A complete edition of his works was published at Paris, 1712, in 11 vols. 12mo; new edition by Genoude and Lourdoucix. 1837, 2 vols. 8vo.

Literature. — The works of Malebranche are probably sufficient of themselves to supply all that is necessary to be known of the peculiarities of his system, and to be indicated in regard to its tendencies. Besides  Brucker and the other historians of philosophy, the following may be consulted with advantage: Arnauld, Des Idees Vraies et Fausses; Bayle, Dict. Hist. et Critique; Norris, Essay towards the Theory of the Ideal or Intellectual World (Lond. 1701, 2 vols. 8vo); Leibnitz, Examen des Sentiments de Malebranche, in Raspe, (Euvres Philosophiques de M. Leibnitz (Amst. 1765); Leibnitz, Theodicee and Epistola ad Remonlldum; Locke, Examination ofMalebranche's Opinion; Fontenelle, Hist. du Renouvellement Deuteronomy 1'Academie Royale des Sciences; Dug. Stewart, Philosophy of the iluman Mind, and Dissertation I, Supplement to the Encyclopedia Britannica; Mackintosh, Dissertation, Supplem. Encycl. Britann.; Sir William Hamilton, Lectures on Metaphysics (Boston, 1859); Blakey, History of the Philosophy of Mind (London, 1850), vol. 2; Saisset, Pantheisme, 1:66 sq.; and the same in Revue des Deux Mondes, April 1, 1862; Herzog, Real-Encyklopädie, vol. 20, s.v.; Erdmann, Malebranche, Spinoza, die Skeptiker und Mystiker des Siebzehnten Jahrhunderts (1836); Relstab, Dissertatio de Malebrancho Philosopho (1846); Hallam, Introd. to the Lit. of Europe (Harpers' edition), 2:91 sq.; Blampignon, Etude sur Malebranche (Paris, 1862, 8vo). (G. F. H.)

## Malec[[@Headword:Malec]]

             (king). So the Mohammedans call the principal angel in care of hell. In the Koran it is said (speaking of the infidels), “And they shall call aloud, saying, O Malec, intercede for us, that the Lord would end us by annihilation. And he shall answer, Verily, ye shall remain here forever. We brought you the truth heretofore, and ye abhorred the truth.” Some of the Mohammedan doctors say this answer will be given a thousand years after the final dissolution of this world. — Broughton, Biblioth. Hist. Sac. vol. 2, s.v.; Sale, Koran, p. 401.

## Malek-taus[[@Headword:Malek-taus]]

             a deity adored by the Yezedees (q.v.), in the Lebanon range. He was represented either as a cock, or a man with a cock's head.

## Malekites[[@Headword:Malekites]]

             the second of the four orthodox Mohammedan sects. The founder of the Malekites was Malek Ibn-Ansa, born at Medina about the year of the Hegira 95. He was remarkable for strenuously insisting on the literal acceptation of the prohibitory precepts. Tradition will have it that when visited in his last illness by a friend, who found him in tears, and asked him the cause of his affliction, he replied, “Who has more reason to weep than I? Would God that for every question decided by me according to my own opinion I had received so many stripes, then would my account be easier.  Would to God I had never given any decision of my own.” The Malekites are chiefly found in Barbary and other parts of Africa. — Sale's Koran, Prel. Disc. § 8; Taylor, Hist. of Mohammedanism, p. 288; Broughton, Biblioth. Hist. Sac. vol. 2, S. V. SEE MOHAMMEDANISM.

## Maleleel[[@Headword:Maleleel]]

             (Luk 3:37). SEE MAHALALEEL.

## Malevolenc[[@Headword:Malevolenc]]

             is that disposition of mind which inclines us to wish ill to any person. It discovers itself in frowns and a lowering countenance, in uncharitableness, in evil sentiments, hard speeches to or of its object, in cursing and reviling, and doing mischief either with open violence or secret spite, as far as there is power. SEE MALICE.

## Maley, George W[[@Headword:Maley, George W]]

             an American Methodist minister, was born in western Pennsylvania in 1799; was educated at an academy in Butler, Pennsylvania; was converted in 1819; was licensed to preach and recommended to the Ohio Conference in 1821, and was appollsted to the Mad River Circuit; in 1822, to London; in 1823, to Piqua; in 1824, to White Oak; in 1825, to Piqua; in 1826-7, to Union; in 1828-9, to Wilmilngton; in 1830-1, to Hillsboro; in 1832-3, to White Oak; in 1834, to Madison; in 1835, to New Richmond; in 18367, to Milford; in 1838, to Franklin; in 1839-40, to Germantown; in 1841, agent for Springfield and Germantown Academy; in 1842, to Franklin; in 1843, to Eaton; in 1844-5, to Cincinnati City Mission. In 1846 he joined the Kentucky Conference, M. E. Church South; in 1846-7, was presiding elder of Covington District; in 1848 was appointed to Soule Chapel, Cincinnati, Ohio; the next ten years was supernumerary, and the remainder of his life superannuated. He died in Urbana, Champaign Co., Ohio, Dec. 14, 1866. In his last illness, though suffering, he was uncomplaining and happy, and sent his love and greetings to his ministerial associates: “Tell my brethren of the Kentucky Conference that I die in the faith, and in full fellowship with the whole Church, East, West, North, and South.” — Minutes of Conferences, 1867.

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

             SEE ALGRIN.

## Malice[[@Headword:Malice]]

             is a settled or deliberate determination to revenge or do hurt to another. It more frequently denotes the disposition of inferior minds to execute every purpose of mischief within the more limited circle of their abilities. It is a most hateful temper in the sight of God, strictly forbidden in his holy Word (Colossians 3:812), disgraceful to rational creatures, and every way inimical to the spirit of Christianity (Mat 5:44). SEE MALEVOLENCE.

## Malignity[[@Headword:Malignity]]

             a disposition obstinately, bad or malicious. Malignancy and malignity are words nearly synonymous. In some connections, malignity seems rather more pertinently applied to a radical depravity of nature, and malignancy to indications of this depravity in temper and conduct in particular instances. SEE MALEVOLENCE.

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

             The Maliseet is a dialect spoken by the Indians of New Brunswick. The Maliseet Indians are, since 1870, in the possession of the gospel of John, which was translated by the Reverend S.T. Rand, and published by the British and Foreign Bible Society. Before the publication of this gospel they were only acquainted with such fragments and quotations of Scripture as are found in the Roman mass-book. (B.P.)

## Mallary, Charles Dutton, D.D[[@Headword:Mallary, Charles Dutton, D.D]]

             an American Baptist minister, was born at Poultney, Vermont, Jan. 23, 1801. He graduated at Middlebury College in 1821, and in 1822 removed to Columbia, South Carolina; was ordained, and preached six years. He afterwards resided in Georgia, and was a principal founder of Mercer University. In the division of the denomination in 1835, on the missionary question, he advocated that system. He died July 31, 1864. Dr. Mallary published a Life of Mercer, and Soul Prosperity. — Drake, Dict. of Amer. Biog. p. 593.

## Malleolus[[@Headword:Malleolus]]

             SEE HEMMERLIN.

## Mallet, Friedrich Ludwig[[@Headword:Mallet, Friedrich Ludwig]]

             a distinguished Reformed theologian of Germany, was born August 4, 1793, at Braunfels, near Wetzlar. He studied at Herborn and Tubingen, and was in 1815 appointed assistant to pastor Buch of St. Michael's, at Bremen, whom he succeeded in 1817. In 1827 he was called to the pastorate of St. Stephen's, and died May 5, 1865. Mallet was a most excellent preacher, and a prolific writer. His publications, however, are mostly polemic, caused by the rationalism and infidelity which he sought to combat. See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2:849 sq.; Hupfeld, Friedrich Ludwig Mallet (1865); Meurer, Zur Erinnerung an Friedr. Ludw. Mallet (1866); Wilkens, Friedrich Mallet, der Zeuge der Wahrheit (1872); Plitt-Herzog, RealEncyklop. s.v. (B.P.)

## Mallinckrodt, Pauline Von[[@Headword:Mallinckrodt, Pauline Von]]

             foundress of the Sisters of Christian Charity, was born at Minden, Westphalia, June 3, 1817. She was the sister of Hermann von Mallinckrodt, the eminent leader of the Catholic party in the Prussian legislature, a speaker and politician of great power, who died suddenly in Berlin, May 26, 1874, aged fifty-three years. When living with her father in Paderborn, Pauline set up a little asylum for blind children. She resolved to secure a permanent organization for carrying out her designs, Aug. 21, 1849. In November, 1850, she took her vows, and soon the sisters of  Christian Charity was established. For twenty years the new institution enjoyed the favor of both the civil and ecclesiastical authorities. In May 1872, the laws against the Catholic Church were passed by the Prussian government, and every house not devoted exclusively to nursing the sick was closed, and its inmates dispersed.

In April 1873, mother Pauline yielded to the wishes of the German Catholics in America, took with her a detachment of sisters, and founded a house in New Orleans. In order to make proper provision for the American undertaking, she established another house at Wilkesbarre, Pennsylvania, which is for America what the house at Paderborn had been for Germany. In 1874 she received a request from the Chilian government to make a foundation in their country. In 1876 she went to Rome, and received the pope's approval of her congregation and the erection of two provinces for North and South America. She sailed for America in October 1879, by way of Cape Horn, and visited every house in the two Americas. She then set out to visit her houses in Belgium, Germany, and Bohemia, returning to Paderborn in March 1881. There she died, April 30 of that year. There were then (1881) twenty-eight houses of the sisters of Christian Charity in the United States, and forty in North and South America. See (N.Y.) Catholic Annual, 1882, page 94.

## Mallos[[@Headword:Mallos]]

             a town of Asia Minor, whose inhabitants (Μαλλώται,Vulg. lallotce, A. V. “they of Mallos”), with the people of Tarsus, revolted from Antiochus Epiphanes because he had bestowed them on one of his concubines (2Ma 4:30). The absence of the king from Antioch to put down the insurrection gave the infamous Menelaus, the high-priest, an opportunity of purloining some of the sacred vessels from the Temple of Jerusalem (2Ma 4:32; 2Ma 4:39), an act which finally led to the murder of the good Onias (2Ma 4:34-35). Mallos was an important city of Cilicia, lying at the mouth of the Pyramus (Seihun), on the shore of the Mediterranean, northeast of Cyprus, and about twenty miles from Tarsus (Tersûs). (See Smith, Dict. of Class. Geography.)

## Mallothi[[@Headword:Mallothi]]

             (Hebrew Mallo'thi, מִלּוֹתַי, perhaps for מִלּאֹתַי, my fullness; Septuag. Μαλλιθί v. r. Μεαλωθί, Μελληθί, Μελλωθί; Vulg. Mellothi), one of the fourteen sons of Heman the Levite (1Ch 25:4), and head of the nineteenth division of Temple musicians as arranged by David (1Ch 25:26). B.C. 1014.

## Mallows[[@Headword:Mallows]]

             ( מִלּוֹח —, mallu'ach, salted; Sept. ἄλιμον, Vulg. herba) occurs only in the passage where Job complains that he is subjected to the contumely of the meanest people, those “who cut up mallows by the bushes for their meat” (Job 30:4). The proper meaning of the word malluach has been a subject of considerable discussion among authors, in consequence, apparently, of its resemblance to the Greek μαλἀχη, signifying “mallow,” and also to nmaluch, which is said to be the Syriac name of a species of Orache, or Atriplex. It is difficult, if not impossible, to say which is the more correct interpretation, as both appear to have some foundation in truth, and seem equally adapted to the sense of the above-quoted passage. (See Gesenius, Thesaur. Heb. p. 791). The malache of the Greeks is distinguished by Dioscorides into two kinds, of which he states that the cultivated is more fit for food than the wild kind. Arabic authors apply the description of Dioscorides to khub-bazi, a name which in India is applied both to species of Malva rotundifolia and of M. sylvestris, which extend from Europe to the north of India, and which are still used as food in the latter country, as they formerly were in Europe, and probably in Syria. That some kind of mallow has been so used in Syria we have evidence in the quotation made by Mr. Harmer from Biddulph, who says, “We saw many poor people collecting mallows and three-leaved grass, and asked them what they did with it; and they answered, that it was all their food, and that they boiled it, and did eat it.” Dr. Shaw, in his Travels, on the contrary, observes that “Mellou-keah, or mulookiah, מלוחיא, as in the Arabic, is  the same with the melochia or corchorus, being a podded species of mallows, whose pods are rough, of a glutinous substance, and used in most of their dishes. Mellou-keah appears to be little different in name from מלוה(Job 30:4), which we render ‘mallows,' though some other plant, of a more saltish taste, and less nourishing quality, may be rather intended.” The plant alluded to is Corchorus olitorius, which has been adopted and figured in her Scripture Herbal (p. 255) by lady Calcott, who observes that this plant, called Jews' Mallow, appears to be certainly that mentioned by the patriarch. Avicenna calls it olus Judaicum; and Rauwolf saw the Jews about Aleppo use the leaves as potherbs; “and this same mallow continues to be eaten in Egypt and Arabia, as well as Palestine.” But there are so many plants of a mild mucilaginous nature which are used as articles of diet in the East, that it is hardly possible to select one in preference to another, unless we find a similarity in the name. Thus species of Amaranthus, of Chenopodium, of Portulacca, as well as the above Corchorus, and the mallow, are all used as food, and might be adduced as suitable to the above passages, since most of them are found growing wild in many parts of the countries of the East.

The learned Bochart, however, contends (Hieroz. part 1, t. 3, c. 16) that the word malluach denotes a saltish plant called ἃλιμος by the Greeks, and which with good reason is supposed to be the Atriplex halimus of botanists, or tall shrubby Orache. The Sept., indeed, first gave ἄλιμα as the interpretation of malluach. Celsius adopts it (Hierobot. 2:96 sq.), and many others consider it as the most correct. A good abstract of Bochart's arguments is given by Dr. Harris. In the first place the most ancient Greek translator interprets malluach by halimos. That the Jews were in the habit of eating a plant called by the former name is evident from the quotation given by Bochart from the Talmudical tract Kiddusin (c. 3:65). By Ibn- Buetar, malukh is given as the synonym of al-kutuf al-buhuri. i.e. the sea- side Kutuf or Orache, which is usually considered to be the Atriplex marinum, now A. halimus. Bochart, indeed, remarks that Dioscorides describes the halimus as a shrub with branches, destitute of thorns, with a leaf like the olive, but broader, and growing on the sea-shore. This notice evidently refers to the ἃλιμος (Dioscor. 1:121), which, as above stated, is supposed to be the Atriplex halimnus of botanists, and the Kutuf buhuri of the Arabs, while the ἀτράφαξις of the same author (2:145) is their kutuf  and A triplex hortensis, Linnaeus. Bochart quotes Galen as describing the tops of the former as being used for food when young. Dioscorides also says that its leaves are employed for the same purpose. (Comp. Theophrast. Plant. 4:17; Athen. Deipn. 4:161; Horace, Eph 1:12; Eph 1:7; Pliny, 21:55; Tournefort, Trav. 1:41.)

What the Arab writers state as to the tops of the plants being eaten corresponds to the description of Job, who states that those to whom he refers cropped upon the shrub — which by some is supposed to indicate that the malluach grew near hedges. These, however, do not exist in the desert. There is no doubt that species of Orache were used as articles of diet in ancient times, and probably still are so in the countries where they are indigenous; but there are many other plants, similar in nature, that is, soft and succulent, and usually very saline, such as the Salsolas, Salicornias, etc., which, like the species of Atriplex, belong to the same natural family of Chenopodece, and which, from their saline nature, have received their respective names. Many of these are well known for yielding soda by incineration. In conformity with this, Mr. Good thinks that “the real plant is a species of Salsola, or ‘salt-wort;' and that the term ἄλιμα, employed in the Greek versions, gives additional countenance to this conjecture.” Some of these are shrubby, but most of them are herbaceous, and extremely common in all the dry, desert, and saline soils which extend from the south of Europe to the north of India. Most of them are saline and bitter, but some are milder in taste and mucilaginous, and are therefore employed as articles of diet, as spinach is in Europe. Salsola Indica, for instance, which is common on the coasts of the Peninsula of India, Dr. Roxburgh states, saved the lives of many thousands of the poor natives of India during the famine of 1791-2-3; for, while the plant lasted, most of the poorer classes who lived near the sea had little else to eat; and, indeed, its green leaves ordinarily form an essential article of the food of those natives who inhabit the maritime districts. For other interpretations, see Rosenmüller (ad loc. Job.). Mr. Tristram (Nat. Hist. of the Bible, p. 466) decides in favor of the above species of sea-purslane (A triplex halimnus), which he says “grows abundantly on the shores of the Mediterranean, in salt marshes, and also on the shores of the Dead Sea still more luxuriantly. We found thickets of it of considerable extent on the west side of the sea, and it exclusively supplied us with fuel for many days. It grows there to the height of ten feet-more than double its size on the Mediterranean. It forms a dense mass of thin twigs without thorns, has a very minute purple flower close to the stem, and small, thick, sour-tasting leaves, which could be eaten, as is the  Atriplex hortensis, or Garden Orache, but it would be very miserable food.”

## Malluach[[@Headword:Malluach]]

             SEE MALLOWS.

## Malluch[[@Headword:Malluch]]

             (Heb. MaIlluk', מִלּוּךְ, reigned over, or from the Syr. a counsellor), the name of several men.

1. (Sept. Μαλώχ, Vulg. Maloch.) A Levite of the family of Merari, son of Hashabiah and father of Abdi (1Ch 6:44). B.C. much ante 1014.

2. (Sept. Μαλούχ,Vulg. Melluch.) An Israelite of the descendants (or residents) of Bani who renounced his Gentile wife after the exile (Ezr 10:29). B.C. 459.

3. (Sept. Μαλούχ v. r. Βαλούχ,Vulg. Maloch.) Another Israelite of the descendants (or residents) of Harim, who did the same (Ezr 10:32). B.C. 459.

4. (Sept. Μαλούχ, Vulg. Abelltch.) One of the priests who returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Neh 12:4). B.C. 536. The associated names would appear to indicate that he was the same with one of those who signed the sacred covenant with Nehemiah (Neh 10:4); although that would imply a very advanced age. B.C. cir. 410. He is probably the same with the son of Jonathan, elsewhere called MELICU (Neh 12:14, מְלַוֹכַיSept. Μαλούχ, Vulg. Milicho).

5. (Sept. Μαλούχ, Vulg. Alelluch.) One of the chief Israelites who subscribed the same covenant (Neh 10:27). B.C. cir. 410.

## Malmesbury, William Of[[@Headword:Malmesbury, William Of]]

             an English monastic and historian of the early period of his country's history, was born near the close of the 11th century, probably in Somersetshire, was educated at Oxford, and afterwards entered the Benedictine monastery whence he derived his name, and of which he became librarian. He died some time after 1142, but the exact date is not known. He wrote (in Latin) De Gestis Regnum, a history of the kings of  England from the Saxon invasion to the twenty-sixth year of Henry I (translated into English by the Rev. John Sharpe [Lond. 1815]; also in Bohn's Library, edited by Dr. Giles [1847]): — Historiae Novellae, extending from the twenty-sixth year of Henry I to the escape of the empress Maud from Oxford; and De Gestis Pontifjcum, containing an account of the bishops and principal monasteries of England from the conversion of Ethelbert of Kent by St. Augustine to 1123: — Antiquities of Glastonbury, and Life of St. Wulstan (printed in Wharton's Anglia Sacra). Malmesbury gives proof in his writings of great diligence, good sense, modesty, and a genuine love of truth. His style is much above that of his contemporaries. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth. (s.v. William of Malmesbury); Lond. Quart. Rev. 1856 (Jan.), p. 295 sq.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.; Chambers, Cyclopaedia, s.v.

## Malou, Jean Baptiste[[@Headword:Malou, Jean Baptiste]]

             a Roman Catholic theologian, was born at Ypern; studied theology at the University of Louvain, where in 1835 he became a professor; in 1848 was made bishop of Bruges, and died March 23, 1864. He wrote La lecture de la Ste. Bible en langue vulgaire (Louv. 1846, 2 vols. 8vo). His brother JULE is the author of Recherches sur le veritable auteur du livre de l'Imitation de Jesus-Christ (Louv. 1848).

## Malta[[@Headword:Malta]]

             SEE MELITA.

## Malta, Knights of[[@Headword:Malta, Knights of]]

             SEE KNIGHTHOOD; SEE TEMPLARS.

## Maltbie, Ebenezer Davenport[[@Headword:Maltbie, Ebenezer Davenport]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Stamford, Conn., Jan. 20, 1799; graduated at Hamilton College, New York, in 1824, and studied theology in the Theological Seminary at Andover, Mass., which he left in 1826 to become tutor in Hamilton College. He was licensed to preach in 1832, and ordained pastor of the Congregational Church in Hamilton, N.Y. In 1841 he took charge of the Hudson River Academy, and in 1843 became principal of a literary institution in Lansingburg, N. Y., which position he resigned eight years after on account of failing health. He died at Syracuse, N. Y., in 1859. Mr. Maltbie was an excellent teacher, beloved and honored  as a pastor, and engergetic and unwearied in his labors of charity and piety. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1860, p. 74.

## Maltby, Edward[[@Headword:Maltby, Edward]]

             D.D., an English prelate, was born at Norwich, England, in 1770; was educated at Pembroke College, Oxford; inl 1831 was made bishop of Chichester, and in 1836 was transferrod to Durham. He died July 3, 1859. Dr. Maltby published several volumes of Sermons (1819, 1822, 1831): — Occasional Sermons: — Illustration of the Truth of the Christian Religion (Lond. 1802, 8vo; 2d ed. 1803, 8vo): — Psalms and Hymns (32 mo). — Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, vol. 2; Thomas, Dictionary of Biography, s.v.

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

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Paris, N. Y., October 5, 1806, and graduated at Hamilton College, N. Y., in 1836. For some years he devoted himself to teaching in his native state, and subsequently built up a flourishing school in Flemingsburg, Ky. He studied theology privately, was licensed in 1847, and ordained pastor of the Third Presbyterian Church, Oxford, Ohio, in 1848. He was also a professor in Oxford Female College. He died May 22, 1860. Mr. Maltby was very successful as a teacher, and greatly beloved as a pastor; his sermons were characterized by systematic arrangement and fullness of thought, and his intercourse with the people was courteous and refined. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1861, p. 97.

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

             The Maltese spoken by the natives of Malta is a curious mixture of Arabic and Italian, the grammar being Arabic, but a large number of Italian words have been grafted into the vocabulary. Many years ago the four gospels were translated into Maltese by Mr. Vargalli, and printed at the expense of the Church Missionary Society. Afterwards the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge had the work revised, and the remainder of the New Test. translated, by Dr. Camilleri, a native of Malta, and a clergyman of the Church of England. The book, however, did not meet with that acceptance which had been hoped for, owing not so much to any defects in the translation as to the awful ignorance of the people, and their benighted adherence to the priests.

A deep interest having been taken by a few Englishmen living on the island in the spiritual welfare of this people, the question was again mooted of printing a gospel in the Maltese, as there are about 10,000 Maltese, principally women and children, country people and villagers, who read their own language. In 1870 a translation of Matthew's gospel was made by a native, and sent over to England. After the MS. had been examined and reported on by the editorial superintendent and by the  Rev. Dr. Camilleri, it was printed under the editorship of the last-named gentleman, and the orthography was made as simple as possible, so as to present no difficulties to those who were able to read at all in their mother tongue. This was in 1871. In the report for 1872 we read: "The edition of Matthew in this language having proved a great boon to religious inquirers among the Maltese, it was resolved that the Acts of the Apostles should be printed. A third portion, namely the gospel according to John, has now been translated, and is about to be printed. The services of the Reverend Dr. Camilleri have proved exceedingly valuable in aiding the preparation of these works." The two gospels and the Acts are the only parts of the New Test. which the Maltese enjoy at present. See Bible of Every Land, page 53. (B.P.)

## Malthus, Thomas Robert[[@Headword:Malthus, Thomas Robert]]

             an English clergyman, was born at Rookery, Surrey County, England, in 1766; was educated at Jesus College, Cambridge, where he obtained a fellowship, graduating B.A. in 1788 and M.A. in 1791; soon after took holy orders, and obtained a curacy in Surrey, and identified himself with the “High-Church” party. In 1805 he was appointed professor of modern history and political economy at the East India College at Haileybury, in Hertfordshire, which position he held until his death, Dec. 29, 1834. Mr. Malthus devoted himself more particularly to the study of political economy and secular history, and received his professorship on this account. (For a résumé of the “Malthusian theory,” concerning the relation of population to the means of sustenance, see Chambers. Cyclop. s.v.) He preached frequently, however, while in this position, and was an earnest  laborer for the upbuilding of Christ's kingdom among men. His works are exclusively of a secular character: a complete list of them may be found in Allibone, Dict. of Auth., and English Cyclopaedia, s.v.

## Maluk Dasis[[@Headword:Maluk Dasis]]

             a subdivision of the Ramavandi Vaishnavas of Hindustan, founded by Maluk Das, who lived in the reign of Akbar the Great, in the 16th century. They worship Vishqu, in the character of Rama, and accept as their chief authority the Bhagavat Gita. The adherents of this sect are said to be numerous, especially among the laboring and trading classes, to the latter of which their founder belonged. The principal establishment of this sect is at Kara Mlanikpur, the birthplace of the founder, and still occupied by his descendants;. and besides this establishment they have six other Mat'hs at Allahabad, Benares, Binldraban, Ayudhya, Lucknow, and Jagunnath, which last is of great repute, because rendered sacred by the death of Maluk Das.

## Malumigists[[@Headword:Malumigists]]

             a sect of Mohammedans who teach that God may be known perfectly in this world by the knowledge which men have themselves.

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

             a learned Spanish exegete, was born at Xativa in 1566, and entered the Dominican convent of Lombay in 1582. A good Latin, Greek, and Hebrew scholar, he now applied his philological talents to the study of the divers texts of the Bible, at the same time devoting much attention also to dogmatics and to ecclesiastical history. In 1585 he wrote a treatise to prove that St. Anna was only once married, and that St. Joseph always held fast to the rule of abstinence. From 1585 to 1600 he taught first philosophy, and afterwards theology. In 1600 he addressed to cardinal Baronius a memoir on some parts of the Annales ecclesiastici, and of the Martyrologiunm Romanum, which he deemed incorrect. Baronius, struck by the knowledge exhibited in this memoir, called Malvenda to Rome, where the general of his order entrusted him with the correcting of the breviary, the missal, and the martyrology of the Dominicans. This work was completed in 1603. The congregation of the Index then submitted to him for revision the Bibliotheca Patrum of La Vigne (Par. 1575, 1589, 9 vols. fol.). His critical annotations on this work appeared at Rome in 1607, and were afterwards published together with the Biblioth. Patr. (Parns, 1609, 1624). About the same time he commenced Annales ordinis fratrum predicatorum, which he never completed; the existing fragment, extending over a period of thirty years, was subsequently published by Gravina (Naples, 1627, 2 vols. fol.). In 1610 Malvenda was recalled to Spain, where the grand inquisitor appointed him a member of the Spanish congregation of the Index librorum praohibitorunm. He died at Valencia in 1628. His principal work, to which the later years of his life were devoted, was a literal translation of the Bible, with commentaries; he was unable to finish it, and left it at the 16th chapter of Ezekiel (published in this incomplete state by the general of the Dominicans, under title Commentaria in sacram Scripturam una cum nova de verbo ad verbum ex Hebraeco translatione, variisque lectionibus [Lyon, 1650, 5 vols. fol.]). The translation is so literal as to be very inelegant and sometimes unintelligible. The notes are mostly grammatical, and though perhaps valuable at the time, are now considered unimportant. Among his other works, which are very numerous, we notice Libri novena de Antichristo (Rome, 1604, often reprinted):Commentarius de Paradiso voluptatis  (Rome, 1605, 4to): — Vida de san Pedro Martir (Saragossa, 1613, 8vo). A complete list of his works is given in Quetif and Echard, Scriptores ordinis praedicatorum, 2:454 sq. See Antonio, Bibl. Hispana nova, vol. 2. — H erzog, Real-Encyklop. 8:771; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 33:122; Pierer, Universal-Lexikon, 10:806. (J. N. P.)

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

             a Scotch prelate, was consecrated bishop of the see of Glasgow in 1200. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 236.

## Mam(O)Un, Al, Abbas-Abdallah[[@Headword:Mam(O)Un, Al, Abbas-Abdallah]]

             a celebrated Mussulman ruler, was born at Bagdad in A.D. 786; was the son of Haroun-al-Raschid; and ascended the throne as the seventh Abasside caliph in 813. By his determintation to enforce the heretical doctrine that the Koran was created and not eternal, he became very unpopular among the Moslem doctors and gave strength to the house of Ali. SEE MOHAMMEDANISM; SEE MOHAMMEDAN SECTS. Mamoun was a patron of science and literature, and is praised by Eastern writers for his talents and liberality. His capital, Bagdad, was in his day the great center of the world of learning and science. — He died in 833. See Weil, Gesch. d. Chalifen, II, chap. 7; Hammer-Purgstall, Literaturgesch. d. Araber.

## Mamachi, Thomas Maria[[@Headword:Mamachi, Thomas Maria]]

             a distinguished Dominican, was born on the island of Chio Dec. 3,1713; was brought to Italy when yet a youth, and joined the Dominicans. He became professor of theology at Florence, and in 1740 was called to Rome as a member of the college of the Propaganda. Benedict XIV made him a doctor of divinity, and appointed him member of the congregation of the Index, of which he became secretary in 1779. Under Pius VI he was appointed Magisterpalatii. He died in 1792, at Corneto, near Montefiascone. His principal works are Ad Joh. D. Mansium de ratione temporum Athanasiorum deque aliquot Synodis iv sceculo celebrats Epistoole iv (Flor. 1748), against Mansi, who, in his De epochis conciliorum Sardicensis et Sirmiensium, cceterumque in causa A rianorum, hac occasione simul rerum potissimarum S. A thanasii Chronologiam restituit (Lucre, 1746), asserted, contrary to general opinion, that the Council of Sardica was held in 344, and that the return of Athanasius to Alexandria took place in 346. His Oriqinum et antiquitatum Christianarum Libb. xx (Rom. 1749-55), of which only five books, however, were completed, is a very important work, holding the same position among the Roman Catholics as Bingham's Origines ecclesiasticoe among the Protestants; it is written in view of the later work, which it often attempts to refute. De Costumi deprimitivi Christiani libri tres (Rome, 1753; Venice, 1757) is an interesting work on the early ages of Christianity, and contains some valuable and curious information. Epistolarum ad Justinum Febronium, de ratione regende Christiance reipublicce, deque legitima Romani Pontificis potestate, Liber primus (Romans 1776), in answer to Justinus Febronius's (J. N. von Hontheim, q.v.) De statu Ecclesiae et legitina potestate Romani Pontificis liber singularis, etc. (Bullioni. 1763), is but a weak production compared to that which it attacked. See Neue theol. Bibliothek, 55. 392 sq.; Acta historico- eclesiastica nostri temporis, 39:888; Göttinger gel. Anzeigen, 1757, p. 1189 sq.; 1759, p. 595; Richard et Giratud, Biblioth. sacree. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale. 33. 123; Herzog, Real-Encyklopädie, 8:772; Pierer, Universal-Lexikon, 10:806.

## Mamaias[[@Headword:Mamaias]]

             (Σαμααί,Vulg. Samea), given (1Es 8:14) in place of the SHEMAIAH SEE SHEMAIAH (q.v.) of the Heb. text (Ezr 8:16).

## Mamakurs[[@Headword:Mamakurs]]

             a kind of bracelets worn by the natives of the Moluccas or Spice Islands, particularly Amboyna, and which the women regard as preservatives against all enchantments.

## Mamani (della Rovere), Terenzio, Count[[@Headword:Mamani (della Rovere), Terenzio, Count]]

             a famous Italian philosopher, was born September 15, 1799, at Pesaro. He studied at Rome, but had to leave his country on account of his participation in the insurrection of 1831. He went to France, but returned to Italy in 1848. In 1857 he was professor of philosophy at Turin, and in 1860 he was made minister of public instruction. In 1870 he took up his abode at Rome, and published the philosophical journal, La Filosofia delle Scuole Italiane. Besides, he wrote, Rinnovamento della Filosofia Antica Italliana (Paris, 1834; 2d ed. Florence, 1836): — Dialoghi di Scienza Prima (Paris, 1846): — Confessioni d'un Metafisico (Florence, 1865, 2 volumes): — Psicologia di Kant (Rome, 1877): — La Religione dell' Avvenire (Milan, 1879): — Critica della Rivelazione (ibid. 1880): — Questioni Sociali (Rome, 1882). Mamiani died May 20, 1885. (B.P.)

## Mamas[[@Headword:Mamas]]

             a saint of the Romish Church, a native of Paphlagonia, flourished in the 3d century. He was born in prison, his mother, Russina, having been arrested on account of her adherence to Christianity. He was brought up by a Christian widow named Ammia, and while a boy was already persecuted for his faith, but wonderfully escaped death. He subsequently preached the Gospel in Caesarea. and died a martyr in 274. He is commemorated on the 17th of August. Mamas was highly honored in the ancient Church. Basil, Gregory of Nazianzen, and Walafrid Strabo make mention of him. See C. Baronii Martyrologium Romanum (Moguntiae, 1631), p. 507; Th. Ruinart, Acta primorum Martyrum (Amst. 1713), p. 264 sq. — Herzog, Real- Encyklopädie, 8:774. (J. N. P.)

## Mamertus[[@Headword:Mamertus]]

             ST., archbishop of Vienna, was a brother of Glaudianus Ecdicius Mamertus, SEE CLAUDIANUS, author of the celebrated work De statu animon. St. Mamertus is especially known for having, on the occasion of a great fire, and other accidents which befell the city of Vienna, instituted the Rogations, i.e. penitential prayers for the three days preceding the ascension. Baronius, in his Martyrologium Romanum (Moguntise, 1631), p. 255 sq. and 296, denies that Mamertus was the first to organize these rogations, claiming that they were an old institution which had fallen into disuse, and which he merely revived. Bingham in his Orgini. eccles. (3:80 sq.; 5:29), subsequently took the same view. However, it is certain that the example of Mamertus induced the Council of Orleans, in 511, to introduce the rogations throughout France. They were subsequently adopted by the whole Western Church, by order of Gregory the Great, in 591. Mamertus is generally believed to have died in 475. He is commersorated on the 11th of May. — Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 8:774; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Genesis 33:129.

## Mamertus, Claudianus[[@Headword:Mamertus, Claudianus]]

             SEE CLAUDIANUS.

## Mammaea, Julia[[@Headword:Mammaea, Julia]]

             SEE SEVERUS, ALEXANDER.

## Mammillarians[[@Headword:Mammillarians]]

             the name of a branch of the Anabaptists which arose in Haarlem, Holland. Its origin is as follows. A young man having taken undue liberties with a young woman whom he intended to marry, was accused of it before the Church; the Church authorities, however, did not agree on the subject, some desiring to expel the offender from their society, and others opposing so severe a measure. This caused a separation, and those who were on the young man's side were visited by their opponents with the reproachful name of Mammillarians (from the French word Mammelle, a woman's breast). See Bayle, Dict. Historique, s.v.; Microelius, Syntag. Hist. Eccl. (ed. 1679) p. 1012. — Herzog, Real-Encyklopidie, 8:774.

## Mammon[[@Headword:Mammon]]

             (μαμμωνᾶς or μαμωνᾶς, from the Chald. מָמוֹןor מָמוֹנָא, that in which one trusts; see Buxtorf, Lex. Chald. col. 1217 sq.), a term pre-eminently, by a technical and invidious usage (see Suidas in his Lex. s.v.), “signifying wealth or riches, and bearing that sense in Luk 16:9; Luk 16:11; but also used by our Savior (Mat 6:24; Luk 16:13) as a personification of the god of riches: ‘Ye cannot serve God and Mammon.' Gill, on Mat 6:24, brings a very apt quotation from the Talmud Hieros. (Yoma, fol. 38), in confirmation of the character which Christ in these passages gives of the Jews in his day: ‘We know that they believed in the law, and took care of the commandments, and of the tithes, and that their whole conversation was good only that they loved the Mammon, and hated one another without cause.” “The word often occurs in the Chaldee Targums of Onkelos, and later writers, and in the Syriac Version, in the sense of ‘riches.' This meaning of the word is given by Tertullian, Adv. Marc. 4:33, and by Augustine and Jerome commenting on Matthew. Augustine adds that it was in use as a ‘Punic, and Jerome adds that it was a Syriac word. There is no reason to suppose that any idol received divine honors in the East under this name. It is used in Matthew as a personification of riches. The derivation of the word is discussed by A. Pfeiffer, Opera, p. 474.” The phrase “mammon of unrighteousness” as used in Luk 16:9, probably refers to gain which is too often unjustly  acquired (as by the publicans), but which may be sanctified by charity and piety so as to become a passport, in some sense, to final blessedness. See Grunenberg, De mammona iniquitatis (Jen. 1700); Wakins, De μαμ. ἀδικίας (Jen. 1701). In Rabbinical language the word is used to denote confidence.

## Mamnitanaimus[[@Headword:Mamnitanaimus]]

             (Μαμνιτάναιμος v. r. Μαμτανάαιμος, Vulg. Mathaneus), given (1Es 9:34) by corruption for the two names “Mattaniah, Mattenai,” of the Heb. list (Ezr 10:37).

## Mamre[[@Headword:Mamre]]

             (Heb. Mamre', מִמְרֵא, fat; Sept. Μαμβρῆ; Josephus Μαμβρῆς, Ant. 1:10, 2; Vulg. Mambre), the name of an Amoritish chief who, with his brothers Aner and Eschol, was in alliance with Abraham (Gen 14:13; Gen 14:24). B.C. cir. 2080. In the Jewish traditions he appears as encouraging Abraham to undergo the pain of circumcision, from which his brothers would have dissuaded shim, by a reference to the deliverance he had already experienced from far greater trials-the furnace of Nimrod and the sword of Chedorlaomer (Beer, Leben Abrahams, p.36). Hence (אֵלוֹנֵי מִמְרֵא, Sept. ἡ δρῦς ἡ Μαμβρῆ), in the Auth.Vers., “the oaks of Mamre,” “plain of Mamre” (Gen 13:18; Gen 18:1), or simply “Mamre” (Gen 23:17; Gen 23:19; Gen 35:27), a grove in the neighborhood of Hebron. It was here that  Abrahar first dwelt after separating from Lot (Gen 13:18); here the divine angel visited him with the warning of Sodom's fate (Gen 18:1); it was in the cave in the corner of the field opposite this place that he deposited the remains of Sarah (Gen 23:17; Gen 23:19); where he was himself buried (Gen 25:9), as was likewise Jacob (Gen 49:30; Genesis 1, 13). In later times the spot is said to have lain six stadia from Hebron, still marked by a reputedly sacred terebinth (Joseph. War, 4:9, 7; Eusebius, Praep. Evang. v. 9; Sozomen, Hist. Ev. 1:18; Eusebius, Onomast. s.v. Α᾿ρχώ, Arboch); and later travelers likewise (Sanutus, Secret. fidel. 3:14, 3, in the Gesta Dei per. Franc. 2:248; Troilo, Trav. p. 418) speak of a very venerable tree of this kind near the ruins of a church at Hebron (see Reland, Palaest. p. 712 sq.). Dr. Robinson found here, at a place called Ramet el-Khulil, one hour distant from Hebron, some ancient remains, which he regards (in accordance with the local tradition) as probably marking the site of Abraham's sepulcher (Researches, 1:318). He saw the venerable oak near Hebron which still passes with the Mohammedans for the tree under which Abraham pitched his tent (Researches, 2:429), but which he states is not a terebinth (ib. 443). SEE OAK.

According to Schwarz, “North of Hebron, and sideward from Halhul, is a plain about two and one half miles in length, which the Arabs call Elon, no doubt the ancient dwelling-place of Abraham” (Palestine, p. 109). SEE HEBRON. “Manre is stated to have been at Hebron, for we read that ‘Jacob came unto Isaac his father, to Mamre, to Kirjath-Arbah, which is Hebron, where Abraham and Isaac sojourned' (Gen 35:27). The relative positions of Machpelah and Mamre are also described with great exactness. Five times Moses states that Machpelah lay ‘before Mamre' (עלאּפני; Sept. ἀπέναντι; Vulg. quae respiciebat); which may mean either that it was to the east of Mamre, or that it lay facing it. The latter seems to be the true meaning. Machpelah is situated or the shelving bank of a little valley, and probably the oakgrove of Mamre stood on the other side of the valley, facing the cave, while the town of Hebron lay a little farther up to the north-west (Gen 23:17; Gen 23:19; Gen 25:9; Gen 49:30; Genesis 1, 13). The identity of Machpelah with the modern Haarna being established, SEE MACHPELAH, there can be little difficulty in fixing the position of Mamre; it must have been within sight of or ‘facing' Machpelah, and so near the town of Hebron that it could be described as at it. The Jerusalem Itinerary places it two miles from Hebron (p. 599), and Sozomen (H. E. 2:4) says it lay on the north towards Jerusalem. It is evident that all these notices refer to the above ruin, Ramet el-Khulil. The Jews of Hebrol call it ‘the house of  Abraham,' and regard it as the site of Mamre (Porter, Handbook, 1:72; Stanley, S. and P. p. 141). The position, however, does not accord with the notices in Genesis, and cannot, therefore, be the true site of Mamre. The sacred grove and the place of the patriarch's tent were doubtless on the face of the hill facing the great Haram, which covers the cave of Machpelah (Stanley, Sermons in the East, p. 166 sq.; Ritter, Pal. und Syr. 3:222 sq.). The tradition which identified Mamre with Ramet el-Khulil may have originated in the existence of a grove of venerable oaks on that spot, just as now the great oak a mile or more west of the town is called ‘Abraham's Oak' (Porter, Handbk. 1:70).” SEE ABRAHAM.

## Mamuchus[[@Headword:Mamuchus]]

             (Μαμοῦχος, Vulg. Maluchus), given (1Es 9:20) by corruption for MALLUCH SEE MALLUCH (q.v.) of the Heb. list (Ezr 10:29).

## Man[[@Headword:Man]]

             is the rendering mostly of four Hebrew and two Greek words in the English Version. They are used with as much precision as the terms of like import in other languages. Nor is the subject merely critical; it will be found connected with accurate interpretation. In our treatment of the subject we thus supplement what we have stated under the article ADAM SEE ADAM .

1. אָדָם, adam', is used in several senses.

(a.) It is the proper name of the first man, though Gesenius thinks that when so applied it has the force rather of an appellative, and that, accordingly, in a translation, it would be better to render it the man. It seems, however, to be used by Luke as a proper name in the genealogy (Luk 3:38), by Paul (Rom 5:14; 1Ti 2:13-14), and by Jude (1Ti 2:14). Paul's use of it in 1Co 15:45 is remarkably clear: “the first man Adam.” It is so employed throughout the Apocrypha without exception (2Es 3:5; 2Es 3:10; 2Es 3:21; 2Es 3:26; 2Es 4:30; 2Es 6:54; 2Es 7:11; 2Es 7:46; 2Es 7:48; Tob 8:6; Eccliasiasticus 33:10; 40:1; 49:16), and by Josephus (ut infra). Gesenius argues that, as applied to the first man, it has the article almost without exception. It is doubtless often thus used as an appellative, but the exceptions are decisive: Gen 3:17, “to Adam he said,” and see Sept., Deu 32:8, “the descendants of Adam;” “if I covered my transgressions as Adam” (Job 31:33); “and unto Adam he said,” etc.  (Job 28:28), which, when examined by the context, seems to refer to a primeval revelation not recorded in Genesis (see also Hos 6:7, Heb. or margin). Gesenius further argues that the woman has an appropriate name, but that the man has none. But the name Eve was given to her by Adam, and, as it would seem, under a change of circumstances; and though the divine origin of the word Adam, as a proper name of the first man, is not recorded in the history of the creation, as is that of the day, night, heaven, earth, seas, etc. (Gen 1:5; Gen 1:8; Gen 1:10), yet its divine origin as an appellative is recorded (comp. Hebrews, Gen 1:26; Gen 5:1); from which state it soon became a proper name, Dr. Lee thinks from its frequent occurrence, but we would suggest, from its peculiar appropriateness to “the man,” who is the more immediate image and glory of God (1Co 11:7). Other derivations of the word have been offered, as

אָדִם, “to be red” or “redhaired;” and hence some of the rabbins have inferred that the first mall was so. The derivation is as old as Josephus, who says that “the first man was called Adam because he was formed from the red earth,” and adds, “for the true virgin earth is of this color” (Ant. 1:1, 2). The following is a simple translation of the more detailed (Jehovistic) account given by Moses (Gen 2:18-25) of the creation of the first human pair, omitting the paragraph concerning the garden of Eden. SEE COSMOGONY.

This [is the] genealogy of the heavens and the earth, when they were created, in the day [that] Jehovah God made earth and heavens. Now no shrub of the field had yet been [grown] on the earth, and no plant of the field had yet sprung up — for Jehovah God had not [as yet] caused [it] to rain upon the earth, nor [was there any] man to till the ground; but mist ascended from the earth, and watered all the face of the ground. Then Jehovah God formed the man, dust from the ground, and blew into his nostrils the breath of life; so the man became a living creature.

But Jehovah God said, “[It is] not good [that] the man be alone; I will make for him a help as his counterpart.” Now Jehovah God had formed from the ground every living [thing] of the field, and every bird of the heavens; and he brought [each] towards the man to see what he would call it: so whatever the man called it [as] a living creature, that [was] its name; thus the man called names to every beast, and to the bird of the heavens, and to every living [thing] of the field: yet for man [there] was not found a help as his counterpart. Then Jehovah God caused a lethargy to fall upon the man, so he slept; and he took one of his ribs, but closed flesh instead of  it: and Jehovah God built the rib which he took from the man for a woman, and brought her towards the man. Thereupon the man said, “This now [is] bone from my bones, and flesh from my flesh; this [being] shall be called Woman [ishah, vira], because from man [ish, vir] this [person] was taken: therefore will a man leave his father and his mother, and cling to his wife; and they shall become one flesh.” Now they were both of them naked, the man and his wife: yet they were not mutually ashamed [of their condition].

(b.) it is the generic name of the human race as originally created, and afterwards, like the English word man, person, whether man or woman, equivalent to the Latin homo and Greek ἄνθρωπος (Gen 1:26-27; Gen 5:2; Gen 8:21; Deu 8:3; Mat 5:13; Mat 5:16; 1Co 7:26), and even without regard to age (Joh 16:21). It is applied to women only, “the human persons or women” (Num 31:35), Sept. Ψυχαὶ ἀνθρώπων ἀπὸ τῶν γυναικῶν. Thus ἡ ἄνθρωπος means a woman (Herod. 1:60), and especially among the orators — (comp. Maccabees 2:28).

(c.) It denotes man in opposition to woman (Gen 3:12; Mat 19:10), though more properly, the husband in opposition to the wife (compare 1Co 7:1).

(d.) It is used, though very rarely, for those who maintain the dignity of human nature, a man, as we say, meaning one that deserves the name, like the Latin vir and Greek ἀνήρ: “One man in a thousand have I found, but a woman,” etc. (Ecc 7:28). Perhaps the word here glances at the original uprightness of man.

(e.) It is frequently used to denote the more degenerate and wicked portion of mankind: an instance of which occurs very early, “The sons (or worshippers) of God married the daughters of men (or the irreligious)” (Gen 6:2). We request a careful examination of the following passages with their respective contexts: Psa 11:4; Psa 12:1-2; Psa 12:8; Psa 14:2, etc. The latter passage is often adduced to prove the total depravity of the whole human race, whereas it applies only to the more abandoned Jews, or possibly to the more wicked Gentile adversaries of Israel. It is a description of “the fool,” or wicked man (Psa 14:1), and of persons of the same class (Psa 14:1-2), “the workers of iniquity, who eat up God's people like breads and called not upon the name of the Lord” (Psa 14:4). For the true view of Paul's quotations from this psalm (Rom 3:10), see M'Knight, adiloc.; and observe the use of the word “man” in Luk 5:20;  Mat 10:17. It is applied to the Gentiles (Mat 27:22; comp. Mar 10:33, and Mar 9:31; Luk 18:32; see Mountenev, ad Demosth. Philippians 1:221). (J:) The word is used to denote other men, in opposition to those already named, as “both upon Israel and other men” (Jer 32:20), i.e. the Egyptians. “Like other men” (Psa 73:5), i.e. common men, in opposition to better men (Psa 82:7); men of inferior rank, as opposed to אַישׁ. men of higher rank (see Hebrew, Isa 2:9; Isa 5:15 : Psa 49:3; Psa 62:10; Pro 8:4). The phrase “son of man,” in the Old Testament, denotes man as frail and unworthy (Num 23:19; Job 25:6; Eze 2:1; Eze 2:3); as applied to the prophet, so often, it has the force of “mortal!”

2. אַישׁ, ish, is a man in the distinguished sense, like the Latin vir and Greek ἀνήρ. It is used in all the several senses of the Latin vir, and denotes a man as distinguished from a woman (1Sa 17:33; Mat 14:21); as a husband (Gen 3:16; Hos 2:16); and in reference to excellent mental qualities. A beautiful instance of the latter class occurs in Jer 5:1 : “Run ye to and fro through the streets of Jerusalem, and see now, and know, and seek in the broad places thereof, if ye can find a man, if there be any that executeth judgment, that seeketh the truth; and I will pardon it.” This reminds the reader of the philosopher who went through the streets of Athens with a lighted lamp in his hand, and being asked what he sought, said, “I am seeking to find a man” (see Herodot. 2:120; Homer, II. 5. 529). It is also used to designate the superior classes (Pro 8:4; Psa 141:4, etc.), a courtier (Jer 38:7), the male of animals (Gen 7:2). Sometimes it means men in general (Exo 16:29; Mar 6:44).

3. אנֵוּשׁ, enosh', mortals, βροτοί, as transient, perishable, liable to sickness, etc.: “Let not man [margin, ‘mortal man'] prevail against thee” (2Ch 14:11). “Write with the pen of the common man” (Isa 8:1), i.e. in a common, legible character (Job 15:14; Psa 8:5; Psa 9:19-20; Isa 51:7; Psa 103:15). It is applied to women (Jos 8:25).

4. גֶּבֶר, ge'ber, vir, man, in regard to strength, etc. All etymologists concur in deriving the English word “man” from the superior powers and faculties with which rman is endowed above all earthly creatures; so the Latin vir, from vis, vires; and such is the idea conveyed by the present Hebrew word.  It is applied to man as distinguished from woman: “A man shall not put on a woman's garment” (Deu 22:5), like ἀνθρωπος in Mat 8:9; Joh 1:6; to men as distinguished from children (Exo 12:37); to a male child, in opposition to a female (Job 3:3; Sept. ἄρσεν). It is much used in poetry: “Happy is the man” (Psa 34:9; Psa 40:5; Psa 52:9; Psa 94:12). Sometimes it denotes the species at large (Job 4:17; Job 14:10; Job 14:14). For a complete exemplification of these words, see the lexicons of Gesenius and Schleusner, etc.

5. מְתַים, methim', “men,” always masculine. The singular is to be traced in the antediluvian proper names Methusael and Methuselah. Perhaps it may be derived from the root mith, “he died,” in which case its use would be very appropriate in Isa 41:14, “Fear not, thou worm Jacob, ye men of Israel.” If this conjecture be admitted, this word would correspond to βροτός, and might be rendered “mortal.”

Other Heb. words occasionally rendered man in the A. V. are בֵּעִל, bdal, a master (husband), נֶפֶשׁ, nephesh, an animate being, etc. The Greek words properly thus rendered are ἄνθρωπος, homo, a human being, and ἀνήρ, vir, a man as distinguished from a woman.

Some peculiar uses of the word in the New Testament remain to be noticed. “The Son of Man,” applied to our Lord only by himself and St. Stephen (Act 7:56), is the Messiah in human form. Schleusner thinks that the word in this expression always means woman, and denotes that he was the promised Messiah, born of a virgin, who had taken upon him our nature to fulfill the great decree of Goci, that mankind should be saved by one in their own form. ῾Ο παλαιός, “the old man,” and ὁ καινός, “the new man”-the former denoting unsanctified disposition of heart, the latter the new disposition created and cherished by the Gospel; ὁ ἔσω ἄνθρωπος “the inner man;” ὁ κρυπτὸς τῆς καρδίας ἄνθρωπος, “the hidden man of the heart,” as opposed to the ὁ ἔξω ἄνθρωπος, ‘“the external, visible man.” “A man of God,” first applied to Moses (Deu 33:1), and always afterwards to a person acting under a divine commission (1Ki 13:1; 1Ti 6:2, etc.). Finally, angals are styled men (Act 1:10). “To speak after the manner of men,” i.e. in accordance with human views, to illustrate by human examples or institutions, to use a popular mode of speaking (Rom 3:5; 1Co 9:8; Gal 3:15). “The number of a man,” i.e. an ordinary number, such as is in general use among men (Rev 13:18); so also “the measure of a man,” all ordinary measure, in common use (Rev 21:17).

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

             SEE MANNA.

## Man Of Sin[[@Headword:Man Of Sin]]

             (ὁ ἃνθρωπος τῆς ἁμαρτίας), an impersonation of the sinful principle spoken of by the apostle Paul in an emphatic manner (2Th 2:3). The context (2Th 2:3-4) gives the following attributes or synonymous titles:

(1.) apostasy (ἡ ἀποστασία, “a [rather the] falling away”), which precedes (πρῶτον) the appearance (ἀπακαλυφθῇ);

(2.) son of perdition (ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀπωλείας, i.e. one sprung from the fall (compare “that wicked”), and doomed to its penalty (comp. 2Th 2:8);

(3.) a persecutor (ὁ ἁντικείμενος), especially of God's cause and government;

(4.) a blasphemer (ὑπεραιρόμενος, etc.), i.e. one arrogating divine honors, and claiming to work miracles (2Th 2:9-10). This is evidently an assemblage of the most striking characteristics of former Antichrists in Scripture, especially the “little horn” of Daniel. As that prophecy referred particularly to Antiochus Epiphanes, this passage must be understood as employing the conventional Scriptural language symbolically to indicate a then (and perhaps still) future effort on the part of some hostile power to overthrow Christianity, and induce its professors to renounce it. Such a peril is clearly intimated in several other passages of the N.T. (e.g. Mar 13:22; 2Ti 3:1; 2Ti 3:13; Rev 20:8). But we are not to confine the prophecy to any one type of Antichrist; “in whomsoever these distinctive features are found — whoever wields temporal or spiritual power in any degree similar to that in which the Man of Sin is here described as wielding it-he, be he pope or potentate, is beyond all doubt a distinct type of Antichrist” (Ellicott, note, ad loc.). For a history of opinion on this passage, see Alford, Gr. Test. 3, proleg. p. 55 sq. SEE ANTICHRIST.

## Man of Sin [[@Headword:Man of Sin ]]

             SEE SIN, MAN OF

## Man, Alexander[[@Headword:Man, Alexander]]

             a Scotch prelate, was bishop of the see of Caithness in 1389, and was witness to a charter of the earl of Sutherland in 1400. He died in 1409. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 213.

## Man, Preadamite[[@Headword:Man, Preadamite]]

             SEE PREADAMITES.

## Man-ho-pa[[@Headword:Man-ho-pa]]

             the Great Spirit, worshipped by the North American Indians, whom they propitiate by presents, and by fastings and lamentations during the space of from three to five days. Their traditions state that the great waters divide the home of the Great Spirit from the abode of the red man; but there is a very general belief among them that he resides in the extreme west.

## Manabosho [[@Headword:Manabosho ]]

             a deity worshipped by the Chippewa Indians, concerning whom legendary stories are told which closely resemble those related of Litaolane (q.v.).

## Managers[[@Headword:Managers]]

             a committee of members appointed annually in many Presbyterian churches, entrusted with all merely secular affairs as to property and finance.

## Manah[[@Headword:Manah]]

             the tutelary god of the Hodhail and other tribes of ancient Arabia, occupying the country between Mecca and Medina. The idol was a large stone, the worship of which consisted of the slaughter of camels and other animals. Though the idol was destroyed by order of Mohammed, the rite is still continued.

## Manahath[[@Headword:Manahath]]

             (Heb. Mana'chath, מָנִחִת, rest), the name of a man and of a place.

1. (Sept. Μαναχάθ.) The second named of the five sons of Shobal, the son of Seir the Horite (Gen 36:23; 1Ch 1:40). B.C. cir. 1927.

2. (Sept. Μαναχαθί v. r. Μαχαναθί.) A town or region to which certain descendants of Ehud, of the tribe of Benjamin, appear to have been exiled from Geba by an act of his father Bela (1Ch 8:6). The context would seem to indicate some locality in the land of Moab. SEE SHAHARAIM. Some refer it to the MENUCHAH of Judah (Jdg 9:43, A. Vers. “with ease;” comp. 1Ch 2:52; 1Ch 2:54), but with little probability. SEE MENUCHITE.

## Manahethite[[@Headword:Manahethite]]

             (1Ch 2:52). SEE HATSI-HAMMENUCHOTH.

## Manain[[@Headword:Manain]]

             (Μαναήν, prob. i.q. MENAHEM; comp. Μανάημος, Josephus, Ant. 9:11,1), a Christian teacher at Antioch, who had been educated with Herod Antipas (Act 13:1; see Kuinol, ad loc.). A.D. 44. He was evidently a Jew, but nothing else is known of him beyond this passage, in which the epithet σύντροφος may mean either playmate (Herod was brought up, however, at Rome, Josephus, Ant. 17:1, 3) or foster-brother, as having the same nurse (see Walch, Dissert. ad Act. p. 234). Some identify him with the person above named by Josephus, others with a Menahem mentioned in the Talmud (see Lightfoot, Harm. of N. Test. ad loc.), but in either case on very slender grounds.

## Manasseas[[@Headword:Manasseas]]

             (Μανασσήας v. r. Μανασσίας, Vulg. Manasses), given (1Es 9:31) in place of the MANASSEH SEE MANASSEH (q.v.), 4, of the Hebrew list (Ezr 10:30).

## Manasseh[[@Headword:Manasseh]]

             (Heb. Menahssheh', מְנִשֶּׁה, who makes to forget; see Gen 41:51; Sept., Josephus, and N.T. Μανασσῆς; “Manasses” in Mat 1:10; Rev 7:6), the name of four men and of a tribe descended from one of them; also of another man mentioned by Josephus.

1. The elder of the two sons of Joseph, born in Egypt (Gen 41:51; Gen 46:20) of Asenath, the priest's daughter of Heliopolis. B.C. 1882. He was afterwards, together with his brother, adopted by Jacob as his own (Gen 48:1), by which act each became the head of a tribe in Israel. B.C. 1856. SEE JACOB.

The act of adoption was, however, accompanied by a clear intimation from Jacob that the descendants of Manasseh, although the elder, would be far less numerous and powerful than those of the younger Ephraim. The result corresponded remarkably with this intimation. SEE EPHRAIM.

He married a Syrian concubine, by whom he  had several children (1Ch 7:14). SEE MACHIR. The only thing subsequently recorded of him personally is that his grandchildren were “brought up on Joseph's knees” (Gen 1:23). “The ancient Jewish traditions are, however, less reticent. According to them Manasseh was the steward of Joseph's house, and the interpreter who intervened between Joseph and his brethren at their interview; and the extraordinary strength which he displayed in the struggle with and binding of Simeon first caused Judah to suspect that the apparent Egyptians were really his own flesh and blood (see Targums Jerusalem and Pseudojon. on Gen 42:23; Gen 43:15; also the quotations in Weil's Bibl. Legends, p. 88, note).'

## Manasseh, Ben-Joseph Ben-Israel[[@Headword:Manasseh, Ben-Joseph Ben-Israel]]

             one of the most distinguished Jewish theologians of the 17th century, was born at Lisbon, Portugal, in 1604, at a time when the Iberian peninsula was a place of torture for all non-Roman Catholic believers, but more particularly the Jews. Joseph, his father, a rich merchant, feared the power of the inquisitors, and, like many religiously persecuted, turned towards hospitable Holland for an asylum for himself and his family. The household found a safe home in Amsterdam, and when yet a youth ben-Joseph was placed under the instruction of the celebrated Isaac Uzziel, then rabbi at the Dutch capital. So rapid was his progress and so unbounded the confidence of the Jews of Amsterdam in Manasseh ben-Israel, as he is commonly called, that on the death of Uzziel, when only eighteen years old (1622), he was deemed a worthy successor of the departed rabbi. In 1626, in need of means to meet the expenses of his father's family, largely dependent upon him for support, he established the celebrated “Amsterdam Hebrew  printing-office.” Two years later he printed his own maiden production, and in 1632 finally came before the public with the first volume of his great and justly celebrated Conciliator, or Harmony of the Pentateuch (see below), in which upwards of two hundred and ten Hebrew works, and fifty-four Greek, Latin, Spanish, and Portuguese authors, both sacred and profane, are quoted. His fame was now established in all Europe, and his authority accepted not only by the Jews, but even Christian scholars acknowledged his scholarship, and wrote to him from far and wide, requesting explanations of difficulties which they encountered in the Hebrew Scriptures and Jewish history.

The celebrated Vossius, Dionysius, Hugo Grotius, Huet, Episcopus, Sobierre, Frankenberg, Thomas Fuller, Nathaniel Homesius, etc., were among his correspondents. He solicited their influence in behalf of his suffering brethren, and was thereby enabled to petition the Long Parliament (1650) to readmit the Jews into England, whence they had been expelled ever since 1290. Shortly after, he dedicated The Hope of Israel to the English Parliament, which was gratefully acknowledged in a letter written by lord Middlesex, addressed To my dear brother M. B. I., the Hebrew philosopher.Encouraged thereby, Manasseh came over to England in1655; presented “A Humble Address” in behalf of hiscnreligionists to Cromwell; published in London, 1656, his Vindication of Jews, in answer to those Christians who opposed the readmission of Jews into that country; and though Cromwell, with all his power, could not carry through the measure permitting Jews to settle in England (see JEWS), he granted to Manasseh ben-Israel a pension of £100 per annum, payable quarterly, and commencing Feb. 20,1656 (comp. Carlyle, 2:163). Manasseh, however, did not long enjoy this generous gift, for he died in Middleburg in 1657, on his way back to Amsterdam. Grätz (Gesch. d. Juden , 10, 184-86) rather belittles Manasseh's literary ability. He regards him as “a man of much information, but of little thought,” and yet his acquaintance with Manasseh is founded mainly on Kayserling's biography. An encyclopadical knowledge was displayed by Manasseh in his writings; this should certainly not stand against him. His most important works are

(1.) פני רבה, in Hebrew, being an index to all the passages of the Hebrew Scriptures in the Midrash Rabboth on the Pentateuch and the Five Megilloth (Amsterdam, 1628);

(2.) Conciliator, sive de convenientia locorum S. Scripturae, quae pugnare inter se videntur, etc. (in Spanish, Amst. 1632-1651, 4 vols.; vol.  1 was translated into Latin by Vossius, Amst. 1633, and the whole into English by Lindo, London, 1842);

(3.) De Creatione Problemata (in Spanish, Amsterd. 1635);

(4.) De Resurrectione Mortuorum, Libri tres (in Spanish, Amsterd. 1636);

(5.) צרור החיים, De Termino Vitae (in Latin, Amsterd. 1639; translated into English by Thomas Pococke, Lond. 1699);

(6.) נשמת חיים: four books on the immortality of the soul (written in Hebrew, Amst. 1651; new ed. Leips. 1862. These are valuable contributions to Biblical literature, inasmuch as Manasseh gives in them all the passages from the Hebrew Scriptures which, according to the explanations of the ancient rabbins, teach the immortality of the soul and the resurrection);

(7.) אבן יקרה, Piedra Gloriosa o de la Estatua de Nebuchadnesar (Amst. 1655), an exposition of Daniel's dream, written in Spanish, which the immortal Rembrandt did not think it below his dignity to adorn with four engravings. He also carried through his own press several beautiful and correctly printed editions of the Hebrew Scriptures; wrote a Hebrew grammar, entitled שפה ברורה, Grammatica Hebrea, dividida en quatuor libros, which has not as yet been published; and left us over four hundred well-written sermons in Portuguese. See Fürst, Biblioth. Jud. 2:354-358; Steinschneider, Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Bibliotheca Bodleiana, col. 1645-1652; and especially the valuable biographies by Kayserling, Jahrbuch fur die Geschichte der Juden (Leipz. 1861), 2:85 sq.; and by Carmoly, in the Revue Orientale (Bruxelles, 1842), p. 299348; C. D. Ginsburg, in Kitto, 3, s.v.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 33:145 sq.

## Manasseh, Tribe Of[[@Headword:Manasseh, Tribe Of]]

             — On the prophetic benediction of Jacob, above referred to, although Manasseh, as the representative of his future lineage, had, like his grand- uncle Esau, lost his birthright in favor of his younger brother, he received, as Esau had, a blessing only inferior to the birthright itself. Like his brother, he was to increase with the fertility of the fish which swarmed in the great Egyptian stream, to “become a people, and also to be great” — the “thousands of Manasseh,” no less than those of Ephraim, indeed more, were to become a proverb in the nation; his name, no less than that of Ephraim, was to be the symbol and the expression of the richest blessings for his kindred.

The position of the tribe of Manasseh during the march to Canaan was with Ephraim and Benjamin on the west side of the sacred tent. The standard of the three sons of Rachel was the figure of a boy, with the inscription “The cloud of Jehovah rested on them until they went forth out of the camp” (Targ. Pseudojon. on Num 2:18). The chief of the tribe at the time of the census at Sinai was Gamaliel ben-Pedahzur, and its numbers were then 32,200 (Num 1:10; Num 1:35; Num 2:20-21; Num 7:54-59). The numbers of Ephraim were at the same date 40,500. Forty years later, on the banks of the Jordan, these proportions were reversed. Manasseh had then increased to 52,700, while Ephraim had diminished to 32,500 (Num 26:34; Num 26:37). On this occasion it is remarkable that Manasseh resumes his position in the catalogue as the eldest son of Joseph. Possibly this is due to the prowess which the tribe had shown in the conquest of Gilead, for Manasseh was certainly at this time the most distinguished of all the tribes. Of the three who had elected to remain on that side of the Jordan, Reuben and Gad had chosen their lot because the country was suitable to their  pastoral possessions and tendencies. But Machir, Jair, and Nobah, the sons of Manasseh, were no shepherds.

They were pure warriors, who had taken the most prominent part in the conquest of those provinces which up to that time had been conquered, and whose deeds are constantly referred to (Num 32:39; Deu 3:13-15) with credit and renown. “Jair, the son of Manasseh, took all the tract of Argob... sixty great cities” (Deu 3:14; Deu 3:4). “Nobah took Kenath and the daughter-towns thereof. and called it after his own name” (Num 32:42). “Because Machir was a man of war, therefore he had Gilead and Bashan” (Jos 17:1). The district which these ancient warriors conquered was among the most difficult, if not the most difficult, in the whole country. It embraced the hills of Gilead, with their inaccessible heights and impassable ravines, and the almost impregnable tract of Argob, which derives its modern name of Lejah from the secure “asylum” it affords to those who take refuge within its natural fortifications. Had they not remained in these wild and inaccessible districts, but gone forward and taken their lot with the rest, who shall say what changes might not have occurred in the history of the nation, through the presence of such energetic and warlike spirits? The few personages of eminence whom we can with certainty identify as Manassites, such as Gideon and Jephthah-for Elijah and others may with equal probability have belonged to the neighboring tribe of Gad — were among the most remarkable characters that Israel produced. Gideon was, in fact, “the greatest of the judges, and his children all but established hereditary monarchy in their own line” (Stanley, S. and P. p. 230).

But, with the one exception of Gideon, the warlike tendencies of Manasseh seem to have been confined to the east of the Jordan. There they throve exceedingly, pushing their way northward over the rich plains of Jaulan and Jedur — the Gaulanitis and Ituraea of the Roman period — to the foot of Mount Hermon (1Ch 5:23). At the time of the coronation of David at Hebron, while the western Manasseh sent 18,000, and Ephraim itself 20,800, the eastern Manasseh, with Gad and Reuben, mustered to the number of 120,000, thoroughly armed — a remarkable demonstration of strength, still more remarkable when we remember the fact that Saul's house, with the great Abner at its head, was then residing at Mahanaim, on the border of Manasseh and Gad. But, though thus outwardly prosperous, a similar fate awaited them in the end to that which befell Gad and Reuben; they gradually assimilated themselves to the old inhabitants of the country — they “transgressed against the God of their fathers, and went a-whoring after the gods of the people of the land  whom God destroyed before them” (1Ch 5:25). They relinquished, too, the settled mode of life and the definite limits which befitted the members of a federal nation, and gradually became Bedouins of the wilderness, spreading themselves over the vast deserts which lay between the allotted possessions of their tribe and the Euphrates, and which had from time immemorial been the hunting-grounds and pastures of the wild Hagarites, of Jetur, Nephish, and Nodab (1Ch 5:19; 1Ch 5:22). On them first descended the punishment which was ordained to be the inevitable consequence of such misdoing. They, first of all Israel, were carried away by Pul and Tiglath- Pileser, and settled in the Assyrian territories (1Ch 5:26). The connection, however, between east and west had been kept up to a certain degree. In Bethshean, the most easterly city of the cis-Jordanic Manasseh, the two portions all but joined. David had judges or officers there for all matters sacred and secular (1Ch 26:32); and Solomon's commissariat officer, Ben-Geber, ruled over the towns of Jair and the whole district of Argob (1Ki 4:13), and transmitted their productions, doubtless not without their people, to the court of Jerusalem.

The genealogies of the tribe are preserved in Num 26:28-34; Jos 17:1, etc.; and 1Ch 7:14-19. But it seems impossible to unravel these so as to ascertain, for instance, which of the families remained east of Jordan, and which advanced to the west. From the fact that Abi-ezer (the family of Gideon), Hepher (possibly Ophrah, the native place of the same hero), and Shechem (the well-known city of the Bene- Joseph) all occur among the names of the sons of Gilead, the son of Machir, it seems probable that Gilead, whose name is so intimately connected with the eastern, was also the immediate progenitor of the western half of the tribe.

Nor is it less difficult to fix the exact position of the territory allotted to the western half. In Jos 17:14-18. a passage usually regarded by critics as an exceedingly ancient document, we find the two tribes of Joseph complaining that only one portion had been allotted to them, viz. Mount Ephraim (Jos 17:15), and that they could not extend into the plains of Jordan or Esdraelon, because those districts were still in the possession of the Canaanites, and scoured by their chariots. In reply Joshua advises them to go up into the forest (Jos 17:15, A.V. “wood”) into the mountain which is a forest (Jos 17:18). This mountain clothed with forest can surely be nothing  but the various spurs and off-shoots of Carmel, the “mountain” closely adjoining the portion of Ephraim whose richness of wood was so proverbial. It is in accordance with this view that the majority of the towns of Manasseh-which, as the weaker portion of the tribe, would naturally be pushed to seek its fortunes outside the limits originally bestowed-were actually on the slopes either of Carmel itself or of the contiguous ranges. Thus Taanach and Megiddo were on the northern spurs of Carmel; Ibleam appears to have been on the eastern continuation of the range, somewhere near the present Jenin. En-Dor was on the slopes of the so-called “Little Hermon.” The two remaining towns mentioned as belonging to Manasseh formed the extreme eastern and western limits of the tribe; the one, Bethshean (Jos 17:11), was in the hollow of the Ghôr, or Jordan Valley; the other, Dor (ibid.), was on the coast of the Mediterranean, sheltered behind the range of Carmel, and immediately opposite the bluff or shoulder which forms its highest point. The whole of these cities are specially mentioned as standing in the allotments of other tribes, though inhabited by Manasseh; and this, with the absence of any attempt to define a limit to the possessions of the tribe on the north, looks as if no boundary- line had existed on that side, but as if' the territory faded off gradually into those of the two contiguous tribes from whom it had borrowed its fairest cities. On the south side the boundary between Manasseh and Ephraim is more definitely described, and may generally be traced with tolerable certainty. Their joint possessions were bounded by the territory of Asher on the north and Issachar on the north-east (Jos 17:10), but the division line between the two kindred tribes is defined by a place called Asher (Jos 17:7), now Yasir, twelve miles north-east of Nablis. Thence it ran to Michmethah, described as facing Shechem (Nablfs); then went to the right, i.e. southward, to the spring of Tappuah, and so doubtless to the Jordan. In the opposite direction it fell in with the watercourses of the torrent Kanah-probably the Nahr Falaik — along which it ran to the Mediterranean. See TRIBE.

From the indications of the history, it would appear that Manasseh took very little part in public affairs. They either left all that to Ephraim, or were so far removed from the center of the nation as to have little interest in what was taking place. That they attended David's coronation at Hebron has already been mentioned. When his rule was established over all Israel, each half had its distinct ruler — the western, Joel ben-Pedaiah; the  eastern, Iddo ben-Zechariah (1Ch 27:20-21). From this time the eastern Manasseh fades entirely from our view, and the western is hardly kept before us by an occasional mention. Such scattered notices as we do find have almost all reference to the part taken by members of the tribe in the reforms of the good kings of Judah — the Jehovah-revival under Asa (2Ch 15:9)-the Passover of Hezekiah (2Ch 30:1; 2Ch 30:10-11; 2Ch 30:18), and the subsequent enthusiasm against idolatry (2Ch 31:1) — the iconoclasm of Josiah (2Ch 34:6), and his restoration of the buildings of the Temple (2Ch 34:9). It is gratifying to reflect that these notices, faint and scattered as they are, are all colored with goods and exhibit none of the repulsive traits of that most repulsive heathenism into which other tribes of Israel fell.

A positive connection between Manasseh and Benjamin is implied in the genealogies of 1 Chronicles 7, where Machir is said to have married into the family of Huppim and Shuppim, chief houses in the latter tribe (1Ch 7:15). No record of any such relation appears anywhere else.

The following are all the Biblical localities in both sections of the tribe, with their preserved modern representatives:

II. According to the usual reading of the text in Jdg 18:30, Manasseh was the father of Gershom who is named as the father of Jonathan that acted as priest to the Danites at Laish; but besides that this would not make him a Levite, and, in addition to the fact that Gershom is a Levitical name, the reading is marked as suspicious (מְנִשֶּׂה, Sept. Μανασσῆ), and should doubtless be corrected to “Moses,” as in the Vulg. and many copies of the Sept. SEE JONATHAN.

III. The fourteenth separate king of Judah, son and successor of Hezekiah, who began to reign at the early age of twelve years, and reigned fifty-five years. B.C. 697-642. For the synchronisms with profane history especially,of Assyria, Babylon, an d Egypt, SEE CHRONOLOGY.

The reign of this monarch is the larger than that of any other of the house of David. There is none of which we know less. In part, it may be, this was the direct result of the character and policy of the man. In part, doubtless, it is to be traced to the abhorrence with which the following generation looked back upon it as the period of lowest degradation to which their  country had ever fallen. Chroniclers and prophets pass it over, gathering from its horrors and disasters the great, broad lessons in which they saw the foot-prints of a righteous retribution, the tokens of a divine compassion, and then they avert their eves and will see and say no more. This is in itself significant. It gives a meaning and a value to every fact which has escaped the sentence of oblivion. The very reticence of the historians of the O.T. shows how free they were from the rhetorical exaggerations and inaccuracies of a later age. The struggle of opposing worships must have been as fierce under Manasseh as it was under Antiochus, or Decins, or Diocletian, or Mary. Men must have suffered and died in that struggle of whom the world was not worthy, and yet no contrast can be greater than that between the short notices in Kings and Chronicles, and the martyrologies which belong to those other periods of persecution.

1. The birth of Manasseh is fixed (B.C. 709) twelve years before the death of Hezekiah (2Ki 21:1). We must, therefore, infer either that there had been no heir to the throne up to that comparatively late period in his reign, or that any that had been born had died, or that, as sometimes happened in the succession of Jewish and other Eastern kings, the elder son was passed over for the younger. There are reasons which make the former the more probable alternative. The exceeding bitterness of Hezekiah's sorrow at the threatened approach of death (2Ki 20:2-3; 2Ch 32:24; Isa 38:1-3), is more natural if we think of him as sinking under the thought that he was dying childless, leaving no heir to his work and to his kingdom. When, a little later, Isaiah warns him of the captivity and shame which will fall on his children, he speaks of those children as yet future (2Ki 20:18). This circumstance will explain one or two facts in the contemporary history. Hezekiah, it would seem, recovering from his sickness, anxious to avoid the danger that had threatened him, of leaving his kingdom without an heir, married, at or about this time, Hephzibah (2Ki 21:1), the daughter of one of the citizens or princes of Jerusalem (Joseph. Ant. 10:3, 1). The prophets, we may well imagine, would welcome the prospect of a successor named by a king who had been so true and faithful. Isaiah (in a passage clearly belonging to a later date than the early portions of the book, and apparently suggested by some conspicuous marriage), with his characteristic fondness for tracing auguries in names, finds in that of the new queen a prophecy of the ultimate restoration of Israel and the glories  of Jerusalem (Isa 62:4-5; compare Blunt, Scriptural Coincid. part 3:5). The city, also, should be a Hephzibah, a delightsome one. As the bridegroom rejoiceth over the bride, so would Jehovah rejoice over his people. SEE HEPHZIBAH.

The child that is born from this union is called Manasseh. This name, too, is strangely significant. It appears nowhere else in the history of the kingdom of Judah. The only associations connected with it were that it belonged to the tribe which was all but. the most powerful of the hostile kingdom of Israel. How are we to account for so singular and unlikely a choice? The answer is, that the name embodied what had been for years the cherished object of Hezekiah's policy and hope. To take advantage of the overthrow of the rival kingdom by Shalmaneser, and the anarchy in which its provinces had been left, to gather round him the remnant of the population, to bring them back to the worship and faith of their fathers, this had been the second step in his great national reformation (2Ch 30:6). It was at least partially successful. “Divers of Asher, Manasseh, and Zebulun humbled themselves and came to Jerusalem.” They were there at the great passover. The work of destroying idols went on in Ephraim and Manasseh as well as in Judah (2Ch 31:1). What could be a more acceptable pledge of his desire to receive the fugitives as on the same footing with his own subjects than that he should give to the heir to his throne the name in which one of their tribes exulted? What could better show the desire to let all past discords and offenses be forgotten than the name which was itself an amnesty?

The last twelve years of Hezekiah's reign were not, however, it will be remembered, those which were likely to influence for good the character of his successor. His policy had succeeded. He had thrown off the yoke of the king of Assyria, which Ahaz had accepted, had defied his armies, had been delivered from extremest danger, and had made himself the head of an independent kingdom, receiving tribute from neighboring princes instead of paying it to the great king, the king of Assyria. But he goes a step further. Not content with independence, he enters on a policy of aggression. He contracts an alliance with the rebellious viceroy of Babylon against their common enemy (2Ki 20:12; Isaiah 39). He displays the treasures of his kingdom to the ambassadors, in the belief that this will show them how powerful an ally he can prove himself. Isaiah protested against this step, but the ambition of being a great potentate continued, and it was to  the results of this ambition that the boy Manasseh succeeded at the age of twelve.

2. The accession of the youthful king appears to have been the signal for an entire change, if not in the foreign policy, at any rate in the religious administration of the kingdom. At so early an age he can scarcely have been the spontaneous author of so great an alteration, and we may infer accordingly that it was the work of the idolatrous, or Ahaz party, which had been repressed during the reign of Hezekiah, but had all along, like the Rorish clergy under Edward VI in England, looked on the reform with a sullen acquiescence, and thwarted it when they dared. The change which the king's measures brought about was, after all, superficial. The idolatry which was publicly discountenanced was practiced privately (Isa 1:29; Isa 2:20; Isa 65:3). The priests and the prophets, in spite of their outward orthodoxy, were too often little better than licentious drunkards (Isa 28:7). The nobles of Judah kept the new moons and sabbaths much in the same way as those of France kept their Lents when Louis XIV had made devotion a court ceremonial (Isa 1:13-14).

There are signs that even among the king's highest officers of state there was one, Shebna the scribe (Isa 37:2), the treasurer (Isa 22:15) “over the house,” whose policy was simply that of a selfish ambition, himself possibly a foreigner (comp. Blunt's Script. Coinc. 3:4), and whom Isaiah saw through and distrusted. It was, moreover, the traditional policy of “the princes of Judah” (compare one remarkable instance in the reign of Joash, 2Ch 24:17) to favor foreign alliances and the toleration of foreign worship, as it was that of the true priests and prophets to protest against it. It would seem, accordingly, as if they urged upon the young king that scheme of a close alliance with Babylon which Isaiah had condemned, and, as the natural consequence of this, the adoption, as far as possible, of its worship, and that of other nations whom it was desirable to conciliate. The morbid desire for widening the range of their knowledge and penetrating into the mysteries of other systems of belief may possibly have contributed now, as it had done in the days of Solomon, to increase the evil (Jer 2:10-25; Ewald, Gesch. Isr. 3. 666). The result was a debasement which had not been equaled even in the reign of Ahaz, uniting in one center the abominations which elsewhere existed separately. Not content with sanctioning their presence in the Holy City, as Solomon and Rehoboam had done, Manasseh defiled with it the sanctuary itself (2Ch 33:4). The worship thus introduced was, as has been said,  predominantly Babylonian in its character. “He observed times, and used enchantments, and used witchcraft, and dealt with a familiar spirit, and with wizards” (2Ch 33:6). The worship of “the host of heaven,” which each man celebrated for himself on the roof of his own house, took the place of that of the Lord God of Sabaoth (2Ki 23:12; Isa 65:3; Isa 65:11; Zep 1:5; “Jer 8:2; Jer 19:13; Jer 22:29). With this, however, there was associated the old Molech worship of the Ammonites. The fires were rekindled in the valley of Ben-Hinnom. Tophet was (for the first time, apparently) built into a stately fabric (2Ki 16:3; Isa 30:33, as compared with Jer 7:31; Jer 19:5; Ewald, Gesch. Isr. 3:667). Even the king's sons, instead of being presented to Jehovah, received a horrible fire-baptism dedicating them to Molech (2Ch 33:6), while others were actually slaughtered (Eze 23:37; Eze 23:39). The Baal and Ashtaroth ritual, which had been imported under Solomon from the Phoenicians, was revived with fresh splendor, and, in the worship of the “queen of heaven,” fixed its roots deep into the habits of the people (Jer 7:18).

Worse and more horrible than all, the Asherah, the image of Astarte, or the obscene symbol of a phallic worship ( SEE ASHEKAH, and, in addition to the authorities there cited, Mayer, De Reforme. Josiae, etc., in the Thes. Theo. philol. Amstel. 1701) was seen in the house of which Jehovah had said that he would there put his name forever (2Ki 21:7). All this was accompanied by the extremest moral degradation. The worship of those old Eastern religions has been well described as a kind of “sensuous intoxication,” simply sensuous, and therefore associated inevitably with a fiendish cruelty, leading to the utter annihilation of the spiritual life of men (Hegel, Philos. of History, 1:3). So it was in Jerusalem in the days of Manasseh. Rival priests (the Chemarim of Zep 1:4) were consecrated for this hideous worship. Women dedicating themselves to a cultus like that of the Babylonian Mylitta wove hangings for the Asherah as they sat there (Mayer, cap. 2, § 4). The Kadeshim, in closest neighborhood with them, gave themselves up to yet darker abominations (2Ki 23:7). The awful words in Isa 1:10 had a terrible truth in them. Those to whom he spoke were literally “rulers of Sodom and princes of Gomorrah.” Every faith was tolerated but the old faith of Israel. This was abandoned and proscribed. The altar of Jehovah was displaced (2Ch 33:16). The very ark of the covenant was removed from the sanctuary (2Ch 35:3). The sacred books of the people were so systematically destroyed that fifty years later men listened to the Book of the Law of Jehovah as a newly-discovered treasure  (2Ki 22:8). It may well be, according to a Jewish tradition, that this fanaticism of idolatry led Manasseh to order the name Jehovah to be erased from all documents and inscriptions (Patrick, ad loc.). All this involved also a systematic violation of the weekly sabbatic rest and the consequent loss of one witness against a merely animal life (Isa 56:2; Isa 58:13). The tide of corruption carried away some even of those who, as priests and prophets, should have been steadfast in resisting it (Zep 3:4; Jer 2:26; Jer 5:13; Jer 6:13).

It is easy to imagine the bitter grief and burning indignation of those who continued faithful. The fiercest zeal of Huguenots in France, of Covenanters in Scotland, against the badges and symbols of the Latin Church, is perhaps but a faint shadow of that which grew to a white heat in the hearts of the worshippers of Jehovah. They spoke out in words of corresponding strength. Evil was coming on Jerusalem which should make the ears of men to tingle (2Ki 21:12). The line of Samaria and the plummet of the house of Ahab should be the doom of the Holy City. Like a vessel that had once been full of precious ointment (comp. the Sept. ἀλαβάστρον), but had afterwards become foul, Jerusalem should be emptied and wiped out, and exposed to the winds of Heaven till it was cleansed. Foremost, we may well believe, among those who thus bore their witness was the old prophet, now bent with the weight of fourscore years, who had in his earlier days protested with equal courage against the crimes of the king's grandfather. On him, too, according to the old Jewish tradition, came the first shock of the persecution. Enraged at the rebukes which the aged prophet doubtless administered, the king is said to have caused him to be sawn asunder with a wooden saw; this fate seems to be alluded to in Heb 11:37. SEE ISAIAH. Habakkuk may have shared his martyrdom (Keil on 2 Kings 21; but SEE HABAKKUK ).

But the persecution did not stop there. It attacked the whole order of the true prophets, and those who followed them. Every day witnessed an execution (Josephus, Ant. 10:3, 1). The slaughter was like that under Alva or Charles IX (2Ki 21:16). The martyrs who were faithful unto death had to endure not torture only, but the mocks and taunts of a godless generation (Isa 57:1-4). Long afterwards the remembrance of that reign of terror lingered in the minds of men as a guilt for which nothing could atone (2Ki 24:4). The persecution, like most other persecutions carried on with entire singleness of purpose, was for a time successful (Jer 2:30). The prophets appear no more in the long history of  Manasseh's reign. The heart and the intellect of the nation were crushed out, and there would seem to have been no chroniclers left to record this portion of its history.

3. Retribution came soon in the natural sequence of events. There are indications that the neighboring nations — Philistines, Moabites, Ammonites — who had been tributary under Hezekiah, revolted at some period in the reign of Manasseh, and asserted their independence (Zep 2:4-15; Jeremiah 47, 48, 49). The Babylonian alliance bore the fruits which had been predicted. Hezekiah had been too hasty in attaching himself to the cause of the rebel prince against Assyria. The rebellion of Merodach-Baladan was crushed, and then the wrath of the Assyrian king fell on those who had supported him. SEE ESAR-HADDON. According to others, during the constant war between Assyria and Egypt, Manasseh adhered to the policy of his father in making common cause with the latter power. One or the other of these causes, although not stated by the sacred historian, brought into Judaea an Assyrian army, under the general of Esar-haddon, and this time the invasion was more successful than that of Sennacherib. The city apparently was taken. The miserable king attempted flight, but was discovered in a thorn-brake in which he had hidden himself, was laden with chains, and sent away as a captive to Babylon, which was then subject to the Assyrians, where he was cast into prison. His name has been discovered on the Assyrian monuments (Journ. of Sac. Lit. April, 1859, p. 75). SEE NINEVEH. Here, at last, Manasseh had ample opportunity and leisure for cool reflection; and the hard lessons of adversity were not lost upon him. He saw and deplored the evils of his reign — he became as a new man — he humbly besought pardon from God, and implored that he might be enabled to evince the sincerity of his contrition by being restored to a position for undoing all that it had been the business of his life to effect. His prayer was heard. His captivity is supposed to have lasted a year, and he was then restored to his kingdom under certain obligations of tribute and allegiance to the king of Assyria, which, although not expressed in the account of this transaction, are alluded to in the history of his successors (2Ch 33:11-13; comp. Maurice, Prophets and Kings, p. 362). SEE MANASSES, PRAYER OF.

Two questions meet us at this point. (a) Have we satisfactory grounds for believing that this statement is historically true? (b) If we accept it, to what  period in the reign of Manasseh is it to be assigned? It has been urged in regard to

(a) that the silence of the writer of the books of Kings is conclusive against the trustworthiness of the narrative of 2 Chronicles. In the former there is no mention made of captivity or repentance or return. The latter, it has been said, yields to the temptation of pointing a moral, of making history appear more in harmony with his own notions of the divine government than it actually is. His anxiety to deal leniently with the successors of David leads him to invent at once a reformation and the captivity which is represented as its cause (Rosenmüller, Bibl. Alterth. 1:2, p. 131; Hitzig, Begr. d. Kritik, p. 130). It will be necessary in dealing with this objection to meet the skeptical critic on his own ground. To say that his reasoning contradicts our belief in the inspiration of the historical books of Scripture, and is destructive of all reverence for them, would involve a petitio principii, and, however strongly it may influence our feelings, we are bound to find another answer. It is believed that the answer is not far to seek.

(1) The silence of a writer who sums up the history of a reign of fifty-five years in nineteen verses as to one alleged event in it is surely a weak ground for refusing to accept that event on the authority of another historian.

(2) The omission is in part explained by the character of the narrative of 2 Kings 21. The writer deliberately turns away from the history of the days of shame, and not less from the personal biography of the king. He looks on the reign only as it contributed to the corruption and final overthrow of the kingdom, and no after repentance was able to undo the mischief that had been done at first.

(3) Still keeping on the level of human probabilities, the character of the writer of 2 Chronicles, obviously a Levite, and looking at the facts of the history from the Levitical point of view, would lead him to attach greater importance to a partial reinstatement of the old ritual and to the cessation of persecution, and so to give them in proportion a greater prominence.

(4) There is one peculiarity in the history which is, in some measure, of the nature of an undesigned coincidence, and so confirms it. The captains of the host of Assyria take Manasseh to Babylon. Would not a later writer, inventing the story, have made the Assyrian, and not the Babylonian,  capital the scene of the captivity; or, if the latter were chosen for the sake of harmony with the prophecy of (233901>Isaiah 39, have made the king of Babylon rather than of Assyria the captor? As it is, the narrative fits in, with the utmost accuracy, to the facts of Oriental history. The first attempt of Babylon to assert its independence of Nineveh failed. It was crushed by Esar-haddon (the first or second of that name; SEE ESAR-HADDON, and Ewald, Gesch. Isr. 3:675), and for a time the Assyrian king held his court at Babylon, so as to effect more completely the reduction of the rebellious province. There is

(5) the fact of agreement with the intervention of the Assyrian king in 2Ki 17:24, just at the same time. The king is not named there, but Ezr 4:2; Ezr 4:10, gives Asnapper, and this is probably only another form of Asardanapar, and this = Esar-haddon (compare Ewald, Gesch. 3:676; Tob 1:21 gives Sarchedonus). The importation of tribes from Eastern Asia thus becomes part of the same policy as the attack on Judah. On the whole, then, the objection may well be dismissed as frivolous and vexatious. Like many other difficulties urged by the same school, it has in it something at once captious and puerile. Those who lay undue stress on them act in the spirit of a clever boy asking puzzling questions, or a sharp advocate getting up a case against the evidence on the other side, rather than in that of critics who have learned how to construct a history and to value its materials rightly (comp. Keil, Comment. on 2 Kings 21). Ewald, a critic of a nobler stamp, whose fault is rather that of fantastic reconstruction than needress skepticism (Gesch. Isr. 3:678), admits the groundwork of truth. Would the prophecy of Isaiah, it may be asked, have been recorded and preserved if it had not been fulfilled? Might not Manasseh's release have been, as Ewald suggests, the direct consequence of the death of Esar- haddon? Indeed, all the soberer German critics accept it as truth, and place Manasseh's captivity under Esar-haddon (Bertheau, ad loc.). Bertheau suggests that some support to the account may perhaps be found in 2Ki 20:17 sq. For other discussions of the alleged improbabilities of the Biblical narrative, see Dahlers, Defide Chronic. hist. p. 139, Gramberg, Chron. p. 199, 210; Religionsid. 2:234; Rosenmüller, Alterth. I, 2:131; Keil, Apoloq. der Chronik. p. 425; Havernick, Einleit. II, 1:221; Stud. u Krit. 1860, vol. 3.

(b.) The circumstance just noticed enables us to return an approximate answer to the other question. The duration of Esar-haddon's Babylonian reign is calculated as being in B.C. 680-667; and Manasseh's captivity must  therefore have fallen within those limits. A Jewish tradition (Seder Olam Rabba, c. 24) fixes the twenty-second year of his reign as the exact date.

4. The period that followed is dwelt upon by the writer of 2 Chronicles as one of a great change for the better. The discipline of exile made the king feel that the gods whom he had chosen were powerless to deliver, and he turned in his heart to Jehovah, the God of his fathers. The compassion or death of Esar-haddon led to his release, and he returned after some uncertain interval of time to Jerusalem. It is not improbable that his absence from that city had given a breathing time to the oppressed adherents of the ancient creed, and possibly had brought into prominence, as the provisional ruler and defender of the city, one of the chief members of the party. If the prophecy of Isa 22:15 received, as it probably did, its fulfillment in Shebna's sharing the captivity of his master, there is nothing extravagant in the belief that we may refer to the same period the noble words which speak of Eliakim, the son of Hilkiah, as taking the place which Shebna should leave vacant, and rising up to be “a father unto the inhabitants of Jerusalem and to the house of Judah,” having “the key of the house of David on his shoulder.”

The return of Manasseh was at any rate followed by a new policy. The old faith of Israel was no longer persecuted. Foreign idolatries were no longer thrust, in all their foulness, into the sanctuary itself. The altar of the Lord was again restored, and peace-offerings and thank-offerings sacrificed to Jehovah (2Ch 33:15-16). But beyond this the reformation did not go. The ark was not restored to its place. The book of the law of Jehovah remained in its concealment. Satisfied with the feeling that they were no longer worshipping the gods of other nations by name, they went on with a mode of worship essentially idolatrous. “The people did sacrifice still in the high places, but to Jehovah their God only” (ibid. 2Ch 33:17).

5. The other facts known of Manasseh's reign connect themselves with the state of the world round him. The Assyrian monarchy was tottering to its fall, and the king of Judah seems to have thought that it was still possible for him to rule as the head of a strong and independent kingdom. If he had to content himself with a smaller territory, he might yet guard its capital against attack by a new wall defending what had been before its weak side (comp. Zep 1:10), “to the entering in of the fish-gate,” and completing the tower of Ophel, which had been begun with a like purpose by Jotham (2Ch 27:3). Nor were the preparations for defense  limited to Jerusalem. “He put captains of war into all the fenced cities of Judah.” There was, it must be remembered, a special reason for this attitude, over and above that afforded by the condition of Assyria. Egypt had emerged from the chaos of the Dodecarchy and the Ethiopian intruders, and again become strong and aggressive under Psammitichus. Pushing his arms northwards, he attacked the Philistines, and the twenty- nine years' siege of Azotus must have fallen wholly or in part within the reign of Manasseh. So far his progress would not be unacceptable.

It would be pleasant to see the old hereditary enemies of Israel, who had lately grown insolent and defiant, meet with their masters. About this time, accordingly, we find the thought of an Egyptian alliance again beginning to gain favor. The prophets, and those who were guided by them, dreaded this more than anything, and entered their protest against it. Not the less, however, from this time forth, did it continue to be the favorite idea which took possession of the minds of the lay-party of the princes of Judah. The very name of Manasseh's son, Amon, barely admitting a possible Hebrew explanation, but identical in form and sound with that of the great sungod of Egypt (so Ewald, Gesch. 3:665), is probably an indication of the gladness with which the alliance of Psammitichus was welcomed. As one of its consequences, it probably involved the supply of troops from Judah to serve in the armies of the Egyptian king. Without adopting Ewald's hypothesis that this is referred to in Deu 28:68, it is yet likely enough in itself, and Jer 2:14-16 seems to allude to some such state of things. In return for this, Manasseh, we may believe, received the help of the chariots and horses for which Egypt was always famous (Isa 31:1). (Comp. Aristeas, Epist. ad Philocr. in Havercamp's Josephus, 2:104). If this was the close of Manasseh's reign, we can well understand how to the writer of the books of Kings it would seem hardly better than the beginning, leaving the root-evil uncured, preparing the way for worse evils than itself. We can understand how it was that on his death he was buried as Ahaz had been, not with the burial of a king, in the sepulchers of the house of David, but in the garden of Uzza (2Ki 21:26), and that, long afterwards, in spite of his repentance, the Jews held his name in abhorrence, as one of the three kings (the other two are Jeroboam and Ahab) who had no part in eternal life (Sanhedr. 11:1, quoted by Patrick on 2Ch 33:13).

Indeed, the evil was irreparable. The habits of a sensuous and debased worship had eaten into the life of the people; and though they might be  repressed for a time by force, as in the reformation of Josiah, they burst out again, when the pressure was removed, with fresh violence, and rendered even the zeal of the best of the Jewish kings fruitful chiefly in hypocrisy and unreality. The intellectual life of the people suffered in the same degree. The persecution cut off all who, trained in the schools of the prophets, were the thinkers and teachers of. the people. The reign of Manasseh witnessed the close of the work of Isaiah and Habakkuk at its beginning, and the youth of Jeremiah and Zephaniah at its conclusion, but no prophetic writings illumine that dreary half-century of debasement. The most fearful symptom of all, when a prophet's voice was again heard during the minority of Josiah, was the atheism which, then as in other ages, followed on the confused adoption of a confluent polytheism (Zep 1:12). It is surely a strained, almost a fantastic hypothesis, to assign (as Ewald does) to such a period two such noble works as Deuteronomy and the book of Job. Nor was this dying out of a true faith the only evil. The systematic persecution of the worshippers of Jehovah accustomed the people to the horrors of a religious war; and when they in their turn gained the ascendancy, they used the opportunity with a fiercer sternness than had been known before. Jehoshaphat and Hezekiah in their reforms had been content with restoring the true worship and destroying the instruments of the false. In that of Josiah, the destruction extends to the priests of the high places, whom he sacrifices on their own altars (2Ki 23:20).

6. But little is added by later tradition to the O.T. narrative of Manasseh's reign. The prayer that bears his name among the apocryphal books can hardly, in the absence of any Hebrew original, be considered as identical with that referred to in 2 Chronicles 33, and is probably rather the result of an attempt to work out the hint there supplied than the reproduction of an older document. There are reasons, however, for believing that there existed at some time or other a fuller history, more or less legendary, of Manasseh and his conversion, from which the prayer may possibly have been an except, preserved for devotional purposes (it appears for the first time in the Apostolical Constitutions) when the rest was rejected as worthless. Scattered here and there, we find the disjecta membra of such a work. Among the offenses of Manasseh, the most prominent is that he places in the sanctuary an ἄγαλμα τετραπρόσωπον of Zeus (Suidas, s.v. Μανασσῆς; Georg. Syncellus, Chonograph. 1:404).

The charge on which he condemns Isaiah to death is that of blasphemy, the words “I saw the  Lord” (Isa 6:1) being treated as a presumptuous boast at variance with Exo 33:20 (Nic. de Lyra, from a Jewish treatise: Jebamoth, quoted by Amama, in Crit. Sacri on 2 Kings 21). Isaiah is miraculously rescued. A cedar opens to receive him. Then comes the order tha the cedar should be sawn through (ibid.). That which made this sin the greater was that the king's mother, Hephzibah, was the daughter of Isaiah. When Manasseh was taken captive by Merodach and taken to Babylon (Suidas), he was thrown into prison and fed daily with a scanty allowance of bran- bread and water mixed with vinegar. Then came his condemnation. He was encased in a brazen image (the description suggests a punishment like that of the bull of Perillus), but he repented and prayed, and the image clave asunder, and he escaped (Suidas and Georg. Syncellus). “And the Lord heard the voice of Manasses and pitied him,” the legend continues, “and there came around him a flame of fire, and all the irons about him (τὰ περὶ αὐτὸν σιδηρᾶ) were melted, and the Lord delivered him out of his affliction” (Const. Apost. 2:22; compare Jul. Afric. ap. Routh, Rel. Sac. 2:288). Then he returned to Jerusalem and lived righteously and justly.

IV. An Israelite of the descendants (or residents) of Pahath-moab, who repudiated his foreign wife after the exile (Ezr 10:30). B.C. 459.

V. Another Israelite of Hashun who did the same (Ezr 10:33). B.C. 459.

## Manasses[[@Headword:Manasses]]

             (Μανασσῆς), the Greek form of the name Manasseh, and, as such, applied not only to those mentioned in the O.T., but to another in the Apocrypha.

1. The son of Joseph by that name (Rev 7:6).

2. The king of Judah (Mat 1:10; and so in “the Prayer” thus entitled).

3. One of the sons of Hashum (1Es 9:33; comp. Ezr 10:33).  4. A wealthy inhabitant of Bethuha, and husband of Judith, according to the legend. He was smitten with a sunstroke while superintending the laborers in his fields, leaving Judith a widow with great possessions (Jdg 8:2; Jdg 8:7; Jdg 10:3; Jdg 16:22-24), and was buried between Dothan and Baal-hamon. SEE JUDITH.

## Manasses, The Prayer Of[[@Headword:Manasses, The Prayer Of]]

             one of the shorter apocryphal pieces appended to the O.T. (In the following account we mainly follow the articles on the subject in Kitto and Smith's Dictionaries.) Though wanting in the early printed editions of the Sept., it must have been included in the ancient MSS. of the Sept., as is evident from the fact that there exists an Ante-Hieronymian Latin version of it. It is found in the Codex Alexandrinus, and the Greek text was first published in Robert Stephens' edition of the Biblia Latina (Paris. 1540), and in the edition of the same printed in 1546. It was also printed in the Apostolical Constitutions in 1563; it was then published by Dauderstadt in 1628; inserted in the fourth volume of the London Polyglot, with the various readings of the Codex Alexandrinus, in the Apostolical Fathers of Cotelerius in 1672; in the Libri apocr. V. T. (Francof. ad M. 1694, Halle, 1749); in the editions of the Apocrypha by Reineccius (1730). Michaelis (1741); and after the text of the Cod. Alexandrinus in the editions of the Sept. by Grabe and Breitinger.

I. Title and Position. — This apocryphal production is called the prayer of Manasses (προσευχὴ Μανασσῆ), or hymn of prayer (προσευχὴ τῇς ῳδῆς), because it purports to be the supplications which this monarch offered to God when captive in Babylon, mentioned in 2Ch 33:12-13. Its position varies in the MSS., printed editions of the text, and in the versions. It is more generally appended to the Psalter with the collection of hymns and prayers, as in the Codex Alexandrinus, the Zurich MS. of the Psalms mentioned by Fritzsche, and in the Ethiopic Psalter, published by Ludolf (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1701); in the three Latin MSS. used by Sabatier it is placed at the end of 2 Chronicles (Sabat. Bibl. Lat. 3:1038); in the editions of the Vulgate formed after the Trident. Canon of the Bible it is usually put at the end of the N.T., succeeded by the third and fourth books of Esdras. Luther placed it as the last of the Apocrypha, at the end of the O.T., while Matthew's Bible, which first inserted it among the Apocrypha, and which is followed by the Bishop's Bible and the A. V., puts it before the Maccabees.

II. Contents, Author, Date, Original Language, etc. — It opens with an appeal to the God of the faithful patriarchs and their righteous seed, describes his greatness as Creator of all things, before whose power every one trembles, and whose wrath no sinner can endure, and speaks of his proffered pardon to the penitent (2Ch 33:1-8). Thereupon the repentant king confesses his sins, humbles himself on account of them, prays for pardon, and promises to lead a life of gratitude and praise (2Ch 33:9-15).

Many writers have seen nothing in this prayer to militate against its being the penitential dirge of the penitent Manasseh; on the contrary, they think that the simnplicity and appropriateness of its style, the earnest and touching manner in which it is expressed, go far to show that if it is not literally “his prayer unto his God” rendered into Greek, that prayer formed the basis of the Greek. It is, indeed, certain that the prayer was still extant when the Chronicles were compiled, that the chronicler saw it “in the book of the Kings of Israel” (2Ch 33:18), and that later writers, as well as tradition, constantly refer to it (compare Sanhedrin, 101, b; 103, a; Jerusalem Sanhedrin 17; Midrash Rabboth on Lev., Parsha 30, p. 150; on Deut., Parsha 2, or ch. 4:25, p. 216, ed. Sulzbach; Chaldee Paraphrase of 2Ch 33:11, etc.; Const. Apost. 2:22). We may more reasonably conclude, however, that it is but the embodiment of these traditions. SEE MANASSEH, 3.

The Greek text is undoubtedly original, and not a mere translation from the Hebrew, for even within the small space of fifteen verses some peculiarities are found (ἄστεκτος, κλίνειν γόνυ καρδίας, παροργίζειν τὸν θυμόν, τίθεσθαι μετάνοιάν τινι). The writer was well acquainted with the Sept. (τὰ κατώτατα τῆς γῆς, τὸπλῆθος τῆς χρηστότητός σου, πᾶσα ἡ δύναμις τῶν οὐρανῶν), but beyond this there is nothing to determine the date at which he lived. The allusion to the patriarchs (2Ch 33:8, δίκαιοι; 2Ch 33:1, τὸ σπέρμα αὐτῶν τὸ δίκαιον) appears to fix the authorship on a Jew, but the clear teaching on repentance points to a time certainly not long before the Christian era. There is no indication of the place at which the prayer was written. All that we know is that reference is made to it in a fragment of Julius Africanus (circa A.D. 221), that it is given ,at length in the Apostolical Constitutions (2:22), a work attributed to Clemens Romanus, but generally believed to be of the 3d or 4th century, and that the whole complexion of it shows it to be an ante-Christian production, compiled most probably in the first century B.C. The Latin translation which occurs in Vulgate MSS. is not by the hand of Jerome,  and has some remarkable phrases (insustentabilis, importabilis [ἀνυπόστατος], omnis virtus clelorum), but there is no sufficient internal evidence to show whether it is later or earlier than his time. It does not, however, seem to have been used by any Latin writer of the first four centuries, and was not known to Victor Tunonensis in the sixth (Ambrosius, 4:989, ed. Migne).

III. Canonicity. — This prayer was considered by many of the ancients as genuine, and used as such for ecclesiastical purposes. It is quoted as such by the author of the Sermons on the Pharisee and Publican; in the sixth volume of Chrysostom's works; by Anthony the monk (2:94); Theodore Studita (Sesrm. Catachet. 93); Theophanes Ceramaeus (Homnil. 2 and 56); by Freculfus, George Syncellus, and George the sinner, in their Chronicles; by Suidas (Lex. s.v. Μανασσῆς); and by Anastasius Sinaita (in Psalms 6); and is still placed by the modern Greeks in their Psalter along with the other hymns (Leo Allatius, De lib. Ecclesiast. Graecorum, p. 62). But the fact of its non-occurrence in the Heb. text, and its uniform rejection by the Jewish Church, clearly stamp it as apocryphal. It was never recognized in the Roman Church as canonical, and has, therefore. been omitted in the ancient editions of the Sept. For this reason it is also omitted from the Zurich Version, and Coverdale's Bible. which follows it, as well as from the Geneva Version; but is retained among the Apocrypha in Luther's translation, Matthew's Bible. and in the Bishop's Bible, and thence passed over into the A.V.

IV. Versions and Exegetical Helps. — Greek and Latin metrical versions of this prayer have been reprinted by Fabricius, in his edition of the books of Sirach, Wisdom, Judith, and Tobit (Leipz. 1691). A Hebrew version of it is mentioned by Wolf, Bibliotheca Hebraea, 1:778; a very beautiful Hebrew version, with valuable notes, is printed in the Hebrew Annual, entitled likure Ha-Itim (Vienna, 1824), v. 12 sq.; important literary notices are given by Fabricius, Codex Pseudepigraphs V. T. 1:1100 sq.; Bibliotheca Graeca (ed. Harles), 3:732 sq.; Müller, Erklurung des Gebet Manasse (Salzwedel, 1733); and especially Fritzsche, Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch z. d. Apokryphen d. A. T. 1:157 sq. (Leips. 1851). SEE APOCRYPHA.

## Manassite[[@Headword:Manassite]]

             (מְנִשּׂי, Menassi', patronymic from MANASSEH, used collectively; Sept. Μανασσή), Auth. Vers. “Manassites,” “of Manasseh”), a descendant of Manasseh, or a member of that tribe (Deu 4:43; Deu 29:8; 2Ki 10:33; 1Ch 26:32).

## Manby, Peter[[@Headword:Manby, Peter]]

             an Irish theologian, was educated at Trinity College, Dublin, became chaplain to Dr. Michael Boyle, afterwards archbishop of Dublin, and at length dean of Perry. In the reign of James II he embraced the popish religion, in vindication of which he wrote several books; then removed to France, thence to England, and died at London in 1697. Manby published several controversial tracts in favor of the Roman Catholic religion. — Hook, Eccles. Biog. 7:214, s.v.

## Manchet[[@Headword:Manchet]]

             is a name given in the 16th century to the wafer used in the mass. — Walcott, Sac. Archaeol. s.v.

## Manchoo (also Mantchoo, Mandshou) Version Of The Scriptures[[@Headword:Manchoo (also Mantchoo, Mandshou) Version Of The Scriptures]]

             The Manchoo belongs to Manchooria, an extreme region lying north of Corea and north-east of China proper. It is also the court language of  Pekin. An imperfect and very unfaithful translation of part of the Scriptures into Manchoo is said to have been executed by some Jesuit missionaries; and in 1818 an abortive attempt towards the production of a version was made under the sanction of the governor of Irkutsk. The prosecution of this important work ultimately devolved upon Lipoffzoff, a learned member of the Russian Bible Society, who had resided fourteen years at Pekin, by appointment of the Russian government, with the view of studying the Chinese and Manchoo.

The translation was carried on under the superintendence of Dr. Pinkerton, and in 1822 an edition of the gospel of Matthew was printed at St. Petersburg, at the expense of the British and Foreign Bible Society. The awful flood which occurred in that city in 1824 destroyed the greater part of this edition. The entire New Test. was published by the same society in 1835, the translation of Mr. Lipoffzoff having been revised by Mr. George Borrow, of Norwich. This edition, which is beautifully printed, was forwarded to London, and there it probably still remains, under the custody of the British and Foreign Bible Society, until a proper time comes for the distribution and circulation of the copies. See Bible of Every Land, page 334. The language has been treated by Gabelentz, Elements de la Grammaire Mandchoue (1833); Adam, Grammaire de la Langue Mandchoue (Paris, 1873); Harlez, Manuel de la Langue Mandchoue (ibid. 1884); Klaproth, Chrestomathie Mandchoue (ibid. 1828). (B.P.)

## Manchuria[[@Headword:Manchuria]]

             SEE MANTCHURIA.

## Mancius, George Wilhelmus[[@Headword:Mancius, George Wilhelmus]]

             one of the prominent ministers of the Reformed Church in America, and a sturdy opposer of the movements for securing its independence of the Church in Holland. He was settled in Bergen County, N. J., at Schraalenbergh and Paramus (1730-32), and at Kingston, N. Y. (1732-56 or ‘59). He possessed much ability and learning, but it was alleged that “consciences slumbered” under his orthodox preaching. His friends, however, claim that his manuscript sermons show him to have been “a faithful, learned, industrious, and zealous preacher of the Gospel, one who did not fear to declare the whole counsel of God; and that it was, on the other hand, his opposition to an illiterate ministry and to heresy, his independence in reproving vice, and his general zeal and fidelity which induced certain of his enemies to misrepresent him.” He left 420 members in full communion of his Church. He died Sept. 6,1762. See Corwin's Manual of the Reformed Church, p. 150. (W. J. R. T.)

## Manco Capac[[@Headword:Manco Capac]]

             the founder of the ancient Peruvian empire, was deified after his death, and altars were erected for his worship. Both he and his wife were regarded as children of the sun, who had been sent from heaven to earth, that they might found a kingdom.

## Mandaeans[[@Headword:Mandaeans]]

             SEE MENDAEANS.

## Mandar[[@Headword:Mandar]]

             in Hindu mythology, is the great mountain which the gods carried into the milky sea, wound the snake Adisseschen about it, and by churning it produced the food of the gods, Amrita.

## Mandata de Providendo[[@Headword:Mandata de Providendo]]

             SEE EXPECTANTIA.

## Mandeville, Bernard de[[@Headword:Mandeville, Bernard de]]

             a skeptical writer inthe English tongue, was born of French extraction about 1670 at Dort, Holland, and went to England near the opening of the 18th century. He practiced medicine in London, but does not appear to have had much success as a physician, and depended mainly on his literary activity for the means of support. He died in 1733. In the article DEISM SEE DEISM (q.v.) the name of Mandeville has not been inserted “because his speculations” (see works below), as Farrar says (Crit. Hist. of Free Thought, p. 135, note 65), “did not bear directly on religion.” Upon morality, however, Mandeville exerted so great an influence that we cannot pass him unnoticed. His attacks on Christian morals already reveal him to have been a champion of Deism. The doctrines laid down in several of his works is nothing more nor less than a further elucidation of the assertion of Bayle (in Pensees diverses), that Atheism does not necessarily make man vicious, nor a state unhappy, because dogmas have no influence on the acts of men. Superficial observation of society led Mandeville to the belief that many institutions of public weal derive their strength and support from prevailing immorality. This view he developed in a poem entitled The Grumbling Hive, or Knaves turned Honest (1714), to which he afterwards added long explanatory notes, and then published the whole under the new title of The Fable of the Bees. However erroneous may be its views of morals and of society, it bears all the marks of an honest and sincere inquiry on an important subject. It exposed Mandeville, however, to much obloquy, and, besides meeting with many answers and attacks, was denounced as injurious to morality. It would appear that some of the hostility against this work, and against Mandeville generally, is to be traced to another publication, recommending the public licensing of stews, the matter and manner of which are certainly exceptionable, though it must at the same time be stated that Mandeville earnestly and with seeming sincerity recommends his plan as a means of diminishing immorality, and that he endeavored, so far as lay in his power, by affixing a high price and in other ways, to prevent the work from having a general circulation.

Mandeville subsequently published a second part of The Fable of the Bees, and several other works, among which are two entitled ‘Free Thoughts on Religion, the Church, and National Happiness, and An Inquiry into the Origin of Honor and the Usefuless of Christianity in War.” The Fable of the Bees, or Private Vices Public Benefits, may be viewed in two ways, as a satire on men and as a theory of society and national prosperity. So far as it is a satire, it is sufficiently just and pleasant; but viewed in its more ambitious character of a theory of society, it is altogether worthless. It is Mandeville's object to show that national greatness depends on the prevalence of fraud and luxury; and for this purpose he supposes a ‘vast hive of bees,' possessing in all respects institutions similar to those of men; he details the various frauds, similar to those among men, practiced by bees one upon another in various professions; he shows how the wealth accumulated by means of these frauds is turned, through luxurious habits, to the good of others, who again practice their frauds upon the wealthy; and, having already assumed that wealth cannot be gotten without fraud and cannot exist without luxury, he assumes further that wealth is the only cause and criterion of national greatness.

His hive of bees having thus become wealthy and great, he afterwards supposes a mutual jealousy of frauds to arise, and fraud to be by common consent dismissed; and he again assumes that wealth and luxury immediately disappear, and that the greatness of the society is gone. It is needless to point out inconsistencies and errors, such, for instance, as the absence of all distinction between luxury and vice, when the whole theory rests upon obviously false assumptions; and the long dissertations appended to the fable, however amusing and full of valuable remarks, contain no attempts to establish by proof the fundamental points of the theory. In an ‘Inquiry into the Origin of Moral Distinctions,' contained in The Fable of the Bees, Mandeville contends that virtue and vice, and the feelings of moral approbation and disapprobation, have been created in men by their several governments, for the purpose of maintaining society and preserving their own power. Incredible as it seems that such a proposition as this should be seriously put forth, it is yet more so that it should come from one whose professed object was, however strange the way in which he set about it, to promote good morals; for there is nothing in Mandeville's writings to warrant the belief that he sought to encourage vice” (English Cyclop. s.v.). This book was translated into French, as well as the other writings of Mandeville, and contributed in no small degree to the corruption of French society, and helped forward the sad days of the Revolution. Schlosser (Hist. of the 18th  and 19th Cent.) is quite severe on Mandeville. He says that “Mandeville was a man wholly destitute of morality, and without any insight into the nature of man or the connection between bodily and mental soundness and well-being.” See Life by Dr. Birch; Blackwood's Magazine, 2:268, 442; 27:712; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Schröckh, Kirchengeschichte s. d. Ref. 6:204 sq.; Henke, Gesch. d. christl. Kirche, 6:85 sq. (J. H. W.)

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

             D.D., a (Dutch) Reformed minister, was born at Kinderhook, N. Y., March 6, 1804; graduated at Union College in 1826, and at New Brunswick Theological Seminary in 1829, and was licensed by the Classis of Albany in 1829. His ministry was chiefly spent in the Reformed Church in the State of New York, viz., at Shawangunk, 1829-31; Geneva, 1831-34; Utica, 1834-41. From 1841 to 1849 he was professor of moral philosophy and belles-lettres in Hamilton College, N. Y. While in this position he published several valuable text-books on elocution and English literature, which evince his thorough scholarship and “aptness to teach.” From Hamilton College he was called to the Government Street Presbyterian Church, Mobile, Ala., where he died of yellow fever in 1858. Dr. Mandeville was a man of large frame, imposing presence, and cultivated manners. He was a brilliant pulpit orator, a powerful reasoner, a successful preacher and professor, and a faithful pastor. He gloried in the cross of Christ, and devoted all of his fine powers to his work. His published address on the Reflex Influence of Foreign Missions, which was delivered before the Society of Inquiry of the Theological Seminary at New Brunswick, N. J., in 1847, is a masterpiece of reasoning and eloquence, and a worthy memorial of the author's genius, piety, and zeal. — Personal Recollections; Corwin's Manual, s.v. (W. J. R. T.)

## Mandingo[[@Headword:Mandingo]]

             is the name of an African people, the nation of the Wangarawa-according to Barth, comprising some 6,000,000 or more. Strictly speaking, however, Mandingoes should be termed only the inhabitants of the most south- westerly territories belonging to the great West African race of the Wangarawa (sing. Wangara), and inhabiting a district extending in lat. from 8 to 12o N., and between the west coasts and the head waters of the Senegal and Niger. Their original seat is said to be Manding, a small  mountain country on the eastern sources of the Senegal, whence, partly by conquest and partly by emigration, they have spread themselves over a most extensive tract of country, and now consist of a variety of tribes. They are black in color, tall and well shaped, with regular features, and are, generally speaking, a fine race, capable of a high degree of civilization and organization, great travelers, fond of trading, and remarkable for their industry and energy. The language of the Mandingo prevails from the Senegal coast up to Sago on the Niger. A grammar of the language was compiled by R. Maxwell Macbrair (Lond. 1837).

Religious Belief, etc. — Of the neighboring nations, the Mandingoes were the first who embraced Islamism. The greater portion of them are now Moslems, and are zealous propagators of their religion. Those of the Mandlingoes adhering to their primitive religion have a very peculiar idea of marriage. With them it is merely a form of regulated slavery, and there is no marriage ceremony observed to evince union (Caille, Travels, 1:350). Most generally the female partner is carried from her home by force (Gray, Travels in W. Africa, p. 56). They have also, according to Park Travels, 1:267), a very peculiar idea of the Deity, whom they regard as “so remote, and of so exalted a nature, that it is idle to imagine the feeble supplications of wretched mortals can reverse the decrees and change the purposes of unerring wisdom.” Neither do they have any confidence in any belief in the hereafter, of which they assert that “no man knows anything about it.”

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

             The Mandingo is the most important language of modern Negroland, and predominates in many powerful states on both sides of the Gambia. The Reverend Mr. Macbrair, a Wesleyan missionary, was the first to undertake  the translation of the Scriptures in this widely extended language. The gospel according to Matthew was printed in London under his superintendence, in 1838, by the British and Foreign Bible Society. The translation of the other three gospels is still in manuscript. See Bible of Every Land, page 406. (B.P.)

## Mandra[[@Headword:Mandra]]

             (sheepfold), a name given to a monastery in the Greek Church. SEE ARCHIMANDRITE.

## Mandrake[[@Headword:Mandrake]]

             (only in the plur. דּוּדָאַים, dudaïm´, from דּוּד, to be hot, from their amatory properties; whence the sing. דּוּדִי, a pot or boiling vessel, hence a basket, Jer 24:1) occurs in Gen 30:14-16 : “Reuben went out in the days of wheat harvest, and found mandrakes in the field, and brought them home to his mother Leah. Then Rachel said to Leah, Give me of thy son's mandrakes;” “And Jacob came out of the field in the evening, and Leah went out to meet him, and said, Thou must come in unto me, for surely I have hired thee with my son's mandrakes; and he lay  with her that night.” The only other passage is Son 7:13 : “The mandrakes give a smell, and at our gates are all manner of pleasant plants.” From the above passages it is evident that the dudaim were collected in the fields, that they were fit for gathering in the wheat harvest in Mesopotamia, where the first occurrence took place; that they were found in Palestine; that they or the plants which yielded them diffused a peculiar and agreeable odor; and that they were supposed to be possessed of aphrodisiac powers, or of assisting in producing conception. It is possible that there is a connection between this plant and the love-charms (דּוֹדַים) which seem to have been worn by Oriental brides (Son 1:2; Son 1:4; Son 4:10; Son 7:12; comp. Son 1:12), like smelling-bottles (Isa 3:20, “tablets”); perhaps these contained an odoriferous mandrake philter. From this it is manifest that there is little to guide us in determining what plant is alluded to at such early periods, especially as no similar name has been recognized in any of the cognate languages. Hence interpreters have wasted much time and pains in endeavoring to ascertain what is intended by the Hebrew word dudaim. Some translate it by “violet,” others “lilies,” “jasmins,” “truffles or mushrooms;” and some think that the word means “flowers,” or “fine flowers.” Bochart, Calmet, and Sir Thomas Browne suppose the citron intended; Celsius (Hierobot. 1:20; but see, on the contrary, Oedmann, p. 99) is persuaded that it is the fruit of the lote-tree; Hiller that cherries are spoken of; and Ludolf (Hist. AEth. 1:9, etc.) maintains that it is the fruit which the Syrians call matuz (that is, the plantain), resembling in figure and taste the Indian fig; but the generality of interpreters and commentators understand mandrakes (not the melon so called “melo dudaim,” but the mandragora) by dudaim. The ground upon which the mandragora has been preferred is that the most ancient Greek translator interprets the Hebrew name in Gen 30:14 by mandrake apples (μῆλα μανὸραγορῶν); and in the Song of Solomon by mandrakes, οἱ μανδραγόραι. Saadias, Onkelos, and the Syriac Version agree with the Greek translators. The first of these puts laffach; the two latter yabruchin, which names denote the same plant (Rosenmüller, Bib. Bot. p. 130, and note; Castelli. Lexicon, p. 1591). The earliest notice of μανδραγόρας c is by Hippocrates, and the next by Theophrastus (Hist. Plant. 6:2). Both of these, C. Sprengel (Hist. Rei. Herb. 1:38. 82) supposes, intend Atropa mandragora. Dioscorides (4:76) notices three kinds:  (1.) the female, which is supposed to be the Mandrcgora asutumnalis of Berloton;

(2.) the male, Mandragorca vesralis of the same botanist (these two are, however, usually accounted varieties of Atropa mandragora);

(3.) a kind called morion. It has been inferred that this may be the same as the mandragora of Theophrastus, which, by some authors, has been supposed to be Atropa belladonna. To all of these Dioscorides ascribes narcotic properties, and says of the first that it is also called Circoea, because it appears to be a root which promotes venery. Pythagoras named the mandragora anthropomorphon, and Theophrastus, among other qualities, mentions its soporific powers, and also its tendency to excite to love. Its fruit was called love-apple, and Venus herself Mandragorites. But it is not easy to decide whether the above all refer to the same plant or plants. (See Lucian, Tim. p. 2; Pliny, 25:94; Apulsei, A sin. 10:233, Bip.; Schol. at Plat. Rep. 6:411, tom. v, Lips.; Philo, Opp. 2:478.) Persian authors on materia medica give madragoras as a synonyme for yebruk, or yabruz, which is said to be the root of a plant of which the fruit is called lufach. This, there is little doubt, must be the above Atropa mandragora, as the Arabs usually refer only to the plants of Dioscorides, and on this occasion they quote him as well as Galen, and ascribe narcotic properties to both the root and the fruit. D'Herbelot (bibl. Orient. 1:72) details some 9f the superstitious opinions respecting this plant, which originated in the East, but which continued for a long time to be retailed by authors in Europe. (See Schubert, 3:116; Schulz, Leit. v. 197; Burckhardt, 1:441.) By the Arabs it is said to be called tilfah al-sheifan, or devil's apple, on account of its power to excite voluptuousness. If we look to the works of more modern authors, we find a continuance of the same statements. Thus Mariti, in his Travels (2:195), says that the Arabs called the mandrake plant, yabrochak, which is, no doubt, the same name as given above. “At the village of St. John, in the mountains, about six miles south-west from Jerusalem. this plant is found at present, as well as in Tuscany. It grows low, like lettuce, to which its leaves have a strong resemblance, except that they have a dark-green color.

The flowers are purple, and the root is for the most part forked. The fruit, when ripe, in the beginning of May, is of the size and color of a small apple, exceedingly ruddy, and of a most agreeable odor; our guide. thought us fools for suspecting it to be unwholesome. He ate it freely himself, and it is generally valued by the inhabitants as exhilarating to their spirits and a provocative to venery.”  Maundrell (Trav. p. 83) was informed by the chief priest of the Samaritans that it was still noted for its genial virtues. H asselquist also seems inclined to consider it the dudacim, for, when at Nazareth, he says (Trav. p. 183), “What I found most remarkable in their villages was the great quantity of mandrakes that grew in a vale below it. The fruit was now (May 16) ripe. From the season in which this mandrake blossoms and ripens its fruit, one might form a conjecture that it is Rachel's dudaim. These were brought her in the wheat harvest, which in Galilee is in the month of Mala about this time, and the mandrake was now in fruit.” Dr. Thomson (Land and Book, 2:380) found mandrakes ripe on the lower ranges of Lebanon and Hermon towards the end of April. On the 15th of May, Schulz also found mandrakes on Mount Tabor, which, as he says, “have a delightful scent. and whose taste is equally agreeable, although not to every body. They are almost globular, and yellow like oranges, and about two and a quarter inches in diameter. This fruit grows on a shrub resembling the mallow; and the fruit lies about the stem, as it were about the root, after such a manner that a single shrub may have six to ten fruits, of which the color is so beautifil that no orange equals its brilliancy.” This fruit, which a recent traveler describes as of an “insipid, sickish taste,” is by the Arabs of other regions alleged to possess strengthening virtues, when used in small quantities, but they call it tufuh el-maujanim, or “apples of the possessed,” owing to the temporary insanity which an over-dose produces. “At first,” says a traveler, “I felt inclined to doubt the assertion, but during my residence in the country I had the opportunity of witnessing its effect on an English traveler, a Mr. L., who had the temerity to test the property of the mandrake. A few hours after partaking of the root he began to show unequivocal symptoms of insanity; and such was its effect on the nervous system that he had to be relieved by cupping and other remedies before he could be restored to consciousness” (Dupuis, Holy Places [1856], 1:272). The name “love-apple” Gesenius's translation of dudaim — was formerly in this country given to a kindred plant, the tomato (Lycopersicum esculentum), a native of South America, but now largely cultivated everywhere for its agreeable acidulous fruit. “From a certain rude resemblance of old roots of the mandrake to the human form, whence Pythagoras is said to have called the mandrake ἀνθρωπόμορφον, and Columella (10, 19) semihonzo, some strange superstitious notions have arisen concerning it. Josephus (War, 7:6, 3) evidently alludes to one of these superstitions, though he calls the plant baaras. In a Vienna MS. of Dioscorides is a curious drawing which represents Euresis, the goddess of  discovery, handing to Dioscorides a root of the mandrake; the dog employed for the purpose is depicted in the agonies of death (Daubeny's Roman Husbandry, p. 275). The mandrake is found abundantly in the Grecian islands, and in some parts of the south of Europe. The root is spindle-shaped, and often divided into two or three forks. The leaves, which are long, sharp-pointed, and hairy, rise immediately from the ground. The flowers are dingy white, stained with veins of purple. The fruit is of a pale orange color, and about the size of a nutmeg; but it would appear that the plant varies considerably in appearance according to the localities where it grows. The man drake (A tropa mandragora) is closely allied to the well-known deadly nightshade (A. belladonna), and belongs to the order Solanacece.” See Liebetantz, De Rachelis Dudaim (Vitemb. 1702); Simon, De רּוּדָאַים, etc. (Halle, 1735); Ant. Bertolini, Comment. de Mandragoris (Bol. 1836); Dougtaei Analect. 1:35; Velthuysen, Comment. ub. d. lohelied, p. 502; Eichhorn. Repert. 11:158; Michaelis, Suppl. p. 410; Oken, Lehrb. d. Natursgesch. II, 2:333; W. Bickerton, Dissertation on the Mandrake of the Ancients (Lond. 1737); Tristram, Nat. Hist. of Bible, p. 466 sq.

## Mandyas[[@Headword:Mandyas]]

             (μανδύας), a vestment of the Greek priests, not unlike the cope of the Romanists, but with bells at the lower edges, in supposed imitation of the Jewish high-priest.

## Maneh[[@Headword:Maneh]]

             (מָנֶה, maneh', Eze 45:12, a portion as divided by weight; hence the Greek μνᾶ, a mina; rendered “pound” in 1Ki 10:17; Ezr 2:69; Neh 7:21-22), a weight of a hundred shekels, as we gather from 1Ki 10:17 (compare 2Ch 9:16). Another and somewhat obscure specification is given in Eze 45:12, “twenty shekels, five and twenty shekels, fifteen shekels, shall be your maneh;” spoken either of a triple maneh of twenty, twenty-five, and fifty shekels; or of a single maneh of sixty shekels, distributed into three parts of fifteen, twenty, and twenty-five. There are other explanations offered (as by the Chaldee paraphrast, by Jarchi, J. D. Michaelis, and others), but the latter is generally supposed to be the best. SEE WEIGHTS.

## Manes[[@Headword:Manes]]

             is a term by which the ancient Romans used to designate the souls of the departed. Sacrifices were offered in their honor, and a festival called Feralia (q.v.), dedicated specially to the Manes, was celebrated annually on February 19.

## Manetho[[@Headword:Manetho]]

             (Μανεθών or Μανεθώς), OF SEBENNYTUS, a distinguished Egyptian historian, a native of Diospolis, according to some, or of Mende or Heliopolis, according to others, is said to have lived in the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus, and to have been a man of great learning and wisdom Elian, De Animal. 10:16). He belonged to the priestly caste, and was himself a priest, and interpreter or recorder of religious usages, and of the religious and probably also historical writings. His name has been interpreted “beloved of Thoth;” in the song of Lagos and Ptolemy Philadelphus, Mai en tet, or Ma Net, “beloved of Neith;” but both interpretations are doubtful. Scarcely anything is known of the history of Manetho himself, and he is more renowned for his Egyptian history than on any other account. On the occasion of Ptolemy I dreaming of the god Serapis at Sinope, Manetho was consulted by the monarch, and, in conjunction with Timotheus of Athens, the interpreter of the Eleusinian mysteries, declared the statue of Serapis, brought by orders of the king from Sinope, to be that of the god Serapis or Pluto, and the god had a temple and his worship inaugurated at Alexandria. It appears probable, however, that there were more than one individual of this name, and it is therefore doubtful whether all the works which were attributed by ancient writers to Manetho were in reality written by the Manetho who lived in the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus. (See below.)

Writings. — The only work of Manetho which has come down to us complete is a poem of six books, in hexameter verse, on the influence of the stars (ἀποτελεσματικά), which was first published by Gronovius (Leyden, 1698), and has also been edited by Axtius and Rigler (Cologne, 1832). It is probable, however, for many reasons, as Heyne has shown in his Opuscula Academica (1:95), that parts, at least, of this poem could not have been written till a much later date. We also possess considerable fragments of a work of Manetho on the history of the ancient kings of Egypt. (See below.) It was in three books or parts, and comprised the period from the earliest times to the death of the last Persian Darius. Some of these fragments are preserved in the treatise of Josephus against Apion; and still greater portions in the “Chronicles” of George Syncellus, a monk of the 9th century. The “Chronicles” of Syncellus were principally compiled from the “Chronicles” of Julius Africanus and Eusebius, bishop of Caesarea, both of whom made great use of Manetho's “History.” The work of Africanus is lost, and we only possess a Latin version of that of  Eusebius, which was translated out of the Armenian version of the Greek text preserved at Constantinople. Manetho is said to have derived his history of the kings of Egypt, whom he divides into thirty classes, called dynasties, from the sacred records in the temple at Heli opolis. In addition to these works, Manetho is also said to have written,

1, ῾Ιερὰ Βίβλος, on the Egyptian religion;

2, Περὶ ἀρχαϊσμοῦ και εὐσεβείας, on the ancient rites and ceremonies of the Egyptians;

3, Φυσικῶν ἐπιτομή (Laertius, Proem. s. 10), probably the same work as that called by Suidas φυσιολογικά;

4, Βίβλος τῆς Σώθεως, both the subject and genuineness of which are very doubtful. See Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. s.v.; English Cyclopaedia, s.v. His name is introduced here on account of the importance of his work on Egyptian history in determining the list of ancient Egyptian kings. SEE EGYPT. In this regard his authority has been overestimated by one class of writers, and almost wholly set aside by others, according to their own preconceived theories. SEE PHARAOH.

Authenticity of Manetho's History. — Manetho was a learned priest at the court of the first Ptolemy, according to Plutarch (de Isaiah et Os. c. 28), who cites a religious work of his in Greek, which is quoted also under various names by Elian, Diogenes Laertius, Porphyry, and other late writers (Fruin, Manethonis Sebennytae Reliquiae, p. 133 sq.; Parthey, Plutarch über Isis u. Osiris, p. 180 sq.). Josephus (Apion, 1:14-16, 26, 27) gives two long extracts, with a list of seventeen reigns, from the Αἰγυπτιακά, “a work composed in Greek by Manetho the Sebennyte, from materials which he professes to have rendered from the sacred records:” of which history all else that is extant is a catalogue of Egyptian dynasties, preserved in two widely different recensions by Georgius Syncellus, A.D. 800; the one from the lost Chronographia of Julius Africanus, A.D. 220; the other from the Chronicon of Eusebius, A.D. 325 (of which we have now the Armenian version); both texts are given by Fruin, and by Bunsen in the appendix to Egypt's Place, vol. 1. The statement that “Manetho the Sebennyte, of Heliopolis, high-priest and scribe of the sacred adyta, composed this work from the sacred records by command of Ptolemy Philadelphus,” rests only on the dedication (ap. Syncell.) prefixed to the Sothis, an undoubted forgery of Christian times.

All that can be inferred from it is that the forger had grounds, good or bad, for placing Manetho in the time of the second Ptolemy. In fact, the incident with which Plutarch (ut sup.) connects his name (the bringing in of Serapis) is related by other writers (without mention of Manetho), and is assigned by Tacitus also (Hist. 4:183 sq.) to the time of the first Ptolemy; but by Clem. Alex. (Protrept. 4:48) and Cyrill. Al. (c. Julian. p. 13) to Ptolemy Philadelphus, with the date 01. 124-B.C. 284-1. If he did live, and was a man of note, under the early Ptolemies, certain it is that “this most distinguished writer, the sage and scholar of Egypt” (as Bunsen calls him, Aeg. St. 1:88), was speedily and long forgotten; for more than three centuries after the time at which he is said to have flourished not a trace of him or his writings is anywhere discoverable. Nothing of the kind occurs in the remains of the Alexandrine scholars, the early Greek Jews, Polyhistor's collections, or the chronological writings of Castor. That the Catalogue of Thirty-eight Theban Kings (ap. Syncell.) is the work of Eratosthenes there is nothing to show; at any rate, it contains no reference to Manetho. If it was from Manetho that Dicsearchas, cir. A.D. 290 (ap. Schol. in Apollon. Rhod.), got his two Egyptian names and dates, it was in quite another form of the work; to the scholiast, Manetho is an unknown name. The Egyptian list in the Excespta Latino-barbara of Scaliger, bearing the name of Castor, is a mere abstract from Africanus. Diodorus Sic. and Strabo visited and wrote about Egypt, yet neither of them names or alludes to Manetho; and the former gives (1:44 sq., from the priests, he says) an account of the kingly succession altogether different from his. If, as Fruin suggests (p. 63), it was through measures taken by Domitian to repair the losses sustained by the public libraries (Sueton. Dom. 29) that Manetho's works were brought to Rome from the Alexandrine library where they had long slumbered unregarded, still it is strange that the AEgyptiaca should have caught the attention of Josephus alone (among extant writers), and that neither those who, as Plutarch, do mention the other work, nor others who have occasion to speak of the ancient times of Egypt, as Tacitus and the elder Pliny (esp. H. N. 36:8-13), ever name this history, or show any acquaintance with its list of kings. Lepsius (Chron. der Aeg. 1:583 sq.) better meets the difficulty by supposing that the original work, never widely known, was so early lost that even in the 1st century all that survived of it was a bare abstract of its names and numbers, and (distinct from this) the two passages relating to the “Hyksos” and the “lepers,” with the accompanying list of seventeen reigns, which some Jewish reader had extracted on account of their Biblical interest, and beyond which  Josephus knew nothing of Manetho. Whatever be the explanation, the fact is that it is only through Jewish and Christian writers that we ever hear of Manetho as a historian.

Of these, Theophilus Ant. (ad Autolyc. 3:20, cir. A.D. 181) does but copy Josephus. Clemens Alex. nowhere names Manetho. A history of “the Acts of the Kings of Egypt, in three books” — not, however, by Manetho, but by “Ptolemy the Mendesian” — is, indeed, quoted by him (Strong. 1:26, 101), but at second-hand from Tatian; who again (ad Gentes, p. 129), as perhaps Justin Martyr before him (ad Gr. 8), quotes Ptolemy, not directly, but from Apion. In short, it is plain, on comparing these passages and Euseb. (Pr. Ev. 10:11, 12), that Apion is the sole source of all that is known of this Ptolemy of Mendes; and Apion, as far as we know, makes no mention of Manetho. In what relation the work of Ptolemy may have stood to Manetho's, as there is no evidence to show, it is idle to speculate; and, indeed, the question with which we are concerned would remain very much where it is, even were it proved that “Manetho” is a borrowed name, and the AEgyptiaca a product of Roman times. For the important point is, not who wrote the book, and when, but what is its value? It may not be genuine, nor so old as it pretends to be, and yet may contain good materials, honestly rendered from earlier writings or original records, probably as available in the time of Domitian as they were under the Ptolemies; and, in fact, existing monuments do furnish so considerable a number of names unquestionably identical with those in the list, that to reject this altogether, and deny it all historical value, would betoken either egregious ignorance or a reckless scepticism that can shut its eyes to manifest facts.

Chronological Value of Manetho's History. — The attestation which the list obtains from contemporary monuments cannot be held to warrant the assumption that it is to be depended upon where these fail. For the monuments which attest, also correct its statements. Monuments prove some reigns, and even dynasties, contemporaneous, which in the list are successive; but we have no means of ascertaining what was truly consecutive and what parallel, where monuments are wanting. Their dates are always in years of the current reign, not of an sera. From Cambyses upward to Psammetichus, and his immediate predecessor, Taracus = Tirhaka, the chronology is now settled [ SEE CHRONOLOGY, sec. 3].

Thence up to Petubastes (dyn. 23) the materials are too scanty to yield any determination. For dyn. 22, headed by Sesonchis = Shishak, the records are copious: dates on apis-stelae, of which Mariette reports seven in this  dynasty, prove that it lasted much more than the 120 years of Africanus. But even these reigns cannot be formed into a canon, and the epoch of Sesonchis can only be approximately given from the Biblical synchronism, “In 5 Rehoboam Shishak invaded Judaea” — in what year of his reign the monument which records the conquest does not say; although the epoch of Rehoboam is, as to B.C., a fixed point, or nearly so, for all chronologists. The inscription is dated 21 Shishak, but does not indicate the order or time of the several conquests recorded. The attempt has been made to prove from Biblical data that the invasion was in the 20th year. Thus: It was while Solomon was building Millo (2 Kings 11:27) that Jeroboam fled to “Shishak, king of Egypt” (2 Kings 11:40). This work began not earlier than 24 Solomon (2 Kings 6:37-7:1). If it began in that or the next year; if Jeroboam was immediately appointed overseer of the forced labor of his tribesmen; if he presently conceived the purpose of insurrection, encouraged by Ahijah; if his purpose became known to Solomon almost as soon as formed if, in short, his flight into Egypt was not later than 26 Solomon; lastly, if Shishak became king in that year, then 5 Rehoboam (= 45 Solomon) will be 20 Shishak. This is a specimen of much that passes for chronology, where the Bible is concerned. Some light is thrown on the dynastic connection of dyn. 12 and 23 by a stele recently discovered by Mariette in Ethiopia, which proves the fact of numerous contemporary reigns throughout Egypt at that time (Brugsch's Zeitschrift, July, 1863; De Rouge, Inscr. du roi Pianchi Meri Arun, 1864). But it helps the chronology little or nothing. In dyns. 20, 21, is another gap, at present not to be bridged over. The seven-named Tanites of 21 (Afr. 130, Eus. 121 years) seem to have been military priest-kings; and that they were partly contemporaneous with 20 and 21 may appear from the absence of apis- stelae, of which 20 has nine, 22 seven. Dyn. 20, for which the list gives no names, consisted of some ten or more kings, all bearing the name Rameses, beginning with R. III, and five of them his sons, probably joint-kings. The apis-inscriptions furnish no connected dates, nor can any inference be drawn f-om their number, since Mariette reports no less than five in the first reign. For dyn. 19 (Sethos), 18 (Amosis), the materials, written and monumental, are most copious; yet even here the means of an exact determination are wanting: indeed, if further proof were needed that the Manethonic lists are not to be implicitly trusted, it is furnished by the monumental evidence here of contemporary reigns which in the lists are successive. It is certain, and will at last be owned by all competent inquirers, that in the part of the succession for which the evidence is  clearest and most ample, it is impossible to assign the year at which any king, from Amosis to Tirhaka, began to reign. No ingenuity of calculation and conjecture can make amends for the capital defects — the want of an sera, the inadequacy of the materials. The brilliant light shed on this point or that, does but make the surrounding darkness more palpable. Analysis of the lists may enable the inquirer, at most, to divine the intentions of their authors, which is but a small step gained towards the truth of facts.

But it has been supposed that certain fixed points may be got by means of astronomical conjunctures assigned to certain dates of the vague year on the monuments Thus,

(I) A fragmentary inscription of Takelut II, 6th king of dyn. 22, purports that “on the 25th Mesori of the 15th year of his father” (Sesonk II, according to Lepsius, Age of XXIT Dyn., but Osorkon II, according to Brugsch, Dr. Hincks, and v. Gumpach), “the heavens were invisible, the moon struggling... Hence Mr. Cooper (Athenaeum, 11 May, 1861) gathers, that on the (lay named, in the given year of Sesonk II, th:re was a lunar eclipse, which he considers must be that of 16th March, B.C. 851. Dr. Hincks. who at first also made the eclipse lunar, and its date 4th April, B.C. 945, now contends that it was solar, and the only possible date 1st April, B.C. 927 (Journnl of Sac. Lit. Jan. 1863, p. 333-376; compare lb. Jan. 1861, p. 459 sq.). In making it solar, he follows M. v. (Gumpach (Hist. Antiq. of the People of Egypt, 1863, p. 29), who finds its date 11th March, B.C. 841. Unfortunately the 25th Mesori of that year was 10th March. This is the only monumental notice supposed to refer to an eclipse: not worth much at the best; the record, even if its meaning were certain, is not contemporary.

(II) In several inscriptions certain dates are given to the “manifestation of Sothis,” assumed to mean the heliacal rising of Sirius, which, for 2000 years before our aera, for the latitude of Heliopolis, fell on the 20th of July. (Biot, indeed, Recherches des quelques dates absolues, etc., 1853, contends that the calculation must be made for the place at which the inscription is datedeach day of difference, of course, making a difference of four years in the date B.C.) The dates of these “manifestations” are —

(1) “1 Tybi of 11 Takelut II” (Brugsch): the quaternion of years in which 1 Tybi would coincide with 20th July is B.C. 845-42.  (2) “15 Thoth in a year, not named, of Rameses VI, at Thebes” (Biot, ut sup.; De Rouge, Memoire sur queques phenomenes celestes, etc., in Rdvue Archeol. 9:686). The date implied is 20th July, B.C. 1265-62 (Biot, 14th July, B.C. 1241-38).

(3) “1 Thoth in some year of Rameses III at Thebes” (Biot and De Rouge, ut sup., from a festival-calendar). The date implied is, of course, B.C. 1325-22 (Biot, 14th July, B.C. 1301-1298).

(4) “28 Epiphi in some year of Thothmes III” (Biot, etc., from a festival- calendar at Elephantine). This implies B.C. 1477-74 (Biot, 12th July, B.C. 1445-42). The antiquity of this calendar is called in question by De Rouge (Athen. Francais, 1855), and by Dr. Brugsch, who says the style indicates the 19th dynasty. Mariette assigns it to Thothmes III (Journal Asiatique, tom. 12, Aug., Sept., 1858). Lepsius, who in 1854 doubted (Monatsbericht of Berlin R. Acad.), now contends for its antiquity (Konigsbuch der Aeg. p. 164), having contrived to make it fit his chronology by assuming an error in the numeral of the month.

(5) “12 Mesori in 33 Thothmes III” (Mr. S. Poole in Trans. R. S. Lit. v. 340). This implies B.C. 1421-18. These dates would make the interval from Rameses III to Takelut II 480 years, greatly in excess even of Manetho's numbers, and more so of Lepsius's arrangement, in which, from the 1st of Rameses III to the 11th of Takelut II are little more than 400 years. Again, the interval of only 152 years, implied in (3) and (4), is unquestionably too little: from the last year of Thothmes III to the first of Rameses III, Lepsius reckons 296, Bunsen 225 years. Lastly, in (4) and (5) the dates imply an interval of 56 years, which is plainly absurd. The fact must be that these inscriptions are not rightly understood. We need to be informed what the Egyptians meant by the “manifestation of this;” what method. they followed in assigning it to a particular day; especially when, as in Biot's three instances, the date occurs in a calendar, and is marked as a “festival,” we ask, were these calendars calculated only for four years? when a new one was set up, were the astronomical notices duly corrected, or were they merely copied from the preceding calendar?

(III) “At Semneh in 2 Thothmes III, one of the three feasts of the Commencement of the Seasons is noted on 21 Pharmuthi.” Biot (ut sup.) supposes the vernal equinox to be meant, and assigns this to 6th April in the quaternion B.C. 1445-42 (as above), in which 6th April was 21 Pharmuthi. But the vernal equinox is not the commencement of one of the  three seasons of the Egyptian year; these start either from the rising of Sirius, 20th July, or, more probably, from the summer solstice: as this, in the 14th century, usually fell on 6th July, the two other tetramenies or seasons would commence cir. 5th Nov. and 6th March. Now 6th March did coincide with 21 Pharmuthi in B.C. 1321-18, at which time it also occupied precisely the place which Mr. Stuart Poole assigns to “the great Rukh” (Leps., “the greater Heat”), just one zodiacal month before the little Rukh, or vernal equinox (Hore AEgypt. p. 15 sq.).

(IV). “On 1 Athur of II Amenophis III the king ordered an immense basin to be dug, and on the 16th s. m. celebrated a great panegyry of the waters” (Dr. Hincks, On the Age of Dynasty X VIII, Trans. R. Irish Acad. vol. 21, pt. 1; comp. Mr. S. Poole, Trans. R. S. Lit. v. 340). If the waters were let in when the Nile had reached its highest point — which, as it is from 90 to 100 days after the summer solstice, in the 14th century would be at 4-14 Oct. — the month-date indicates one of the years B.C. 1369-26. But if (which is certainly more likely) the time chosen was some weeks earlier, the year indicated would be after B.C. 1300. So this and the preceding indication may agree, and so far there is some evidence for the supposition that the sothiac epochal year B.C. 1322 lies in the reign of Thothmes III. (See Dr. Hincks, ut sup., and in the Dublin Univ. Magazine, 1846, p. 187.)

(V.) An astronomical representation n the ceiling of the Hameseum (the work of Rameses II) has been supposed to yield the year B.C. 1322 as its date (bishop Tomlinson, Trans. R. S. Lit. 1839; Sir G. Wilkinson, Manners and Customs, etc., 2d ser. p. 377); while Mr. Cullimore, from the same, gets B.C. 1138. The truth is, these astronomical configurations, in the present state of our knowledge, are an unsolved riddle. Lepsius's inferences (Chron. der Aeg.) from the same representations in the reigns of Rameses IV and VI are little more than guesses, too vague and precarious to satisfy any man who knows what evidence means.

It appears, then, that the supposed astronomical notes of time hitherto discovered lend but little aid, and bring nothing like certainty into the inquiry. We cannot accept the lists as they stand. How are they to be rectified? Until we have the means of rectifying them, every attempt to put forth a definite scheme of Egyptian chronology is simply futile. The appeal to authority avails nothing here. Lepsius, Bunsen, Brugsch, and many more, all claim to have settled the matter. Their very discrepancies — on the scale of which half a century is a mere trifle — sufficiently prove that to  them, as to us, the evidence is defective. The profoundest scholarship, the keenest insight, cannot get more out of it than is in it; “that which is crooked cannot be made straight, and that which is wanting cannot be numbered.” Yet, from the easy confidence with which people assign dates — their own, or taken on trust — to the Pharaohs after Amosis, and even of much earlier times, it might be thought that from Manetho and the monuments together a connected chronology has been elicited as certain as that of the Roman emperors. In particular, there appears to be a growing belief — even finding its way into popular Bible histories and commentaries — that the Pharaoh of the Exodus can be identified in Manetho, and so the time of that event determined.

Early Christian writers usually assumed, with Josephus, that the Hyksos or “shepherd-kings,” whose story he gives from Manetho (Apion, 1:14-16), were the Israelites, and their expulsion by Amosis or Tethmosisone or both, for the accounts are confused — the Egyptian version of the story of the exode. This view has still its advocates (quite recently Mr. Nash, The Pharaoh of the Exodus, 1863), but not among those who have been long conversant with the subject. Indeed, there is a monument of Thothmes III which, if it has been truly interpreted, is conclusive for a much earlier date of the exode than this reign, or perhaps any of the dynasty. A long inscription of his twenty-third year gives a list of the confederates defeated by him at Megiddo, in which De Rouge reads the names Jacob and Joseph, and Mr. Stuart Poole thinks he finds the names of some of the tribes, Reuben, Simeon, Issachar, Gad (Report of R. S. H. in Athenceum, March 21, 1863).

But the story of the Jews put forth by “Manetho” himself (Josephus, Apion, 1:26, 27). with the confession, however, that he obtained it not from ancient records, but from popular tradition (ἀδεσπότως μυθογούμενα), represents them as a race of lepers, who, oppressed by the reigning king, called to their aid the Hyksos from Palestine (where these, on their expulsion some centuries earlier by Tethmosis, had settled and built Jerusalem), and with these allies overran all Egypt for thirteen years, at the end of which Amenophis, who had taken refuge in Ethiopia, returning thence with his son Sethos, drove out the invaders. These, headed by Osarsiph (= Moses). a priest of Heliopolis, retired into Palestine, and there became the nation of the Jews. Josephus protests against this story as a mere figment, prompted by Egyptian malignity, and labors to prove it inconsistent with Manetho's own list: unsuccessfully enough, for,  in fact, Amenophis (Ammenephthes, Afr.) does appear there just where the story places him, i.e. next to Sethos and Rameses II, with a reign of nineteen years and six months. The monuments give the name Menephtha, and his son and successor Seti Sethos II, just as in the story. The names are not fictitious, whatever may be the value of the story as regards the Israelites. This Menephtha, then, son and successor of Rameses the Great, is the Pharaoh of the Exode, according to Lepsius and Bunsen, and of late accepted as such by many writers, learned and unlearned.

Those to whom the name of Manetho is not voucher enough, will demand independent evidence. In fact, it is alleged that the monuments of the time of Menephtha attest a period of depression: no great works of that king are known to exist; of his reign of twenty years the highest date hitherto found is the fourth; and two rival kings, Amenmessu (the Ammenemses of the lists) and Siphtha, are reigning at the same to e with him, i.e. holding precarious sovereignty in Thebes during the time of alien occupation and the flight of Menephtha (Bunsen, Aeg. Stelle, 4:208 sq.). That these two kings reigned in the time of Menephtha, and not with or after Sethos II, is assumed without proof; that the reign of Rameses II was followed by a period of decadence proves nothing as to its cause; and the entire silence of the monuments as to an event so memorable as the final expulsion of the hated “Shepherds” (Shas-u), who so often figure in the monumental recitals of earlier kings (e.g. of Sethos I, who calls them shas-u p'kanana- kar, “shepherds of the land of Canaan”), tells as strongly against the story as any merely negative evidence can do it. More important is the argument derived from the mention (Exo 1:11) of the “treasure-cities Pithom and Raamses,” built for the persecuting Pharaoh by the forced labor of the Hebrews; the Pharaoh (says Rosellini, Mon. Storici, 1:294 sq.) was Rameses [II, son of Sethos I], who gave one of the cities his own name. (Comp. Ewald, Gesch. 2:66, note.) Lepsius, art. Aegypten, in Herzog's Encyklop., calls this “the weightiest confirmation,” and in Chronol. der A eg. 1:337-357, enlarges upon this argument. Raamses, he says, was at the eastern, as Pithom (Πάτουμος) was certainly at the western end of the great canal known to be the work of Rameses II, and the site of the city bearing his name is further identified with him by the granite group disinterred at Abu Keisheib, in which the deified king sits enthroned between the gods Ra and Tum. Certainly a king Rameses appears first in the 19th dynasty, but the place may have taken its name, if from a man at all, from some earlier person.  That the exode cannot be placed before the 19th dynasty, Bunsen (ut sup. p. 234) holds to be conclusively shown by the fact that on the monuments which record the conquests of Rameses the Great in Palestine, no mention occurs of the Israelites among the Kheti (Hittites) and other conquered nations; while, on the other hand, there is no hint in the book of Judges of an Egyptian invasion and servitude. On similar negative grounds he urges that the settlement in Palestine must have been subsequent to the conquests made in that country by Rameses III, first king of the 20th dynasty. To this it may be replied,

(1.) that we have no clear information as to the route of the invaders; if it was either along the coast or to the east of Jordan, the tribes. perhaps, were not directly affected by it.

(2.) The expeditions so pompously described on the monuments (as in the Statistical Table of Karnak, Thothmes III, and similar recitals of the conquests of Ramses II and III; see Mr. Birch, in Tratns. Of R. S. Lit. 2:317 sq.; and 7:50 sq.) certainly did not result in the permanent subjugation of the countries invaded. This is sufficiently shown by the fact that the conquests repeat themselves under different kings, and even in the same reign. Year by year the king with his army sets out on a gigantic razzia, to return with spoil of cattle, slaves, and produce of the countries overrun.

(3.) If the lands of the tribes were thus overrun, it may have been during one of the periods of servitude, in which case they suffered only as the vassals of their Canaanitish, Moabitish, or other oppressors. That this may possibly have been the case is sufficient to deprive of all its force the argument derived from the silence of the monuments, and of the book of Judges.

There remains to be noticed one piece of documentary evidence which has quite recently been brought to light. Dr. Brugsch (Zeitschrift, Sept. 1863) reports that “one set of the Leyden hieratic papyri, now publishing by Dr. Leemans, consists of letters and official reports. In several of these, examined by M. Chabas, repeated mention is made of certain foreigners, called Apuruju, i.e. Hebrews, compelled by Rameses II to drag stones for the building of the city Raamses.” In his Melanges Egyptol. 1862, 4th dissertation, M. Chabas calls them Aperiu. It is certainly striking, as Mr. Birch remarks (in Revue Archeol. April, 1862, p. 291), that “in the three documents which speak of these foreigners, they appear engaged on works  of the same kind as those to which the Hebrews were subjected by the Egyptians; it is also important that the papyri were found at Memphis. But the more inviting the proposed identification, the more cautious one needs to be.” As the sounds R and L are not discriminated in Egyptian writing, it may be that the name is Apeliu; and as B and P have distinct characters, one does not see why the b of עבריםshould be rendered byp. (The case of Epep = אָבַיב is different; see below.) It seems, also, that the same name occurs as late as the time of Rameses IV, where it can hardly mean the Hebrews. Besides, the monument of Thothmes III above mentioned leads to quite a different conclusion. Where the evidence is so conflicting, the inquirer who seeks only truth, not the confirmation of a foregone conclusion, has no choice but to reserve his judgment.

The time of this Menephtha, so unhesitatingly proclaimed to be the Pharaoh of the Exode, is placed beyond all controversy — so Bunsen and Lepsius maintain — by an invaluable piece of evidence furnished by Theon, the Alexandrine mathematician of the 4th century. In a passage of his unpublished commentary on the Almagest, first given to the world by Larcher (Hierodot. 2:553), and since by Biot (Sur la periode Sothiaque, p. 18, 129 sq.), it is stated that the Sothiac Cycle of Astronomy which, as it ended in A.D. 139, commenced in B.C. 1322 (20th July), was known in his time as “the sera of Menophres” (ἔτη ἀπὸ Μενόφρεως.). There is no king of this name: read Μενόφθεως — so we have Menephtha of the 19th dynasty, the king of the leper-story, the Exodus Pharaoh. Lepsius, making the reign begin in B.C. 1328, places the exode at B.C. 1314-15 Menephtha, in accordance with the alleged thirteen years' retirement into Ethiopia and the return in the fourteenth or fifteenth year. Certainly the precise name Menophres does not appear in the lists; but in later times that name may have been used for the purpose of distinguishing some particular king from others of the same name; and there is reason to think this was actually the case.

(1.) The king Tethmosis or Thothmes III repeatedly appears on monuments with the addition to his royal legend Mai-Re, “Beloved of Re,” with the article Mai-ph-Re, and with the preposition Mai-n'-ph-Re, which last is precisely Theon's Μενόφρης.

(2.) The acknowledged confusion of names in that part of the 18th dynasty where this king occurs — Misaphris, Misphres, Memphres (Armen.), then Misphragmuthosis (the ΑΛΙΣΦΡ. of Josephus is evidently an error of  copying for ΜΙΣΦΡ: in the list ibid. the 5th and 6th names are Μήφρης, Μεφραμούθωσις) — is perhaps best explained by supposing that the king was entered in the lists by his distinctive as well as his family name.

(3.) In Pliny's notice of the obelisks (H. N. 36:64), that known to be of Thothmes III is said to belong to Mesphres, which, says Bunsen (4:130), “would be the popular distinctive name given to this Thothmes.” Just so! And in the statement of Theon the king is presented by “his popular distinctive name,” Menophres.

(4.) “There was (says Dr. Hincks, Trans. R. Irish. Acad. vol. 21, pt. 1) a tradition, if it does not deserve another name, current among the Egyptians in the time of Antoninus, to the effect that the Sothiac Cycle, then ending (A.D. 139), commenced in the reign of Thothmes III. The existence of such a tradition is evidenced by a number of scarabaei, evidently of Roman workmanship, referring to the Sothiac Cycle, and in which the royal legend of this monarch appears.” These are sufficient grounds for believing that the Menophres of Theon is no other than Thothmes III, and that his reign was supposed (rightly or wrongly) to include the year B.C. 1322. It may be, also, that when Herodotus was told that Moeris lived about 900 years before the time of his visit to Egypt — a date not very wide of B.C. 1322 Thothmes was named to him by his popular distinctive appellation, Mai- Re. only confused with Mares = Ameneinha III, the Pharaoh of the Labyrinth and its Lake. (Other explanations of the name Menophres may be seen in Bockh, Manetho, p. 691 sq.; Biot, Recherches, interprets it as the name of Memphis, Mennofru, importing that the normal date, 20th July, for the heliacal rising of Sirius and epoch of the cycle, is true only for the latitude of Memphis.) What has been said is sufficient to show that there is no necessity for altering a letter of the name; consequently that the time of Menephtha is not defined by the authority of Theon. De Rouge emphatically rejects Lepsius's notion of Menophres (Revue Archeol. 9:664; Journal Asiatique, Aug. 1858, p. 268). He thinks the year 1322 lies in the reign of Rameses III.

In support of his date, B.C. 1314, for the exode, Lepsius (Chronol. p. 359 sq.) has an argument deduced from the modern Jewish chronology (Hillel's Mundane Era), in which he says that it is the precise year assigned to that event. Hillel, he is confident, was led to it by Manetho's Egyptian tradition, which gave him the name of the Pharaoh, and this being obtained would easily give him the time. Bunsen, though finally settling on the year B.C.  1320, had previously declared with Lepsius for B.C. 1314,” decided by the circumstance that a tradition not compatible with the usual chronological systems of the Jews, but which cannot be accidental, places the exode at that year. This fact seems, from Lepsius's account of the Seder Olam Rabba, to admit of no doubt” (4:336). It admits of more than doubt — of absolute refutation. Hillel's whole procedure, from first to last, was simply Biblical. Daniel's prophecy of the seventy weeks gave him B.C. 422 for 11 Zedekiah; thence up to 6 Hezekiah he found the sum — 133 years; for the kings of Israel the actual numbers were 243, of which he made 240 years; then 37 years of Solomon; 480 years of 1Ki 6:1, added to these, made the total 890 years, whence the date for the exode was B.C. 422 +890 = 1312; for that this, not 1314, was Hillel's year of the exode is demonstrable (Review of Lepsius om Bible Chronology, by H. Browne, in Arnold's Theolog. Critic, 1:52-59, 1851). Yet, though the process by which Hillel got his date is so transparent, it is spoken of as “an important tradition” by those who take ready-made conclusions at second-hand, without inquiry into their grounds. So Duncker, Gesch. des Alterthums, 1:196, note; Dr. Williams, in Essays and Reviews, p. 58.

It is alleged that an indication confirmatory of the low date assigned by these writers is furnished by the month-date of the Exodus passover, 14 Abib, a name which occurs only in connection with that history (Exo 12:2; Exodus 13, 4; Exo 23:15; Exo 34:18; Deu 16:1). This argument proceeds on the presumption that Abib is the Hebraized form of the Egyptian Epep, Coptic Epiphi, of which the Arabic rendering is also Abib. The Egyptian month takes its name from the goddess Apap: the change of p to b is intended to make the word pure Hebrew, denoting the time of year, חֹדֶשׁ הָאָבַיב= the month when the barley is in the ear (abib) (Exo 9:31). “At the time assigned, the vague month Epep would pretty nearly coincide with the Hebrew Abib” (Lepsius, Chron. p. 141). Hardly so, for in the year named 1 Epiphi would fall on 14th May, and it is scarcely conceivable that the passover month (whose full moon is that next to the vernal equinox, which in that century fell cir. 5th April) should begin so late as the middle of May. Not till a hundred years later would the vague month Epiphi and the Hebrew passover month coincide. The argument proves too much, unless we are prepared to lower the exode to cir. B.C. 1200. (To some it may imply that the narrative of the exode was written about that time — Mr. Sharpe, History of Egypt, 1:63 — but one can hardly suppose that the Hebrews retained the vague Egyptian months as  well as their names so long after their settlement in Palestine.) If in any year from B.C. 1300 upwards, the full moon next the vernal equinox fell in the month Epiphi, it would follow that the Coptic month-names (which, it is well understood, never occur on the monuments) belonged then to a different form of the year.

For the first seventeen dynasties, numbering in Afr. more than 4000 years, a bare statement of their contents and of the monumental evidence would greatly exceed the limits of this article. Perhaps the time is not far distant when the attempt to educe a connected chronology from Manetho (whether for or against the Mosaic numbers) will be abandoned by all sensible men. Full and unprejudiced inquiry can have but one result: for times anterior to B.C. 700 Eg.(?) has no fixed chronology. De Rouge has in two words set the whole matter in its true light: “Les textes de Manethlon sont profondement alteres, et la serie des dates monumentales est tres incomiplete.” The incompleteness of the record is palpable: the alteration of the texts is the result of their having passed through numerous hands, and been refashioned according to various intentions, by which the whole inquiry has been complicated to a degree that baffles all attempts to determine what was their original form. These intentions were mainly cyclical. A very brief statement of facts, not resting on critical conjecture and questionable combinations, as in the elaborate treatise of Bickh, but lying on the surface, will place the character and relations of the several texts in a clear light. Menes stands,

1. In Africanus (according to Syncellus's running summation of the numbers in book 1) just three complete sothiac cycles, 3 x 1460 Julian years, before B.C. 1322;

2. In Eusebius, according to the epigraphal sum of book 1, three cycles before the epoch of Sethosis, dyn. 19;

3. In Eusebius, according to the actual sum of book 1, three cycles before the year B.C. 978-77, meant as the goal of the Diospolitan monarchy or epoch of Shishak;

4. In Syncellus's period of 3555 years (accepted by Lepsius and Bunsen as the true Manethonic measure from Menes to Nectanebus), two cycles before the same goal;  5. In the Old Chronicle, according to its scthiac form, one cycle before the same goal;

6. In the Sothis, one cycle before B.C. 1322; but here it is contrived that Osiropis, or the commencement of Diospolitan monarchy, stands one cycle before Susak-eim = Shishlak. ‘The inquirer may easily verify these facts for himself. In the series of papers, “Cycles of Egyptian Chronology,” published in Arnold's Theol. Critic, 1851-52, he will find them fully stated, with many other like facts, which prove that these chronographies, one and all, are intensely cyclical. But if Manetho, as we have him, is cyclical, then, Lepsius himself confesses (K. B. p. 6, 7), “the historical character of his work falls to the ground; for the very fact of Menes heading a sothiac circle could only be the result of after-contrivance;” and Bunsen (Aeg. Jam 4:13) sees that in place of “the genuine historical work of Manetho, the venerable priest and conscientious inquirer,” we get “a made-up thing, systematically carved to shape, and therefore really fabulous.” Whether or not the original “Manetho,” whatever its authorship and date, was contrived upon a cyclical plan, we have but the lists as they come to us finally from the hands of Annianus and Pandorus through Syncellus. It may be observed, however, that the cardinal dates given by Dicesarchus, which we have from an independent source, imply that the cyclical treatment of Egyptian chronology is at least as old as the alleged time of Manetho (“Cycles,” etc., u. s., sec, 4, 16, 34, 36).

For literature additional to the above, SEE EGYPT; also Fruin, Dissertatio Historica de Manethone (Leyd. 1847, 8vo); Böckh, Manetho (Berlin, 1845, 8vo); A. H. von Sagaus, Mtanethos, die Origines unserer Gesch. (Gotha, 1865, 8vo); Ain. Presb. Rev. Jan. 1866, p. 180.

## Manger[[@Headword:Manger]]

             is the rendering found in Luk 2:7; Luk 2:12; Luk 2:16, of the term , φατνη used to designate the place in which the infant Redeemer was cradled; which seems to denote a crib or “stall” for feeding cattle, as it is rendered in Luk 13:15 (see Horrei Miscell. Crit. Leon. 1738, bk. 2, ch. 16). It is employed in the Sept. in a similar sense for the Heb. אֵבוּס, Job 39:9; Isa 1:3; also by Josephus, Ant. 8:2, 4; comp. Lucan, Tim. p. 14; Xenophon, — Eg. 4:1. Gersdorff (Beitrege zur Sprachchalrakterestik des N.T. p. 220) is in favor of translating the word crib everywhere, and quotes Elian (apud Suid. s.v.), Philo (De sommdiis, p. 872, b. ed. Colon. 1613), and Sybile.  Eryth. (ap. Lactantius, 7:24, 12) to that effect. Schleusner (Lex. s.v.) says it is any enclosure, but especially the vestibule to the house, where the cattle were enclosed, not with walls, but wooden hurdles; but in common Greek the word undoubtedly often refers to a trough hollowed out to receive the food for horses, etc. (see Homer, II. v. 271; 10:568; 24:280). The Peshito Version evidently so understands it. On the other hand, it is doubtful if such a contrivance as a proper manger was known in the East, especially in the khans or “inns” of the description alluded to in the text. SEE CARAVANSERAI.

“Stables and mangers, in the sense in which we understand them, are of comparatively late introduction into the East (see the quotations from Chardin and others in Harmer's Observations, 2:205), and, although they have furnished material to modern painters and poets, did not enter into the circumstances attending the birth of Christ, and are hardly less inaccurate than the ‘cradle' and the ‘stable' which are named in some descriptions of that event.” We are therefore doubtless here to regard the term as designating the ledge or projection in the end of the room used as a stable, on which they have or other food of the animals of travelers was placed. (See Strong's Harmonyos and Expos. of the Gospels, p. 14.) Several of the Christian fathers maintain at that the stable itself was in a cave, and the identical manger in which the infant Jesus is traditionally stated to have lain is still shown by the superstitious monks, being no other than a marble sarcophagus; but the whole story is at variance with the narrative in the Gospels. (See Meldon, De praesepi Christi, Jen. 1662.) SEE BETHLEHEM.

“avernier, speaking of Aleppo, states that” in the caravanserais, on each side of the hall, for persons of the best quality, there are lodgings for every man by himself. These lodgings are raised a along the court, two or three steps high, just behind which are the stables, where many times it is as good lying as in the chambers. Right against the head of every horse there is a niche with a window into the lodging-chamber, out of which every man may see that his horse is looked after. These niches are usually so large that three men may lie in them, and here the servants dress their victuals.” In modern Oriental farm-houses, however, something corresponding to a Western “manager” may be found.” It is common to find two sides of the one room where the native farmer resides with his cattle fitted up with these mangers, and the remainder elevated about two feet higher for the accommodation of the family. The mangers are built of small stones and mortar, in the shape of a box, or, rather, of a kneading- trough, and when cleaned up and whitewashed, as they often are in  summer, they do very well to lay little babes in” (Thomson, Land and Book, 2:98). SEE STABLE.

## Manger, Samuel Heinrich[[@Headword:Manger, Samuel Heinrich]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, who died at Franeker in 1788, doctor and professor of theology, is the author of, De Siphra Deque Nomine דביר(Utrecht, 1751): — Commentarius in Librum Prophete losece (Franeker, 1785). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:225; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 2:320. (B.P.)

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

             an English theologian, was born at Leeds in 1684; was educated at St. John's College, Cambridge; held successively the livings of St. Mildred, Bread Street, London; St. Nicholas, Guilford, and Ealing, in Middlesex; was chaplain to Dr. Robinson, bishop of London; in 1721 was presented to the fifth stall in the cathedral of Durham, and was advanced to the first stall in 1722; became D.D. in 1725, and died in 1755. Dr. Mangey published a number of Sermons: and controversial tracts, and a most valuable edition of the works of Philo Judoeus: Philonis Judaei Opera omnia quel reperiripotuerunt (Lond. 1742, 2 vols. fol.). — Allibone, Dict. Brit. and Amer. Auth. s.v.; Hook, Eccles. Biog. 7:222.

## Mangum, Adolphus Williamson, D.D[[@Headword:Mangum, Adolphus Williamson, D.D]]

             a minister and educator of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born April 1, 1834. At the age of twenty-one he graduated from Randolph- Macon College, and, joining the North Carolina Conference in 1856, he served as pastor and chaplain until 1875, when he was elected professor of mental and moral science in the University of North Carolina, which post he occupied until his death, May 12, 1890. See Minutes of Annual Conferences of the M.E. Church, South, 1890, page 114.

## Manhartists Or Haagleitnerians[[@Headword:Manhartists Or Haagleitnerians]]

             the name of a party in the Romish Church, especially in the archbishopric of Salzburg, from 1814 to 1826, whose founder and chief was a young priest named Caspar Haagleitner, of Hopfgarten; and its most distinguished and active member was Sebastian Manzl, of Westendorf (known also by the name of Manhart, from one of his estates). In 1809 Napoleon I had appointed the prince-bishop of Chiem-see and the coadjutor of Salzburg as ecclesiastical authorities in the diocese. The clergy submitted with the exception of Haagleitner, who refused to recognize them, and showed symptoms of heresy. He left Hopfgarten and went to Tyrol, where he created some religions and political troubles, and gained a number of followers. At the peace of Schonbrunn the Tyrol fell again into the hands of the French, and Haagleitner was taken a prisoner to Kusstein and Salzburg. He finally succeeded in making good his escape; and when, in 1814, Austria recovered the Bavarian Tyrol, he was appointed vicar at Worgel. Here he continued his intrigue, and succeeded so well that the people came to consider him as the only true priest in the country, the others having failed to do their duty by submitting to the dictates of Napoleon. Manhart assisted Haagleitner greatly in propagating his doctrines in Westendorf, Hopfgarten, and Kirchbichel, and their effect was felt even long after Haagleitner had been removed from Worgel. Manhart held meetings in his own house, preaching himself, or allowing his wife to preach, as well as another woman from Hopfgarten. The administrator of  the diocese of Salzburg, and afterwards the archbishop Augustin Gruber, sought in vain to reconcile them with the Church; they asked to be instructed by the pope himself in case they were in the wrong, and for this purpose went to Rome in 1825. The difficulty ended soon after. — Herzog, Real-Encyklopädie, 8:781.

## Mani[[@Headword:Mani]]

             (Μανί,Vulg. Banni), given (1Es 9:30) by error for BANI (q.v.) of the Heb. list (Ezr 10:29).

## Mani, Manes, Or Manichaeus[[@Headword:Mani, Manes, Or Manichaeus]]

             (entitled Zendik, Sadducee), the founder of the heretical sect of the Manichaans, is said to have flourished in the second half of the 3d century. Little is known with regard to his early history, and the accounts transmitted through two distinct sources — the Western or Greek, and the Eastern — are legendary and contradictory on almost every important point. According to the most probable supposition, he was a native of Persia, and was born about 214. His real name appears to have been Curbicus, and he was the slave of a rich woman of Ctesiphon, who bought him when he was but seven years of age, had him carefully educated, and at her decease left him all her wealth. Among the books she left him he is said to have found the writings of Scythianus, which had been given to her by one of the latter's disciples named Terebinthus, or Budda. The East was at this time in great ferment. The progress of Christianity had awakened the opposition of all the heathen religions from the Indus to the Euphrates. Parsism was the most powerful among them. Mani, with the aid of the treasure left him in the writings of Scythianus, believed it possible to accomplish the amalgamation of Parsism and Christianity, and for this purpose he emigrated to Persia, changed his name so as to obliterate all traces of his origin and former state, and, to carry out his plans more successfully, he proclaimed himself the Paraclete promised by Christ. It is said that the attempt was looked upon with favor by king Sapor and by Hormisdas, but this appears doubtful. Followers soon gathered, and three of the new sect — Thomas, Buddas or Addas, and Hermas — propagated the doctrines, the first in Egypt and the second in India. Hermas only remained with Mani to assist him. While they were away the son of Sapor fell ill, and Mani, who had been highly spoken of as a physician, was called to attend him; but, not succeeding, he was thrown into prison. Mani bribed  his keepers, and succeeded in escaping, but was pursued and captured, and publicly executed.

There are other accounts, however, which make Mani the scion of a noble magian family, and a man of extraordinary mental powers and artistic and scientific abilities — an eminent painter, mathematician, etc. According to them Mani embraced Christianity in early manhood, and became presbyter at a church in Ehvaz or Ahvaj, in the Persian province of Hazitis. He purposed to purge Christianity of its alleged Jewish corruptions, to demonstrate its unity with Parsism, and thereby to present the perfect universal religion. He gave himself out to be the Paraclete, and styled himself in ecclesiastical documents “Mani, called to be an apostle of Jesus Christ through the election of God the Father. These are the words of salvation from the eternal and living Source.” Persecuted by king Sapor I, he sought refuge in foreign countries, went to India, China, and Turkistan, and there lived in a cave for twelve months, during which he claimed to have been in heaven. He reappeared with a wonderful book of drawings and pictures, called Erdshenk or Ertenki-Mani. No doubt during his residence in these countries he had become acquainted with Buddhism, and had decided to incorporate some of its best points in his syncretistic religion (comp. Hardwick, Christ and other Masters, 1:288 sq.). After the death of Sapor (A.D. 272) he returned to Persia, where Hormas, the new king, who was well inclined towards him, received him with great honors, and, in order to protect him more effectually against the persecutions of the magi, gave him the stronghold of Deshereh, in Susiana, as a residence. After the death of this king, however, Bahram, his successor, entrapped Mani into a public disputation with the magi, for which purpose he had to leave his castle; and he was seized and flayed alive, A.D. 277. His skin was stuffed and hung up for a terror at the gates of the city Jondishapur.

Among the works of Mani may be reckoned four books, sometimes ascribed to Terebinthus and sometimes to Scythianus, entitled the Mysteries, the Chapters or Leads, the Gospel, and the Treasure. In the Mysteries Man endeavored to demonstrate the doctrine of two principles from the mixture of good and evil which is found in the world. He grounded his reasons on the argument that if there were one sole cause, simple, perfect, and good in the highest degree, the whole, corresponding with the nature and will of that cause, would show simplicity, perfection, and goodness, and everything would be immortal, holy, and happy like himself. The Chapters contained a summary of the chief articles of the  Manichaean scheme. Of the Gospels nothing certain can be asserted. Beausobre, apparently without sufficient grounds, considers it as a collection of the meditations and pretended revelations of Mani. The Treasure, or Treasure of Life, may, perhaps, have derived its name from the words of Christ, wherein he compares his doctrine to a treasure hid in a field. Mani also wrote other works and letters, and among them the Epistle of the Foundation, of which we have fragments still extant in St. Augustine, who undertook to refute it. His works appear to have been originally written, some in Syriac, some in Persic. For his doctrine, etc., SEE MANICHAEISM. (J. H. W.)

## Manichaeism[[@Headword:Manichaeism]]

             As we have seen in the life of MANI SEE MANI (q.v.), the origin of Manichaeism, as well as the history of its founder and propagator, is matter of obscure and confused tradition. Although it utterly disclaimed being denominated Christian, it was reckoned among the heretical doctrines of the Church. It was intended, as we have already indicated in the sketch of Mani, to blend the chief doctrines of Parsism, or rather Magism, as reformed by Zoroaster, with a certain number of Buddhistic views, under the outward garb of Biblical, more especially New-Testament history, which, explained allegorically and symbolically, was made to represent an entirely new religious system, and one wholly at variance with Christianity and its fundamental teachings (comp. Hardwick, Christ and other Masters, 2:389 sq.; and see the references there for Lassen and others).

Doctrines. — Like Magism, Manichaeism holds that there are two eternal principles from which all things proceed, the two everlasting kingdoms, bordering on each other-the kingdom of light under the dominion of God, and the kingdom of darkness under the demon or hyle (ὕλη). The Light, the Good, or God, and the Darkness, the Bad, Matter, or Archon, each inhabited a region akin to their natures, and excluding each other to such a degree that the region of Darkness and its leader never knew of the existence of that of the Light. Twelve aeons — corresponding to the twelve signs of the zodiac and the twelve stages of the world — had sprung (emanated) from the Primeval Light; while “Darkness,” filled with the eternal fire, which burned but shone not, was peopled by “daemons,” who were constantly fighting among themselves. In one of these contests, pressing towards the outer edge, as it were, of their region, they became aware of the neighboring region, and forthwith united, attacked it, and  succeeded in taking captive the Ray of Light that was sent against them at the head of the hosts of Light, and which was the embodiment of the Ideal or Primeval Man (Christ). A stronger aeon (the Holy Ghost) then hastened to the rescue, and redeemed the greater and better part of the captive Light (Jesus Impatibilis). The smaller and fainter portion, however (Jesus Passibilis), remained in the hands of the powers of Darkness, and out of this they formed, after the ideal of The Man of Light, mortal man. But even the small fraction of light left in him (broken in two souls) would have prevailed against them had they not found means to further divide and subdivide it by the propagation of this man (Eve-Sin). Not yet satisfied, they still more dimmed it by burying it under dark “forms of belief and faith, such as Paganism and Judaism.” Once more, however, the Original Light came to save the light buried in man — to deliver the captive souls of men from their corporeal prison. On this account there were created two sublime beings, Christ and the Holy Ghost. Christ was sent into the world clothed with the shadowy form of a human body, and not with the real substance, to teach mortals how to deliver the rational soul from the corrupt body, and to overcome the power of malignant matter. But again the daemons succeeded in defeating the schemes of the power of light. Obscuring men's minds, even those of the apostles, so that they could not fully understand Christ's object, his career of salvation was cut short by the daemons seducing man to crucify him. His sufferings and death were, naturally, only fictitious, since he could not in reality die; he only allowed himself to become an example of endurance and passive pain for his own, the souls of light. But to carry out the intended salvation of men Christ, shortly before his crucifixion, gave the promise recorded by John (16:7- 15), that he would send to his disciples the Comforter, “who would lead them into all truth.” This promise, the Manichaeans maintain, was fulfilled in the person of Mani, who was sent by the God of light to declare to all men the doctrine of salvation, without concealing any of its truths under the veil of metaphor, or under any other covering.

Mani, like Christ, surrounded himself with twelve apostles, and sent them into the world to teach and to preach his doctrine of salvation. To carry out his work more successfully, and to make converts also of the Christians, he rejected the authority of the Old Testament, which, he said, was the work of the God of darkness, whom the Jews had worshipped in the place of light, and also a good part of the New Testament, upon the ground that many of the books had been grossly interpolated, and were not  the productions of the persons whose names they bear. As strictly canonical, he admitted only his own writings, and such parts of the New Testament as answered his purpose. “Whatever,” says Baur (Manicsh. Religions system p. 375), “in the writings of the New Testament seemed to concur with the dualism set forth by Mani was accounted among the most genuine ingredients in the doctrines of Christianity, and Mani and his adherents were very glad to cite for the confirmation of their own doctrines and principles passages like Mat 7:18; Mat 13:24; Joh 1:5; Joh 8:44; Joh 14:30; 2Co 4:4 (comp. Epiph. Haer. 66:67-69); and especially those in which the apostle Paul speaks of the opposition between flesh and spirit. As they found, however, so much in the New Testament which not only did not confirm the Manichaean doctrines, but stood in opposition to them, they were obliged, in accordance with the hypothesis that the original doctrines. of Christianity did no differ from those of Manicheism,. to regard all passages of this kind as a distortion and falsification of Christianity. Accordingly, they laid, down the rule that the written records of Christianity ought not to be received unconditionally, but must be subjected to a previous scrutiny, with a view to ascertain how far they exhibited the genuine substance of Christianity; and this was limited to those portions which bore the character of Manichaeism, so that, following this criterion, whatever did not harmonize with their own doctrines was rejected without hesitation, because original Christianity could not contradict itself.”

Mani also taught that those souls which obeyed the laws delivered by Christ, as explained by himself the Comforter, and struggled against; the lusts and appetites of a corrupt nature, would, on their death, be delivered from their sinful bodies, and, after being purified by the sun and moon — “the two light-ships for conducting the imprisoned light into the eternal kingdom of light” — would ascend to the regions of light; but that those souls which neglected to struggle against their corrupt. natures would pass after death into the bodies of animals or other beings, until they had expiated their guilt. Belief in the evil of matter led to a denial of the doctrine of the resurrection. “These ideas,” says Donaldson, (Christian Orthodoxy, p. 143), “they [the Manicheans]) worked out in a manner peculiar to themselves, and with results decidedly unfavorable to the integrity and authenticity of the New Testament. They could accept. neither the doctrine nor the facts of revelation, unless. they could regard them as a reflex of their own dualism. Without wishing to reject  Christianity, they made their own system the standard of measurement, and lopped off or stretched the religion of the Cross, wherever it did not fit the religion of light and darkness. The identification of Christ with Mithras led, of course, to a profession of Docetism, namely, to the assertion that our Lord's sufferings on the cross were not real, but apparent only. Christ had no real human body, no double nature, but only a fantastic semblance of corporeity, in which his essence, as the Son of Everlasting Light, was presented to the eyes of men... Accordingly, Christ had no human birth, and his apparent sufferings were really inflicted on him by his enemy, the Prince of Darkness; and in thus resolving the life of Jesus into a series of illusory appearances, the Manichaeans take from Christianity all its historical foundation, and leave us nothing but the realistic applications of a few Christian metaphors.” “Christianity,” says Dr. Schaff (Ch. History, 1:249) “is here resolved into a fantastic, dualistic-pantheistic philosophy of nature; moral regeneration is identified with a process of physical refinement; and the whole mystery of redemption is found in light, which was always worshipped in the East as the symbol of deity. Unquestionably there pervades the Manichaean system a kind of groaning of the creature for redemption, and a deep sympathy with nature, that hieroglyphic of spirit; but all is distorted and confused. The suffering Jesus on the cross, Jesus patibilis, is here a mere illusion, a symbol of the world-soul still enchained in matter, and is seen in every plant which works upwards from the clark bosom of the earth towards the light; towards bloom and fruit, yearning after freedom. Hence the class of the ‘perfect' would not kill nor wound a beast, pluck a flower, nor break a blade of grass. The system, instead of being, as it pretends, a liberation of light from darkness, is really a turning of light into darkness.”

Organization. — “Manichaeism,” says Dr. Schaff (1:250), “differed from the Gnostic schools in having a fixed, and that a strictly hierarchal organization. At the head of the sect stood twelve apostles or magistri, among whom Mani and his successors, like Peter and the pope, held the chief place. Under them were seventy-two bishops, answering to the seventy-two (strictly, seventy) of the disciples of Jesus; and under these came presbyters, deacons, and itinerant evangelists. In the congregations there were two distinct classes, designed to correspond to the catechumens and the faithful in the Catholic Church — the ‘hearers' (Auditores) and the ‘perfect' (Electi), the esoteric, the priestly caste, which represents the last stage in the process of the liberation of the spirit and its separation from  the world, the transition from the kingdom of matter into the kingdom of light, or, in the Buddhistic terms, from the world of Sansara into Nirvana.” The Elect are required to adhere to the Signaculumn Oris, Muanes, and Sinus, that is, they have to take the oath of abstinence from evil and profane speech (including “religious terms such as Christians use respecting the Godhead and religion”), further, from flesh, eggs, milk, fish, wine, and all intoxicating drinks (comp. Manu, Instit. 2Co 4:51, 52, 53: “He who makes the flesh of an animal his food... not a mortal exists more sinful... he who... desires to enlarge his own flesh with the flesh of another creature,” etc.); further, from the possession of riches, or, indeed, any property whatsoever; from hurting any being, animal or vegetable; from heeding their own family, or showing any pity to him who is not of the Manichaean creed; and finally, from breaking their chastity by marriage or otherwise. The Auditors were comparatively free to partake of the good things of this world, but they had to provide for the subsistence of the Elect, and their highest aim, also, was the attainment of the state of their superior brethren.

Cultus. — In Manichaean worship, the visible representatives of the light (sun and moon) were revered, but only as representatives of the Ideal, of the good or supreme God. Neither altar nor sacrifice was to be found in their places of religious assemblies, nor did they erect sumptuous temples. Fasts, prayers, occasional readings in the supposed writings of Mani, chiefly a certain Fundamental Epistle, were all their outer worship. Sunday, as the day on which the visible universe was to be consumed, the day consecrated to the sun, was kept as a great festival; Church festivals they rejected, and, instead, made the most solemn day in their year the anniversary of the death of Mani. Baptism they repudiated, considering it useless; the Lord's Supper was celebrated, but only by the Elect. Of the mode of celebration, however, we know next to nothing; even Augustine, who, for about nine years, belonged to the sect, and who is our chief authority on this subject, confesses his ignorance of it. Dr. Schaff (Ch. Hist. 1:250) says that they partook of it without wine (because Christ had no blood), “and regarded it perhaps according to their pantheistic symbolism, as the commemoration of the light-soul crucified in all nature.”

Character. — As to the general morality of the Manichaeans, we are equally left to conjecture; but their doctrine certainly appears to have had a tendency, chiefly in the case of the uneducated, to lead to a sensual fanaticism hurtful to a pure mode of life. Bower, in the second volume of  his History of the Popes, has attempted to prove that the Manichaeans were addicted to immoral practices, but this (pinion has been ably controverted by Beausobre and Lardner. “The morality of the Manichaeans,” says Dr. Schaff, “was severely ascetic, based on the fundamental error of the intrinsic evil of matter and the body; the extreme opposite of the Pelagian view of the essential moral purity of human nature. The great moral aim is to become entirely unworldly, in the Buddhistic sense; to renounce and destroy corporeity; to set the good soul free from the fetters of matter. This is accomplished by the most rigid and gloomy abstinence, which, however, is required only of the elect, not of the catechumens.”

Extent. — Mani, as we have noted already in cur sketch of his life, was put to death about 275; but the sect soon spread into proconsular Asia, and even into Africa, Sicily, and Italy, although they were vehemently opposed by the Catholic Church, and persecuted by the heathen emperors, who enacted bloody laws against them, as a sect derived from hostile Persia. The precise time when the doctrines of Mani made their way into the Roman empire it is impossible definitely to determine. The principal document on the subject, entitled Acta disputationis Archelai, episcopi Mesopotanmice, et Manetis haeresiarchoe, is deemed apocryphal. Diocletian, as early as A.D. 296, issued rigorous laws against the Manichaeans, which were reiterated by Valentinian, Theodosius I, and successive monarchs. Notwithstanding this, they gained numerous adherents; and very many medieval sects, as the Priscillians, Paulicians, Bogomiles, Catharists, Josephinians, etc., were suspected to be secretly Manichaeans, and were therefore called “New Manichaeans.” “Indeed, the leading features of Manichaeism, the dualistic separation of soul and body, the ascription of nature to the devil, the pantheistic confusion of the moral and the physical, the hypocritical symbolism, concealing heathen views under Christian phrases, the haughty air of mystery, and the aristocratic distinction of esoteric and exoteric, still live in various forms even in modern systems of philosophy and sects of religion. The Mormons of our day strongly bring to mind, in many respects, even in their organization, the ancient Manichaeans” (Dr. Schaff). It is a remarkable circumstance in their history, that though they could not stand openly against the power and severity of their persecutors, they continued for ages, up to the very time of the Reformation, to make proselytes in secret. Their doctrines lurked even among the clergy and the monks. The profound and noble Augustine  fell under their influence, and was a member of the sect from his twentieth to his twenty-ninth year (374-383). They were still to be found in Leo's time, 440. The Arian Hunneric, in 477, began his reign with attempts to persecute them, and was mortified to find most of those whom he detected had professed to be lay or clerical members of his own sect. Gregory the Great, about 600, had to take means for extirpating them from Africa; and even after his pontificate traces of them appeared now and then in Italy, as well as other countries, threatening danger to the Church. About the year 1000 they spread from Italy into other countries, especially into southern France, Spain, and even Germany.

Literature. — Archelaus (bishop of Cascar about 278), Acta disputationis cum Manete (first composed in Syriac, but extant only in a Latin translation, and in many respects untrustworthy), in Routh's Reliquiae sacrae, v. 3-206. The Oriental accounts, of later date, indeed (the 9th and 10th centuries), but drawn from ancient sources, are collected in Herbelot, Bibl. Orient. (Par. 1679), s.v. Mani. See Titus Bostrensis (about 360), Κατὰ Μανιχαίων; Epiphanius, Haer. p. 66 (drawn from Archelaus); Zachagni, Monumenta Ecclesiae Graecae et Latinae (Rome, 1698); St. Augustine, De Moribus Manichceorum; De Genesi contra Manichaeos; e duabus animabus contra Manichaeos; De Tera religione Epoistola fundamentis contra lustum; Fabricius, Biblioth. Graeca, v. 284; Beausobre, Histoire crit. de Manichee et du Scanicheisnme (Anhst. 1734 and 1739, 2 vols.); F. Chr. Baur, Deas Manichusche Religionssysteml nach den Quellen untersucht (Tiub. 1831); Fligel, Marni, seine Iebre u. seine Schriften (Lpz. 1862); Trechsel, Ueber den Kranon1 die Kritiki, u. die Exeyese der Manlimchaier (Berne, 1832); Colditz, Entstehung d. mancich. Reli/ionss;ysntemls (Lpz. 1837); Reichlin-Meldegg, Theologie d.s Milliers Jlansi ut. ilhr Ursprung (Frankf. 1825); V. de Wagnerln, Manich. indulgoentiaicum brevi totius Munich. adumilbratione, e fbntibus descripsit (Lpz. 1827); P. de Lagardle, Titi Bostreni contra Manich. libri quatuor Syriace (Berl. 1859); Stud. und Ksrit.vi. 3, 875 sq. (review of Baur); Schrockh, Kirchengesch. 4:400 sq.; 11:245 sq.; Neander, Chl. Hist. 2:707 sq.; Schaff, Ch. Hist. i, § 73; Donaldson, Christian Orthodoxy, p. 127 sq.; Haag, Hist. des Dogmes Chretiens (see Index); Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctrines, 1:240 sq., 337, 352, 353; Pressense, L'histoire du Dogme (Par. 1869), chap. 2 (J. H. W.)

## Manipa[[@Headword:Manipa]]

             the name of a monstrous idol worshipped in the kingdoms of Tangut and Barantola, in Tartary. It has nine heads, which rise pyramidally, there being three in the first and second row, then two, and one at the top of all. A bold, resolute young fellow, dressed in armor, and prompted by enthusiastic courage, on certain days of the year, runs about the city Tanchuth, and kills every one he meets in honor of the goddess. By such outrageous sacrifices as these the devotees imagine they extremely oblige Manipa. — Kircher, China illustr.; Broughton, Bibliotheca Hist. Sac. s.v.

## Maniple[[@Headword:Maniple]]

             (Lat. manipulum). Doubtless this was, nothing more than a strip of the finest linen, attached to the left arm of the priest by a loop, with which to wipe the chalice previous to the first oblation, that is, at the offertory. Soon, however, it began to be enriched with embroidery, like the stole, and finally became merely an ornament worn by the priest and his assistants, just above the left wrist, at the celebration of the eucharist. It is now of the same width and color as the stole and the vestment or chasuble, fringed at the ends, and generally about a yard and a quarter in length. It has been kept up in the English Church ever since the alterations in the 16th century,  ordinarily in the shape of a napkin folded like a band, for use at the eucharist; and at St. George's Chapel, Windsor, at Durham and Westminster, some of the ancient maniples can still be seen which have been occasionally worn.

## Manitou[[@Headword:Manitou]]

             is the name of any object used as a fetish or amulet among some tribes of the American Indians those of the North and North-west. “The Illinois,” wrote the Jesuit Marest, “adore a sort of genius which they call Manitou; to them it is the master of life, the spirit that rules all things. A bird, a buffalo, a bear, a feather, a skin — that is their manitou.” “If the Indian word manitou,” says Palfrey, “appeared to denote something above or beside the common aspects and agencies of nature, it might be natural, but it would be rash and misleading to confound its import with the Christian, Mohammedan, Jewish, Egyptian, or Greek conception of the Deity, or with any compound or selection from some or all of those ideas.” SEE INDIANS.

## Manks (or Manx) Version Of The Scriptures[[@Headword:Manks (or Manx) Version Of The Scriptures]]

             This language is spoken to some extent on the Isle of' Man, the ancient Mona. It is characterized by the incorporation of many Scandinavian words, which were doubtless introduced during the continued sway of the Danes and of the Norwegians, who succeeded the Saxons in the government of the island. The present version of the Manks Bible was commenced in the jail of Castle Rushen by the excellent bishop Wilson, in concert with Dr. Walker, one of his vicars, in 1722. The gospel of Matthew was translated by Dr. Walker, and printed, under the direction and at the expense of the bishop, in London, in 1748. The other gospels and the Acts were left in a state of readiness for the press by this venerable bishop, who died in 1755. His successor, Dr. Mark Hildesley, entered with the utmost ardor and anxiety on the prosecution of the translation of the New Test., which was finally published ill London in 1767, by aid of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. About the time of the completion at press of the New Test., the bishop made arrangements for the translation of the Old Test., dividing it for this purpose among twenty- four different individuals. When the work was completed it was committed for final revision to Dr. Moore and Dr. Kelly. The latter was then only eighteen years of age, but very proficient in the knowledge of Manks, which was his native language. Dr. Kelly transcribed the whole version, from Genesis to Revelation, for the press, and, in conjunction with Dr. Moore, corrected and revised the proof-sheets. In 1772 the Old Test. was completed and published, and in 1775 the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge published the second edition of the Manks Scriptures; other editions have since been issued by the same society. In 1810 the British and Foreign Bible Society published a stereotyped edition of two thousand copies of the New Test., and in 1819 the entire Bible was published by the same society. Since then no further editions of the Manks Scriptures have appeared, as the Bible in English is now in general circulation on the island. See Bible of Every Land, page 166. (B.P.)

## Manley, Basil, D.D., L.L.D[[@Headword:Manley, Basil, D.D., L.L.D]]

             a Baptist minister, was born in Edgefield County, S.C., December 19, 1825. After graduating from the University of Alabama in 1843, and from Princeton Theological Seminary in 1847, he became pastor until 1854;  from 1854 to 1859 president of Richmond Female Institute; 159-71 professor of Biblical introduction and Old Testament interpretation in the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary; 1871-79 president of Georgetown College, Kentucky; thereafter professor in the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, and died January 31, 1892. He was the author of A Call to the Ministry (1867): — and The Bible Doctrine of Inspiration Explained and Vindicated (1888).

## Manley, Ira[[@Headword:Manley, Ira]]

             a Congregational minister and home missionary, was born about the year 1780; was a graduate of Middlebury College, studied law, was admitted to the bar, and left a fine practice to enter the ministry. He was a home missionary for sixty years, and a pioneer in all good enterprises. The last twenty-two years of his life were mostly spent in Wisconsin. He died at Keene, Essex County, N.Y., Feb. 5, 1871. — New Amer. Cyclop. 1871, p. 569.

## Manliple[[@Headword:Manliple]]

             an article of dress introduced when the use of the stole as a handkerchief fell into disuse. It now represents the cord with which our Lord was bound to the pillar at his scourging. — Walcott, Sac. Archaeol. s.v.; Siegel, Archceol. s.v. Manipulus.

## Manlius[[@Headword:Manlius]]

             the name of one of the ambassadors who is said to have written a letter to the Jews confirming whatever concession Lysias had granted them. Four letters were written to the Jews, of which the last is from “Quintus Memmius and Titus Manlius (Gr. Τίτος Μάνλιος, v. r. Μάνιος; Vulg. Titus Manilius), ambassadors (πρεσβῦται) of the Romans” (2Ma 11:34). There is not much doubt that the letter is a fabrication, as history is entirely ignorant of these names. Polybius (Reliq. 31:9, 6), indeed, mentions C. Sulpitius and Manius Sergius, who were sent to Antiochus IV Epiphanes about B.C. 163, an also (Relig. 31:12, 9) Cn. Octavius, Spurius Lucretius, and L. Aurelius, who were sent into Syria in B.C. 162 in consequence of the contention fir the guardianship of the young king Antiochus V Eupator, but entirely ignores Q. Memmius or T. Manlius. We may therefore conclude that legates of these names were never in Syria. The true name of T. Manlius may be T. Manius, and as there is not sufficient time for an embassy to have been sent to Syria between the two recorded by Polybius, the writer may have been thinking of the former. The letter is dated in the 148th year of the Seleucidan sera (= B.C. 165), and in this year there was a consul of the name of T. Macnlius Torquatus, who appears to have been sent on an embassy to Egypt about B.C. 164, to mediate between the two Ptolemies, Philometor and Euergetes (Livy, 43:11; Polybius, Relig. 32:1, 2). The employment of this Seleucidan aera as a date, the absence of the name of the city, and especially the fact that the first intercourse of the Jews and Romans did not take place till two years later, when Judas heard of the fame of the Romans (1 Maccabees 8, I sq.), all prove that the document is far from authentic.

The three other letters do not merit serious attention (2Ma 11:16-33). See Wernsdorff, Defid. Libr. Maccab. sec. 66; Grimm, Exeg. Handbuch, ad loc., and on the other side, Patritius, De Cons. Maccabees p. 142, 280.

## Manly, Basil, D.D[[@Headword:Manly, Basil, D.D]]

             a Baptist divine and educator of note, was born in Chatham County, N. C., Jan. 28, 1798. At the age of sixteen he became a member of a Baptist Church, and not long after began speaking in public, though he was not regularly licensed till 1818. He preached his first sermon in Beaufort, S. C., and must have made a favorable impression, for he at once received an  offer of aid from a society for the education of ministers, and commenced his studies. In December, 1819, he entered the junior class in South Carolina College, and graduated with the highest honor in 1821. He immediately entered into an engagement to preach in the Edgefield District, and was ordained in March, 1822. A Church was formed at Edgefield Court-house about a year later, of which he was pastor for three years, gaining a wide reputation as a preacher in upper South Carolina. He was called in 1826 to the pastorate of the Baptist Church in Charleston, and continued there eleven years, during which time he not only sustained and extended his reputation as a preacher, but was active in the cause of liberal and theological education, effecting the establishment of what is now known as Furman University, at Greenville, S. C. At that period theological instruction was included in the plans of this and similar institutions. Dr. Manly lived to see the Baptists of the South concentrate their energies upon the establishment and support of a single theological seminary. He took a lively interest in this matter, partly, no doubt,, from a sense of the disadvantages under which he had himself labored; for, though a good scholar, he was a self-educated theologian. He was chosen in 1837 to the presidency of the University of Alabama, and administered the office for about eighteen years with eminent ability and success. In 1855 he returned to Charleston, and to the pastoral office over one of the four churches that now existed in place of the one to which he had formerly ministered. He was subsequently engaged as a missionary and evangelist in Alabama, and as a pastor at Montgomery. He died at Greenville, S. C., Dec. 21, 1868. As a preacher, Dr. Manly was eminently popular. His discourses, though instructive and convincing, were also charged with the elements of emotional power, and, with all his success as an educator, this was the work in which he most delighted. Dr. Manly wrote a “treatise on Moral Science,” which was for years a text-book in Southern colleges. It indicated a high order of talent. See New Amer. Cyclop. 1868, p. 450, Drake, Dict. Amer. Biog. s.v. (L. E. S.)

## Manly, Robert Woolf, D.D[[@Headword:Manly, Robert Woolf, D.D]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Muskingum County, Ohio, August 5, 1830. He studied three years (1847-50) in the Ohio Wesleyan University, joined the Ohio Conference in 1859, was transferred to the Colorado Conference in 1881, and died at Denver, July 15, 1883. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1883, page 310; Simpson, Cyclop. of Methodism, s.v.

## Mann, Carl[[@Headword:Mann, Carl]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born September 22, 1806, at Konigsbach, Baden. He studied at Tubingen; was in 1833 preacher at Wilhelmsdorf, Wurtemberg; in 1842 at Hochstetten, Baden; in 1852 at Wdssingen, near Durlach, and died at Eppingen, December 1, 1861. He published, Wie und wodurch is Martin Luther der grosse Bibel- Uebersetzer geworden? (Stuttgart, 1835): — Jubel-Buchlein der evangelishen Reformation in Wurtemberg (ibid. 1836): — Die augsburgische Confession erklart (Carlsruthe, 1842): — Evangelischer Cofirmations-Unterricht (1850): — Was thut unserer Kirche noth? (1843): — Die Bibel als das Wort des lebendigen Gottes an die Menschheit (1855). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:788; 2:303; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2:851; Koch, Gesch. des deutschen Kirchenliedes, 7:302 sq. (B.P.)

## Mann, Cyrus[[@Headword:Mann, Cyrus]]

             an American Congregational minister and author, was born at Oxford, N. H., April 3, 1785; was educated at Dartmouth College (class of 1806); was principal of Gilmanton Academy two years; teacher of the Troy high- school one year; tutor at Dartmouth College from 1809 to 1814; pastor of the Church at Westminster, Mass., from 1815 to 1841; then of Robinson Church, Plymouth, three years; next a teacher at Lowell several years;  finally, from 1852 to 1856 acting pastor of the North Falmouth Church. He died at Stoughton, Mass., Feb. 9, 1859. Mr. Mann published An Epitome of the Evidences of Christianity: — History of the Temperance Reformation: — Memoir of Mrs. Myra W. Allen; and some Sermons. — Drake, Dict. of Amer. Biog. p. 595.

## Mann, Horace[[@Headword:Mann, Horace]]

             LL.D., one of the most prominent educators in our country, a philanthropist whose name deserves to be honored by every American — “a soul whose life was a galvanic thrill along the muscles of our age” — was born, of very humble parentage, at Franklin, Mass., May 4, 1796. Though not privileged with the advantages of a careful training in his early boyhood, he yet managed to acquire a pretty good knowledge of the so- called “common branches.” At the age of twenty he resolved to secure for himself the advantages of a collegiate training. His instructors hitherto, he tells us himself, he had found to be “very good people, but very poor teachers.” He had lost his father when only thirteen years old, and since that time “all the family,” he tells us, “labored together for the common support, and toil was considered honorable, although it was sometimes of necessity excessive.” Notwithstanding all these disadvantages, Horace was bent upon a course of study in college. Within the short space of six months he had acquired a sufficient preparation to enter the sophomore year at Brown University, and at this institution he graduated, with the highest honors, in 1819. The subject of his graduating speech was “The Progressive Character of the Human Race.” This was always a favorite theme with him, and his first oration may be said to have foreshadowed his subsequent career as a philanthropist and statesman. After serving his alma mater for two years as instructor, he entered upon the study of jurisprudence at the law-school in Lichfield, and in 1823 was admitted to practice at Dedham. In 1827 he was elected to the legislature of Massachusetts, and during his connection with that body was distinguished for the zeal with which he devoted himself to the interests of education and temperance. His first speech was in favor of religious liberty. He was active in founding the State Lunatic Asylum. In 1831 he removed to Boston, and was elected in 1836 to the state senate, of which he became president.

At the organization of the Massachusetts Board of Education, June 29, 1837, Horace Mann was elected its secretary, and, as such, he served for eleven years. He now gave up all other business, withdrew from politics,  and devoted his whole time to the cause of education, introducing normal schools and paid committees. During these eleven years he worked fifteen hours a day, held teachers' conventions, gave lectures, and conducted a large correspondence. In 1843 he made a visit to educational establishments in Europe. His Report was reprinted both in England and America. In 1848 he was elected to Congress, as the successor of ex- president John Quincy Adams, whose example he followed in energetic opposition to the extension of slavery. Mr. Mann's years in Congress were those stormy cloud-gathering years whose records are labeled “Fillmore,” “Fugitive-Slave Law,” “New Mexico and California.” Staunch and steady he stood, a man of iron, in those days of compromise and political corruption. Hating slavery through every fibre of his soul, he had his weapon drawn whenever and wherever its crest arose. His great abilities as a statesman are evinced in his letters written at this time, foreshadowing the troubles of 186165.

His first speech in Congress was in advocacy of the right and duty of the national government to exclude slavery from the territories. In a letter dated Dec., 1848, he says on this subject, “I think the country is to experience serious times. Interference with slavery will excite civil commotion at the South. Still, it is best to interfere. Now is the time to see whether the United States is a rope of sand or a band of steel.” In another letter, dated January, 1850, he says, “Dark clouds overhang the future, and that is not all; they are full of lightning.” Again, “I really think that if we insist upon passing the Wilmot Proviso for the territories, that the South — a part of them — will rebel. But I would pass it, rebellion or no rebellion. I consider no evil so great as the extension of slavery.” After having spent two terms in Congress, we find Mr. Mann in 1853 embarking into a new and somewhat formidable enterprise — the establishment of a college at the West to be open to both sexes, and to be founded and conducted on the educational principles which he had espoused in Massachusetts, and which we shall presently pass in review.

The experiment made here for the co-education of the sexes proved a success, and in our own day the admission of young ladies to our best and highest schools is likely to be commendatory of Mr. Mann's enterprise in 1853. The labors and anxieties of this position at Antioch College, however, proved at length too much for his health, never strong, and now undermined by a life of the most intense and unremitting activity. The fiery soul consumed the body at last, Aug. 2,1859.  Mann on the Relation of Religion to Education. — Mr. Mann had been reared under the influence of the Calvinistic faith. While yet a youth he had cherished an aversion to this orthodox belief, because, as he tells us, it had taught him to look upon God as “Infinite Malignity personified.” When, at the mature age of forty, just as he entered on his work as an educator, he fell in with Combe's Constitution of Mann, he at once became a warm admirer of the theological, psychological, or anthropological school of which Mr. George Combe was the distinguished teacher. Education has certainly no less to do with the conscience and heart than with the understanding, as “most of our relations to our fellowmen, for which education is to prepare us. grow out of our relations to God;” it therefore should derive its knowledge from the holy Scriptures, and make these, indeed, the corner-stone. Mann, however, held that it should depend for its guidance on the lights of natural religion.

He came forward now to assert that “natural religion stands as pre-eminent over revealed religion as the deepest experience over the lightest hearsay,” and proposed to substitute, for the Christian influence which pervaded our whole educational institution, a system of “philosophical and moral doctrines,” the prevalence of which would, in his view, “produce a new earth at least, if not a new heaven.” Believing what is called the “evangelical faith,” at that time ruling New England, to be in its influence derogatory to the character of God, and dwarfing and enslaving to the mind of man, he conceived it to be his task to vindicate the former and to emancipate the latter. Especially he conceived it his mission to overcome the “foul spirit of orthodoxy,” so far as it entered the domain of the public schools, and this he believed to be “the greatest discovery ever made by man.” “Other social organizations,” he says, “are curative and remedial; this is a preventive and antidote. They come to heal diseases and wounds; this is to make the physical and moral frame invulnerable to them. Let the common school be expanded to its capabilities, let it be worked with the efficiency of which it is susceptible, and nine tenths of the crimes in the penal code would become obsolete — the long catalogue of human ills would be abridged — men would walk more safely by day — every pillow would be more inviting by night — property, life, and character held by a stronger tenureall rational hopes respecting the future brightened.

It is obvious that these glowing anticipations were born of something more, if not better, than reading, writing, and arithmetic.” Education was, in Mann's view, a word of much higher import than that popularly given to it. “Its function is to call out from within all that was divinely placed there, in the proportion requisite to  make a noble being.” It was one of his maxims, however, that “every human being should determine his religious belief for himself.” “It seems to me,” he says, “that a generation so trained would have an infinitely better chance of getting at the truth than the present generation has had.” Herein lay the greatest defect of the system he sought to establish in our schools. Stamping with the name of bigotry all religious views that did not coincide with his own, regarding orthodoxy as the great thraldom by which man was enslaved, he would introduce a system of Christian ethics and doctrine respecting virtue and vice, rewards and penalties, time and eternity, constituting the basis of his theories and schemes of popular education, which meant nothing else than the substitution of natural religion for revealed. How far Mr. Mann succeeded in this attempt we may judge by the prevalence of the doctrines of the so-called “liberal theology” in the Eastern States, particularly in Massachusetts. In the West he must certainly have been disappointed. Though more than a thousand students sat at his feet in Antioch, he was only in a very moderate degree successful in spreading “a religionism from whose features the young would not turn away.” But if Mr. Mann failed in meeting that success which a person of his indomitable will, uncommon energy, and rare acquirements must have looked for and desired, we would not in the least detract from the value of his labors in behalf of education among the masses, and the greatness of his services to common-school education in America.

Besides his annual reports, a volume of lectures on education, and voluminous controversial writings, his principal work is Slavery: Letters and Speeches (Boston. 1851). Since his decease all his writings have been collected and published by his wife, under the title The Works of Horace Mann (Cambridge, 1867 sq., 2 vols. 8vo). See Life of Horace Mann, by his wife (Boston, 1865, 12mo); Thomas, Dict. Biog. and Mythol.; Princeton Review, 1866 (January); reprinted in the Brit. and For. Evan. Review, 1866 (August). (J. H. W.)

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

             D.D., an American educator of note, was born in Burlington County, N. Y., about the year 1784. When quite young he was placed in a printing- office, where he remained until his fourteenth year. Though unable to attend school a single day, he acquired a thorough education by private study. He was converted in his 23d year. joined the Methodist Episcopal Church, and shortly after became a local preacher. The principal part of his  life after this time was devoted to teaching. He was for some years principal of Matthew Holly Academy, in his native state. Subsequently he removed to Philadelphia, where he maintained a high reputation for his success in teaching the classics. The degree of D.D. was conferred upon him by Dickinson College. He died in Philadelphia July 4,1867. — New An. Cyclop. 1867, p. 567.

## Manna[[@Headword:Manna]]

             (מָן, man, according to Gesenius, a portion, from the Arabic; but a different derivation is alluded to in the passage where it first occurs [see Thym, De origine vocis Manna, etc., Vitemb. 1641]), the name given to the miraculous food upon which the Israelites were fed for forty years during their wanderings in the desert. The same name has in later ages been applied to some natural productions, chiefly found in warm, dry countries, but which have little or no resemblance to the original manna. This is first mentioned in Exodus 16. It is there described as being first produced after the eighth encampment in the desert of Sin, as white like hoar frost (or of the color of bdellium, Num 11:7), round, and of the bigness of coriander seed (gad). It fell with the dew every morning, and when the dew was exhaled by the heat of the sun, the manna appeared alone, lying upon the ground or the rocks round the encampment of the Israelites. “When the children of Israel saw it, they said one to another, What is it? for they knew not what it was” (Exo 16:15). In the authorized and some other versions this passage is inaccurately translated — which, indeed, is apparent from the two parts of the sentence contradicting each other (“It is manna; for they wist not what it was”).

The word occurs only in Exo 16:15; Exo 16:31; Exo 16:33; Exo 16:5; Num 11:6-7; Num 11:9; Deu 8:3; Deu 8:16; Jos 5:12; Neh 9:20; Psa 78:24. In the Sept. the substance is almost always called manna (μάννα, and so the N. Test. always: Joh 6:31; Joh 6:49; Joh 6:58; Heb 9:4; Rev 2:17; also the Apocrypha, Wis 16:20-21) instead of man (μάν, Exo 16:31; Exo 16:33; Exo 16:35). Josephus (Ant. 3:1, 6), in giving an account of this substance, thus accords with the textual etymology: “The Hebrews call this food manna (μάννα), for the particle manuz (μάν) in our language is the asking of a question, ‘What is this?' (Heb. מִןאּהוּא, man-hu).” Moses answered this question by telling them, “This is the bread which the Lord hath given you  to eat.” We are further informed that the manna fell every day, except on the Sabbath. Every sixth day, that is on Friday, there fell a double quantity of it. Every man was directed to gather an omer (about three English quarts) for each member of his family; and the whole seems afterwards to have been measured out at the rate of an omer to each person: “He who gathered much had nothing over, and he who gathered little had no lack.” That which remained ungathered dissolved in the heat of the sun, and was lost. The quantity collected was intended for the food of the current day only, for if any were kept till next morning it corrupted and bred worms. Yet it was directed that a double quantity should be gathered on the sixth day for consumption on the Sabbath. It was found that the manna kept for the Sabbath remained sweet and wholesome, notwithstanding that it corrupted at other times if kept for more than one day. In the same manner as they would have treated grain, they reduced it to meal, kneaded it into dough, and baked it into cakes, and the taste of it was like that of wafers made with honey or of fresh oil. In Num 11:6-9, where the description of the manna is repeated, an omer of it is directed to be preserved as a memorial to future generations, ‘that they may see the bread wherewith I have fed you in the wilderness;” and in Jos 5:12 we learn that after the Israelites had encamped at Gilgal, and “did eat of the old corn of the land, the manna ceased on the morrow after, neither had the children of Israel manna any more.”

This miracle is referred to in Deu 8:3; Neh 9:20; Psa 78:24; Joh 6:31; Joh 6:49; Joh 6:58; Heb 9:4. Though the manna of Scripture was so evidently miraculous, both in the mode and in the quantities in which it was produced, and though its properties were so different from anything with which we are acquainted. yet, because its taste is in Exodus said to be like that of wafers made with honey, many writers have thought that they recognized the manna of Scripture in a sweetish exudation which is found on several plants in Arabia and Persia. The name man, or manna, is applied to this substance by the Arab writers, and was probably so applied even before their time. But the term is now almost entirely appropriated to the sweetish exudation of the ash-trees of Sicily and Italy (Ornus Europaea and Fiaxuinus rotundidfilia). These, however, have no relation to the supposed manna of Scripture. Of this one kind is known to the Arabs by the name of guzunjbin, being the produce of a plant called guz, which is ascertained to be a species of tamarisk.

The same species seems also to be called turfa, and is common along different parts  of the coast of Arabia. It is also found in the neighborhood of Mount Sinai. Burckhardt, while in the valley wady el-Sheik, to the north of Mount Serbal, says: “In many parts it was thickly overgrown with the tamarisk or turfa; it is the only valley in the Peninsula where this tree grows at present in any quantity, though some small bushes are here and there met with in other parts. It is from the tufa that the manna is obtained; and it is very strange that the fact should have remained unknown in Europe till M. Seetzen mentioned it in a brief notice of his ‘Tour to Sinai,' published in the Mines de l'Orient. The substance is called by the Arabs mann. In the month of June it drops from the thorns of the tamarisk upon the fallen twigs, leaves, and thorns which always cover the ground beneath the tree in the natural state. The Arabs use it as they do honey, to pour over their unleavened bread, or to dip their bread into; its taste is agreeable, somewhat aromatic, and as sweet as honey. If eaten in any quantity it is said to be highly purgative.” He further adds that the tamarisk is one of the most common trees in Nubia and throughout the whole of Arabia; on the Euphrates, on the Astaboras, in all the valleys of the Hejaz and Beja it grows in great quantities, yet nowhere but in the region of Mount Sinai did he hear of its producing manna. Ehrenberg has examined and described this species of tamarisk, which he calls T. manunifera, but which is considered to be only a variety of T. gallica. The manna he considers to be produced by the puncture of an insect which he calls Coccus manniparus. Others have been of the same opinion. When Lieut Wellsted visited this place in the month of September, he found the extremities of the twigs and branches retaining the peculiar sweetness and flavor which characterize the manna. The Bedouins collect it early in the morning,, and, after straining it through a cloth, place it either in skins or gourds; a considerable quantity is consumed by themselves; a portion is sent to Cairo, and some is also disposed of to the monks at Mount Sinai. The latter retail it to the Russian pilgrims. “The Bedouins assured me that the whole quantity collected throughout the Peninsula, in the most fruitful season, did not exceed 150 wogas (about 700 pounds); and that it was usually disposed of at the rate of 60 dollars the woga” (Travels in Arabia, 1:511).

Another kind of manna, which has been supposed to be that of Scripture, is yielded by a thorny plant very common from the north of India to Syria, which by the Arabs is called Al-haj, whence botanists have constructed the name Alhagi. The two species have been called Alhagi Mauorum and A.  desertorum. Both species are also by the Arabs called ushter-khar, or “‘camel's-thorn;” and in Mesopotamia aqul, according to some authorities, while by others this is thought to be the name of another plant. The Alhagi Maurorum is remarkable for the exudation of a sweetish juice, which concretes into small granular masses, and which is usually distinguished by the name of Persian manna. The late professor Don was so confident that this was the same substance as the manna of Scripture that he proposed calling the plant itself Manna Hebraica. The climate of Persia and Bokhara seems also well suited to the secretion of this manna, which in the latter country is employed as a substitute for sugar, and is imported into India for medicinal use through Caubul and Khorassan. In Arabian and Persian works on Materia Medica it is called Turungbin. These two, from the localities in which they are produced, have alone been thought to be the manna of Scripture. But, besides these, there are, several other kinds of manna. Burckhardt, during his journey through El-Ghor, in the valley of the Jordan, heard of the Beiruk honey.

This is described as a substance obtained from the leaves and branches of a tree called Gharb or Gasrrab, of the size of an olive-tree, and with leaves like those of the poplar. When fresh this grayish-colored exudation is sweet in taste, but in a few days it becomes sour. The Arabs eat it like honey. One kind, called Shir-khisht, is said to be produced in the country of the Uzbecs. A Caubul merchant informed Dr. Royle that it was produced by a tree called Gundeleh, which grows in Candahar, and is about twelve feet high, with jointed stems. A fifth kind is produced on Caloropis procera, or the plant called Ashur. The sweet exudation is by Arab authors ranked with sugars, and called Shukur- al-ashur. It is described under this name by Avicenna, and in the Latin translation it is called Zuccarunz-al-husar. A sixth kind, called Bedkhisht, is described in Persian works on Materia Medica as being produced on a species of willow in Persian Khorassan. Another kind would appear to be produced on a species of oak, for Niebuhr says, “At Merdin, in Mesopotamia, it appears like a kind of pollen on the leaves of the tree called Ballot and Afs (or, according to the Aleppo pronunciation, As), which I take to be of the oak family. All are agreed that between Merdin and Diarbekir manna is obtained, and principally from those trees which yield gall-nuts.” Besides these there is a sweetish exudation found on the larch, which is called Manna brigantiaca, as there is also one kind found on the cedar of Lebanon. Indeed a sweetish secretion is found on the leaves of many other plants, produced sometimes by the plant itself, at others by the punctures of insects. It has been supposed also that these sweetish  exudations, being evaporated during the heat of the day in still weather, may afterwards become deposited, with the dew, on the ground and on the leaves of plants, and thus explain some of the phenomena which have been observed by travelers and others. According to Colossians Chesney, “The most remarkable production in ancient Assyria is the celebrated vegetable known here by the name of manna, which in Turkish is most expressively called Kzudret-hal-vassiz, or ‘the divine sweetmeat.' It is found on the leaves of the dwarf oak, and also, though less plentifully and scarcely so good, on those of the tamarisk and several other plants. It is occasionally deposited on the sand, and also on rocks and stones.

The latter is of a pure white color, and appears to be more esteemed than the tree manna. It is collected chiefly at two periods of the year, first in the early part of spring, and again towards the end of autumn; in either case the quality depends upon the rain that may have fallen, or at least on the abundance of the dews, for in the seasons which happen to be quite dry it is understood that little or none is obtained. In order to collect the manna the people go out before sunrise, and having placed cloths under the oak, larch, tamarisk, and several other kinds of shrubs, the manna is shaken down in such quantities from the branches as to give a supply for the market after providing for the wants of the different members of the family. The Kurds not only eat manna in its natural state, as they do bread or dates, but their women make it into a kind of paste; being in this state like honey, it is added to other ingredients used in preparing sweetmeats, which, in some shape or other, are found in every house throughout the East. The manna, when partially cleaned, is carried to the market at Mosul in goat-skins, and there sold in lumps at the rate of 4.5, pounds for about 2.5 d. But for family consumption, or to send to a distance out of the country, it is first thoroughly cleansed from the fragments of leaves and other foreign matter by boiling. In the natural state it is described as being of a delicate white color. It is also still, as in the time of the Israelites, like coriander seed, and of a moderate but agreeable sweetness” (Euphrates Expedition, 1:123).

“The manna of European commerce comes mostly from Calabria and Sicily. It is gathered during the months of June and July from some species of ash (Ornus Europaea and Ornus rotundifolia), from which it drops in consequence of a puncture by an insect resembling the locust, but distinguished from it by having a sting under its body. The substance is fluid at night, and resembles the dew, but in the morning it begins to harden.”  “The natural products of the Arabian deserts and other Oriental regions, which bear the name of manna, have not the qualities or uses ascribed to the manna of Scripture. They are all condiments or medicines rather than food, stimulating or purgative rather than nutritious; they are produced only three or four months in the year, from May to August, and not all the sear round; they come only in small quantities, never affording anything like 15,000,000 pounds a week, which must have been requisite for the subsistence of the whole Israelitish camp, since each man had an omer (or three English quarts) a day, and that for forty years; they can be kept for a long time, and do not become useless in a day or two; they are just as liable to deteriorate on the Sabbath as on any other day; nor does a double quantity fall on the day preceding the Sabbath; nor would natural products cease at once and forever, as the manna is represented as ceasing in the book of Joshua. The manna of Scripture we therefore regard as wholly miraculous, and not in any respect a product of nature.”

Manna is the emblem or symbol of immortality (Rev 2:17): “I will give him to eat of the hidden manna;” i.e. the true bread of God, which came down from heaven, referring to the words of Christ in Joh 6:51, a much greater instance of God's favor than feeding the Israelites with manna in the wilderness. It is called hidden, or laid up, in allusion to that which was laid up in a golden vessel in the holy of holies of the tabernacle (comp. Exo 16:33-34, and Heb 9:4).

See Liebentanz, De Manna (Vitemb. 1667); Zeibich, De miraculo Mannae Israeliticae (Gerae, 1770); Hoheisel, De vasculo Mannae (Jen. 1715); Schramm, De urna Mannae (Herb. 1723); Fabri Historia Mannae, in Fabri et Reiskii Opusc. sled. Arab. (Hal. 1776), p. 121; Hardwick, in Asiatic Researches, 14:182; Frederic, in Transact. of the Lit. Society of Bombay (Lond. 1819), 1:251; Ehrenberg, Symbol. Phys. (Berl. 1829); Martius, Pharnakogn. p. 327; Oedmann, Sanml. 6:1; Buxtorf, Exercit. (Basil. 1659), p. 335 (and in Ugolini, Thesaur. vol. viii); Rosenmüller, Alterthumsk. 4:316 sq.; Kitto, Daily Bible Illust. ad loc.; Tristram, Nat. Hist. of Bible, p. 362; comp. Robinson's Researches, 1:470, 550; and other Oriental travelers.

## Mannheim[[@Headword:Mannheim]]

             in Norse mythology, was one of the nine worlds of Northern fable, the middle designed as the habitation of men.

## Mannheimer, Isaak Noa[[@Headword:Mannheimer, Isaak Noa]]

             one of the most celebrated of modern Jewish pulpit orators and theologians, was born at Copenhagen, Denmark, Oct. 17,1793. His father was the reader of the synagogue of the Danish capital, and, anxious to  afford his Isaak all the advantages of modern culture, placed the child in a school at the tender age of three years and a half. When only nine years old, Isaak was introduced to the study of the Talmud, and at the age of responsibility (thirteen) was noted for his great erudition in Jewish tradition. In his secular studies, also, he made rapid progress, and promised much for the future. In 1808 he entered the gymnasium, and by 1814 he was ready to pass his examination for admission to the university. Here he devoted himself to the study of philosophy, philology, and the Oriental languages. Scarcely had his course been completed when the government offered him employment as catechist of the Jewish society of his native place; he accepted the proffered position, and served his people to their great satisfaction. About this time the reformatory movements among the Jews of Northern Europe were taking place, and Mannheimer became one of the leaders in the progressive step. He was especially encouraged by a personal acquaintance with the German-Jewish reformer Jacobson, whom he met in Berlin, .whither he was called in 1821, as pastor of the Temple. But, by the interference of the government, the reform movement was greatly barred there, and, after a vain struggle with the orthodox, he accepted a call from Vienna in 1824, and removed to the Austrian capital in June, 1825.

Austria, which was always slow to grant religious liberty to non-Roman-Catholics, had not up to this time recognized the Jews as a religious sect, and, without authority to act as pastor, Mannheimer was called to perform substantially similar duties in the official capacity of “principal of the Religious School” (“Direktor der Wiener Kaiserlich Konigl. offentlichen israelitischen Religionsschule”). Though personally decidedly in favor of the reform movement inaugurated by Jacobson and others, he felt it his duty, in this new relation, to assume a conservative position, and by his moderation and wisdom succeeded in building up one of the best Jewish congregations in Germany. His great oratorical talent did much to swell the number of his auditors, but his success as a leader of the Jews of the Austrian capital is due solely to his determination “to produce no rupture in the Jewish camp.” He served his people faithfully to the end of his terrestrial course, March 17,1865. His influence on the Jews of Germany, however, still remains, and will be felt for years to come. During the stormy days of 1848 he represented his people in the nation's councils, as a deputy from Lemberg (Gallicia). His humane principles are manifest in his exertions for the abolishment of capital punishment. “Isaak Noa Mannheimer,” says Grtitz (Gesch. d. Juden, 11:433), “might be called the embodied nobility of the Jews. He was a perfect man.... The inner and  outer man, disposition and wit, inspiration and wisdom, ideal life and practical safety, poetical talent and sober sense, childlike goodness and hitting sarcasm, gushing oratory and earnest activity, love for Judaism and a special liking for reform, were in his being most harmoniously blended.” As a pulpit orator he had no peer among his Hebrew brethren. Unfortunately, however, but few of his sermons were ever printed. For a list of them see Kayserling. Bibliothek jud. Kanzelredner, Jahrgang i (Berl. 1870), p. 291. His other works consist of a translation of the Jewish Prayer-book for Sabbath and holy-days (Sidur and Machzor), a few polemical tracts, and a translation of part of the Bible for Salomon's German version. For the study of homiletics his sermons are valued by both Christian and Jewish divines. See, besides Grätz and Kayserling, Ehrentheil Jüd. Charakterbilder (Rest. 1867), 1:57-66; Wolf, Isak Noa Maneheinler (Vienna, 1863); the same, Gesch. d. israelit. Culiusgemeinde in Wien (1861); Geiger, Zeitschrift, 3:167 sq. (J. H. W.)

## Manning, Henry Edward, D.D[[@Headword:Manning, Henry Edward, D.D]]

             a Roman Catholic prelate, was born at Potteredge Hertfordshire, July 15, 1808. He graduated from Baliol College, Oxford, in 1830, and was elected fellow of Merton College. In 1834 he became rector at Lavington, and in 1840 archdeacon of Chichester. He was a leader in the "Oxford movement," and in 1851 gave up his preferments and went to Rome, studying there until 1854. Returning to England in 1857, he organized at Bayswater, "The Oblates of St. Charles Borromeo," and became their first superior, founding a university at Kensington in 1874. He became successively provost of the archdiocese of Westminster, 1857, prothonotary apostolic, 1860, archbishop of Westminster, 1865, cardinal priest, 1875. He occupied a seat in the Vatican council of 1869-70. He died in 1890. He was the author of a large number of volumes. See W.S. Lilly, Cardinal Manning's Characteristics, Political, Philosophical, and Religious (1885).

## Manning, Jacob Merrill, D.D[[@Headword:Manning, Jacob Merrill, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Greenwood, N.Y., December 31, 1824. He studied at Prattsburg, in 1850 graduated from Amherst College, and in 1853 from Andover Theological Seminary; was ordained pastor of the Mystic Church, Medford, Massachusetts, January 5, 1854, and dismissed February 17, 1857. The latter year he was installed as associate pastor of Old South Church, Boston, and so remained until 1872, when he became the sole pastor. He became pastor emeritus, March 15, 1882, and died November 29 of the same year. Among his published addresses and sermons are the following: — The Death of Abraham Lincoln (1865): — Peace under Liberty (eod.): — Half Truths and The Truth (1873): — Helps to a Life of Prayer (1875), etc. See Cong. Year-book, 1883, page 26.

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

             D.D., a Baptist minister, was born at Elizabethtown, N.J., Oct. 22, 1738, and was educated at Princeton College (class of 1762). Soon after the completion of his collegiate course he was ordained pastor of a Baptist Church in Morristown, N. J., but he remained only a year, and then became pastor of the Baptist Church in Warren, R. I. During his ministry there he instituted a Latin school, which seems to have been the germ of the great Baptist College, now the Brown University, he having been chiefly instrumental in the procuring of the charter in 1764. He was appointed its first president and professor of languages in 1765, when the college went into operation at Warren, whence it was removed to Providence in 1770, and was given the name it now bears. President Manning remained connected with the college until his death, July 29, 1791. During his residence at Providence, however, he was also pastor of a church for twenty years, absenting himself only for some six months in 1786, when he was chosen member of Congress for Rhode Island. “Dr. Manning was equally known in the religious, political. and literary world. Nature had given him distinguished abilities. The resources of his genius seemed adequate to all duties and occasions. He was of a kind and benevolent disposition, social and communicative in habit, and enchanting in manners. His life was a scene of labor for the benefit of others. His piety, and his fervent zeal in preaching the Gospel, evinced his love to God and man. With a most graceful form, a dignified and majestic appearance, his address  was manly, familiar, and engaging, his voice harmonious, and his eloquence irresistible. In the government of the college he was mild, yet energetic. He lived beloved and died lamented, beyond the lot of ordinary men. The good order, learning, and respectability of the Baptist churches in the Eastern States, under God, are much owing to his personal influence, and assiduous attention to their welfare” (Benedict, 2:346). See Guild (R. H.), Life, Times, and Correspondence of Dr. James Manning (1864, 8vo); Sprague, Annals, 6:89.

## Manning, John H., D.D[[@Headword:Manning, John H., D.D]]

             a minister of the Reformed (Dutch) Church, graduated from Rutgers College in 1844, and New Brunswick Seminary in 1847; was licensed by the Classis of New Brunswick the same year; was pastor at Spotswood  from 1847 to 1854; South Brooklyn from 1854 to 1873, and thereafter remained without a charge until his death, October 25, 1878. See Corwin, Manual of the Ref. Church in America, 3d ed. page 366.

## Manning, Owen[[@Headword:Manning, Owen]]

             an English clergyman, was born at Orlingburg, Northamptonshire, in 1721; was educated at Queen's College, Cambridge, of which he became fellow in 1741; became prebend of Lincoln in 1760; in 1763, vicar of Godalming, Surrey; in 1769, rector of Pepperharrow, and died in 1807. Mr. Manning published Two Occasional Sermons: — Sermons on Important Subjects (1812, 2 vols. 12mo): — Discourse on Justification, Rom 3:28; published by Rev. J. H. Todd, with a discourse of Abp. Sharp's (1829, 8vo); and several works of a secular character. — Allibone, Dict. Brit. and Amer. Auth. s.v.; Thomas, Dict. of Biog. s.v.

## Manning, Samuel, LL.D[[@Headword:Manning, Samuel, LL.D]]

             an English Baptist minister, was born at Leicester, November 26, 1821. He was educated at Bristol College, and spent a few terms of study in the Glasgow University. In 1846 he accepted the pastorate of the Church at Sheppard's Barton, Frome, where he remained fifteen years. His labors were eminently successful, and his influence was widely felt. He contributed to the Eclectic Review, the Christian Spectator, and other periodicals; and in 1857 took the entire editorial management of the Baptist Magazine. In 1861 he became book editor of the Religious Tract Society, an office which he was in a high degree qualified to adorn. His talents for the next fifteen years were devoted to the elevation of literature to the Christian standard. In 1876 he became secretary of the same society, and remained an efficient officer until the close of his life, Sept. 13,1881. Among his publications are several illustrated volumes, viz.: Italian Pictures: — Swiss Pictures: — Spanish Pictures: — American Pictures: — Those Holy Fields: — and The Land of the Pharaohs. See (Lond.) Baptist Hand-book, 1882, page 307.

## Mannus[[@Headword:Mannus]]

             according to Tacitus, the name given by the Germans to the son of the earth-born god Tuisco. From his three sons they derived their three great tribes, the Ingavones, the Iskavones, and the Herminones. Mannus belongs, not to the Teutonic people alone, but to the great mythus of the origin of the human race, common to the whole Aryan family, and, like the Hindu Mannu or Manus, stands forth as the progenitor of the inhabitants of earth endowed with reason. The name is derived from the Aryan root mian, to think. Compare Wackernagel, in Haupt's Zeitschrift für Deutsches Alterthum, vol. vi.

## Manoah[[@Headword:Manoah]]

             (Heb. Manoach,: מָנוֹח, rest, as in Gen 8:9, and often; Sept. Μανωέ; Josephus Μανώχης, Ant, v. 8, 2 [where the Biblical narrative is greatly embellished]; Vulg. Manue), the father of Samson, of the tribe of Dan, and a native of Zorah (Jdg 13:2-22; Jdg 16:31). B.C. 1185. “The narrative of the Bible (Jdg 13:1-23), of the circumstances which preceded the birth of Samson, supplies us with very few and faint traits of  Manoah's character or habits. He seems to have had some occupation which separated him during part of the day from his wife, though that was not field-work, because it was in the field that his wife was found by the angel during his absence. He was hospitable, as his forefather Abraham had been before him; he was a worshipper of Jehovah, and reverent even to a degree of fear. We hear of Manoah once again in connection with the marriage of Samson and the Philistine of Timnath. His father and his mother remonstrated with him thereon, but to no purpose (Jdg 14:2-3). They then accompanied him to Timnath, both on the preliminary visit (Jdg 14:5-6) and to the marriage itself (Jdg 14:9-10). Manoah appears not to have survived his son: not he, but Samson's brothers, went down to Gaza for the body of the hero, and bringing it up to the family tomb between Zorah and Eshtaol, reunited the father to the son (16:31) whose birth had been the subject of so. many prayers and so much anxiety. Milton, however, does not take this view. In Samson Agonistes Manoah bears a prominent part throughout, and lives to bury his son.' SEE SAMSON.

## Manse[[@Headword:Manse]]

             the Scottish name synonymous with our word parsonage. In Scotland the manse, with unendowed churches, is the property of the Church, erected and maintained by it. In the Established Church it is built and maintained by law, and belongs to the heritors. Dunlop says, “While manses and houses which had belonged to the popish clergy were still standing, these, of course, fell to be first designed for a manse, and an order of designation, similar to that prescribed by the act of 1593 as to glebes, seems to have been followed. SEE GLEBE.

A minister accordingly was not allowed to have a manse designed to him within the precincts of an abbey or bishop's palace if there was a parson's or vicar's manse in the parish; nor was he entitled to any house which, though erected on Church lands, had not of old belonged to any kirkman, or incumbent serving at the church. Where there is no manse in a parish the minister is entitled to have designed to him by the presbytery of the bounds half an acre of land for the manse, offices, and garden, and to have the heritors ordained to erect a manse and offices thereon. The statutes regarding manses require that they shall be situated near the parish church; and in general the manse and glebe are contiguous. The presbytery are, of course, in the designation of a new manse, entitled, in the first instance, to fix its situation; and even in the case of an old manse to be rebuilt they may fix on a new situation, always, of course, within the ground or glebe allotted to the minister.

The act of 1663 provides ‘that  where competent manses are not already built,' the heritors shall ‘build competent manses to their ministers, the expenses thereof not exceeding one thousand pounds, and not being beneath five hundred merks;' and it has been questioned whether, in respect of the phrase ‘competent manses,' heritors can be compelled to expend a greater sum than one thousand pounds Scots on the erection of a manse.” Hill says, “‘The law of Scotland provides the minister of every country parish with a dwelling-house, called a manse, a garden, a glebe of not less than four acres of arable land, designed' out of lands in the parish near the manse, and with grass, over and above the glebe, for one horse and two cows; and with the out-houses necessary for the management of his small farm. As the act of James VI, parl. 3, c. 48, declares that the manse and glebe shall be marked and designed by the archbishop, bishop, superintendent, or commissioner of each diocese or province, upon whose testimonial being presented by the minister, the lords of Council and Session are instructed to direct letters, charging the former occupiers to remove, and entering the minister to possession; as the act of Charles II, parl. 1, sess. 3, c. 21, ordains that the heritors of the parish, at the sight of the bishop of the diocese, or such ministers as he shall appoint, with two or three of the most knowing and discreet men of the parish, build competent manses to the ministers; and as, by the settlement of presbyterian government in Scotland, the presbytery has come in place of the bishop, all applications concerning manses and glebes are made, in the first instance, to the presbytery of the bounds. After taking the regular steps suitable to the nature of the business, which, as a civil court specially constituted for that purpose, they are called to discuss, the presbytery pronounce a decreet; and their sentence, unless brought by a bill of suspension before the Court of Session, is binding upon all concerned.” Prior to the Reformation, canon 13 ordained that every parish should have a dwelling for the minister, built at the expense of the parsons and their vicars, the support of it afterwards falling as a burden on the vicars. By the General Assembly of 1563 ministers having manses were required to live in them.

## Manser, George B., D.D[[@Headword:Manser, George B., D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal minister, was born at New Haven, Connecticut, August 8, 1803. He graduated from Dartmouth College in 1827; studied law; for several years was secretary of civil and military affairs, but afterwards entered the ministry; and for about nine years was rector of the parish in Montpelier, Vermont, which he himself had organized. In 1850 he took charge of St. Peter's Church in Bennington, where he remained until death, November 17, 1862. See Amer. Quar. Church Rev. April 1863, page 151.

## Mansey, Henry Longueviille[[@Headword:Mansey, Henry Longueviille]]

             one of the leading English divines of our day, noted particularly for his ability as a philosopher of the Hamiltonian school, was born in 1820 in the parish of Cosgrove, Northamptonshire, of which his father was then rector. He was educated at Merchant Taylors' School, and later at St. John's College, Oxford, where he graduated in 1843. He was shortly after  ordained, and served the Church in various positions until 1855, when he was appointed reader in moral and metaphysical philosophy at Magdalen College, Oxford, and in 1859 became the Waynfiete professor. In 1867 he was made regius professor of ecclesiastical history, and at the same time also canon of Christ Church, Oxford. In October, 1868, he was appointed dean of St. Paul's, London, and died in the English metropolis in 1871. His works are: Aldrich's Logic, with Notes (1849): — Prolegomena Logica (1851): — article “Metaphysics,” in the 8th ed. of the Encyclopaedia Britannica (1857), afterwards published separately: — Bampton Lectures — The Limits of Religious Thought (1858): — The Philosophy of the Conditioned (1866), in reply to Mill's Review of Hamilton's Philosophy. He was also one of the editors of Sir William Hamilton's Lectures. Mansel wrote in a clear and elegant style. His Bampton Lectures occasioned much controversy, both theological and philosophical. In the first one mentioned, on The Limits of Religious Thought, which passed through a number of editions, both in England and in this country, he takes as the basis of his arguments Sir W. Hamilton's position that “the unconditioned is incognizable and inconceivable.” This treatise of Mansel is regarded as “one of the most important applications of the Hamiltonian philosophy to questions of religion.” Farrar (in his Crit. Hist. of Free Thought. p. 470) thus speaks of The Limits of Religious Thought: “It is a work which is valuable for its method, even if the reader differs (as the author of these lectures does in some respects) from the philosophical principles maintained, or occasionally even from the results attained. It is an attempt to reconstruct the argument of Butler from the subjective side. As Butler showed that the difficulties which are in revealed religion are equally applicable to natural, so Mr. Mansel wishes to show that the difficulties which the mind feels in reference to religion are parallel with those which are felt by it in reference to philosophy. Since the time of Kant a subjective tone has passed over philosophy. The phenomena are now studied in the mind, not in nature; in our mode of viewing, not in the object viewed. Hence Butler's argument needed reconstructing on its psychological side. Mr. Mansel has attempted to effect this; and the book must always in this respect have a value, even to the minds of those who are diametrically opposed to its principles and results. Even if the details were wrong, the method would be correct, of studying psychology before ontology; of finding the philosophy of religion, not, as Leibnitz attempted, objectively in a theodicee, but subjectively, by the analysis of the religious faculties; learning the length of the sounding-line before attempting to fathom the  ocean.” See The Nation (N.Y.), Jan. 10, 1867, p. 27 sq.; Grote, Review of Niel's Examination of Hamilton's Philosophy (Lond. 1868, 18mo), p. 43 sq.; McCosh, Intuitions of the Mind (see Index); Porter, Human Intellect (Index). SEE HAMILTON, SIR W. (J. H. W.)

## Mansfield, Richard, D.D[[@Headword:Mansfield, Richard, D.D]]

             a minister of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born at New Haven, Connecticut, in 1724. In 1741 he graduated from Yale College, and devoted two years to study as a resident-graduate. For three years, from 1744, he was principal of a grammarschool in New Haven. In 1748 he was ordained in London by the archbishop of Canterbury, and received an  appointment from the Society for Propagating the Gospel in Foreign Parts. Returning to America in 1749, he began his missionary work in Derby, Conn., in connection with West Haven, Waterbury, and Northbury, a position which he retained until his death, in April 1820. In 1775 he was compelled to flee for a time from his churches and family to the town of Hempstead, because of his adherence to the English crown. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 5:131.

## Mansi, J., Dominicus[[@Headword:Mansi, J., Dominicus]]

             a noted Italian prelate, was born in Lucca Feb. 16, 1692; entered the Church at an early age, and was for a long time professor of theology at Naples. He was created archbishop in 1765, and died Sept. 27, 1769. He was distinguished for his historical and philological acquirements, as also for his zeal as a compiler. Among his principal works are Supplementum, collectionis concilior. et decretorum Nicol. Coleti (Lucre, 1748-52, 6 vols.): — his own very complete collection, Sacrorum conciliorums nova et namplissima collectio, etc. (Florent. et Venet. 1759-88. 31 vols.), which was continued after his death. He published also a valuable edition of St. Baluzii Miscellanea (Lucca, 1761, 2 vols.), and the splendid Lucca edition of Baronius's Annal. Eccles., with the continuation by Raynaldus (1738- 56); a new edition of Natalis Alexandri Historia eccles. Vet. Novique Test. (Lucre, 1748-52), and of J. A. Fabricii Bibl. Lat. need. et inf. cet. (Patavii. 1754). He also published the 2d edition of the important Memoirie della Gran Contessa Matilda da Fr. M. liorentini (Lucca, 1756), to which he made many important additions. He wrote also De epochis conciliorum Sardicensis et Sirmiensium. See Ant. Zatti, Commentar. de vita et scriptis J. D. Mansi (Ven. 1772); Anton. Lombardi, Storia della letteratura- Italiana nel secolo xviii (Modena, 1827); Sarteschi, De Scriptoribus Congreg. Matris Dei, p. 352; Saxii Onon. lit. 7:4 sq.; Baur, Neues hist.biog. — lit. Handb. 3:488; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 33:259; Herzog, Real-Encyklopädie, 9:1. SEE MAMACHI.

## Mansionarii[[@Headword:Mansionarii]]

             (παραμονάριοι), a class of functionaries who were not only keepers of churches, but especially bailiffs or stewards of the glebes or lands belonging to the Church or the bishop. SEE DOORKEEPERS.

## Mansionaticum[[@Headword:Mansionaticum]]

             SEE TAXES.

## Manslayer[[@Headword:Manslayer]]

             (מְרִצֵּח, meratstse'äch, a murderer, ἀνδροφόνος, 1Ti 1:9, as sometimes rendered), one who by an accidental homicide was entitled to the benefit of asylum (Num 35:6; Num 35:12; elsewhere usually “slayer”). SEE BLOOD-REVENGE. “One of the most peculiar provisions in the statute respecting the manslayer was the limitation of the period of his compulsory residence in one of the cities of refuge: The shall abide in it until the death of the high-priest, which was anointed with the holy oil.' After that he was allowed to ‘return into the land of his possession' (Num 35:28). Different reasons have been assigned by commentators for making the one event dependent on the other, which it is unnecessary to particularize. As the enactment was intended for the whole body of the people, and is recorded in Scripture without any explanation, the most simple view that can be taken of it is likely to be the nearest to the truth. One thing, however, all knew respecting the anointed high-priest, viz. that he was the head and representative of the whole community in matters pertaining to life and death; and as some limitation would evidently require to be set to the restraint laid on the manslayer, the thought would naturally commend itself to the people to make responsibility for an accidental death cease and determine with the death of him who stood nearest to God in matters of that description. In the general relations of the community a change had entered in that respect, which touched all interests, and it was fit that it should specially touch those who had been casually bereft of the freedom of life.” “The principle on which the ‘man-slayer' was to be allowed to escape, viz. that the person slain was regarded as delivered into his hand' by the Almighty, was obviously open to much wilfull perversion (1Sa 24:4; 1Sa 24:18; 1Sa 26:8; compare Philo, De Spec. Leg. 3:21; 2:320), though the cases mentioned appear to be a sufficient sample of the intention of the lawgiver.

a. Death by a blow in a sudden quarrel (Num 35:22).

b. Death by a stone or missile thrown at random (ib. 22, 23).

c. By the blade of an Axe flying from its handle (Deu 19:5).

d. Whether the case of a person killed by falling from a roof unprovided with a parapet involved the guilt of manslaughter on the owner is not clear; but the law seems intended to prevent the imputation of malice in any such case, by preventing, as far as possible, the occurrence of the fact itself  (Deu 22:8) (Michaelis, Oz the Laws of Moses, arts. 223, 280, ed. Smith).

In all these and the like cases the manslayer was allowed to retire to a city of refuge. SEE CITY OF REFUGE. Besides these, the following may be mentioned as cases of homicide:

a. An animal, not known to be vicious, causing death to a human being, was to be put to death, and regarded as unclean. But if it was known to be vicious, the owner also was liable to fine, and even death (Exo 21:28; Exo 21:31).

b. A thief overtaken at night in the act might lawfully be put to death, but if the sun had risen the act of killing him was to be regarded as murder (Exo 22:2-3). Other cases are added by the Mishna, which, however, are included in the definitions given above (Sanh. 9:1, 2, 3; Macccoth, 2:2; compare Otho, Lex. Rabb. s.v. Homicida).” SEE MURDER.

## Mansus Ecclesiae[[@Headword:Mansus Ecclesiae]]

             Mansus is in reality equivalent to locus, ubi quis MANET, the residence including the portion of land belonging to it (huoba), and both expressions are sometimes used the one for the other (see Du Fresne, s.v.; Grimm, Deutsche Rechtsalterthiinmer, p. 536; Eichhorn, Deutsche Rechtsgeschichte, vol. i, § 84; Guerard, Polyptique de l'abb Irminon [Paris, 1844, 4to]). Birnbaum, in Die rechtliche Natur der Zehnzten (Bonn, 1831), p. 174, is of opinion that the word mansus is derived from manumissio or mancipiumm, from the slaves in early times becoming free in obtaining an estate, a mansus hereditarius. But, putting aside the philological difficulties, we find that the mansi were properties with which serfs (glebae adscripti) or even freemen were invested on some conditions, hence the distinction between mansi serviles and ingenuiles (Grimm, p. 537; Eichhorn, vol. i, § 83). In the 9th century the whole of France was divided into mansi, as the taxes were based on this division, as well as the obligation to military service (see Capitulare, i, a. 803, c. 1, a. 807, 811; Pertz, Monumenta Germaniae, 3:119, 172; Walter, Corpusjuris Germanici, 2:228; Hincnmari Remensis Annales, ad a. 866, 877). The Church itself was not free from these taxes, but paid according to the number of mansi it held (see Capitul. Aquisgran. a. 812, cap. 11; Pertz, 3:175: ‘Ut de rebus unde censum ad partem regis exire solebat, si ad  aliquam ecclesiam traditae sunt, aut tradantur propriis heredibus, aut qui eas retinuerit, vel illum censum persolvat”), with the exception of those which they held from the liberality of the king, and which were given with such immunities; as also the mansi forming the dos of a church, and given to it at its foundation. SEE IMMUNITY. In this case the immunity covered the whole mansus (mansus integer), and it became the duty of the incumbents to see to it that their privilege was not infringed (see Capitulare Wormatiense, a. 829, cap. generalia, no. 4; Pertz, 3:350). This principle was also adhered to afterwards, so that both Gratian (see c. 24, 25, can. xxiii, qu. viii) and Raymondus a Pennaforte (c. i, x, de censibus, 3:39) considered it well to recall these enactments. The size of the mansus did not always remain the same; yet it was at all times calculated so as to afford a dos competens to the church, the income from which would be sufficient to defray the expenses of worship and to supply the greater part of the requisites of the clergy (see Ziegler, De dote ecclesiastica ejusquejuribus et privilegiis [Wittemb. 1686, 4to], chap. vii, § 34 sq.). If we study the history of the establishment of Christianity in the different countries, we find that many adopted these principles of the French law. Thus in Prussia, at the foundation of churches, they were each endowed with eight hides of land. In 1232 we see the parishes of Kulm and Thorn receiving besides forty hides. When in 1249 peace was made with the heathen Prussians, a stipulation required that each new church should receive a dos of eight hides (see Voigt, Gesch. Preussens, 2:239, 630). The later documents on the subject (see Voigt, Codex diplomaticus Prussicus) show that this custom was observed in after times. This practice of church endowments was continued notwithstanding the changes introduced by the Reformation. See Jacobson, Gesch. der Quellen d. evangelischen Kirchenrechts von Preussen, 1:2, Urkunden, p. 8, 25, etc.; Moser, Algem. Kimrchenbl. 1856, p. 141 sq.; Berlin Evang. Kirchenzeit. 1857, No. 9; Herzog, Real-Encyklopädie, 9:1. (J. N. P.)

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

             (1), D.D., an English prelate and commentator, was born at Southampton, Feb. 12, 1776; was educated at Winchester College, and Trinity College, Oxford; became fellow of Oriel College in 1798; vicar of Great Coggeshall, Essex, in 1810; of St. Botolph's, Bish. opsgate, London, in 1815; and of East Horsley, Surrey, in 1818; bishop of Killaloe and Kilfenora, in 1820; was translated to Down and Connor in 1823; and in 1842 succeeded bishop Saturin in the diocese of Dromore. He died Nov. 2, 1848. He  published, in conjunction with D'Oyly, An Edition of the Bible, with Notes (1817): — Eight Sermons: — An Appeal to the Gospel or an Inquiry into the Justice of the Charge that the Gospel is not preached by the National Clergy (1812, 8vo; 6th wc 1816, 8vo; reviewed in the Lond. Quart. Rev. 8:356-374, and 15:475): — The Book of Common Prayer, selected, with Notes (1829, 4to; abridged, 2 vols. 8vo; 5th ed. 1840, 4to): — The Book of Psalms in an English Metrical Version, with Notes, critical and illustrative (1824, 8vo): — Biographical Notices of the Apostles, Evangelists, and other Saints (1828, 8vo): — Primitive Christianity (Lond. 1843, 8vo): — Hist. Ch. of Ireland (1840, 2 vols. 8vo): — Horae liturgicae (1845, sm. 8vo): — Sermons, and other productions on various subjects. See Allibone, Dict. Brit. and Amer. Biog. s.v.; Darling, Cyclop. Bibiogr. s.v.

## Mant, Richard (2)[[@Headword:Mant, Richard (2)]]

             (2), D.D., an English divine, who flourished in the latter part of the 18th and beginning of the 19th century; was educated at Trinity College, Oxford, and became rector of All Saints, Southampton. He died in 1817. He published a sermon entitled Public Worship (1796, 8vo): — Ordes or the Visitation of the Sick, from the Book of Common Prayer (1805, 12mo): — Eight Sermons on the Occurrences of the Passion Week (1807,12mo): — Guide to the Understanding of the Church Catechism (1807). — Allibone, Dict. Brit. and Amer. Auth. S. V.

## Mantchoo Version[[@Headword:Mantchoo Version]]

             SEE MANCHOO.

## Mantchuria[[@Headword:Mantchuria]]

             a Chinese territory in Eastern Asia, extending between lat. 42° and 53° N., is now the possession partly of the Chinese and partly of the Russians. It, is bounded, according to its present limits, by the Amur on the north; by the Usuri and the Sungacha on the east, separating it from the Russian maritime territory of Orochi; by the Shan-Alin range on the south, separating it from Korea; and by a portion of the Khinganl Mountains, the river Sira-Muren, and the district of the upper Sungari, which separate it on the west from the desert of Gobi. Previously to the recent incursions of the Russians on the north, the area of this territory was about 682,000 square miles. Since the treaty of Nov. 14, 1860, the Russians possess all the territory east of the Usuri n and north and east of the Amur, and the Chinese possession is reduced to about 378,000 square miles. The population is variously estimated at from 3.000,000 to 4,000,000.  Mantchuria is divided into three provinces: Shing-King (formerly Leaotong), which alone contains upwards of 2,100,000 inhabitants, and the chief town of which, Mukden, is the seat of government for the three provinces; Girin, or Kirin; and Tsi-tsi-har. The country is mountainous, densely wooded in the south, but consisting chiefly of prairies and grass- land in the north. It is well watered and fruitful in the valleys. Chinese form the great bulk of the population. The Mantchus themselves are for the most part soldiers; they are the present rulers of China, who gradually subjugated the country. They are not a nomadic race like the Mongols, but are given to agriculture or hunting, according to the part of their country they inhabit. They are of a lighter complexion and slightly heavier build than the Chinese. have the same conformation of the eye-lids, but rather more beard, and their countenances present greater intellectual capacity. Literary pursuits are more esteemed by them than by Mongolians. They are of the same religious faith as the Chinese, but they are less under the priesthood. The Mantchus, in short, may be regarded as the most improvable race in Central Asia, if not on the continent. See Williams, Middle Kingdomn, 1:153 sq.; Chambers, Cyclops s.v. SEE CHINA; SEE TARTARY.

## Mantelet[[@Headword:Mantelet]]

             a long cape, with slits for the arms, worn by prelates. Regular bishops wore it without the rochet; and cardinals, vested in rochet and mozzetta, lay it aside when visiting another of their order. The mantellone is a purple cloak, with long, hanging sleeves. Walcott, Sac. Archaeol. s.v.

## Mantelletum[[@Headword:Mantelletum]]

             is a large cape of silk reaching from the neck to below the waist, with open spaces for the arms on each side. It is commonly worn over the rochet, and is no doubt the foreign equivalent to the English chimere. Anciently it was of scarlet satin in England. Foreign bishops commonly wear a mantelletum of purple silk, lined with silk of the same color, only lighter in shade. Abroad, in some places, monsignori, canons, vicars-general, apostolical prothonotaries, and doctors in canon law wear the mantelletum; in which case it is usually of black, though sometimes of scarlet or brown silk. The mantelletumn is by some affirmed to be the same as the mozette.

## Mantis, The Praying[[@Headword:Mantis, The Praying]]

             an insect said to have been worshipped formerly by the Hottentots. It derives its name from the erect position and motion it assumes when alarmed. It was regarded by the Hottentots as a creature of bad omen, and to kill, or even to injure it, was looked upon as in the highest degree unlucky.

## Mantle[[@Headword:Mantle]]

             in the A.V., is the term used to render four Hebrew words, viz.,

1. אִדֶּרֶת, adde'reth, from אִדַּיר, “ample,” and therefore probably meaning a large over-garment like the Roman pallium. The Sept. renders it by μηλωτή (a sheep's skin), 1Ki 19:13, etc.; δεῤῥίς, Zec 13:4 : and δορά, Gen 25:25. From the passages in which it is mentioned we can conjecture its nature. It is used most frequently (1 Kings 19; 2Ki 2:8; 2Ki 2:13, etc.) of Elijah's “mantle,” which was in all probability a mere sheepskin, such as is frequently worn by dervishes and poor people in the East, and which seems, after Elijah's time, to have been  in vogue among the prophets (Zec 13:4). Accordingly, by it only is denoted the cape or Wrapper which, with the exception of a strip of skin or leather round his loins, formed, as we have every reason to believe, the sole garment of the prophet. The Baptist's dress was of a similar rough description, and we see from Heb 11:37 (ἐν μηλωταῖς, ἐν αἰγείοις δέρμασιν) that such garments were regarded as a mark of poverty and persecution. The word addereth twice occurs with the epithet שֵׂעָר, “hairy” (Gen 25:25; Zec 13:4). On the other hand, it is sometimes undoubtedly applied to royal and splendid robes, and is even used to mean “magnificence” in Eze 17:8 (“vine of magnificence”) and Zec 11:3. It is the expression for the “goodly Babylonish garment” stolen by Achan, and the “robe” worn by the king of Nineveh (Jos 7:21; Jon 3:6). The connection between two meanings apparently so opposite is doubtless to be found in the etymology of the word (from אִדַּיר, ample), or in the notion of a dress richly lined or trimmed with costly furs. SEE ROBE.

2. מְעַיל, meil', which in the A.V. is variously rendered “mantle,” “robe,” “cloke;” and in the Sept. ἐπενδύτης, διπλοϊvς, ὑποδύτης, ποδήρης, χιτών. Josephus calls it μεείρ. It is a general term derived from מָעִל, to cover, and is most frequently applied to “the robe of the ephod” (Exo 28:4, etc.; Lev 8:7), which is described as a splendid under-tunic of blue, wrought on the hem with pomegranates of blue, purple, and scarlet, with golden bells between them. It came below the knees, being longer than the ephod, and shorter than the kittoneth. It was a garment of unseamed cotton, open at the top so as to be drawn over the head, and; having holes for the insertion of the arms (Joseph. Ant. 3:7, 4; Jahn, Bibl. Arc. sec. 122; Braunius, De Vest. Sac. p. 436; Schroder, De Vest. Mul. p. 237, etc.). It was worn, however, not only by priests, like Samuel (1Sa 2:19; 1Sa 15:27; 1Sa 28:14), but by kings and princes. (Saul, 1Sa 24:4; David, 1Ch 15:27), and rich. men (Ezr 9:3-5; Job and his friends, Job 1:20; Job 2:12), and even by king's daughters (2Sa 13:18), although. in the latter case it seems to have had sleeves (see Gesenius, Thesaur. p. 811). Properly speaking, the meil was worn under the simnlah, or outer garment, but that it was often itself used as an outer garment seems probable from some of the passages above quoted. It is interesting to know that the garment which Samuel's. mother made and brought to the infant prophet at herannual visit to the holy tent at Shiloh was a miniature of the official priestly tunic or robe; the same that the great  prophet wore in mature years (1Sa 15:27), and by which he was on one occasion actually identified. When the witch of Endor, in answer to Saul's inquiry, told him that “an old man was come up, covered with a meil,” this of itself was enough to inform the king in whose presence he stood — “Saul perceived that it was Samuel” (28:14).

3. שְׂמַיכָה, semikah' (Jdg 4:14), the garment (marg. “rug,” or “blanket”) used by Jael to fling over the weary Sisera as a coverlid (Sept. ἐπιβόλαιον, but δεῤῥίς appears to have been the reading of Origen and Augustine). The word is derived from סָמִךְ, imponere, and is evidently a general term. Hesychius defines ἐπιβόλαιον by πῶμα ἢ ῤάκος, and Suidas by τὸ τῷ προτέρῳ ἐπιβαλλόμενον. The word used in the Targum is. גּוּנְכָה, which is only the Greek καυνάκη, and the Latin: gaunacum; and this word is explained by Varro to be. “majus sagumn et amphimallon” (De Ling. Lat. 4:35), i.e. a larger cloak woolly on both sides. Hesychius differs from Varro in this, for he says καυνάκαι στρώματα ἣ ἐπιβόλαια ἐτερομαλλῆ, i.e. ewoolly on one side; the, Scholiast, on Aristophanes, adds that it was a Persian,and Pollux that it was a Babylonian robe (Rosenmuller, Schol. ad loc.). There is, therefore, no reason to understand it of a curtain of the tent, as Faber does. Since the Orientals constantly used upper garments for bedding, the rendering “mantle,” though inaccurate, is not misleading (compare Rth 3:9; Eze 16:8, etc.). In the above passage the Hebrew word has the definite are tide prefixed, and it may therefore be inferred that it was some part of the regular furniture of the tent. The clue to a more exact signification is given by the Arabic version of the Polyglot, which renders it by al-katifah, a word which is explained by Dozy (Dictionnaire des Vetements Arabes, p. 232), on the authority of Ibn Batuta and other Oriental authors, to mean certain articles of a thick fabric, in shape like a plaid or shawl, which are commonly used for beds by the Arabs: “When they sleep they spread them on the ground. For the under part of the bed they are doubled several times, and one longer than the rest is used for a coverlid.” On such a bed, on the floor of Heber's tent, no doubt the weary Sisera threw himself, and such a coverlid must the senikah have been which Jael laid over him.

4. מִעֲטָפוֹתmaataphoth', occurs only in Isa 3:22. It was some article of female dress, and is derived from עָטִ, to weave. Schroder, the chief authority on this subject, says it means a large exterior tunic with  sleeves, worn next to the pallium (De Vest. Mezl. 15:247-277). In this same verse, and in Rth 3:15, occurs the word מַטְפָּחוֹת, msitpachoth', A.V. “wimples,” which appears to have been a sort of square covering like a plaid (Michaelis, Suppleml. p. 1021; Rosenmüller, Schol.; Isa 3:22). We cannot find the shadow of an authority for Jahn's very explicit statement, that both these words mean the same article, מִעֲטָפָהbeing the fashion for the winter, and מַטְפָּחָהfor the summer; though his assertion that “it covered the whole body from head to foot” may be very true (Jahn, Bibl. Arch. sec. 127).

For other terms, such as , שַׂמְלָה, simlah' (Gen 9:23, etc.), χλαμύς (Mat 27:28), στολή (Mar 12:38). etc., SEE DRESS. The φελόνης (A.V. cloke) to which St. Paul makes such an interesting allusion in 2Ti 4:13, seems to have been the Latin penula (comp. פליון), a sort of travelling-cloak for wet weather. A great deal has been written about it, and at least one monograph (Stosch, Dissert. de Pallio Pauli, Lugd. 1709). Even in Chrysostom's time some took it to be τὸ γλωσσόκκομον ἔνθα τὰ βίβλια ἔκειτο (a sort of travelling-bag), and Jerome, Theophylact, Grotius, etc., shared in this opinion (Schleusuer. Lex. N.T. s.v. φαιλόνης). SEE CLOAK.

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

             one of the most eminent of the Puritan divines of the 17th century, was born in 1620 at Lawrence-Lydiard, Somerset, England. His father and both his grandfathers were ministers. He was educated at Wadham College, Oxford, and received orders from bishop Hall before he had attained the age of twenty, being regarded by the good prelate as an extraordinary young man. The greatness of his character displayed itself even at this early age. Believing that admission to deacon's orders constituted authority to preach, he steadfastly refused priest's orders after having received deacon's. After staying a short time at Colyton, in Devonshire, he removed to London, and was printed in 1643 with the living of Stoke-Newington, near London. Here he prepared and afterwards published his Expositions of James and Jude. (The former was published in 1651; edited by Sherman, 1840, royal 8vo; edited by M'Donough, 1842, 8vo: the latter was published in 1658, 4to; new ed. 1838, 8vo.) During the Revolution he was frequently called to preach before Parliament, where he had the courage to speak against the death of the king. though he gave great  offense. In 1653 he was chosen preacher of St. Paul's, Covent Garden, where he had a numerous congregation of persons of great note and rank, and was eminently successful in his ministry. Joining in the Rebellion, he became one of the chaplains to the protector, and one of the committee for examining ministers under the commonwealth. He was forward, however, to promote the Restoration in 1660, was chosen one of the king's chaplains, and was also honored by Oxford at this time with the degree of D.D. by special request of king Charles II. In 1661 he was offered the deanery of Rochester, but this position he refused.

Like Baxter, he clung to the last to the hope that a scheme of comprehension might be carried for the Presbyterians; and he had yielded so far as to receive episcopal institution from Sheldon to permit the reading of the Common Prayer in his church, but when he clearly saw that there was peace only within the Establishment, and by an utter abandonment of all Puritan principles, he let the deanery go, content to remain in the position he was then filling. The passing of the Act of Uniformity forced him into the ranks of the Nonconformists. Efforts were made by Calamy, Manton, and Bates, the leaders of those Presbyterians who still hoped for redress, to secure their rights from the king by personal interview, and they even received encouragement from Charles II of a favorable change, who “promised to restore them to their employments and places again, as pitying that such men should lie vacant” (Stoughton, 1:302). But the king proved false, and the Puritans lost their places. Among the Nonconformist ministers who would not quit the pulpit until forced was Thomas Manton. Deprived of a church, he opened his rooms in Covent Garden, and there gathered a congregation. Here the Oxford oath was tendered to him, and on refusal he was committed a prisoner to the Gate-house, and was kept confined for six months. He died Oct. 18, 1677. Perhaps few men of that age had more virtue and fewer failings; but his only trust was in the Lamb of God. As a preacher he was most highly esteemed by his contemporaries. Usher calls him “one of the best preachers in England.” As a practical expositor of Scripture he was perhaps never surpassed. He left numerous writings, chiefly sermons and expositions. A collective edition of his works was published in 5 vols. 8vo, in 1681-84-89-93-1701, with Life by Dr. William Harris; but this collection is incomplete. A list of all his productions is given by Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. 1:1953-56. The publication of a complete collection of his works, prepared under the supervision of the Rev. Thomas Smith, D.D., and others, with full indexes and an original memoir by the Rev. J. C. Ryle, was begun in 1869, and is to be completed,  in 20 vols. demy 8vo, in 1874. See the excellent article in Allibone's Dictionary of British and American Authors, vol. 2, s.v.; Hook, Ecclesiastical Biogr. vol. 7, s.v.; Middleton, Evangelical Biography, 3:429. (J. H. W.)

## Mantra[[@Headword:Mantra]]

             a secret, the communication of which forms the chief ceremony of initiation in all Hindu sects. It generally consists of the name of some deity, or a short address to him; it is conveyed by the teacher to the disciple in a whisper, and when once known, is carefully concealed from all the uninitiated. The word mantra is also employed generally to denote a spell or enchantment, and also a hymn or a prayer.

## Mantua[[@Headword:Mantua]]

             an Italian province, formerly an independent duchy, had a high reputation in the time of the Romans. After sharing the fate of the rest of Northern Italy, it was seized by the Gonzagas about the commencement of the 14th century. The last duke of the house of Gonzaga died childless at Padua in 1708, when Mantua fell into the hands of Austria. In 1859 the province was given up to Italy, but the town of Mantua was not restored to Italy until 1866, since which time Mantua has formed a province of the new kingdom of Italy. SEE ITALY. The city of Mantua is noted in ecclesiastical history for a council that was held there in 1067 to judge pope Alexander II for a charge of simony brought against him. Alexander II took an oath to deny the accusation, and, proving the validity of his election, was recognized as the proper incumbent of the papal chair; while Honorius II (q.v.), the and-pope, was unanimously condemned as simoniacal. See Landon, Manual of Councils, p. 390.

## Mantz, Felix[[@Headword:Mantz, Felix]]

             a Baptist martyr of the early part of the 16th century, and a leader of the Reformation in Germany, was a native of Zurich. In 1519 he studied Hebrew with Zwingle, under Carlstadt, and was intimate with that reformer, and also with Myconius, Capito, and other leaders of the Swiss Reformation. About 1522 he objected openly to the doctrine of infant baptism, to the tithes, usury, and other peculiarities of the Romish Church,  and thus failing to harmonize with the opinions of Zwingle, he was led to a separation from the party of that reformer, and became connected with the Baptists. In 1523 he preached publicly on the subject of baptism. In the three disputes held at Zurich in 1525, Mantz appears to have taken part, and after that of March was thrown into prison, from which, however, he escaped. He afterwards preached in different parts of Switzerland; in 1526 was imprisoned in the tower of Wellenberg, on the charge of baptizing contrary to the prohibitory edict of the magistrates of Zurich, and, refusing to recant, was condemned, and drowned in January, 1527. See Brown, Baptist Martyrs, p. 49 (Amer. Bap. Pub. Soec. Phila.).

## Manu[[@Headword:Manu]]

             (from the Sanscrit man, to think; literally, the thinking being) is the name of the reputed author of the most renowned law-book of the ancient Lindus, and likewise of an ancient Kalpa sutra (q.v.). It is matter, however, of considerable doubt whether both works belong to the same individual, and whether the name Manu, especially in the case of the author of the lawbook, was intended to designate a historical personage. In several passages of the Vedas (q.v.), as well as of the Mahaibhlirata (q.v.), Manu is spoken of as the progenitor of the human race, and in the first chapter of the law-book ascribed to him he declares himself to have been produced by Virij, an offspring of the Supreme Being, and to have created all the universe. Hinldu mythology, moreover, recognizes a succession of Manus, each of swhom created, in his own period, the world anew after it had perished at the end of a mundane age. The word Manu — kindred with our “man” — belongs therefore, properly speaking, to ancient Hindu mythology, and it was connected with the renowned law-book in order to impart to the latter the sanctity on which its authority rests. This work is not merely a law-book in the European sense of the word; it is likewise a system of cosmogony, or, as Sir William Jones has it, “comprises the Indian system of duties, religious and civil.” It propounds metaphysical doctrines, teaches the art of government, and, among other things, treats of the state of the soul after death. The chief topics of its twelve books are the following;

1. Creation; 2. Education and the duties of a pupil, or the first order; 3. Marriage and the duties of a householder, or the second order; 4. Means of subsistence, and private morals;  5. Diet, purification, and the duties of women; 6. The duties of an anchorite and an ascetic, or the duties of the third and fourth orders; 7. Government, and the duties of a king and the military caste; 8. Judicature and law, private and criminal; 9. Continuation of the former, and the duties of the commercial and servile castes; 10. Mixed castes, and the duties of the castes in time of distress; 11. Penance and expiation; 12. Transmigration and final beatitude.

It is the opinion of Maine (Ancient Law) and other eminent scholars that the code of Manu was never fully accepted or enforced in India, and remained always an ideal of the perfect Brahmanic state. It is supposed, by Wilson, Lassen, Max Müller, and Saint Martin, to have been written about B.C. 900 or 1000. The text of this work has been published in several editions both in India and Europe. An excellent English translation of it we owe to Sir W. Jones (Calcutta, 1796; 2d ed., by Haughton, Lond. 1825), and a very good French translation to A. Loiseleur Deslongchamps (Paris, 1833). See Johbintzen, Ueber das Gesetzbuch des Malnu (Berl. 1863); Max Miiller, Chips from a German Workshop (Index to vol. 2); Elphinstone, Hist. of India (3d ed.), p. 226 sq.; Hardwick, Christ and other Masters, 1:194 sq.; James Freeman Clarke, Ten Great Religions, p. 100 sq. SEE HINDUISM.

## Manuductor[[@Headword:Manuductor]]

             is the name of an ecclesiastical officer whose duty it was to give the signal to the choristers to sing, to mark the measure, beat the time, and regulate the music. The word means to lead by means of the hand; and the officer was so called because he was required to stand in the middle of the aisle, and to guide the choir by the motions of his hand. The Greek Church has an officer who performs similar services, who is called Mesochoros, because he is seated in the midst of the choir.

## Manuel (I)[[@Headword:Manuel (I)]]

             COMNENUS (Μανουὴλ ὁ Κομνηνός), emperor of Constantinople from 1145 to 1180, was the fourth son of John II, and was born about A.D. 1120. Two of his elder brothers, Alexis and Andronicus, both died before their father, and a special declaration of the emperor appointed Manuel as his successor, to the prejsliice of his third son, Isaac Sebastocrator. As soon as Manuel ascended the throne, he surrounded himself with the bravest warriors of the West, and soon became foremost even among them for his courage. His reign was a succession of wars, sometimes in Asia, sometimes in Europe. Conrad III and Louis VII having informed him that they were preparing a new crusade, Manuel, although apparently disposed to help them, gave secret information to the Turks of the approaching danger.

The relation which Manuel Comnenus sustained to the Church of Rome is of special interest to us. His Latin subjects he treated with kindness, embellished their churches, and readily did all they asked of him. This generous disposition on the part of Manuel Comnenus towards the Latins encouraged pope Hadrian IV (1154-1159) to make proposals for a union of the Eastern with the Western Church, but the plan failed of success because of the objections of the Greek patriarch to acknowledge the  supremacy of the pope of Rome. SEE GREEK CHURCH. After Hadrian's death Manuel entered into correspondence with Alexander III, declared himself in favor of the Crusades, and offered assistance. The German emperor, Frederick I, had taken sides with the rival pope Victor, and Manuel embraced this opportunity to urge upon Alexander the claims of the Greek emperor to the Roman crown, promising in return to aid the pope in establishing the papal power in all Italy, and in the union of the Eastern and Western Church. So long as the pope was in danger from the invading Allemanni, he acted as if he felt inclined to acknowledge to the true representative of Constantine and Augustus. But after the establishment of peace and friendship with Frederick, Alexander “spoke a more peremptory language, confirmed the acts of his predecessors, excommunicated the adherents of Manuel, and pronounced the final separation of the churches, or at least the empires of Constantinople and Rome” (Gibbon, v, 491). Manuel died Sept.24, 1180. He is said to have been deeply versed in theology, but “was certainly rather a great talker than a great thinker on religion.” See Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Romans Biog. s.v.; Lebeau, Hist. du Bas-Empire (Paris, 1834), 16:63 sq.; Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lexikon, s.v.

## Manuel Of Constantinople[[@Headword:Manuel Of Constantinople]]

             There were two Manuels patriarchs of Constantinople, Manuel I (Charitopulus), and Manuel II, the subject of the present article. Cave, Oudin, and others seem to have confounded the two, for they state that Manuel Charitopulus succeeded Germanus II in A.D. 1240. Charitopulus was the predecessor of Germanus, not his successor; Manuel II was his successor, though not immediately, for the brief patriarchate of Methodius II and a vacancy in the see, of considerable but uncertain length, intervened. Manuel's death is distinctly fixed as having occurred two months before that of the emperor Joannes Ducas Vatatzes, A.D. 1255, Oct. 30. The duration of his patriarchate is fixed by Nicephorus Callisti, according to Le Quien, at eleven years; but the table in the Parotrepticon of Labbe assigns to him fourteen years, so that A.D. 1240 or 1244 may be assumed as the year of his accession, according as one or the other of these authorities is preferred. Manuel held, before his patriarchate, a high place among the ecclesiastics of the Byzantine court, then fixed at Nice, and was reputed a man of piety and holiness, “though married,” and of a mild and gentle disposition, but by no means learned. The three Sententice Synodales of the patriarch Manuel given in the Jus Graeco-Romanum  undoubtedly belong to this patriarch, not to Charitopulus, for the second of them. De Translatione Episcoporum, is expressly dated July, Indict. 8, A.M. 6578, oera of Constant. = A.D. 1250. Some works in MS., especially a letter to pope Innocent by “Manuel Patriarcha CPol.,” probably belong to Manuel of Constantinople (Le Quien, Oriens Christianus, i, col. 279; Cave, Hist. Litt. ad ann. 1240, 2:297 [ed. Oxford, 174C-42]; Oudin, Conment de Scriptorib. et Scriptis Eccles. iii, col. 177; Fabricius, Bibl. Graec. 11:668). — Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Romans Biog. and Mythol. s.v.

## Manuel, Charitopulus[[@Headword:Manuel, Charitopulus]]

             (ὁ Χαριτόπουλος), or SARANTENUS (ὁ Σαραντηνός), or the Philosopher, a Greek ecclesiastic who flourished in the 12th and 13th centuries, acquired a high reputation by his philosophical attainments. He was appointed patriarch of Constantinople on the death of Maximus II,  A.D. 1215, and held the patriarchate for five years and seven months. He died about A.D. 1221. Three synodal decrees of a Manuel, patriarch of Constantinople, are given in the Jus Graeco-Romanum of Leunclavius (lib. iii, p. 238, etc.), who assigns them to Charitopulus, and is followed by Cave and Oudin, who have confounded Charitopulus with another Manuel (of Constantinople). Le Quien objects to this judgment of Leunclavius, as not founded on evidence, and, with better reason, adjudges them to Manuel Bryennius. Ephraem of Constantinople celebrates Charitopulus as “an exact observer of the laws and canons” (Georg. Acropolit. Annnal. [c. 19, p. 17, ed. Paris; p. 35, ed. Bonn]; Ephraem. De I'atriarchis [Charitop. v. 10, 251, ed. Bonn]; Anonymous [supposed by some to be Niceph. Callist.], De Patriarchis Charitopolitanzis Carmen Iambicurm, and Patriarchae Chsaritopoleos, apud Labbe, De Histor. Byzant. Scriptorib. Προτρεπτικόν; Le Quien, Oriens Christianus, i, col. 278; Cave, list. Litt. ad ann. 1240, 2:297 [ed. Oxford, 1740-42); Oudil, Comment de Scriptorib. et Scriptis Eccles. iii, col. 177). — Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Roms. Biog. and Mythol. s.v.

## Manuel, Holoblius[[@Headword:Manuel, Holoblius]]

             a Byzantine ecclesiastic of the 13th century, about 1261 or 1262 was cruelly mutilated by the cutting off of his nose and lips, by order of the ambitious Michael Palaeologus, because he had expressed grief at the deposition, persecution, and banishment of Joannes Lascaris, emperor of Nicwea, by Palaeologus, his successor in the empire. Holobolus was then confined to the monastery of the Precursor, where, having excellent abilities and opportunities, he pursued his studies with success. About A.D. 1267 Germanus III, bishop of Constantinople, procured for him the appointment of teacher of a school of young ecclesiastics, and prevailed upon the emperor to remit his punishment and allow him to quit the monastery. Germanus also conferred on him the ecclesiastical office of rhetor, reader and expounder of the Scriptures. When the emperor Paloeologus attempted a reconciliation of the Greek and Latin churches, he sought the counsel of Holobolus, but he declared against the plan of reconciliation. This brought upon him the emperor's indignation, and he was obliged to take refuge in the church sanctuary to escape violence from the emperor's courtiers; was banished thence to the monastery of Hyacinthus, at Nice, A.D. 1273; was afterwards taken back to Constantinople, and beaten and paraded ignominiously through the streets. In A.D. 1283, after the accession of Andronicus II, Palaeologus, son of Michael, who pursued with respect to the union of the churches an opposite policy to that of his father, Holobolus appeared in the Synod of Constantinople, in which Joannes Veccus was deposed from the patriarchate of Constantinople, and he took part in the subsequent disputations with that chief of the Latinizing party. Little else is known of Holobolus. See Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Romans Biog. and Mythol. s.v.

## Manuel, Niclaus[[@Headword:Manuel, Niclaus]]

             or NICOLAS, sometimes called DEUTSCH, one of the most prominent characters in the ecclesiastical history of Switzerland, in the age just preceding the Reformation, was born at Bern in 1484, His real name is conjectured by his biographer, Dr. Gruneisen, to have been Alleman, but, as he was illegitimate, it was, for family reasons, changed anagrammatically into that of Manuel. It is further conjectured that he was brought up by his maternal grandfather, Thüring Frickart. He was an artist by profession, but he excelled also as a poet and author. He studied the art of painting at Colmar, under the successors of the celebrated Martin Schon, until the fame of Titian attracted him to Venice, where, about 1511, he became one of his pupils: he is the Emanuello Tedesco of Ridolfi and other Italian writers. He is said to have assisted Holbein, in 1515 in his “Dance of Death;” but this is very improbable, as he was himself employed at that time in painting the same subject in the cloister of the Dominican convent at Bern. It was executed in fresco or distemper. The picture consisted of forty-six subjects, forty-one of which were the actual Todtentanz; it has long since been destroyed, but the compositions are preserved in prints and copies: the wall on which it was painted was pulled down in 1660. Manuel was an active reformer, and many of these designs are reflections upon the abuses of the Roman Church. He also ornamented his own house with a large fresco, representing Solomon worshipping idols. But of these and several other of his works nothing now remains, except some small watercolor copies preserved in the library at Basle. However, either because his pencil did not bring him sufficient for the maintenance of his family, or from his political ardor, he was induced to engage in military and public affairs. He served, as quartermaster or commissary, among the Swiss allies who assisted Francis I in his expedition against Milan, 1522, and was present both at the storming of Novara and the battle of Bicocca. In the following year he was chosen lanedvogt of Erlach, and from the year 1526 distinguished himself by his zeal in the cause of the Reformation. From this period he was entirely devoted to that cause, and to his various public employments. He died in 1530, when only forty-six years of age. As a writer he began to distinguish himself in 1509, by various popular poems and songs in the Swiss dialect, full of humor and sharp satire. He is said by  some to be the author of a song, which originated in the early part of the 16th century, deriding the belief in the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary. But though this be doubtful, it is certain that Manuel wielded his pen in support of the Reformation by attacking the gross abuses of the clergy and the licentiousness of monastics. His Facstnachtsspiele, or “Dramatic Moralities and Mysteries,” which he began to compose about 1522, are marked by the same qualities as his polemical pieces. See Dr. Grüneisen, Nicolas Manuel, Leben und Werke eines Malers, Dichters, Kriegers, Staatsmannes, und Reformuators (Stuttgart and Tübingen, 1837); Nagler, Neues Allgemeines Ksilstler-Lexikon, s.v.; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 9:4 sq.; English Cyclop. s.v.

## Manuel, Paleologus[[@Headword:Manuel, Paleologus]]

             SEE FERRARA; SEE FLORENCE, SYNOD OF.

## Manure[[@Headword:Manure]]

             Although the Scriptures do not furnish us with many details respecting the state of agriculture in Judaea, yet we may collect from various passages many interesting hints that will enable us to form some idea of the high state of its cultivation. SEE AGRICULTURE. It is not probable that the Hebrews derived their knowledge of manures from Egypt, but they doubtless adopted and preserved the customs which existed among the previous inhabitants of the country. In the parable of the fig-tree which had for three years been barren, and which the proprietor therefore doomed to be cut down, the gardener is represented as praying for delay, until he should “dig about it and dung it” (Luk 13:7). To explain this, Lightfoot quotes the following from the Talmud: “They lay dung to moisten and enrich the soil; dig about the roots of trees; pluck up the seckers; take off the leaves; sprinkle ashes; and smoke under the trees to kill vermin.” In addition to the various modes of irrigation, the soil was likewise enriched by means of ashes; to which were added the straw (תֵּבֶן, teben), stubble (קִשׁ, kash husks, or chaff (מוֹוֹ, mois), together with the brambles and grass that overspread the land during the sabbatical year; all being reduced by fire and used as manure (Pro 24:31; Isa 7:23; Isa 32:13). The burning over the surface of the land had also another good effect, that of destroying the seeds of noxious herbs (Jahn, Bibl. Arch. § 57).

Dunghills are mentioned in 1Sa 2:8; Ezr 6:11; Dan 2:5; Dan 3:29, and one of the gates at Jerusalem was called the Dung-gate. from dung being carried out there (Neh 2:13). That the soil was manured with dung, we learn from 2Ki 9:37; Psa 83:10; Jer 8:2; Jer 9:22; Jer 16:4; Jer 25:33; Luk 14:35. The Israelites  had comparatively few horses and few swine, two sources of excellent strong manure. Their animals consisted chiefly of oxen, camels, asses, sheep, and goats. The dung of the cow and camel was used to a considerable extent for fuel, and the dung of the sacrifices was directed to be burned — circumstances calculated to diminish the supply. That salt was used for manure we learn from Mat 5:13 and Luk 14:34-35, and it would appear that salt was sometimes sown by itself on the land, at others mixed in the dunghill. From the Talmud we learn that a dunghill in a public place exposed the owner to the payment of whatever damage it might occasion, a an any person might remove it as a nuisance. Dung might not, during the seventh year, be transported to the neighborhood of the fields intended to be manured. Under certain restrictions it was, however, permitted to fold cattle, for the sake of their manure, upon the lands that required it in the sabbatic year, and it is from this only we learn that the practice existed among the Jews, who would seem more generally to have folded their sheep within walled enclosures (Joh 10:1-5), the occasional clearance of which must have afforded a principal supply of manure. It would seem that gardens, except a few old rose-gardens, were not allowed within the walls of Jerusalem, on account of the manure they would have required, and “because of the stench,” as the Mishnah states, this produced, as well as because of that arising from the weeds thrown out from gardens. From another passage of the Talmud we are informed that the surplus blood of the sacrifices offered in the Temple, that is to say, the blood which was poured out at the foot of the altar, after the altar had been duly sprinkled, was conducted by a subterraneous channel to the outside of the city, and was sold to the gardeners as manure for their gardens; by which we are to understand that the gardeners were allowed to use it on paying the price of a trespass-offering, without which it could not be appropriated to any common use after having been dedicated at the altar. SEE DUNG.

## Manus Mortua[[@Headword:Manus Mortua]]

             SEE AMORTISATION.

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

             These are either Hebrew or Greek; we shall treat of them separately, referring for details to subordinate articles, where they are discussed more copiously.  I. Jewish Manuscripts. —

1. These are divided into

(a.) Synagogue rolls or sacred copies, and

(b.) Private or common copies.

(a.) The synagogue rolls contain the Pentateuch, the appointed sections of the prophets, or the book of Esther, which last is used only at the Feast of Purim. The three are never put together, but are written on separate rolls. They are in the Chaldee or square Hebrew character, without vowels and accents, accompanied with the puncta extraordinaria, and having the unusual forms of certain consonants. The parchment is prepared in a particular manner by the hands of Jews only, and made from the hides of clean animals, which, when duly wrought, are joined together by thongs made out of the same material. They are then divided into columns, the breadth of which must not exceed half their length. These columns, whose number is prescribed, must be of equal length and breadth among themselves, and contain a certain number of lines, each line having no more than three words. The Talmud contains strict rules concerning the material, the color, the ink, letters, divisions, writing instrument, etc., which are closely followed, especially in the Pentateuch. These rules are extracted from the Talmud, and translated in Adler's Judaeorum Codicis Sacri rite scribendi leges, etc. (Hamburg, 1779, 8vo). The minuteness of such regulations renders it a most irksome task for the sopher or scribe to write out a synagogue roll. The revision of the Torah, as the synagogue roll is often called, must be undertaken within thirty days after its transcription, else it is unfit for use. Three mistakes on one side or skin are allowable; but should there befour, or should there happen to be an error in the open and close sections of the law, in the position of the songs in Exodus 5 and Deuteronomy 22, which are the only portions of the Pentateuch written in poetical lines, then the whole copy is worthless. The great beauty of penmanship exhibited in these synagogue copies has always been admired. They are taken from authentic exemplars, without the slightest deviation or correction. Seldom do they fall into the hands of Christians; since, as soon as they cease to be employed in the synagogue, they are either buried or carefully laid aside, lest they should be profaned by coming into the possession of Gentiles.

(b.) Private MSS, are written partly in the square or Chaldee character, partly in the Rabbinical. They are held in far less esteem than the synagogue rolls, and are wont to be denominated profagne (pesulim). Their form is entirely arbitrary. They are in folio, quarto, octavo, and duodecimo. Of those written in the square character, the greater number are on parchment, some on paper. The ink of the letters is always black, but the vowel points are usually written with ink of a different color from that of the consonants. Initial words and letters are frequently decorated with gold and silver colors. The prose parts are arranged in columns; the poetic in parallel numbers. Some copies are without columns. The columns are not always occupied with the Hebrew text alone; for a version is frequently added, which is either written in the text after the manner of verses, or ill a column by itself; or in the margin in a smaller character. The number of lines is not prescribed by the Talmud. The upper and lower margin are filled with the Great Masorah, and sometimes with a rabbinical commentary; as also with prayers, psalms, and the like. The external margin is for corrections, scholia, variations, notices of the haphtaroth (sections from the prophets), parshioth (sections from the law), the commentaries of the rabbins, etc. The inner margin, or that between the columns, is occupied with the Little Masorah. The single books of the O.T. are separated from one another by spaces. except the books of Samuel, Kings, Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah, which are written continuously. The sections of the law and prophets are generally marked. In the MSS. of different countries the books are differently arranged. These copies generally pass through various hands before they are finished. The consonants proceed from the sopher or scribe. When the same person writes both consonants and vowels, as is frequently the case — he never makes them at the same time — the former are finished before he begins to append the latter. The Keris in the margin uniformly proceed from the vowel-writer. It is probable that these copies were in no instance made by Christians.

The square character employed in the MSS. of which we have spoken has varieties. The Jews themselves distinguish in the synagogue rolls —

1. the Tam letter, with sharp corners and perpendicular coronulee, used among the German and Polish Jews; 2. the Velske letter, more modern than the Tam, and rounder, with coronulae, particularly found in the sacred copies of the Spanish and Oriental Jews. SEE OLD TESTAMENT.

2. The age of Hebrew MSS. is not easily determined. It is true that they often contain subscriptions giving an account of the time when they were written, and the name of the scribe, or also of the possessor. But these accounts are often ambiguous, occasionally incorrect. Where they are altogether wanting it is still more difficult to discover the age. In the latter case the character of the writing, the color of the ink, the quality and complexion of the parchment, the absence of the Masorah, of the vowel- points, of the unusual letters, etc., have been chiefly rested upon. Still, however, such particulars are uncertain marks of age.

The oldest Hebrew MS. known to Kennicott or De Rossi was 634 of De Rossi, a mere fragment, containing small portions of Leviticus and Numbers. According to its former possessor, it belongs to the 8th century. So much uncertainty attaches to the internal marks adopted by these two Hebraists that the ages to which they assign several Hebrew MSS. are gratuitous. Since Pinner examined a number of MSS. belonging to the Bible Society of Odessa, older ones are now known. (For the dates of his MSS., see below.) In the imperial public library at St. Petersburg there is a collection of Hebrew MSS. made by Mr. Firkowicz, containing several very ancient ones. The oldest date is in a roll found in a Karaite synagogue in the Crimea, viz. A.D. 489; but that date is very suspicious. Several fragments of rolls give, as the dates of purchase or dedication, A.D. 639, 764, 781, 789, 798, 805, 815, 843, 848.

3. A few of the oldest Hebrew MSS. may be briefly described here. We begin with the Helali or Hillel Codex (סֵפֶר הֵלָאלַי), one of the most ancient and most celebrated codices of the Hebrew Scriptures, which derived its name from the fact that it was written at Hilla (הֵלָאלָה), a town built near the ruins of ancient Babel. Others, however, maintain that it was called Hilali because the name of the man who wrote it was lillel. But whatever uncertainty there may be about the derivation of its name, there can hardly be any doubt that it was written A.D. 600, for Sakkuto tells us most distinctly that when he saw the remainder of it (cir. A.D. 1500) the Codex was 900 years old. His words are, “In the year 4956, on the 28th of Ab (1196, better 1197), there was a great persecution of the Jews in the kingdom of Leon from the two kingdoms that came to besiege it. It was then that the twenty-four sacred books which were written long ago, about the year 600, by R. Moses ben-Hillel (on which account the Codex was called Hilali), in an exceedingly correct manner, and after which all the  copies were corrected, were taken away. I saw the remaining two portions of it — viz. the earlier and later prophets-written in large and beautiful characters, which were brought to Portugal and sold in Africa, where they still are, having been written 900 years ago. Kimchi, in his Grammar on Num 15:4, says that the Pentateuch of this Codex was extant in Toleti” (Juchassin, ed. Filipowski, Lond, 1857, p. 220). The Codex had the Tiberian vowels and accents, Masorah and Nikud glosses, and it served up to A.D. 1500 as a model from which copies were made. The Codex which Haja had in Babylon about A.D. 1000 was conveyed to Leon, in Spain, where the greater part of it became a prey to the fury of the martial hosts who sacked the Jewish dwellings in 1197. The celebrated grammarian, Jacob ben-Eleazar, fixed the renderings of the Biblical text according to this Codex, and the older philologians frequently quote it. Comp. Grätz, Geschichte der Juden (Lpz. 1859), 6:132, 229; Fürst, Geschichte des Karäerthums (Leipzic, 1869), 1:22, 138; Kimchi, Radicum Liber ed. Biesenthal et Lebrecht (Berolini. 1847), p. 26. SEE JACOB BEN-ELEAZAR.

No. 1, Pinner. This is a Pentateuch roll on leather, containing the five Mosaic books complete. It has no vowels, accents, or Masorah. The roll consists of forty-five pieces. As to the form of the letters, it differs considerably from the present style. This is particularly מלז ג ב א. The variations in the text from the Masoretic recension are few and inconsiderable. The MS., according to the subscription, was corrected in the year 580, consequently the roll must have been written upwards of 1280 years. It was brought from Derbend, in Daghestan, and is now at St. Petersburg. If the subscription be genuine, it is the oldest MS. known, except that one in the Firkowicz collection dated 489. (See Rule, Karaites, p. 100 sq.)

No. 634, De Rossi, quarto. This is but the fragment of a MS., containing Lev 21:19 - Num 1:50. It is on parchment, without the vowel-points, Masorah, or Keris. It, has also no interval between the parshioth or sections. But there are sometimes points between the words. It belongs, in De Rossi's opinion, to the 8th century, and is corroded by age. The character of the letters is intermediate, approaching the German. It is now at Parma.  No. 5, Pinner. This is a roll of the Pentateuch, but incomplete. The writing begins with Num 13:19. The form of the letters is very different from the present style. It is carelessly written, words and letters being frequently omitted. The subscription states that it was written A.D. 843.

No. 11, Pinner. This is a fragment of a synagogue roll, beginning with Deu 31:1. The date is 881.

No. 503, De Rossi, in quarto. This is a MS. of the Pentateuch, made up of different pieces. It begins with Gen 42:15, and ends with Deu 15:12. There is a chasm in it from Lev 21:19 to Num 1:50, because De Rossi separated this portion, thinking it to be older than the rest, and characterized it as an independent fragment by the No. 634. The vowel-points are attached, but not throughout, evidently by the same hand as that which wrote the consonants. There are no traces of the Masorah or Keris. Sometimes its readings have a remarkable agreement with those of the Samaritan text and ancient versions. De Rossi places the various pieces of which it is made up in the 9th and 10th centuries.

No. 3, Pinner, small folio. This MS. contains the greater and lesser prophets, on 225 leaves. Every page is written in two columns, between which, as well as below, and in the outer margin, stands the Masorah. Every column contains twenty-one lines. After each verse are two points, to which, without any interval, a new verse succeeds. The vowels and accents, as well as the greater and lesser Masorah, are wholly different from the Masoretic. The former are placed above the consonants. The first page has a twofold pointing, viz. above and below, but this does not occur again except occasionally in verses or words. From Zec 14:6 to Mal 1:13 there is no punctuation, and the first three verses of Malachi alone have been pointed much later in the manner now usual. The whole Codex is very correctly written. The form of the consonants differs considerably from the present text. The various readings of this MS., according to Pinner's collation, are numerous and important. The date is 916. Two others in the same collection, Nos. 15 and 17, have the same vowel and accent system, i.e. the Babylonian or Eastern, which originated in the 6th century, and from which, in the 7th, that of the Western, or the school of Tiberias, was developed. Pinsker has written ably on the subject Zieitlung in das Babylonisch-Hebrsische Punktationsystem, etc., Wien,  1683), reviewed by Furst in the Zeifschrsflt der cealuschen morgenlandischen Gesellschaft, 18:314 sq.

No. 13, Pinner, folio. This is an incomplete MS., consisting of 115 leaves, on good parchment, containing 2 Samuel from 6:10 to the end, and the books of Kings. Each page has three columns, between which, as also at the sides of the text, stands the Masorah. The vowels and accents are different from those now in use. The text has many and important readings; and the Masorah deserves to be examined. Two points stand after each verse; and 2d succeeds 1st Kings without a vacant space between. An inscription states that the MS. was purchased in 938. It is obviously an important codex.

Codex 590, Kennicott, folio. This MS. contains the Prophets and Hagiographa on parchment. The text has the vowel-points, but apparently from a later hand. The margin does not exhibit the Masorah, but variations are noted here and there. Some books have the final Masorah. The separate books have no titles, and they are arranged in the oldest order, Jeremiah and Ezekiel coming before Isaiah, and Ruth before the Psalms. According to the subscription, it was written A.D. 1019, or 1018 by another reckoning. The MS. is in the imperial library of Vienna.

Pinner, small folio. A MS. containing the Pentateuch, Prophets, and Hagiographa, on good parchment. Every page has three columns, except in Psalms, Job, and Proverbs, where there are but two. The text is furnished with vowels and accents, two points standing after each verse. The letters and accents are like those in No. 3 of Pinner. The Great and Little Masorah are in the margins. Being a Karaite MS., it has not been written with great accuracy. Words and verses are sometimes repeated. It is highly ornamented with gold and silver colors. The Codex states that it was written in Egypt in the year 1010.

The most important and oldest Hebrew MSS. collated by Kennicott, Bruns, De Rossi, Pinner, and others, are described in Davidson's Biblical Criticism, 1:346 sq.; and his Text of the Old Testament considered, etc., p. 98 sq. See also the third section of Tychsen's Tentamen de svariis Codicum Hebraicorum Vet . est. SS. generibus, etc. (Rostock, 172, 8vo), in which the learned writer examines the marks of antiquity assumed by Simon, Jablonski, Wolf, Houbigant, Kennicott, and Lilienthal, and shows that the Masorah alone is a certain index for determining the age and goodness of Hebrew MSS. See also the same writer's Beurtheilung der  Jahrzahlen in den Hebriaisch-Biblischen Handschriften (Rostock, 1 786, 8vo), in which the mode of determining the age of MISS. adopted by Kennicott, Bruns. and Do kossi is rejected; and Schnurrer's Dissertatio Inauguralis de Codicnum Hebraeorumn Vet. Test. cetate . diculter determinandas (Tübingen, 1772, 4to), reprinted in his Dissertationes Philologico-Criticae (Gotha and Amsterdam, 1790, 8vo).

Private MSS. written in the Rabbinical character are much more recent than the preceding, none of them being older than 500 years. They are on cotton or linen paper, in a cursive character, without vowel-points or the Masorah, and with many abbreviations.

The MSS. found among the Chinese Jews are partly synagogue rolls, partly private copies, whose text does not differ from the Masoretic. The Pentateuch of the Malabar Jews, brought from India to England by the late Dr. Buchanan, and described by Mr. Yeates, resembles, on the whole, the usual synagogue rolls of the Jews, except that it is written on red skins. Its text is the Masoretic, with a few unimportant deviations.

Eight exemplars are celebrated among the Jews for their correctness and value. They are now lost, but extracts from them are still preserved. From Jewish writings, and from the margin of some MISS., where a reference is made to them, we learn that they were highly prized for their singular accuracy. They formed the basis of subsequent copies. They are,

1. The Codex of Hillel (see above); 2. The Babylonian Codex; 3. The Codex of Israel; 4. An Egyptian Codex; 5. Codex Sinai; 6. The Pentateuch of Jericho; 7. Codex Sanbuki; 8. The book Taggin.

For a more copious account of Hebrew MSS. we refer to Eichhorn's Einleitung (Introduction), vol. 2; Kennicott's Dissertatio generalis; Walton's Prolegomena to the Polyglott, separately edited by Dathe and Wrangham; Tychsen's Tentamene; De Rossi's Variae Lectiones Vet. Test. etc.; and his Scholia critica in V. T. libros, etc.; De Wette, Lehrbuch der Historisch-Kritischen selinleitun.g; Davidson's Treatise on Biblical  Criticism; and his Introd. to the Old Test., in Horne. SEE OLD TESTAMENT.

II. Manuscripts of the Greek Testament. —

1. Those that have descended to our time are either on vellum or paper. The oldest material was the Egyptian papyrus, but even so early as the 4th century the N.T. was written on the skins of animals. This writing material continued in use till the 11th century, when paper began to be employed. Till the 10th century, MSS. were usually written in capital or uncial letters; then the cursive character came into use. The most ancient copies have no division of words, being written in a continued series of lines. Accents, spirits, and iota, postscribed or subscribed, are also wanting.

2. The whole of the N.T. is contained in very few MSS. Transcribers generally divided it into three parts; the first, containing the four Gospels; the second, the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles; the third, the Apocalypse of St. John. The greatest number of MSS. are those which have the four Gospels, because they were most frequently read in the churches. Those containing the Acts and Epistles are also numerous. Such as have the book of Revelation alone are extremely few, because it was seldom read in public.

Greek codices are not often complete in all their parts. They have many chasms. Again, some contain merely detached portions of the N.T., or sections appointed to be read on certain days in the churches. Such codices are called ἀναγνώσεις or ἀναγνώσματα in Greek; in Latin, lectionaria. Those containing lessons from the Gospels are called evangelistaria; such as were taken from the Acts, πραξαπόστολοι; those from the epistles, epistolaria or ἀπόστολοι.

Several MSS. are accompanied with a Latin translation interlined, or in a parallel column. Such have been called bilinigues .

3. We shall now advert to the uncial MS. of the Greek Testament, and to those usually quoted in the examination of the controverted passage 1 John v. 7. The former are marked with the letters of the alphabet, A, B, C, etc.; the latter by the Arabic numerals, 1. 2, 3, etc. (in some late critics by small letters, a, b, c, etc.).

The number of uncial MSS. remaining, though great when compared with the ancient MSS. extant of other writings, is inconsiderable. (See the table  in 4. below.) Tischendorf (N.T. Praef. cxxx) reckons 40 in the Gospels, of which 5 are entire, B K MU; 3 nearly entire, ElA; 10 contain very considerable portions, A C D F G H V X F A; of the remainder, 14 contain very small fragments, 8 fragments more (I P Q R Z) or less considerable (N T Y). To these must be added א (Cod. Sinait.), which is entire;(H), a new MS. of Tischendorf (Not. Cod. Sin. p. 51-52), which is nearly entire; and Ξ (Cod. Zacynth.), which contains considerable fragments of Luke. Tischendorf has likewise obtained 9 additional fragments (1. c.). In the Acts there are 12, of which 4 contain the text entire ( אA B), or nearly so (E2); 5 have large fragments (C D II2 G2= L2 and P2), 3 small fragments. In the Catholic Epistles 7, of which 5, ל אבּ K2 G2 —lare entire; 2 (C P2) nearly entire. In the Pauline Epistles there are 18: 1 (א) entire; 3 nearly entire, D2 L2 P2; 7 have very considerable portions, A B C E3 F2 G3 K2 (but Eis of little account); the remaining 7 some fragments. In the Apocalypse 5: 3 entire ( אA B2), 2 nearly entire (C P2).

According to date these MSS. are classed as follows:

Fourth century: א B.

Fifth century: A C, and some fragments.

Sixth century: D P R Z E2 D2 H3, and 9 smaller fragments.

Seventh century: Some fragments.

Eighth century: El(A) Ξ B2, and some fragments.

Ninth century: F K in V X rA II H2 G2 =L2 F G2 K2 M2 P2, and fragments.

Tenth century: G HU (En).

A complete description of these MSS. is given in the great critical editions of the N.T.: here those only can be briefly noticed which are of primary importance.

(a.) Uncials.

א, Codex Sinaiticus (Cod. Frid. Aug. of the Sept.) at St. Petersburg, obtained by Tischendorf from the convent of St. Catherine, Mount Sinai, in 1859. The fragments of the Sept. published as Cod. Frid. Aug. (1846) were obtained at the same place by Tischendorf in 1844. The N.T. is entire,  and the Epistle of Barnabas and parts of the Shepherd of Hermas are added. The whole MS. was published in 1862 by Tischendorf, at the expense of the emperor of Russia. It is probably the oldest of the MSS. of the N.T., and of the 4th century (Tischendorf, Not. Cod. Sin. 1860). SEE SINAITIC MANUSCRIPT.

A, Codex Alexandrinus (British Museum), a MS. of the entire Greek Bible, with the Epistles of Clement added. It was given by Cyril Lucar, patriarch of Constantinople, to Charles I in 1628, and is now in the British Museum. It contains the whole of the N.T. with some chasms: Matthew 1; Mat 25:6, ἐξέρχεσθε; Joh 6:50, ἵνα, Joh 6:52, λέγει; 2Co 4:13, ἐπίστευσα Joh 12:6, ἐξ ἐμοῦ. It was probably written in the first half of the 5th century. The N.T. has been published by Woide (1786, fol.), and with some corrections by Cowper (1860, 8vo). Compare Wetstein, Proleg. p. 13-30 (ed. Lotzc). SEE ALEXANDRIAN MANUSCRIPT.

B. Codex Vaticanus (No. 1209), a MS. of the Greek Bible, which seems to have been in the Vatican Library almost from its commencement (cir. A.D. 1450). It contains the N.T. entire to Heb 9:14, καθα; the rest of the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Pastoral Epistles, and the Apocalypse were added in the 15th century. Various collations of the New Test. were made by Bartolocci (1669), by Mico for Bentley (cir. 1720), whose collation was in part revised by Rulotta (1726), and by Birch (1788). An edition of the whole MS., on which Mai had been engaged for many years, was published three years after his death in 1858 (5 vols. 4to, ed. Vercellone; N.T. reprinted, London and Leipsic). Mai had himself kept back the edition (printed 1828-1838), being fully conscious of its imperfections, and had prepared another edition of the N.T., which was published also by Vercellone and others in 1859 (8vo). This was revised by Tischendorf (Lpz. 1867). The whole of Codex B is to be published by authority of the pope, and the N.T. part has already appeared (Rome, 1868), nearly complete. The MS. is assigned to the 4th century (Tischendorf, N.T. p. 136-149). SEE VATICAN MANUSCRIPT.

The Apocalypse in these last editions is taken from Codex Vaticanus, 2066 (formerly Codex Basilianus, 105), in the Vatican Library. It belongs to the 8th century (see Tischendorf's N.T. p. 142 sq. [7th ed.]).

C, Codex Ephraemi rescriptus (Paris, Bibl. Imp. 9), a palimpsest MS. which contains fragments of the Sept. and of every part of the N.T. In the 12th century the original writing was effaced, and some Greek writings of  Ephraem Syrus were written over it. The MS. was brought to Florence from the East at the beginning of the 16th century, and came thence to Paris with Catherine de Medici. Wetstein was engaged to collate it for Bentley (1716), but it was first fully examined by Tischendorf, who published the N.T. in 1843; the O.T. fragments in 1845. The only entire books which have perished are 2 Thessalonians and 2 John, but lacunae of greater or less extent occur constantly. It is of about the same date as the Codex Alex. SEE EPHRAEM MANUSCRIPT.

D. (of the Gospels), Codex Bezae (University Library, Cambridge), a Graeco-Latin MS. of the Gospels and Acts, with a small fragment of 3 John, presented to the University of Cambridge by Beza in 1581. Some readings from it were obtained in Italy for Stephens's edition, but afterwards Beza found it at the sack of Lyons in 1562, in the Monastery of St. Irenmeuts. The text is very remarkable, and, especially in the Acts. abounds in singular interpolations. The MS. has many lacunse. It was edited in a splendid form by Kipling (1793, 2 vols. fol.), but so imperfectly that it has been published anew under the care of the Rev. F. H. Scrivener (Cambr. 1864, 4to). The MS. is referred to the 6th century. Comp. Credner, Beitrlage, 1:452-518; Bornemann, Acta Apostolorunm, 1848; Schulz, De Codice D, Cantab. 1827. SEE CAMBRIDGE MANUSCRIPT.

D2 (of the Epistles), Codex Claromontanus, or Regius (in the Imperial Library at Paris, 107), marked by the same letter of the alphabet as the preceding, but containing a different part of the N.T., viz., all Paul's Epistles with the exception of a few verses. It is a Greek-Latin MS., written stichometrically, with accents and breathings, but without division into words. According to Montfaucon, it belongs to the 7th century, but Tischendorf assigns it to the 6th. The text was edited by the latter scholar in 1852, and is very valuable. Various correctors may be traced, but it is not always easy to distinguish them. The first readings are of course the principal ones (see the prolegomena to Tischendorf's edition). SEE CLERMONT MANUSCRIPT.

E (of the Gospels), Codex Basiliensis (K, 4:35 in the public library at Basle). It contains the Gospels, with a very few chasms in Luke's. In some parts smaller writing has taken the place of the older. It belongs to the middle of the 8th century, and was collated by Tischendorf in 1843. See his description in the Studien und Kritiken for 1844. SEE BASILEAN MANUSCRIPT.  E2 (of the Acts), Codex Laudianus, a Greek-Latin MS. in the Bodleian Library at Oxford. The text is written stichometrically. It contains the Acts, and has a hiatus from 26:29 to 28:26. Its age is the end of the 6th century, as Tischendorf supposes; or the 7th, as Wetstein prefers. The readings are very valuable. Hearne published an edition at Oxford (1715, 8vo), and Tischendorf proposes to publish it more correctly in a future volume of his — Monumenta Sacra; but Scrivener has undertaken a new edition. SEE LAUDIAN MANUSCRIPT.

E3 (of the Epistles). Codex Sangermanensis (in the Imperial Library of St. Petersburg), a very incorrect transcript of the Codex Claromontanus, and therefore possessing no authority or importance. It appears to belong to the 10th century.

F (of the Gospels), Codex Boreeli, now in the library of Utrecht, containing the Gospels, but with many chasms. It was collated and described by Heringa, whose work was published by Vinke (1843). The MS. belongs to the end of the 9th century. SEE BOREELS MANUSCRIPT.

Fa, Codex Coislinianus, containing a few fragments of the Gospels, Acts, and Epistles, found among the scholia of Codex Coislin. 1, which has the Octateuch, with the book of Kings. They were edited by Tischendorf in his Monumenta Sacra inedita (1846), p. 400 sq. The fragments belong to the 7th century. SEE COISLIN MANUSCRIPT, 1.

Fb, in the British Museum, 17,136, a rescript fragment from the Nitrian ‘desert, containing a few places of John's Gospel, which were deciphered and published by Tischendorf in his Monum. ined. vol. 2:The text agrees with the most ancient and best authorities. Tischendorf assigns the fragment to the 4th century; it rather belongs to the 5th.

F2 (of the Epistles), Codex Augiensis, a Greek-Latin MS. of St. Paul's Epistles, in the library of Trinity College, Cambridge. It wants the Epistle to the Hebrews in Greek, and Rom 1:1 to Rom 3:18. Dots are inserted between many of the Greek and Latin words. The text is ancient and valuable. It belongs to the 9th century. In 1842 and 1849 it was collated by Tischendorf, and edited by Scrivener (1859). SEE AUGIAN MANUSCRIPT.  G (of the Gospels), Codex Harleianus (5684 in the British Museum), a MS. of the four Gospels, but inperfect. in many places. It belongs to the 9th or 10th century, and was collated by Tregelles and Tischendorf.

G, (of the Epistles), Cod. Boernerianus, a Greek-Latin MS. of Paul's Epistles, now in the Royal Library of Dresden. It has the same chasms as F, Augiensis, with which it agrees remarkably, so that both texts seem to have proceeded from the same copy. They belong to one country and age — probably to Switzerland and the 9th century. Matthaei published it in 1791, 8vo. SEE BOERNER MANUSCRIPT.

H (of the Gospels), Codex Seidelii, II, a MS. of the four Gospels in the public library of Hamburg. It is imperfect in many places, belongs to the 9th or 10th century, and was collated by Tregelles in 1850.

H, (of the Acts), Codex Mutinensis (196 in the Ducal Library of Modena), a MS. of the Acts, with considerable gaps. Its age is the 9th century. From Act 27:4 till the end was supplied in uncial letters in the 11th century. The Pauline and Catholic Epistles were added in cursive letters in the 15th or 16th century. Tischendorf collated it in 1843.

H3 (of the Epistles), Codex Coislinianus (202 in the Imperial Library at Paris). This MS. contains fragments of Paul's Epistles. It consists only of twelve leaves, two which it formerly had being now at Petersburg. Another leaf was recently brought by Tischendorf from Mount Athos, containing Col 3:4-11. The fifteen leaves should be put together. It has been collated by Tischendorf, who intends to publish it all. It belongs to the 6th century. SEE COISLIN MANUSCRIPT, 2.

I, a MS. in the library of St. Petersburg, found by Tischendorf on his travels in the East. It is a rescript, containing the remains of seven very ancient MSS. exhibiting parts of the Gospels, Acts, and two Pauline Epistles. Tischendorf thinks that the first, second, and third belong to the 5th century. All are edited by him in the first volume of Monumenta Sacra, p. 1, etc.

Ib. See Nb.

K (of the Gospels), Codex Regius, or Cyprius (now 63 in the Imperial Library of Paris). It, contains the four Gospels complete, belongs to the middle of the 9th century, and was accurately collated by Tischendorf in 1842. SEE PARIS MANUSCRIPTS.  K, (of the Epistles), Codex Mosquensis (98 in the Library of the Holy Synod at Moscow), containing the Catholic and Pauline Epistles. It belongs to the 9th century, and was collated by Matthaei.

L (of the Gospels), Codex Regius (62 in the Imperial Library at Paris), containing the Gospels entire with the exception of five places. The text of this codex contains very old and good readings, agreeing remarkably with B. It belongs to the 8th century, and was published by Tischendorf in his Monumn. Sacra, 1846, p. 57. SEE PARIS MANUSCRIPTS.

L2 (of the Acts and Epistles), Codex Bibliothecae Angelicae (A 2,15 in the library of the Augustine monks at Rome), a MS. containing the Acts, Catholic Epistles, and those of Paul. It begins with Acts viii, i0, and ends with Heb 13:10. Its age is the 9th century. It was first collated with care by Fleck; afterwards by Tischendorf and Tregelles.

M (of the Gospels), Codex Regius (48 in the Imperial Library of Paris), containing the Gospels entire. This MS. has been transcribed by Tischendorf, but is not yet published. He assigns it to the latter part of the 9th century. SEE PARIS MANUSCRIPTS.

M2 (of the Epistles), two fragments; one at Hamburg, the other at London. The former contains some parts of the Epistle to the Hebrews; the latter, portions of the Epistle to the Corinthians. Both were published by Tischendorf in his Anecdota Sacra, p. 174 sq. The text is both ancient and valuable.

N (of the Gospels), Codex purpureus, the fragment of a MS., of which four leaves are in the British Museum, six in the Vatican, and two at Vienna. Tischendorf has recently found 33 leaves more. containing about a third of the entire Gospel of Mark, between 6:53 and 15:3. The letters were silver on purple vellum. They are larger and rounder than in A B C. The text is in two columns. The Ammonian sections and Eusebian canons are placed in the margin. All contain portions of the Gospels. The contents of the twelve leaves were published by Tischendorf in his Monumenta inedita, who assigns the fragment to the end of the 6th century. SEE PURPLE MANUSCRIPT.

N2 (of the Epistles), a fragment consisting of two leaves, with Galatians 5, 6, and Hebrews 5, 6 :Assigned by Tischendorf to the 9th century.

Nb [Tisch. Ib] (Brit. Mus. Add. 17, 136), a palimpsest of the 4th or 5th century, deciphered by Tregelles, and published by Tischendorf (Mon. Ined. vol. ii).

Nc. a few fragments, now at Moscow, of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Tischendorf thinks they may be of the 6th century, but Matthaei did not state enough to determine their age.

O, a small fragment, consisting of two leaves, containing 2Co 1:20 -ii. 12, belonging to the 9th century.

O1, Codex Mosquensis (120, at Moscow), a fragment consisting of eight leaves, containing a few parts of John's Gospel; probably of the 9th century. Matthoei published the text.

Oa, the two hymns, Luk 1:46-55; Luk 1:68-79, in a Latin MS. containing the grammar of Pompeius. They are written in uncial Greek letters, and belong to the 9th century. Tischendorf published them in his Anecdota sacrac et profana, p. 206 sq.

Ob, the same two hymns, together with a third, Luk 2:29-32, in a Psalter in the Bodleian Library, No. 120, belonging to the 9th century. See Tischendorf, Anecdota, p. 206.

Oc, the hymn of Mary, Luk 1:46-55, contained in the Verona Psalter, and belonging to the 6th century. The Greek is in Latin letters. It was published by Blanchini in the Psalterium duplex appended to his Vindiciae calonicarum Scripturarum (Romae, 1740).

Od, the three hymns of Luke i and ii, as contained in the Psalter of Turin, written in gold and silver letters, belonging to the 7th century. Tischendorf is about to publish the entire Psalter.

Oe, the same three hymns in a St. Gall Codex. 17, written partly in Greek and partly in Latin. Tischendorf assigns the MS. to the 9th century.

P (of the Gospels), Codex Guelpherbytanus, A (in the library of Wolfenbüttel), a palimpsest MS. containing fragments of the Gospels. In 1762 Knittel published all he could read. In 1854 Tischendorf succeeded in deciphering almost all the portions of the Gospels that exist, which he has published in his Monumenta Sacra inedita (1860). See below, Q.

P2 (of the Acts and Epistles), a MS. of the Acts, Catholic and Pauline Epistles, and Apocalypse, belonging to the library of bishop Uspenski in St. Petersburg. This is a valuable palimpsest, consisting of upwards of 300 leaves. Though belonging to the 9th century, the text, except in 1 Peter and Acts, agrees with that of the oldest codices. The Epistles were published in 1865, and the Acts and Rev. in 1869, by Tischendorf, in his Monum. Sacra.

Q, Codex Guelpherbytanus, B, another palimpsest, containing fragments of Luke and John's Gospels, discovered by Knittel, and published with the last fragments. Tischendorf is about to re-edit it in a more complete and accurate state. According to him, P belongs to the 6th, and Q to the 5th century. SEE WOLFENBUTTEL MANUSCRIPTS.

Q', a papyrus fragment, containing parts of 1 Corinthians i, vi, vii, belonging to the 5th or 6th century.

R, a rescript MS. belonging to the British Museum, brought from the Nitrian desert, with many other codices, chiefly Syriac ones. The Syriac text of Severus of Antioch was written over it. The forty-eight leaves contain parts of Luke's Gospel. The writing is in two columns; and the Ammonian sections have not the canons of Eusebius. Tischendorf published almost the whole text (for some of it is illegible) in his Monumenta Sacra inedita, vol. 2. Dr. Wright found three leaves overlooked by Tischendorf, of which he gave an account in the Journal of Sacred Literature for January, 1864. It is assigned to the 6th century, but may belong to the 7th.

S, Codex Vaticanus, 354. This MS. contains the four Gospels entire. It is in the Vatican Library, where Birch carefully collated it twice for his Greek Testament. A subscription to it states that it was written A.D. 949. See Tischendorf, in the Annales Vindobon. (1847), where a fac-simile better than those of Blanchini and Birch is given.

T, Codex Borgianus (1 in the library of the Propaganda at Rome), a MS. of thirteen leaves, containing fragments of John's Gospel. The Greek text has a Thebaic translation by its side. Giorgi published the text in 1789 at Rome. Tischendorf, who inspected the MS. and made a facsimile of it, assigns it to the 5th century. SEE BORGIAN MANUSCRIPT.

Tb, six leaves, containing John 1, 2, 3, 4, belonging to the 6th century.

Tc, two leaves, containing Matthew 14, 15, belonging to the 6th century. The writing and text resemble those of the Borgian fragments.

Td, fragments of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, from Borgian MSS. of the 7th century.

Ts, Fragmentum Woideanum, a few leaves, Greek and Sahidic, whose text was edited by Woide (contained in the Appendix to the Codex Alexandrinus, 1799). The one contains Luk 12:15 to Luk 13:32; the other, Joh 8:33-42. Tischendorf has discovered that these fragments are parts of T, published by Giorgi. Hence they belong to the same time.

U, Codex Venetus Marcianus, formerly Nanzianus (in St. Mark's Library at Venice), a MS. of the Gospels complete, with a text elegantly written. It was first collated accurately by Tischendorf in 1843, and again by Tregelles in 1846. According to Tischendorf it belongs to the end of the 9th or to the 10th century.

V, Codex Mosquensis (in the library of the Holy Synod at Moscow), a MS. of the four Gospels, with several chasms. From Joh 7:39 has been supplied by a more recent hand of the 13th century, in cursive letters. It belongs to the 9th century, and was twice collated by Matthaei.

Wa, two leaves at the end of Codex Regius, now in the Imperial Library of Paris. They contain Luk 9:34-47; Luk 10:12-22, and are the fragment of a continuous MS. of the Gospels belonging to the 8th century. Tischendorf has edited the whole in his Monumenta Sacra inedita.

Wb, Codex Neapolitanus rescriptus, consisting of fourteen leaves which contain fragments of the first three Gospels as old as the 8th century. Tischendorf edited some verses of it in the Annales Vindobonenses (1847); and it is described by Scotti. Tischendorf supposes that the leaves belong to the same MS. as Wa.

Wc, three leaves at St. Gall, containing fragments of Mark and Luke. They are a sort of palimpsest, the writing having been effaced, though nothing new was written over. Tischendorf; who copied, and intends to edit these fragments, assigns them to the 9th century.

Wd, fragments of Mark's Gospel, 7, 8, 9, found in Trinity College, Cambridge, belonging to the 9th century.

X, Codex Monacensis, in the library of the University of Munich, containing fragments of the four Gospels. Commentaries of several fathers, especially Chrysostom, accompany the text, except Mark's. It belongs to the 9th or 10th century. Between Joh 2:22; Joh 7:1, is supplied by a later hand of the 12th century. The MS. was collated by Tischendorf and Tregelles. SEE MUNICH MANUSCRIPT.

Y, Codex Barberinus, No. 225, six leaves containing fragments of John's Gospel, belonging to the 8th century, copied by Tischendorf in 1843, and published in his Monumenta Sacra inedita, 1846. They are now in the Barberinian Library at Rome.

Z, Codex Dublinensis, in the library of Trinity College, Dublin, a palimpsest, containing fragments of Matthew's Gospel, and belonging to the 6th century. The text of this MS. presents ancient and valuable readings. It was published in facsimile by Barrett, 1801, 4to, and Tregelles has since (1853) deciphered the remainder (Printed Text, p. 166 sq.). SEE DUBLIN MANUSCRIPT.

Γ, a MS., now in the Bodleian Library, consisting of 157 leaves large 4to. It contains Luke's Gospel entire, and parts of the other three. The form of the letters resembles the Codex Clyprius or K. Tischendorf, who got it in the East, assigns it to the 9th century. He collated and described it in Anecdota sacra et profana.

The second half of this MS. has recently been found, containing the greatest part of Matthew and John. The date is 844.

Δ. Codex Sangallensis, a Greek-Latin MS. in the library of St. Gall, containing the four Gospels entire, with the exception of Joh 19:17-35. It is very similar in character to G (Cod. Boerneriansus), both belonging to the same age and country, i.e. they were written in the monastery of St. Gall, in Switzerland, in the 9th century. Rettig published it at Zürich, in fac-simile, in 1836. This MS., with the codices Augiensis and Boernerianus, are portions of one and the same document. SEE GALL, ST., MANUSCRIPT.

θ. Codex Tischendorfianus I, in the library of Leipzic University, consisting of four leaves, of which the third is almost decayed, containing a few fragments of Matthew's Gospel. Tischendorf assigns them to the end  of the 7th century. He published the contents in his Monumenta Sacra inedita, p. 1, etc.

θb, a fragment, containing six leaves, with Mat 22:23, and Mark 4, belonging to the 7th century.

θc, two leaves, containing Mat 21:19-24, and Joh 18:29-35, belonging to the 6th century.

θd, a small fragment of the 8th century, containing Luke 11.

θe, a fragment of Matthew 26, of the 6th century.

θf, four leaves, containing Mat 26:27, Mar 1:2. Of the 6th century.

θg, a fragment of John vi, belonging to the 6th century.

θh, a Greek-Arabic MS., containing three leaves, with Mat 14:25, belonging to the 9th century.

Λ, a MS. in the Bodleian Library, containing the Gospels of Luke and John entire. It consists of 157 leaves, and belongs to the 9th century. Tischendorf and Tregelles have collated it.

Π, a valuable MS. of the Gospels, almost complete, brought by Tischendorf from Smyrna to St. Petersburg. It belongs to the 9th century. (See Tischendorfs Notitia editionis codicis Bibliorum Sinaitici, etc., p. 51.)

Ξ, Codex Zacynthius, a palimpsest containing fragments of Luke's Gospel, belonging to the committee of the British and Foreign Bible Society. It is of the 8th century, and is accompanied by a catena of the 13th. Tregelles transcribed and published the fragments (1861). SEE ZACYNTHIAN MANUSCRIPT.

Such are the uncial MSS. hitherto collated. Their number is not great, but every year is adding to it. There are known upwards of a hundred uncials, including evangelistaria and apostoli. (See the table below.)

4. The number of the cursive MSS. (minuscules) in existence cannot be accurately calculated. Tischendorf catalogues about 500 of the Gospels, 200 of the Acts and Catholic Epistles, 250 of the Pauline Epistles, and a little less than 100 of the Apocalypse (exclusive of lectionaries); but this  enumeration can only be accepted as a rough approximation. Many of the MSS. quoted are only known by old references; still more have been “inspected” most cursorily; few only have been thoroughly collated. In this last work the Rev. F. H. Scrivener (Collation of about 20 MSS. of the Holy Gospels, Camb. 1853; Cod. Aug. etc., Camb. 1859) has labored with the greatest success, and removed many common errors as to the character of the later text. His summary is as follows:

Among the MSS. which are well known and of great value the following are the most important:

A. Primary Cursives of the Gospels: 1 (Acts 1; Paul. 1; Basileensis, K. 3:3). 10th cent. Very valuable in the Gospels. Collated by Roth and Tregelles.

33 (Acts 13; Paul. 17; Paris, Bibl. Imp. 14). 11th cent. Coll. by Tregelles.

59 (Coll. Gonv. et Cai. Cambr.). 12th cent. Coll. by Scrivener, 1860. but as yet unpublished.

69 (Act. 31; Paul. 37; Revelation 14; Cod. Leicestrensis). 14th cent. The text of the Gospels is especially valuable. Coll. by Tregelles, 1852, and by Scrivener, 1855, who published his collation in Cod. Aug. etc., 1859.

118 (Bodleian. Miscell. 13; Marsh 24). 13th cent. Coll. by Griesbach, Symnb. Crit. i, ccii sq.

124 (Caesar. Vindob. Nessel. 188). 12th cent. Col]. by Treschow, Alter, Birch.

127 (Cod. Vaticanus, 349). 11th cent. Coll. by Birch. 131 (Act. 70; Paul. 77; Apoc. 66; Cod. Vaticanus, 360). 11th cent. Formerly belonged to Aldus Maanutius, and was probably used by him in his edition. Coll. by Birch.

157 (Cod. Urbino-Vat. 2). 12th cent. Coll. by Birch. 218 (Act. 65; Paul. 57; Apoc. 33; Caesar-Viadob. 23). 13th cent. Coll. by Alter.

238, 259 (Moscow, S. Synod. 42, 45). 11th cent. Coll. by Matthlei.

262, 300 (Paris, Bibl. Imp. 53, 186). 10th and 11th cent. Coil. (?) by Scholz. 346 (Milan, Ambros. 23). 12th cent. Coll. (?) by Scholz. 2pe (St. Petersburg. Petropol. 6:470). 9th cent. Coll. by Muralt. (Transition cursive.)

cscr, gscr (Lambeth, 1177, 528, Wetstein, 71). 12th cent. Coll. by Scrivener. pscr (Brit. Mus. Burney, 20). 13th cent. Coll. by Scrivener. wscr (Cambr. Coll. SS. Trin. B. 10:16). 14th cent. Coll. by Scrivener.

To these must be added the Evanglelistarium (B. M. Burney, 22), marked yscr, coll. by Scriveler. (Cut, fig. 4.)

The following are valuable, but need careful collation: 13 (Paris, Bibl. Is-p. 50). Coll. 1797. 12th cent. (Comp. Griesbach, Symb. Crit. i, cliv-clxvi.) 22 (Paris, Bibl. Imp. 72). 11th cent.

28 (Paris, Bibl. Insp. 379). Coll. by Scholz.

72 (Brit. Mus. Harl. 5647). 11th cent.

106 (Cod. Winchelsea). 10th cent. Coll. by Jackson (used by Wetstein), 1748.

113,114 (Brit. Mus. Harl. 1810, 5540). 126 (Cod. Guelpheribytanus, 16:16). 11th cent. 130 (Cod. Vaticanus, 359). 13th cent. 209 (Act. 95: Paul. 138; Apoc. 46; Venice, Bibl. S. Marci. 10). 15th cent. The text of the Gospels is especially valuable.

225 (Vienna, Bibl. Insp. Kollar. 9, Forlos. 31). 12th cent. 372, 382 (Rome, Vatican. 1161. 2017). 15th and 13th cent. 405, 408, 409 (Venice, S. Marci, i. 10, 14,15). 11th and 12th cent.

B. Primary Cursives of the Acts and Catholic Epistles:

13=Gosp. 33, Paul. 17.

31= Gosp. 69 (Codex Leicestrensis).

65=Gosp. 218. 73 (Paul. 80. Vatican. 367). 11th cent. Coll. by Birch. 95. 96 (Venet. 10, 11). 14th and 11th cent. Coll. by Rinck. 180 (Argentor. Bibl. Sem. M.). Coll. by Arendt. loti=pscr 61 (Tregelles, Brit. Mus. Add. 20,003). 11th cent. Coll. by Scrivener. See cut, fis. 2.

ascr (Lambeth, 1182). 12th cent. Coll. by Scrivener. cscr (Lambeth, 1184). Coll. by Sanderson ap. Scrivener. The following are valuable, but require more careful collation:

5 (Paris, Bibl. Imp. 106).

25, 27 (Paul. 31; Revelation 7; Paul. 33. Brit. Mus. Harl. 5537, 5620). Comp. Griesbach, Symb. Crit. 2:184,185.

2) (Paul. 35; Genev. 20). 11th and 12th cent. 36 (Coll. Nov. Oxon.). 40 (Paul. 46: Revelation 12. Alex. Vatican. 179). 11th cent. Coll. by Zacagni.

66 (Paul. 67). 68 (Paul. 73, Upsal). 12th and 11th cent. 69 (Paul. 74; Apoc. 30; Guelph. 16:7). 14th and 13th cent.

81 (Berberini. 377). 11th cent. 137 (Milan. Ambros 97). 11th cent. Coll. by Scholz.

142 (Mutinensis, 243). 12th cent.

5. MSS. are sometimes divided by the critics of Germany into, 1. Such as were written before the practice of stichometry, a mode of dividing the text in lines or clauses. SEE STICHOMETRY. 2. The stichometrical. 3.Those written after stichometry had ceased. So Hug and De Wette, in their Introductions to the N.T. According to this classification, א, A, B, and C belong to the first class; D, D2, etc.. to the second; and by far the greatest number to the third. We have alluded to them under the two great heads of uncial and cursive.

In examining MSS. and comparing their characteristic readings, it is not easy in every instance to arrive at the true original form of a passage. Many circumstances are to be taken into account, and many cautions to be observed. They are more useful in detecting interpolated passages than in restoring the correct reading. The reading of an older MS. is preferable cceteris paribus. In determining the age of a MS. internal marks are chiefly followed, such as the form of the letters, the divisions, abbreviations, the nature of the lines, the presence or absence of the accents, etc. These particulars, however, are not safe criteria. Age alone is not sufficient to  insure the value of the text of a MS. The copyist may have been guilty of negligence or inattention. In proportion to his accuracy or carelessness the authority of the codex will be greater or less. Again, a document certainly copied from one which is very ancient will have greater authority than an earlier taken from another of no great antiquity. Thus a MS. of the eqihth century may have been directly copied from one of the fifth, and consequently the former will be entitled to greater estimation than one belonging to the 7th century transcribed from one of the 6th. In determining the value of a codex, it is usual to refer to the country where it was written. Griesbach and others prefer the African; Scholz, the Constantinopolitan. Those written in Egypt are the best. With respect to Hebrew MSS., it is admitted by all that the Spanish are the best. The Italian, again, are superior to the German. The reading contained in the greater number of MSS. is preferable to that of a less number. Mere majority, however, is not a safe criterion.

A majority arising from independent sources, or, in other words, of those belonging to different recensions, can alone be relied on as decisive. But here critics are not agreed as to the number of recensions belonging to Greek MSS. Some have proposed four, some three, others two. Besides, the same MS. may belong to a different recension in different parts of itself. In others, the characteristic readings of two or three recensions are mingled together, rendering it difficult to determine which recension or family preponderates. Hebrew MSS. belong to one and the same recension. It is true that some have distinguished them into Masoretic and Ante-masoretic, but the existence of the latter is a mere fiction. One great family alone, viz. the Masoretic, can be distinctly traced. Since the time of Lachmann's first edition, greater importance has been attached by N.T. critics to the age of MSS. It has been the object of his followers in the same department to adhere for the most part to the oldest copies. This is right within certain limits. The true text of the N.T., as far as we can now obtain it, lies in the MSS. of the 4th till the 8th centuries, accompanied and modified by the testimony of ancient versions and fathers during that period. But within this period we can easily distinguish MSS. of a second order in goodness, viz. E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, from those of the first class, א, A, B, C, Z (see Davidson's Biblical Criticism, vol. ii). SEE CRITICISM, BIBLICAL.

## Manuscripts, Hebrew[[@Headword:Manuscripts, Hebrew]]

             That Hebrew MSS. existed at a very early time may be seen from the following passage in the Mishna (Sopherim, 6:4): "R. Simon ben-Lakish says, three codices (of the Pentateuch) were found in the court of the temple, one of which had the reading מְעוֹן, the other ז — עִטוּטֵי, and the third differed in the number of passages wherein היאis read with a yod. Thus in the one codex it was written מְעוֹן, dwelling (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, ז — עִטוּטֵיwas found (Exo 24:11), while the other two codices had אֵתאּנ — עִרֵי; the reading in which the two codices agreed was declared valid, and that of the one invalid. In the third codex there were only nine passages which had היאwritten with a yod (as it is generally written הואwith a vav), whereas the other two had eleven passages; the readings of the two were declared valid, and those of the one invalid." The minute prescriptions contained in the Talmud concerning the material, color, letters, writing instruments, etc., for the manuscripts, only prove the fact that such manuscripts existed, otherwise St. Jerome could not have written "Veterum librorum fides de Hebraicis voluminibus examinanda est" (Epist. ad Luciniun). The greatest care was exhibited in writing of MSS., and three mistakes were sufficient to make a copy worthless (Menachoth, fol. 29, Colossians 2).

When the study of the Talmud was no longer attractive amid the disorder and frequent closing, of the Babylonian academies, and ulterior development of the traditions became exhausted, attention was more directed to Scripture. The number of MSS. increased, and to them the various systems of vowel-points and accents, together with the first elements of grammar, were appended. But not all of these MSS. are now extant, some are only known from the quotations made from them by different writers. In treating, therefore, of the different MSS., we shall have to speak of two kinds of such as are lost, and of such as are extant.

I. LOST MANUSCRIPTS.

1. The Codex Hillel (q.v.).

2. The Codex Sanbuki (q.v.).

3. The Jericho Pentateuch. Concerning this יריחי חומשElias Levita writes thus: "The Pentateuch of Jericho is doubtless a correct codex of the Pentateuch derived from Jericho. It discusses the plene and defectives as הִתּוֹעֵבוֹת, 'the abominations' (Lev 18:27), which is in this Pentateuch without the second vav. So also יְלַידֵי, which occurs twice in the same chapter (Num 13:13; Num 13:22), of which the first is plene (written in the Jericho codex), and the second defective."

4. The Codex Sinai (q.v.).

5. The Codex Ben-Naphtali. Moses ben-David Naphtali, a contemporary of Ben-Asher, flourished about A.D. 900-960. He distinguished himself by his edition of a revised text of the Hebrew Scriptures in opposition to Ben- Asher, in which he had no great success, inasmuch as the different readings he collated and. proposed are very insignificant, and are almost entirely confined to the vowel-points and accents. The codex itself is lost, but many of its readings are preserved, e.g. by Kimchi in his Grammar and Lexicon, while a complete list of these different readings is appended to Bomberg's and Buxtorfs Rabbinic, and to Walton's Polyglot Bible. First, in his Concordance, page 137, sec. 48, has also given the variations between these two scholars.

The most important difference between Ben-Naphtali and Ben-Asher is the reading of שלהבת יה, Son 8:6, as two words, while Ben- Asher reads it as one word, שלהבתיה, both readings having the same meaning. In a very convenient form these variations are given by Bar and Delitzsch in their edition of the different parts of the Old Test., on Genesis, page 81, Job, page 59, Psalms, page 136, Proverbs, page 55, Isaiah, page 90, Minor Prophets, page 90, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Daniel, pages 91, 126, Ezekiel, page 112.

Our printed editions have for the most part the rending of Ben-Asher; very seldom, however, that of Ben Naphtali is found, with the exception of such codices as have the Babylonian system of punctuation, and which always follow Ben-Naphtali. The editions in which the reading שלהבת יה(i.e., Ben-Naphtali's) is found are: Bomberg's Rabbinic (1517) and his quarto edition (1518), Stephen's (1543), Munster's (15461, Hutter (1587), Antwerp Polyglot (1571), Bragadin's Hebrew Bible (1614), Simoni's (1767-1828), Jahn's (1806), Bagster's (1839), Basle edition (1827), Hahn- Rosenmiiller's (1868).  I. EXTANT MANUSCRIPTS.

I. In order to have a correct opinion of the codices extant, the following points must be observed:

1. Whether the MS. was written for public or private use. Those written for public use, commonly called "synagogue rolls" or "sacred copies," were prepared with that care and minuteness of which prescriptions are given in the Talmud, while the others were less carefully made. They are written sometimes in the square, at others in the rabbinical character. Their size is entirely arbitrary. They are in folio, quarto, octavo, and duodecimo. Of those written in the square character, the greater number are on parchment, some on paper. As to the square character employed in the MSS., it has varieties. The Jews themselves distinguish in the synagogue roll (1) the Tam letter, with sharp corners and perpendicular coronulse, used among the German and Polish Jews: (2) the Velshe letter, more modern than the Tam, and rounder, with coronulse, particularly found in the sacred copies of the Spanish and Oriental Jews.

2. Whether the copyist, in writing and correcting the MS., had regard to some version or not. That such was sometimes the case may be seen from a MS. containing the Psalms, and belonging to the 15th century, known as Scaliger 8 (because Scaliger once had it), and preserved at the.Academy of Leyden (comp. Heidenheim, in his Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift, 2:466- 468).

3. What its date is. The Jews employed different dates in their MSS. Some used the "Seleucidic" or "Greek" era (חשבון היונים), called also AEra Contractuum (מנין שטרות), which was employed until the 11th century, and ceased entirely in the year A.D. 1511. Another computation was the reckoning from the destruction of Jerusalem (A.M. 3828, A.D. 68). A third computation was the sera of the creation (לבריאת עולם, לבריאה), and was introduced by European transcribers. When it became more general, after the year of the world 4000, the 4000 years were gradually omitted. This system of mentioning only the hundreds and lower numbers was called "the small aera" (לפרט קטן, abbreviated לפ8 8ק), in contradistinction from the full numbering (פרט גדול).

In order to find out to which year A.D. one of the years of the Seleucidic or Greek sera, or of the Jewish computation, either from the creation or  from the destruction, corresponds, it must be borne in mind that the Jewish civil calendar commences with the month of Tishri, תשרי, corresponding to our September or October, and the Seleucidic sera with the first of October, 312 B.C. Thus, e.g. the year 283 of the Seleucidic erae would be the year 329 B.C., i.e., 312-283 = 29, allowing, however, some months because of the difference in the calendar 30-29. In Jewish MSS. we frequently find the small sera, or לפרט קטן. Thus cod. 2 of Kennicott has an epigraph which states that it was written in the year 64, that is 5064. By adding to this number the number 240 (i.e., the difference between the Jewish and Christian computation), we get 5304; deducting from this 4000 (i.e. the time from the creation to the birth of Christ), we get the year A.D. 1304; or the same date may be had by adding to the year 64 the number 240=304, combined with the fifth thousand=1304. The date according to the era of the destruction of Jerusalem is found by adding 68 to the given date: thus the year 900 after the destruction would be 900+68=968, or A.I). 1885 would be the year 1817 after the destruction (i.e., 1885- 68=1817).

4. Where the codices were written, as there is a difference between the Spanish and the German, the Eastern and Western codices.

(a) As to the Spanish and German codices, there is a great diversity of opinion. Kennicott and De' Rossi speak of the German very highly, while Jewish authorities prefer the Spanish codices. Thus Elias Levita tells us," Most of the correct codices I found to be Spanish, and it is upon these that I relied, and it is their method which I followed.... The Spanish codices are more correct than all other exemplars."

(b) As to the Eastern and Western codices. At the beginning of the Christian era there were two rival academies, one in Palestine and the other in Babylonia. Both had their Talmud (q.v.), respectively known as the Palestinian and Babylonian Talmud, but also their codices, in which they differed from each other. And thus we find in Rabbinical as well as in Biblical codices marginal notes, giving the passages where the Eastern and Western differ from each other. Thus, e.g. cod. Kennic. 516 (Florent. 13, Laur. 3, 3, scr. an. 1291), "The Westerns or Palestinians read עשריה, the Easterns or Babylonians עשיריה.'" These variations were first collected by Jacob ben-Chayim in the Rabbinic Bible (Venice, 1526), under the title, המקרא שבין בניארוֹ ישראל ובן בני בבל חלוŠ. Chayim does not  give the source from which he took these variations, but Morinus (Exercitt. Biblic. page 409, Paris, 1669 fol.) testifies that he saw a list of these variations in some MSS.

As to the Eastern and Western readings, which were published by Chayim, we must observe

(1) that none occur in the Pentateuch;

(2) that these readings only refer to letters and words (with two exceptions, viz. Jer 6:6, where the Eastern write עצהּ מפיק, i.e., עצהwith a mappik, and Amo 3:6, where they note עשהּ מפיק, i.e., עשהwith a mappik);

(3) they seldom change the sense, as for the most part they concern the omission or addition, or permutation or transposition, of quiescent letters (Lam 5:21, יהוהis read by the Occidentals, while the Orientals have אדני);

(4) there are two hundred and sixteen various readings in Chayim's Bible (and in all Rabbinic Bibles which followed that of Chayim), viz. Joshua 11 : Judges 8; Samuel 10; Kings 21; Isaiah 18; Jeremiah 34; Ezekiel 22; Minor Prophets, 13; Chronicles 11; Psalms 8; Job , 12; Proverbs 8; Ruth, 7; Song of Solomon , 2; Ecclesiastes 6; Lamen. 6; Esther 4; Daniel 8; Ezra , 7.

(5) The European or Western Jews follow the reading of the Western (מערבאי), and thus it happens that in the one or the other codex we find another reading from that of the Eastern codices. Thus, in 2Ki 18:29, Norzi (q.v.) remarks on the reading להציל אתכם מידו, that those codices which read מידיfollow the Babylonian (כבני בבל), but the Palestinian codices, which we follow, give in the list of variations מידו.

II. After these preliminaries, we will speak of the extant codices.

1. The Codex of Asher. 'See Asher Manuscript.

2. The Codex of Cahira. This codex contains the prophets, and is preserved at Cahira, in the synagogue of the Karaites. It was written in the year 827 after the destruction of the temple, or in the year 4656 of the creation = A.D. 895.

3. Codex Kennic. 126. This codex contains the later prophets, and is preserved in the British Museum (Sloane, 4708). See Sloane Codex.

4. The Codices of Damascus and Guber. The former codex the late Dr.Moses Margoliouth saw at Damascus, belonging to the family Farrhi. It is regarded as very sacred, and the Jews themselves are only allowed to look at it once a year, that is on the feast of שמחת תורה, i.e., "the Joy of the Law," which takes place at the termination of the Feast of Tabernacles. Dr. Margoliouth, who saw it, says that this codex "deserves the palm for beauty and execution." According to a notice added later on the title-page, it should belong to the 3d century. Another codex, Dr. Margoliouth states, is at Guber or Juber, near Damascus. "There is a synagogue at that small place which is considered the most ancient in the world; and, moreover, Hebrew writers affirm that it is built over the cave of Elijah. The MS. there is by no means so fine a masterpiece as the Damascus one, but is certainly much older. A most awful anathema is written on the cover, against any one selling or stealing it" (Pilgrimage to the Land of my Fathers, 1:257).

5. Codices Kennicottiani. Of these we enumerate the following:

(1) Cod. 590 — containing the Prophets and Hagiographa, written about 1018 or 1019, now in the Imperial Library at Vienna.

(2) Cod. 536 — containing the Pentateuch, Haphtaroth, and Megilloth [i.e., Song of Songs, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, and Esther] (Cesense Bibl. Malatest. Patrum D. Franc. Convent. plut. 29: cod. 2), of the end of the 11th century. It commences with Gen 2:13.

(3) Cod. 162 — Joshua, Judges, Samuel (Florentiae Biblioth. Laurent. part. 1, pars 2, cod. 45), of the beginning of the 12th century.

(4) Cod. 154 — Prophets, with both Targums (Carlsruhe, Biblioth. publ.), A.D. 1106. This is the famous Code Reuchlinianus, which has the epigraph: "In the year 4866 A.M. and 1038 since the destruction of the temple." The Targum, according to this codex, has been published by Lagarde, Leipsic, 1872.

Besides these we may mention:

(5) Cod. 193 — Pentateuch, without points (Mediolani Bibl. Ambros. G. 2), A.D. 1287, or somewhat earlier. Of various readings, the following are marked by De' Rossi: Exo 12:31, ויקרא פרעה, so also Sept.,  Vulg., Syr. Lev 12:7, עליה הכהן, Samuel, Sept., Syr. 25:35, וחי אחי,ָ Samuel, Sept.

(6) Cod. 201 — Prophets and Hagiographa, of the 12th century (Norimb. Biblioth. Ebner). Jeremiah follows the book of Samuel, and 1 Kings, Ezekiel, and Isaiah follows Jeremiah.

(7) Cod. 210 — Bible of the 12th century (Parisiis Biblioth. Reg. 10).

(8) Cod. 224 — Prophets and Hagiographa, of the 12th century (Regiomonti Biblioth. Reg.).

(9) Cod. 366 — Prophets, in large 4to, of the 12th century (Parisiis San- German. 2). Jer 29:19 to Jer 38:2 and Hos 4:4 to Amo 6:12 is wanting.

(10) Cod. 293 — Pentateuch, with the Megilloth and Masorah in fol., A.D. 1144 (Toleti ap. Bayerum). The epigraph reads, "Written כֹוֹֹדֹ, i.e., 4904 A.M." Deu 7:13, יהוה נשבעfor נשבע, confirming the reading of the Samuel and Sept.

(11) Cod. 531 — Prophets and Hagiographa, with the Masorah and Targum, fol., 2 volumes, A.D. 1193 (Boonoisa, Biblioth. S. Salvatoris Canon. Reg. 646, 647). The epigraph bears the date 953 (+240) =1193.

(12) Cod. 326 — Hagiographa, Joshua, Judges, Samuel, 4to, A.D. 1198 (Parisiis Bibl. Regian. 48).

6. De' Rossi's Codices. Of these we particularize the following:

(1) Cod. 634 — fragments of Leviticus and Numbers, 4to, 8th century, Containing Lev 21:22 to Num 1:50. Lev 22:4, ואיש, so Sept.

(2) Cod. 503 — Pentateuch, in 4to, 9th or 10th century, commencing with Gen 42:14 to Deu 15:12,

Exo 21:20, בשבטis omitted, as in Samuel 22:9, אוכל הבהמה, Samuel, Sept., Syr., Arab. 23:23, והחתי והגרגשי, Samuel, Sept. 24:12, האבנים, Samuel 13, ויעל משה ויהושע, Sept. ἀνέβησαν. 37:5, בהם לשאת את הארן, Samuel, Arab. 39:33, ובריחו, Syr., Arab. Lev 1:2, מן הצאן, 1Sa 7:6, יאכלomitted, Vulg.

(3) Cod. 262 — Pentateuch, Megilloth, Haphtaroth, in fol. 11th or 12th century. Lev 4:14, אלפתח אהל, Sept., Vulg. 5:8, והקריב הכהן, Compe, Sept. sx,40, יכבס בגדיו ורחוֹ במים, Sept. (but not the Complut. and Aldine). 19:27, ולא, Samuel, Vulg., Arab. Deu 1:40, פנו וסעו לכם, 1Sa 3:14, ויאיר, Samuel, Sept., Syro, Arab., Targ., Jonathan. הארגב, 1Sa 6:2, ובני,ָ Sept., Vulg. 34:2, נפתלי כלארוֹ, Sept., Syr.

(4) Cod. 274 — Pentateuch, with points, 4to, 11th or 12th century: it ends with Deu 32:51, and has the Masorah finalis.

Gen 31:35, ותאמר רחל אל אביה, Syr. Num 29:11, ונסכה, Sept. 27, כמשפטם, Sept., Syr.

7. The Odessa MSS. In the year 1845 E. M. Primer published his Prospectus der der Odessaer Gesellschaft fur Geschichte und Alterthumer gehorenden altesten tund rabbinischen Manuscripte, whereby a number of MSS. became known to the literary world. They were bought in 1863, and are now in the Imperial Library at St. Petersburg. A very accurate catalogue of them was published by Harkavy and Strack (Leipsic and St. Petersburg, 1875). Of these codices only two are of great importance, viz,, one containing the later prophets, dated A.D. 916, and another containing a complete Old Test. with both Masorahs, on 491 leaves, said to be a copy of Asher's codex (?). It is dated A.D. 1009. Of the latter, Bar and Delitzsch availed themselves in their Hebrew-Latin edition of the Psalms and in the edition of Job, where a facsimile of that codex is also given. The former has been-published by H.L. Strack (Prophetarum Posteriorum Codex Babylonicus Petropolitanus, Lipsiae, 1876) in facsimile, by means of photo-lithography, at the expense of the emperor Alexander II of Russia. The whole work was done in three years, and is a monument to the editor and his imperial patron. The text, surrounded with Masoretic notes, and furnished with the so-called Babylonian system of vocalization, occupies 449 folio pages.

The Latin preface gives the history of the codex, and the critical annotations, which follow the text, are intended to help the student in the perusal of the same. The following list of various "readings does not affect the vowel points, but merely the consonants. The reading of Van der Hooght is given first:  Isa 1:7, עריכם— ועריכם, and so many codd., Syr., Arab. 22, לסגים— לסיגים, thus some older and modern editions, as Miinaster, Hutter, Michaelis, Hahn-Rosenmuller, Letteris, Bar-Delitzsch. 3:23, הגלינים— והגלינים, so great many codd., all versions, Rashi, Kimchi, Ibn-Ezr 4:1, ושמלתנו— ושמלתינו, so some codd., Sept., Syr., Arab., Vulg. 7:14, עמנואל— עמנו אל, thus many codd. and editions, as Munster, Hutter, Clodius-Birkelin, Michaelis, Reineccius, Simonis, Hahn- Rosenmiller, Stier and Theile's Polyglot, the Warsaw Rabbinic Bible. 10:16, אדני— יהוה, so many codd. and editions. 15:2, כל— גדועה וכל— גרועה, so many codd., and editions of Athias, Clodius, Opitz, Michaelis, Reineccius, Simonis, Letteris, Bar-Delitzsch.

4, נפשו— ונפשו. 16:7, חרשֹת— חרשׁת. 10, לא ירעע— ולא ירעע, the ולאis found in many codd., Sept., Syr., Targ., Vulg., Arab. six, 13, והתעו— התעו, many codd., Vulg., Targ., Norzi, and a great many editions. 20:2, רגל—ָ רגלי,ָ codd, Sept., Syr., Vulg., Arab. 21:12, אתא — אתה, so many codd. 18:2, לאדני— ליהוה, so many codd. 29:19, ואביוני— ואביני. 23, ימעשה— מעשה. 30:6, עורים, Kethib, עירים, Keri — עירים, Kethib and Keri. 33:1, בגדו ב—ָ בגדו בו. 34:13, קמושׁ — קמושֹ. 35:9, לא יהיה— ולא יהיה. 36:2, רבשקה— רב שקה. 15, לא— ולא. 37:9, על— אל. 17, עינ—ָ עיני,ָ Sept., Syr., Vulg. 3S, אסר הדן— אסרהדן. 38:11, חדל— חלד. 14, יהוה— — אדני. 18, לא ישברו— ולא ישברו39:6, לא יותר— — ולא יותר. 43:19, עתה — ועתה. 44:24, מיאתי— מי אתי. 45:21, יועצו— נועצו, but by a later hand יועצו. 49:9, לאשר— ולאשר, many coddo, Sept., Vulg., Syr., Targ. 51:9, רננו— ורננו. 54:9, כי מי— כימי. 56:1, אל יהוה— — על יהוה. 63:11, רעה— רעי, so many codd.,Vulg., D. Kimchi, Abarbanel, Solomon ben-Melech. 64:3, לא האזינו— ולא האזינו, so many codd, 65:20, לא יהיה— ולא יהיה. 22, לא יטעו— ולא יטעו. 66:2, על דברי— אל דברי. 17, אחד, Kethib, אחת, Keri — אחת, Kethib and Keri. This very incomplete list from the prophet Isaiah (space prohibits our giving readings from the other prophets) is sufficient to show the great importance of this codex.

8. The Firkowitsch MSS. This famous collection of the Karaite Abraham Firkowitsch (q.v.) was bought for the Imperial Library at St. Petersburg in the year 1862, and is also described by Harkavy and Strack in their Catalogue. Altogether this collection contains 146 MSS., of which 47 are synagogue rolls (1-5 on leather, 6-47 on parchment), three of which contain only the entire Pentateuch (No. 10, dated A.D. 940, 19, dated A.D. 920, and No. 47), and the rest manuscripts in book form (viz., No. 48-146; of which 48123 are without translation, 124-146 with translation, the translations being either Arabic, Tartar, or Persian). In the several parts of the Old Test. edited by Bar and Delitzsch, the prelaces also contain notices concerning manuscripts used by the editors.

Literature. — Tychsen, Tentfamen de Variis Codicum Hebraicorum . . . Generibus (Rostock, 1772); Befreytes Tentamen, etc. (Leipsic, 1774); Eichhorn, Einleitungy in das Alte Testament, 2:456-584 (4th ed. Gottingen, 1823); De' Rossi, Proleg. 1:19-21, § 19; De Wette, Einleitung, § 140-146, 8th ed.; § 108-114, 7th ed.; Strack, Prolegomena Critica, page 9-58. For a description of manuscripts, see Le Long, Biblioth. Sacra, I, ch. 2, page 4961 (ed. Paris, 1723 fo.); Wolf, Bibl. Hebraea, 2:293-324; 4:79- 98; Kennicott, Dissert. Generalis (Oxford, 1780 fol.; ed. Bruns, Brunswick, 1783); De' Rossi, I, 59-94; 97-125; 126-135; IV, 22-28; Manuscripti Codices Hebraici Bibliotheca (Parma, 1803, 3 volumes); G.B. De' Rossi, Libri Stampati di Letteratura Sacra Ebraica ed Orientale della Bibliotheca del Dott. pages 79-82 (ibid. 1812); Kocher, Nova Bibliotheca Hebraica, 2:42-46; Rosenmuller, Handbuch fur die Literatur der bibl. Kritik, etc., 2:17 sq.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:96; Catalogus Universitatis Lipsiensis, tom. 83 (exeg. appar.), fol. 203-205. Besides these works, compare the different catalogues of public librarie's, viz.,

1. Vatican: Assemani, Bibliothecae Apostolicae Vaticanae Codicum Manua Scriptorum Catalogus (Rome, 1756 fol.).

2. Bodleian: Uri, Catalogus (Oxford, 1787), and Steinschneider, Conspectus Codd. MSS. Hebraeorum, etc. (Berlin, 1857).

3. Cambridge: Schiller-Szinessy, Catalogue of the Hebrew MSS. preserved in the University Library (Cambridge, 1875).

4. Paris: Catalogue des Manuscrits Hebreux et Samaritans de la Bibliotheque Imperiale (Paris, 1866).

5. Vienna: Krafft und Deutsch, Die handschriftlichen hebraischen Werke der k. Hofbibliothek zu Wien (Vienna, 1847).

6. St. Petersburg: Catalog der hebraischen Bibelhandschriften der kaiserlichen offentlichen Bibliothek in St. Petersburg, by Harkavy and Strack (1875).

7. Munich: Steinschneider, Die hebrniischen Handschriften der k. Hof-und Staats-Bibliothek in Munchen (1875).

8. Berlin: Steinschneider, Verzeichniss der hebraischen Handschriften der kiniglichen Bibliothek (1878).

9. Leyden: Steinschneider, Catalogus Codicum Hebraeorum Bibl. Acad. Lugd. Batavice (Leyden, 1858).

10. Leipsic: Catalogus Librorum Manui Scr'iptorum ... Codices Linguaruman Orientalium Descripserunt, by Fleischer and Delitzsch (Grimnla, 1838).

11. Hamburg: Steinschneider, Catalog der Handschriften in der Stadtbibliothek zu Hamburg (1877).

12. Turinl: Codices Manuscripti Bibliothecae Regiae Taurinensis Athenaei, edd. Pasinus, Rivantella, Berta (Turin, 1749).

13. Dresden: Fleischer, Catalogus Codicum MSS. Orientalium Biblioth. Reg. Dresdensis (Dresden, 1831).

14. Florence: Bisconius, Bibliothecae Ebraicae Graecae Florentinae. S. Bibliothecae Mediaeo-Laurentianae Catalogus (Florence, 1757).

15. Cesena: Mucciolus, Catalogus Codicumn Manuscriptorum Malatestianae Caesenatis Bibliothecae (1780, 1784, 2 volumes, fol.).

16. Parma. See above, De' Rossi.

17. Spain and Portuqgatl: Neubauer, Notes sur des Manuscrits Rebreux Existant dans Quelques Bibliotheques de l'Espagne et du Portugal, in the Archives des Missions Scientifiques et Litteraires, II, 5:423-435 (Paris, 1868).

The various readings found in the St. Petersburg manuscripts and in such as have of late come.to light, but are enumerated by Bar and Delitzsch in  the different parts of their Old-Test. edition, have been made use of by the latter, and are given in a very convenient form in the Appendices Criticae et Masoreticae, viz. Genesis, pages 74 sq.; Job, pages 33-56; Psalms, pages 83-123; Proverbs, pages 30-54; Isaiah, pages 65-82; Ezekiel, pages 73-107; Minor Prophets, pages 59-85; Daniel, pages 62-85; Ezra- Nehemiah, pages 99-119 (these last three books printed together). Of the St. Petersburg manuscripts, professor Delitzsch has also made use in his commentary on Song of Songs (pages 178-184) and Ecclesiastes (pages 425-435), published at Leipsic in 1875. A comparison of the Codex Babylonicus from the year 916, and of the MS. from the year 1009, with Hahn's edition of the Old Test., which in the main is a reprint of Van der Hooght, has been made by Strack with reference to Isaiah, and the result was published in the Zeitschrift fur lith. Theologie, 1877, pages 17-52. All these various readings do not essentially impair the authority of the Masoretic text, nor materially alter the meaning of any important passage. (B.P.)

## Manwantara[[@Headword:Manwantara]]

             a grand period of time in Hindu chronology, including seventy-one maha- yugs, or divine ages, being the reign of one Manu (q.v.), with his posterity of sons and grandsons. The reigns of the fourteen Manus who reigned in succession extended to one thousand maha-yugs, or one kalpa.

## Manx Version[[@Headword:Manx Version]]

             SEE MANKS.

## Maoch[[@Headword:Maoch]]

             (Heb. Maok', מָעוֹךְ, compressed; Sept. ‘Α᾿μμάχ,Vulg. Maoch), the father of the Achish king of Gath to whom David repaired for safety (1Sa 27:2). B.C. ante 1054. By many he has been confounded with the MAACAH of 1Ki 2:39. SEE ACHISH.

## Maon[[@Headword:Maon]]

             (Heb. Maon', מָעוֹן, habitation, as often; Sept. Μαών), the name of a man and of a place. SEE MAONITE.

1. The son of Shammai, of the tribe of Judah and family of Caleb, and the “father” (i.e. founder) of Bethzur (1Ch 2:45). B.C. prob. post 1618.

2. A town in the tribe of Judah (Jos 15:55), which gave name to a wilderness (part of the desert of Judaea), where David hid himself from Saul, and around which the churlish Nabal had great possessions (1Sa 23:24-25; 1Sa 25:2). Josephus calls it Emma (Ε᾿μμᾶ, Ant. 6:13, 6). Eusebius and Jerome place it to the east of Daroma (Onomast. s.v. Μανῶν, Maon). Irby and Mangles were in the neighborhood in 1818, but did not detect this and other ancient names. Robinson finds it in the present lMain, which is about seven miles south by east from Hebron. Here there is a conical hill about 200 feet high, on the top of which are some ruins of no great extent, consisting of foundations of hewn stone, a square enclosure, the remains probably of a tower or castle, and several cisterns. The view from the summit is extensive. The traveler found here a band of peasants keeping their flocks, and dwelling in caves amid the ruins (Bibl. Researches, 2:190-196). With this identification De Saulcy (Narrative, 1:441) and Schwarz (Palestiune, p. 106) agree. SEE MEHUNIM.

## Maonite[[@Headword:Maonite]]

             (Heb. same word as MAON, used collectively; Sept. and Vulg. interpret Χαναάν [v. r. Μαδιάμ], Chanaan, Auth. Vers. “Maonites”), an Arabian tribe mentioned in connection with the Amalekites, Sidonians, Philistines, and others as having oppressed the Hebrews (Jdg 10:12). They are the same as the MEUNITES (מְעוּנַים, Meuinim', the plural of MAON; Sept. Μιναῖοι, confounding them with the Ammonites; Vulg. Ammonitae, and tabernzacult; Auth. Vers. “Mehunims,” and “the habitations”), elsewhere  mentioned in a similar connection (2 Chronicles 26:27; 1Ch 4:41). SEE MEHUNIM. At the present day there exists a town called Maa'ni, with a castle, in Arabia Petraea, to the south of the Dead Sea (see Seetzen, in Zach's Monatl. Corresp. 18:382; Burckhardt, Travels in Syria, p. 437). Prof. Robinson says, “Ma'an, the well-known town on the route of the Syrian Haj, nearly east of wady Musa, is with good reason assumed as the probable seat of the Maonites mentioned in the Scriptures. Abulfeda (Syr. p. 14) describes Ma'an as inhabited by Ommiades and their vassals” (Researches, 2:572). That the Mincei of Arabia (Diod. Sic. 3:42; Ptol. 6:7, 23; Strabo, 16:768) are a different people has long since been shown by Bochart (Phaleg, 2:23). Traces of the name AMaon are found in several localities besides that of the above passages. It is given to a town in the south of Judah, now identified with the ruins of Tell Main (Porter, Handbook for S. and P. p. 61). In pronouncing a prophetic curse upon Moab, Jeremiah mentions Beth-meon (48:23), which may perhaps be the same as the Beth-baal-meon of Jos 13:17, and the Baal-meon of Num 32:38, and would thus be identical with the ruin Main, three miles south of Heshbon. SEE BETH-BAAL-MEON. Hence “it is probable that all these names indicate the presence of an ancient and powerful nomad tribe, which was allied to the Phoenicians (or Sidonians), whose earliest settlements were in the vale of Sodom, and with the Amalekites who dwelt in the wilderness south of Palestine. These Mnaonites migrated eastward, leaving their name at Maon in the south of Judah, where they may have had their headquarters for a time, and again at Beth-meon, on the plateau of Moab; and also at the large modern village above described.”

## Maori (or New Zealand) Version Of The Scriptures[[@Headword:Maori (or New Zealand) Version Of The Scriptures]]

             The Maori is the most cultivated of all the Polynesian dialects. SEE NEW ZEALAND. The first copies of portions of the New Test. were printed in 1832, having been translated by the Reverend Mr. Yate, but the first complete edition of the New Test. did not appear till 1840. A second was printed in 1842, and a third in 1844, all at the expense of the British and Foreign Bible Society. A revised edition by bishop Williams and the Reverend T.W. Meller was published more recently. The Old Test. was completed in 1856, the translation being that of the Reverend R. Maunsell. In 1859 a revision of the Bible was undertaken, which was completed in 1867. This revised edition has also been printed since. See Bible of Every Land, page 383. (B.P.)

## Maoris[[@Headword:Maoris]]

             SEE NEW ZEALAND.

## Maphrian[[@Headword:Maphrian]]

             is in the Syrian Church the highest episcopal dignitary after the patriarch of Antioch. The jurisdiction of the maphrian extends over Chaldaea, Assyria, and Mesopotamia. His residence was formerly at Tabriz, beyond the Tigris, but since this see has coalesced with that of Mosul it is at the latter place. Neale (Introd. Hist. of the Eastern Church, p. 152) says that “the maphrians are now only nominally distinguished from the other metropolitans.”

## Maphrida[[@Headword:Maphrida]]

             the second dignitary of the Jacobite Church (q.v.) in the East.

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

             an English minister, was born at Margaret-Inge, Huntingdonshire, in 1631; received his education at Westminster School and Trinity College, Cambridge; in 1653 became fellow of Trinity; in 1658 became tutor to Joscelin, earl of Northumberland; in 1660 entered upon the study of medicine, and finally practiced it with great success, filling at one time the chair of physic in Gresham College, London. Having turned his attention to the study of divinity, he took, in 1682, both deacon's and priest's orders; was soon after presented to the rectory of Braybrooke, in Northamptonshire, by lord Griffin; in 1684 was chosen lecturer of Ipswich; in 1685 vicar of St. Lawrence, Jewry, and lecturer of St. Christopher's, in London; received his D.D. in 1689, and in 1707 was chosen president of Sion College. He died at Westminster in 1721. Dr. Mapletoft published Principles and Duties of the Christian Religioni (2d ed., corrected and enlarged, Lond. 1713, 8vo), and other minor pieces upon moral and theological subjects.

## Mappa[[@Headword:Mappa]]

             the name of the linen cloth with which the communion table, and subsequently the altar, was covered. It came to be considered essential that this cloth should be of linen, according to some, in commemoration of the linen cloth in which the body of the Lord was wrapped. This, however, it seems would apply better to the corporale (q.v.). Optatus of Milene, in De schismnate Donatistarum, speaks of this custom as general. In the Roman Catholic Church there are a number of regulations concerning the maspspa, which is always to be blessed by the bishop, or by some one commissioned by him for the purpose. — Pierer, Universal-Lexikon, 10:848; Herzog, Real-Encyklopädie, 9:7.

## Mara[[@Headword:Mara]]

             (Heb. Mlara', מָרָא, for מָרָה, bitter, as explained in the context; Sept. πικρία Vulg. Matrl , id est amara), a symbolical name proposed for herself by Naomi on account of her misfortunes (Rth 1:20). SEE RUTH.

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

             a famous diva of Hindu mythology mentioned in the history of Gautsama (q.v.).

## Marabuts[[@Headword:Marabuts]]

             a name given to the descendants of the Moravides (q.v.; SEE MOHAMMEDANS ), or Amoravides, a certain Arabic tribe which, in 1075, founded a dynasty in the north-western parts of Africa, and held Morocco and Spain for a considerable period. The Almohades having put an end to their temporal dominion, their descendants exercise to this day a kind of spiritual superiority over the Moslem negroes in Barbary, the coast of Guinea, etc. At present the Marabuts form a kind of priestly order, officiating at mosques and chapels, explaining the Koran, providing the faithful with amulets, prophesying, and working miracles. They are looked up to with great awe and reverence by the common people, who also allow them a certain vague license over their goods and chattels, their wives not excluded. The Great Marabut ranks next to the king, and the dignity of a Marabut is generally hereditary. One of the most eminent Marabuts of our day is the celebrated Mohammedan warrior Abd-el-Kader, who was born in 1807, and in 1832 opened the contest against the French to expel the latter from African territory, which resulted so unsuccessfully to the Mohammedan cause.

## Maracas[[@Headword:Maracas]]

             idols of the Brazilians. The word is a corruption of Tanmaraca, which is the name of a certain fruit about the size of an ostrich's egg, and shaped like a gourd. These idols, indeed, were nothing more than the fruit Tamaraca dressed up in beautiful feathers, and fixed on a staff, which the priests stuck in the ground, and ordered the people to bring food and drink before it.

## Marae[[@Headword:Marae]]

             is the name given in the South Sea islands to a heathen temple. All were uncovered, and resembled oratories rather than temples. The form of the interior or area was frequently that of a square or parallelogram, the sides of which extended forty or fifty feet. Two sides of this space were enclosed by a high stone wall; the front was protected by a low fence; and opposite, a solid pyramidal structure was raised, in front of which the images were kept and the altars fixed. These piles were often immense. Within the enclosure, the houses of the priests and keepers of the idols were erected. Ruins of these temples are found in every situation; on the summit of a hill, on the extremity of a point of land extending into the sea, or in the recesses of an extensive and overshadowing grove.

## Marafoschi, Prospero[[@Headword:Marafoschi, Prospero]]

             an Italian prelate, was born Sept. 29,1653, at Macerata; entered the priesthood while yet a youth; became canon of St. Peter's at Rome, and later bishop in partibus of Cyrene. He enjoyed the favor and confidence of several of the incumbents of the papal chair. Clement XI, in 1721, gave him the archiepiscopal see of Cesarea and Cappadocia; Benedict XIII created him cardinal in 1724, and in 1726 made him vicar-general of Rome. He died Feb. 24, 1732. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 23:347.

## Marah[[@Headword:Marah]]

             (Hebrew Marah', מָרָה,: bitterness, from the taste of the water; Sept. Μεῤῥᾶ, Πικρία, Vulg. Mara), a brackish fountain, forming the sixth station of the Israelites, three days distant from their passage across the Red Sea (Exodus 15:33; Num 23:8). Finding here a well so  bitter that, thirsty as they were, they could not drink its water, they murmured against Moses, who at the divine direction cast in “a certain tree,” by which means it was made palatable. “It has been suggested (Burckhardt, Syria, p. 474) that Moses made use of the berries of the plant Ghurkud (Robinson says [i. 26] the Peganum retusum of Forskal, Flora Egy. Arab. p. lxvi; more correctly, the Nitraria tridentata of Desfontaines, Flora Atlant. 1:372), and which still, it is implied, would be found to operate similarly. Robinson, however (1:67), could not find that this or any tree was now known by the Arabs to possess such properties; nor would those berries, he says, have been found so early in the season as the time when the Israelites reached the region. It may be added that, had any such resource ever existed, its eminent usefulness to the supply of human wants would hardly have let it perish from the traditions of the desert. Further, the expression ‘the Lord showed' seems surely to imply the miraculous character of the transaction.” With regard to the cure of the water, it has been well argued (Kitto, Pictorial History of Palestine, p. 209) that no explanation of the phenomena on natural grounds has proved consistent or satisfactory; neither is there any tree in that region or elsewhere now known which possesses such virtue in itself, or which is used for a similar purpose by the Arabs. We are therefore compelled to conclude, as, indeed, the narrative spontaneously suggests, that the shrub selected was indifferent, being one nearest at hand, and that the restorative property ceased with the special occasion which had called for its exercise, leaving the well to resume its acrid taste as at present found.

The name Marah, in the form of Anmarah, is now borne by the barren bed of a winter torrent, a little beyond which is still found a well called Howarah, the bitter waters of which answer to this description. Camels will drink it, but the thirsty Arabs never partake of it themselves — and it is said to be the only water on the shore of the Red Sea which they cannot drink. The water of this well, when first taken into the mouth, seems insipid rather than bitter, but when held in the mouth a few seconds it becomes exceedingly nauseous. The well rises within an elevated mound surrounded by sand-hills, and two small date-trees grow near it. The basin is six or eight feet in diameter, and the water about two feet deep. (See Burckhardt, Trav. in Syria, p. 472, Robinson, Researches, 1:96 sq.; Bartlett, Forty Days in the Desert, p. 30; and other travelers.) “Winer says (Handwb. s.v.) that a still bitterer well lies east of Marah, the claims of which Tischendorf, it appears, has supported. Lepsius prefers wady  Ghürundel. Prof. Stanley thinks that the claim may be left between this and Howarah, but adds in a note a mention of a spring south of Howarah ‘so bitter that neither men nor camels could drink it,' of which ‘Dr. Graul (2:254) was told.' The Ayouni Motlsal, ‘wells of Moses,' which local tradition assigns to Marah, are manifestly too close to the head of the gulf, and probable spot of crossing it, to suit the distance of ‘three days' journey.' The soil of this region is described as being alternately gravelly, stony, and sandy; under the range of the Gebel Wardan chalk and flints are plentiful, and on the direct line of route between Ayoun Mousa and Howarah no water is found (Robinson, 1:67).” SEE EXODE.

## Maralah[[@Headword:Maralah]]

             (Heb. Maraalah', מִרְעֲלָה, a trembling; Sept. Μαραλά), a place on the southern boundary of Zebulon, but apparently within the bounds of Issachar, west of Sarid and east of Dabbasheth (Jos 19:11). These indications point to some locality not far from the present Mujeidil, although the name would seem to agree better with that of the neighboring site, Melul. The latter place agrees with the identification of Porter, who remarks that Malul is a little village about four miles south-west of Nazareth, on the top of a hill, containing the ruins of a temple, and other vestiges of antiquity. In the surrounding rocks and cliffs are some excavated tombs (Handbook, p. 385). SEE NAHALAL.

## Maramba[[@Headword:Maramba]]

             an idol of the negroes of Angola, Congo, etc., in Africa. It stands erect over against the temple dedicated to its peculiar service, in a basket formed like a bee-hive. To this divinity the negroes make particular application for success when they go hunting or fishing, and for the relief of such as are sick. Those also charged with crime are obliged to plead their cause before it. In order to do this the accused prostrates himself at the feet of the idol, embraces it with the profoundest veneration, and says, "Behold, Maramba, thy servant is come to justify himself before thee." If the defendant is guilty, he is said to fall dead on the spot. The devotees usually carry little images in small boxes about with them. Maramba always marches at the head of their armies, and he is presented with the first morsel, and the first cup of wine served at the king's table.

## Maran(Us), Prudentius[[@Headword:Maran(Us), Prudentius]]

             a noted French theologian, was born, according to Winer (Theol. Literatur, p. 654), at Sezanne, whilst Le Cerf (Biblioth. historique tde la Cong. de St. Maur, p. 293) and Zedler (Universal-lexikon) consider him to have been born at Troyes, in Champagne, October 14, 1683. In 1703 he entered the Congregation of St. Maur, taking the vows at the Abbey of St. Faron, at Meaux. He subsequently resided at the Convent of St. Germain des Pros, Paris. He died April 2,1762. He published the works of Cyril of Jerusalem in Greek and Latin (Paris, 1720; Venice, 1763). Though the best edition of Cyril's works, it was attacked by the author of the Memoires de Trevoux. Maranus defended himself in his Dissertation sur les semi-Ariens (Paris, 1722). He also completed the edition of the works of Cyprian commenced by St. Baluze (Paris, 1726; Venice, 1728), and published the works of Justin Martyr in Greek and Latin, with a valuable introduction (Paris, 1742; Venice, 1747). He published also a work of his own on the divinity of Christ, under the title Divinitas Domuin oi nosti Jesu Ciristi manifesta in scripturis et traditione (Paris, 1746). This work is divided into four parts. The first treats of the proofs contained in the Old and the New Testaments; the second, of the unanimity, on this point, of the Roman Catholic Church and of the different sects; the third, of the continuous controversies with the Jews, heathen, and heretics; and the fourth, of the unanimous testimony of the fathers. It contains, besides, arguments to prove the divinity of the Holy Ghost. Maranus took also an active part in the controversies arising from the bull ‘“Unigenitus Dei filius,” siding with the party called appellants; and, although he had written nothing on the subject, he had in  consequence to endure great annoyances from the acceptants, who were the strongest. — Herzog, Real-Encyklopadie, 9:9. SEE JANSENISTS. (J.N.P.)

## Maran-atha[[@Headword:Maran-atha]]

             (Μαρὰν ἀθά, from the Arameaan מָרָן אֲתָה, maran'athah', our Lord comes, i.e. to judgment, Buxtorf, Lex. Chald. col. 1248, and so found in the Peshito version), a phrase added to the sentence of excommunication by way of appeal to the divine Head of the Church for ratification (1Co 16:22). SEE ANATHEMA. “In the A. V. it is combined with the preceding ‘anathema,' but this is unnecessary; at all events it can only be regarded as adding emphasis to the previous adjuration. It rather appears to be added ‘as a weighty watchword' to impress upon the disciples the important truth that the Lord was at hand, and that they should be ready to meet him (Alford, Gr. Test. ad loc.). If, on the other hand, the phrase be taken to mean, as it may, ‘our Lord has come,' then the connection is, ‘the curse will remain, for the Lord has come who will take vengeance on those who reject him.' Thus the name ‘Maronite' is explained by a tradition that the Jews, in expectation of a Messiah, were  constantly saying Maran, i.e. Lord; to which the Christians answered Maranatha, the Lord is come, why do you still expect him? (Stanley, Corinthians, ad loc.).”

## Maranos[[@Headword:Maranos]]

             is one of the names used to designate the new Christians of Spain, i.e. those Jews (q.v.) who, during the religious persecutions under Romish rule, publicly avowed conversion to Christianity and yet privately confessed the religion of their fathers, as e.g. the family of Maimonides (q.v.). The name owes its origin to the fact that not only Jews, but also Moors (q.v.) made a feigned profession of conversion to the Christian faith. SEE INQUISITION; SEE SPAIN.

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

             The Marathi, which is spoken by the Marathas or Mahrattas (q.v.), may be regarded as a link between the Sanscrit, dialects of northern India and the languages of the Deccan. Some of the words and idioms are obviously of cognate origin with the Bengalee, while in others a notable approximation may be detected to the Tamil, Telinga, and the other languages of the South. Two different characters are used in writing Marathi, the Modior Modhe, a kind of running hand, which is derived from, and still retains a strong resemblance to the Devanagari (or Sanscrit character), and the Balboodh or Balborah, which appears to be almost, if not quite, the Devanagari itself. The former, vulgarly termed Modi, is most generally understood, being employed in all transactions of business; but the latter is preferred for printing, because it possesses several letters in which the Modi is deficient; it is, besides, uniform and regular in appearance, while the Modi varies as much in style as the handwriting of different individuals in Europe.

A version of the Scriptures in Marathi was commenced at Serampore in 1804. The first few copies of the gospel of Matthew were printed in the Devanagari character, but this character was soon replaced by the Modi, as the more generally intelligible to the natives. This latter character was employed in all the subsequent Serampore editions. In 1811 the New Test. was completed, and in 1820 the Old Test. left the press. A second and revised edition of the New Test. appeared about the year 1825.

Another version of the Marathli Scriptures was commenced in 1817 by American missionaries, and in 1826 the entire New Test. was published by them, with the aid of the Bombay Auxiliary and the British and Foreign Bible Society. An improved and carefully revised edition of this Test. was printed in 1830. In 1834 the Bombay Bible Society undertook another revisal of the Marathi New Test. and determined upon issuing an edition in the Balboodh character. The printing of this edition was commenced in 1835, but in the same year it was found necessary to print a separate edition of the gospels in the Modi, or current character, for the use of the lower class of natives.

While these editions of the New Test. were in course of preparation, the American missionaries, together with the Reverend J. Dixon of the Churoh mission at Nassuck, zealously prosecuted the translation of the Old Test. into Marathi, which was completed at the American mission press in 1855.  Mr. Dixon, by whom the greater part of this important version was made, did not live to see the completion of this edition at press. From the report of the British and Foreign Bible Society for 1863 we learn that the entire Bible has been revised, published, and put into circulation. In the report for 1881 it is stated that the revision of the entire Bible has again been inaugurated, with the assistance of Reverend Baba Padmanji. The revision work is still in progress. See Bible of Every Land, page 126.

For linguistic purposes see Ballantyne, A Grammar of the Mahratta Language;, Bellairs, A Grammar of the Marathi Language; Molesworth, A Dictionary, Marathi and English (Bombay, 1857); Padmanji, A Compendium of Molesworth's Marathi and English Dictionay; Navalkar, The Student's Marathi Grammar (new ed. Bombay, 1879). (B.P.)

## Maratta Or Maratti, Carlo[[@Headword:Maratta Or Maratti, Carlo]]

             a celebrated Italian painter, was born at Camurano, near Ancona, Mav. 1625; became a pupil of Andrea Sacchi and a devout student of Raphael's works, and chose Rome as his permanent residence. He was employed by Clement IX and by four other successive popes, and received the title of painter ordinary to Louis XIV, for whom he painted a picture of Daphne. His Madonnas are admired for modest dignity and amiable expression. Maratta also excelled in the art of etching. He was the last great painter of the Roman school. He died in 1713.

## Maraviglia[[@Headword:Maraviglia]]

             (Latin Mirabilia), GIUSEPPE MARIA, an Italian philosopher, a native of Milan, flourished near the middle of the 17th century. He at first belonged to the body of regular clergy, was commissioned in 1651 to teach ethics in Padua, and exchanged the duties of provincial prior for those of bishop at Novara in 1667. He died there in 1684. Among his works we find Leges honestae Vitcae (Ven. 1657, 12mo), a moral treatise dedicated to Christine, queen of Sweden: — Legees Doctrinae a sanctis Patribus (Venice, 1660, 24mo): — Proteus ethicopoliticus seu de multiformi homuinis statu (Venice, 1660, folio): — Pseudomantia veteruim et recentiorumn explosa, seu defide divinationibus adhibenda (Ven. 1662, fol.): — De erroribus virornum, doctorumn (Ven. 1662,12mo; Rome, 1667, 4to): — Legatus ad principes Christianos (Ven. 1665, 12mo): — Anancestramenti dell anima Christianas (Novara, 1675, 8vo). — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Genesis 33:362.

## Marbach, Johann[[@Headword:Marbach, Johann]]

             an eminent German Protestant theologian, was born at Lindau Aug. 24, 1521, and was educated at the University of Wittenberg, where he commenced in 1539 the study of theology. He became successively deacon at Jena in 1540, preacher at Ivry in 1544, and at Strasburg in 1545. He was afterwards sent by the latter city to the Council of Trent, together with Sleidan. In 1552 he was appointed chief pastor and professor of theology. Here he labored to introduce the Lutheran doctrines in the place of the  Reformed, whereby he became involved in numberless controversies. In 1556 he was employed by the elector Otto Henry to organize the Reformation in the Palatinate, and in 1557 was present at the Diet of Worms. He ceased preaching in 1558, and died deacon of Thomas College, March 17, 1581. He wrote Christlicher und wahrhafter Unterricht von d. Worten d. Einsetzunsg d. heil. Abendemalls, etc. (Strasb. 1565, 8vo), and other similar works, all upholding the ultra-Lutheran views. See Treuss, Situation interieure de l'tglise Lutherienne de Strasbourg sous la direction de Mabach (Strasb. 1857); Pierere, Universal-Lexikon, 10:852; Herzog, Real-Encykl. 9:10.

## Marban, Pedro De[[@Headword:Marban, Pedro De]]

             a Spanish Jesuit and missionary, flourished near the close of the 17th century. In 1675 he went to Bolivia, and later to Mexico, and labored industriously to spread the Gospel of Christ among the savages of America, and finally became superior of all the missions of the Jesuits in this quarter. He wrote Arte de la Lengua Moxa, con su vocabulario y catechismo (Lima, 1701, 8vo). — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Genesis 33:361.

## Marbeck Or Merbecke, John[[@Headword:Marbeck Or Merbecke, John]]

             the composer of the solemn and now venerable notes set to the “Preces” and Responses in use in the cathedrals of England, to our day with only slight modifications, was organist of Windsor during the reigns of Henry VIII and his successor. A zeal for religious reformation led him to join a society in furtherance of that object, among the members of which were a priest, a singing-man of St. George's Chapel, and a tradesman of the town. Their papers were seized, and in the handwriting of Marbeck were found notes on the Bible, together with a concordance, in English. He and his three colleagues were found guilty of heresy, and condemned to the stake. The others were executed according to their sentence; but Marbeck, on account of his great musical talents, and being rather favored by Gardiner, bishop of Winchester, was pardoned, and lived to witness the triumph of his principles, and to publish his work, which appeared under the title of The Boke of Common Pralier, noted. The colophon is “Imprinted by Richard Grafton, printer to the kinges majestic, 1550, cum privilegio ad imprimendum solum” (a verbatim reprint was given by John Pickering, London, 1848, sm. 4to). In the same year appeared also his Concordance of the Whole Bible (1550, folio), the first complete work of the kind in  English; and, in 1574, The Lives of Holy Saints, Prophets, Patriarchs, and others; and, subsequently, his other books connected with religious history and controversy. See Allibone, Dict. of British and Amer. Authors, vol. 2, s.v.; English Cyclop. s.v.

## Marble[[@Headword:Marble]]

             is the rendering in the Auth.Vers. of two forms of the same Heb. word, and is thought by some to be signified by others differently rendered. שֵׁשׁ (shesh, Est 1:6, Sept. πάρινος; Son 5:15, Sept. μαρμάρινος), or שִׁיַשׁ(sha'yish, 1Ch 29:2, Sept. πάριος), so called from its whiteness, undoubtedly refer to a pure kind of marble, μάρμαρος (Rev 18:12). Primary limestone, or marble, is a simple rock, consisting of carbonate of lime. In its pure state, it is granular, crystalline, and of a color varying from pure white to gray and yellowish. It is sometimes found in irregular masses, or beds, or large nodules, with little or no appearance of stratification; more generally, however, it is regularly stratified, and these strata alternate with other rocks, and are of all varieties of thickness. The texture varies from a highly crystalline, of a larger or finer grain, to a compact and even earthy. Other substances are sometimes combined with the simple rock, which modify its appearance and texture, such as mica, quartz, hornblende. It is never found in veins, except in the form of regular crystals, and, in this respect, it exactly resembles quartz. There is considerable difficulty in drawing the line of distinction between the primary and secondary limestones, where the latter do not happen to contain organic remains. In the primary limestone, strictly speaking, no organic remains have yet been discovered. With one or two exceptions, and as a general rule, it may be said, they, like the primary schists, are almost destitute of organic bodies. Like the strata which it accompanies, beds of limestone are often bent and contorted, evidently from disturbance below. The colors vary from a pure white, which constitutes the statuary marble, to various shades of gray, brown, black, and green. These tints are derived from a carbonaceoas matter or oxide of iron, or an admixture of other minerals.

Several other terms occur in Est 1:6, as the names of stones in the pavement of the magnificent hall in which Ahasuerus feasted the princes of his empire. That rendered “white” marble, is דִּר, dar, which some take to signify Parian marble, others white marble; but nothing certain is known  about it. In Arabic, the word dar signifies a large pearl. Now pearls were certainly employed by the ancients in decorating the walls of apartments in royal palaces, but that pearls were also used in the pavements of even regal dining-rooms is improbable in itself, and unsupported by any known example. The Septuagint refers the Hebrew word to a stone resembling pearls (πίννινος λίθος), by which, as J. D. Michaelis conjectures, it intends to denote the Alabastrites of Pliny (Hist. Nat. 36:7, 8), which is a kind of alabaster with the gloss of mother-of-pearl. SEE ALABASTER.

The בָּהִט (bahat'; Sept. σμαραγδίτης, “red” marble) of the same passage was, Gesenius thinks, the verdeantique, or half-porphyry of Egypt. The סֹחֶרֶת. (soche'reth; Sept. Πάρινος λίθος, “black” marble) is likewise there mentioned with the other kinds of marble for forming a pavement. Gesenius says, perhaps tortoiseshell. Others, from the rendering of the Syriac, think it refers to black marble. It was probably some spotted variety of marble. SEE MINERALOGY.

The pavement in the palace of Ahasuerus was no doubt of mosaic work, the floors of the apartments being laid with painted tiles or slabs of marble, in the same way as Dr. Russell describes the houses of the wealthy in modern times. In these a portion of the pavement of the courts is of mosaic, and it is usually that part which lies between the fountain and the arched alcove on the south side that is thus beautified. SEE HOUSE.

“The marble pillars and tesserae of various colors of the palace at Susa came doubtless from Persia itself, where marble of various colors is found, especially in the province of Hamadan, Susiana (Marco Polo, Travels, p. 78, ed. Bohn; Chardin, Voy. 3:280, 308, 358, and 8:253; P. della Valle, Viagg i, 2:250). The so-called marble of Solomon's architectural works, which Josephus calls λίθος λευκός, may thus have been limestone — (a) from near Jerusalem; (b) from Lebanon (Jura limestone), identical with the material of the Sun Temple at Baalbek; or (c) white marble from Arabia or elsewhere (Josephus, Ant. 8:3, 2; Diod. Sic. 2:52; Pliny, H. N. 36:12; Jamieson, Mineralogy, p. 41; Raiumer, Pal. p. 28; Volney, Trav. 2:241; Kitto, Plays. Geogr. of Pal. p. 73, 88; Robinson, 2:493; 3:508; Stanley, S. and P. p. 307, 424; Wellsted. Trav. 1:426; 2:143). That this stone was not marble seems probable from the remark of Josephus, that whereas Solomon constructed his buildings of ‘white stone,' he caused the roads which led to Jerusalem to be made of ‘black stone,' probably the black basalt of the Hauran; and also from his account of the porticoes of Herod's temple, which he says were μονόλιθοι λευκοτήτης μαρμάρου  (Josephus, Ant. 1. c., and War, v. 5, 1, 6; Kitto, ut sup. p. 74, 75, 80, 89). But whether the ‘costly stone' employed in Solomon's buildings was marble or not, it seems clear, from the expressions both of Scripture and Josephus, that some, at least, of the ‘great stones,' whose weight can scarcely have been less than forty tons, must have come from Lebanon (1Ki 5:14-18; 1Ki 7:10; Josephus, Ant. 8:2, 9). There can be no doubt that Herod, both in the Temple and elsewhere, employed Parian or other marble. Remains of marble columns still exist in abundance at Jerusalem (Josephus, Ant. 15:9, 4, 6, and 11,3, 5; Williams, Holy City, 2:330; Sandys, p. 190; Robinson, 1:301, 305).” SEE STONE.

## Marburg Bible[[@Headword:Marburg Bible]]

             is the name given to an edition of the holy Scriptures, published at Marburg (1712, 4to), under the care of Prof. Dr. Horch (with the aid of others, particularly of inspector Scheffer, in Berleburg). It contains the text of Luther's, corrected by comparison with the original texts, and gives, in the introductions and in the headings, commentaries on the most important allegories and prophecies (by Cocceius). The most complete of these are the notes on Solomon's Song and the Apocalypse. It was highly prized by the theologians and Mystics of that time, and was the predecessor of the Mystic Berleburg Bible (1726-74, 8 vols. fol.), hence it is sometimes called the little Mystic Bible. — Herzog, Real-Encyclopädie, 9:13. SEE BERLEBURG BIBLE.

## Marburg Conference[[@Headword:Marburg Conference]]

             a gathering of all the reformed theological leaders, held at the city of Marburg, Oct. 3, 1529, and designed to bring about, if possible, an agreement between Luther and Zwingle and their adherents. The landgrave Philip of Hesse, one of the noblest princes of the Reformation days, believing that the dissensions in the Protestant camp should be allayed, directed all his energies towards the conciliation of the two reformed factions, caused by a difference of opinion as to the proper observance of the eucharistic ceremony. With such a purpose in view, he invited the principal theologians of both parties to meet for the purpose of comparing their opinions in a friendly manner. Melancthon had already, in 1529, at the Diet of Spires, declared his readiness to attend such a conference (Corp. Ref. 1:1050 and 1078), and even had gone so far as to declare that he attached no special importance to the differences concerning the Eucharist  (Corp. Ref: 1:1046). Philip of Hesse now applied to Zwingle (Zwingli Opp. 8:287), who also expressed his willingness to come (Zwingli Opp. 8:662). Luther, however, at first strongly opposed the plan, fearing that it might result in more harm than good; but the landgrave persisting, Luther finally consented, and on Sept. 30, 1529, Luther, Melancthon, Cruciger, Jonas, Mykonius, and Menius, accompanied by the Saxon counsellor Eberhard, went to Marburg, where Philip had called the conference. The Swiss theologians had arrived the day before; among them, Zwingle, professor Rudolph Collin, OEcolampadius, Sturm, Bucer, and Hedio. Osiander, Brenz, and Agricola arrived only on October 2. A number of other theologians and eminent persons from all parts of Germany were also present. After a private conference between Luther and (Ecolampadius, and Zwingle and Melancthon, the public debates commenced. “In the first place, several points were discussed touching the divinity of Christ, original sin, baptism, the Word of God, etc., regarding which the Wittenbergers suspected the orthodoxy of Zwingle.

These were all secondary matters with Zwingle, in reference to which he dropped his unchurchly views, and declared his agreement with the views of the oecumenical councils. But in regard to the article of the Lord's Supper he was the more persistent. Appealing to Joh 6:33, ‘The flesh profiteth nothing,' he argued the absurdity of Luther's view” (Kurtz). Luther had insisted upon the literal interpretation of the expression, Hoc est corpus mncum. Both parties disputed without arriving at any better appreciation of each other's views. “Agreement was out of the question. Zwingle, nevertheless, declared himself ready to maintain fraternal fellowship, but Luther and his party rejected the offer. Luther said, Ihr habt einen andern geist denn wir.'“ Still the conference, while failing in its main object, was not entirely fruitless. “Luther found that his opponents did not hold as offensive views as he supposed, and the Swiss also that Luther's doctrine was not so gross and Capernaitic as they thought.” Both parties engaged to refrain in future from publishing injurious pamphlets against each other as they had formerly done, and agreed “to earnestly pray God to lead them all to a right understanding of the truth.” At the request of the landgrave, Luther drew up a series of fifteen articles (Articles of Marburg), containing the common fundamental principles of the Reformation, which were subscribed to by the Zwinuglians. “In the first fourteen they declared unanimous consent to the oecumencical faith of the Church against the errors of papists and Anabaptists. In the fifteenth the Swiss conceded that the body and blood of Christ were present in the sacramenit, but they could not  agree to his corporeal presence in the bread and wine” (Kurtz). The Articles of Marburg were subsequently used as a basis for the Confession of Augsburg (q.v.). See L. J. K. Schmitt, Das Religiongesepräch z. Marburg (Marb. 1840); A. Ebrard, D. Gesch. ud. Dogma's v. h. Abendmahle, 2:268; Hassenkamp, Hessiche Kirchengesch. 2:1, p. 35 sq.; H. Heppe, D. fünzfzehn Marrburger Artikel (Cassel, 1847 and 1854); Krauth, Te Conservative Reformationa (Philadel. 1871, 8vo), p. 355 sq., 427; Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctrines, 2:309, 314; Gieseler, Eccles. Hist. (Harper's edit.), 4:133; Kurtz, Ch. Hist. since the Reformation, p. 72 sq.; Herzog, Real-Encyklopädie, 9:13 sq. (J. H. W.)

## Marbury, Alexander M., M.D., D.D[[@Headword:Marbury, Alexander M., M.D., D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal clergyman, was rector in Petersville, Maryland, for seven years preceding 1858, when he became rector of St. Paul's, Aquasco, in which relation he remained until his death in 1873. See Prot. Episc. Almanac, 1874, page 138.

## Marbury, Edward[[@Headword:Marbury, Edward]]

             an English minister of the 17th century, became rector of St. James's, Garlickhithe, London, in 1613; subsequently rector of St. Peter's, Paul's Wharf, and retired from public labors during the Rebellion. He died about 1655. Marbury published A Commentary on Obadiah (Lond. 1649, 4to): — A Commentary on Habakkuk (1650, 4to). — Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Marca, Pierre De[[@Headword:Marca, Pierre De]]

             a French Roman Catholic theologian and historian, was born at Pan, in Beam, Jan. 24, 1594. He was of good family, was brought up by the Jesuits of Auch, and afterwards studied law at Toulouse. In 1613 he became member of the Council of Pan, and when, in 1621, this body was erected into a parliament by Louis XIII, he was appolinted its president, as a reward for his services to Romanism. After the death of his wife, which occurred in 1632, he entered the Church. In 1639 he was made counselor of state. Cardinal de Richelieu having commissioned him to reply to Hersent's Optatus Gallus, Marca composed De Concordia Sacerdotii et Imperii (Paris, 1641 sq.), which is his ablest work, and was rewarded by the bishopric of Conserans, to which he was appointed in 1643. The pope, however, would not approve the Gallican writer as incumbent of the episcopal office, and the appointment was not sanctioned at Rome until Marca had recalled the work in 1647. In 1652 he was promoted to the archbishopric of Toulouse; later was transferred to the archiepiscopal see of Paris, and there died in the year of his transfer, 1662. He wrote also Dissertsatio de Priimatu Lu. dunensi et caeteris rimatibus (1644, 8vo): — Relation de ce qui s'est fait depuis 1653 dans les assemblees des iveques  au sujet des cinq propositions (Paris, 1657, 4to). This was unfavorable to the Jansenists, and was refuted by Nicole in his Belga percoantator, and some other writers. Collections of some other writings of Marca on divers subjects were published by Baluze (1669 and 1681, 2 vols. 8vo) and abbé Faget (1668, 4to), who, however, brought out the best edition of Marca's De Concordia (Paris, 1663, and often). See Gallia Christiana, vols. i and vii; De Faget, Vie de Pierre de lMarca; Bompart, Eloge de Marca (Paris, 1672, 8vo); De Longuerue, Dissertations diverses; AMercure de France, 1644 to 1662; Fisquet, France Pontificate. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 33:374; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 9:17 sq.

## Marcella[[@Headword:Marcella]]

             ST., is the name of two saints in the Romish Church. (1) One of these was a Roman widow, the intimate friend of Paula and of Eustochius, and a pupil of the noted Church father Jerome, who said of her that we could judge of her merits by her noble disciples. Marcella was a Christian, and deeply learned in the Scriptures. She was greatly opposed to the errors of Origen, who mingled the dogmas of Oriental philosophy with the truths of Christianity. On difficult passages of Scripture she consulted Jerome; but she herself was consulted from all parts as a great theologian, and her answers were always dictated by prudence and humility. She died A. D. 409, soon after Rome was taken by the Goths, from the effects of the assault and abuse of the troops of Alaric. She is commemorated January 31. (2) The second, a martyr of the Church in Alexandria, flourished in the days of the emperor Severus. She is commemorated June 28.

## Marcellians[[@Headword:Marcellians]]

             a sect of heretics who flourished towards the close of the 4th century; so called from Marcellus of Ancyra, whom the Arians unjustly accused of reviving the errors of Sabellius. Epiphanius informs us that great diversity of opinion prevailed in his day on the justness of charging Marcellus of Ancyra with the heretical tendencies of the so-called Marcellians. The latter denied the three hypostases, holding the Son and the Holy Ghost as two emanations from the divine nature, to exist independently only until the performance of their respective offices, and then to return again into the substance of the Father. SEE MARCELLUS OF ANCYRA.

## Marcellina[[@Headword:Marcellina]]

             a noted female pupil of Carpocrates (q.v.), commenced teaching at Rome the Gnostic system of her instructor, in 160, under Anicetus, and met with so great success (see Ireneus, Adv. Haer. 1:25, 6; Epiphanius, Haer. 27, 6) that her followers and pupils were denominated Marcellinists. This is the sect mentioned by Celsus (Orig. c. Celsum, vol. v), and are not to be mistaken for the followers of Marcellus of Ancyra, the Marcellians. Origen asserts that he could find no trace of the Marcellinists. Another Marcellina was the sister of Ambrosius, and a strict ascetic. — Herzog, Real- Encyklopädie, 9:20; Pierer, Universal-Lexikon, 10:855.

## Marcellinus[[@Headword:Marcellinus]]

             a native of Rome, son of Projectus, is said to have been made bishop of Rome May 3, 296. As he lived in a period of violent persecution, we have but little certain information concerning him; the acts of a svnod said to have been held at Sinuessa in 303 (published by Mansi, Coll. 1:1250 sq.; and Hardouin, Coll. Cone. 1:217 sq.) relate as follows: Diocletian had succeeded in compelling the hitherto steadfast bishop to come with him into the temple of Vesta and His, and to offer up incense to them; this was afterwards proclaimed by three priests and two deacons who had witnessed the deed, and a synod was assembled to investigate the affair at Sinuessa, at which no less than three hundred bishops were present — “a number quite impossible for that country, especially in a time of persecution” (Dr. I. B. Smith, in Dillinger's Fables, p. 82, foot note). Marcellinus denied everything for the first two days, but on the third came in, his head covered with ashes, and made a full confession, adding that he had been tempted with gold. The synod declared that Marcellinus had condemned himself, for the prima sedes nonjudicatur a quoquam. This resulted, however, in Diocletian causing a large number of the bishops who had taken part in the synod, and even Marcellinus himself, to be put to death, August 23, 303.

Although the Roman Breviary itself credits this account of the weakness and punishment of Marcellinus (in Nocturn. ii, April 26), this account of the synod is now considered spurious both by Romanists and by Protestants. Indeed, Augustine (De unico baptismo contra Petilianuml, c. 16) and Theodoret (Hist. Ecc 1:2) declared the statement of Marcellinus having betrayed Christianity and offered sacrifices to idols false. Dr. Dollinger, in his Fables respecting Popes in the Middle Ayes (edit. by Dr. H. B. Smith, N. Y. 1872, 12mo), p. 84, says “the acts of the  pretended synod are evidently fabricated in order to manufacture a historical support for the principle that a pope can be judged by no man. This incessantly-repeated sentence is the red thread which runs through the whole; the rest is mere appendage. By this means it is to be inculcated on the laity that they must not venture to come forward as accusers of the clergy, and on the inferior clergy that they must not do the like against their superiors.” As the date and occasion of the fabrication, Dr. Dollinger assigns “those troubled sixteen years (498-514) in which the pontificate of Symmachus ran its course. At that time the two parties of Laurentius and Symmachus stood opposed to one another in Rome as foes. People, senate, and clergy were divided; they fought and murdered in the streets, and Laurentius maintained himself for several years in possession of part of the churches. Symmachus was accused by his opponents of grave offenses. . . The hostile party were numerous and influential... and therefore the adherents of Symmachus caught at this means of showing that the inviolability of the pope had been long since recognized as a fact and announced as a rule... This was the time at which Eunodius wrote his apology for Symmachus, and this, accordingly, was also the time at which the Synod of Sinuessa, as well as the Constitution of Sylvester, was fabricated.” Marcellinus is commemorated in the Romish Church April 24. See Pagi, Crit. in annaless Baronii ad ann. 302, n. 18; Papebroch, Acta Sancta in Propyl. Meji, t. 8; Xaver de Marco, Difesa di alcuni pontefici di errore, c. 12; Bower, Hist. of the Popes, 1:80 sq.; Hefele, Conciliengesch. 1:118; 3, § 10, note 2, where the main authorities against the fable are cited. (J. H. W.)

## Marcellius, Henricus[[@Headword:Marcellius, Henricus]]

             a Jesuit, who died at Bamberg, April 25, 1664, wrote, Canones Explicanden Sacrae Scripturae: — De Augustissimo Corporis et Sanguinis Domini Sacramento: — Theologia Divinae Scripturae: — De Justificatione Christiana: — Commentarius in Librum Josuae: — Testimonium Danielis de Regno Christi Inexpugnabili: — Enchiridion Militiae Christianae. See Alegambe, Bibliotheca Scriptorum Societatis Jesu; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Marcello, Benedetto[[@Headword:Marcello, Benedetto]]

             an eminent Italian composer of sacred music, was born at Venice, July 24, 1686. He made a thorough study of music under various masters, and at the same time studied law and became an advocate, holding several offices under the government. He was a member of the Council of Forty, and treasurer at Brescia, where he died, July 17, 1739. His most esteemed work is his music for Giustiniani's version of Fifty Psalms, of which a fine edition was published by John Garth, of Durham, in eight volumes folio, with English words. His other works consist of oratorios, masses, cantatas,  madrigals, and different parts of the Roman Catholic service. He also left a MS. treatise on music.

## Marcellus[[@Headword:Marcellus]]

             ST. (martyr). Aside from Marcellus I, pope of Rome (q.v.), and Marcellus of Apamea (q.v.), the martyrologues mention a number of other martyrs of that name, the more important of which are:

I. MARCELLUS who perished during the persecution of Antoninus Philosophus. Having refused to participate in a repast with the prefect Priscus, and remonstrated with the latter and his guests on account of their idolatry, he was half buried in the ground, in the open air, and died thus after three days. The year 140 is given as the date of his death; he is commemorated on September 4. See Surius, T.V. Gregorii Turon. Lib. de gloriamart. c. 53; Ruinart, Acta primorum martyrum, p. 73.

II. MARCELLUS, the chief of the Trajan Legion, who, for refusing to participate in heathen sacrifices at Tingis, in Mauritania, was beheaded by order of the governor, Aurelianus Agricola, in 270. See Surius, vol. 5; Ruinart, p. 302 sq. He is commemorated on Oct. 20.

III. MARCELLUS who suffered at Argenton, in France, under Aurelian. He was a native of Rome, son of a heathen father and a Christian mother, who brought him up a Christian. When of age, he fled to Argenton on account of the persecution of Aurelian. Here he wrought some wonderful cures, which attracted the attention of the prefect Heraclius. Arrested, he fearlessly confessed his faith, and, after scourging, was roasted on a spit; but as this neither converted nor killed him, he was beheaded. He is commemorated on June 29. See Gregorii Turon. Lib. de gloria mart. c. 52.

IV. MARCELLUS, bishop of Die, in France, was born at Avignon of Christian parents, and religiously brought up. He was ordained by his brother, who was bishop of Die before him. At the time of his election another was also appointed, but he was taken to the church by his adherents and there reconciled with his adversaries. On this occasion. it is said, a dove was seen to descend upon his head. He was thrown into prison by the Arians for opposing their views, and died there in the beginning of the 6th century. He is commemorated on April 9. See Gregorii Turon. Lib. de gloria confess. c. 7. — Herzog, Real-Encyklopädie, 9:22; Pierer, Univ. — Lexikcon, 10:855. (J. N. P.)

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

             bishop OF ANCYRA, in Galatia, noted for the part he took in the Synod of Ancyra (314 or 315), held at the end of the persecution of Maximin, SEE ANCYRA, made himself conspicuous at the Council of Nicaea (325) by his homoousian views, and was upheld by Athanasius and the whole Western Church. We next find him at the Council of Tyre (335), where he opposed the condemnation of Athanasius, and of Maximus III, patriarch of Jerusalem. In the Council of Jerusalem, of the same year, he declared against the admission of Arius to communion. At the Council of Constantinople, in 336, the Arians having the majority, Marcellus was deposed with the assent of the emperor. who had been prejudiced against him. After the death of Constantine, May 22, 337, he was restored to his bishopric; but once more expelled, he sought refuge in the West, where he was absolved by the councils of Rome and of Sardica (347). He returned to  Ancyra, but Basil, who had been appointed bishop in his place, refused to surrender his seat. Marcellus, who was already well advanced in years, retired to a monastery, where he subsequently died. St. Jerome states that he wrote several works, principally against the Arians; but we now possess under his name only a letter addressed to Julius I, containing an exposition of his doctrine, given by St. Epiphanius; two confessions of faith, given by his disciples; and some passages, quoted by Eusebius. of his work against Asterius. There has been great diversity of opinion concerning his orthodoxy. His confessions are perfectly correct; but in the passages of the work against Asterius, his doctrine, otherwise very difficult to make out, seems to border on Sabellianism. Photinus of Sirmium, who was condemned as a heretic, was his disciple, and had been his deacon, and a sect who refused to admit the three hypostases took the name of Marcellians (q.v.). Yet all ecclesiastical writers agree in calling him a saint; and it is possible that his enemies, the Arians and others, unjustly made Marcellus the father of'heretic views. See Athanasius, Apoll. 2; Basilins, Epist. 52; Theodoret, Hist. Eccl. vol. 2; Socrates, Hist. Eccles. vol. 1; Sozomen, Hist. Eccl. vol. 2 and 3; Hermani, Vie de Si. Athanase; Du Pin, Bibl. Ecclesiastique, 2:79; Rettberg, Marcelliana (Gotting. 1794); Klose, Gesch. u. Lehre des Marcellus und Photin (Iamb. 1837); Zahn, Marcellus von Ancyra (Gotha, 1867, 8vo); Willenborg, Ueber die Orthodoxie des Mearcellus (Aullnich, 1859); Schaff, Ch. Hist. 3:651 sq.; Hagenbach, History of Doctrines, 1:255, 263, 368; Lardner, Works (see Index); Herzog, Real-Encyklopädie, 9:22 sq.

## Marcellus (3)[[@Headword:Marcellus (3)]]

             bishop OF APAMEA (1), in Syria, near the close of the 4th century, distinguished himself particularly by his zeal for the destruction of the heathen temples. He considered them as maintaining heathen tenenncies among the people. Having attempted to destroy the main temple of the city with the help of soldiers and gladiators, he was taken by the people and put. to death. His sons sought to avenge his death, but were restrained by the provincial synod, held in 391.

(2.) Another Marcellus of Apamea is mentioned, who is said to have lived in the 5th century. He was a native of Syria, of a wealthy family, and after the death of his parents went to Antioch, where he devoted himself to study. Dividing his fortune among the poor, he went to Ephesus, and there attempted to support himself by copying books. He subsequently joined  abbot Alexander at Constantinople, and was afterwards chosen as his successor. To avoid this honor, Marcellus fled to a neighboring convent until another abbot had been selected, and then returned and was made deacon. The new abbot, named John, however, became jealous of his deacon, and obliged him to perform menial service. Marcellus cheerfully submitted; but after the death of John he was again appointed abbot. Under his direction the convent acquired such reputation that it had to be greatly enlarged, and other convents applied to be governed by pupils of Marcellus. He died in 485. See Fleury, Hist. ad a. 448; Herzog, Real- Encyklopädie, 9:25; Lardner, Works (see Index).

## Marcellus I[[@Headword:Marcellus I]]

             Pope, son of Benedict, a Roman priest, succeeded Marcellinus (q.v.) as bishop of Rome (according to Pagi, June 30, 308), but held that position only during eighteen months. He endeavored to restore ecclesiastical discipline, which had become much relaxed during the persecutions. For this purpose he organized in Rome twenty dioceses, the incumbents of which were to administer to converts from heathenism the sacraments of baptism and penance. They were also bound to attend to the burial of the martyrs. By command of Maxentius, who had ordered him to resign his office of bishop and to sacrifice to idols, he was imprisoned, and condemned to serve as a slave in the imperial stables. After nine months he was freed by his clergy, and concealed in the house of a Roman matron named Lucinia, who, it is said, converted that house afterwards into a church. Maxentius was so angry when he heard of it that he commanded the church to be turned into a stable, and condemned Marcellus to the lowest employment about the stables. Marcellus is said to have died a martyr. He is commemorated on the 16th of January. — Herzog, Real- Encyklop. 9:21; Pierer, Universal-Lexicon, 10:855. (J. N. P.)

## Marcellus II[[@Headword:Marcellus II]]

             Pope, succeeded Julius III, April 9, 1555, but died twenty-two days afterwards. He was a native of the Papal States, and was originally named Mezarcello Cervini. He was first secretary of Paul III, and afterwards cardinal of Santa Croce. By appointment from pope Julius III, he took part in the Council of Trent as cardinal legate, and evinced in that capacity great talents, as well as moderation. His election gave rise to many hopes, which were speedily crushed by his death, the result, no doubt, of poison. He is  also noted for the minor but curious circumstance of his refusing to comply with the ancient custom by which the pope, on his election, lays aside his baptismal name and assumes a new one. Marcello Cervini retained on his elevation the name which he had previously borne. See Herzog, Real- Encyklopädie, 9:21; Pierer, Universal-Lexikon, 10:855; Chambers, Cyclop.; Bower, Hist. of the Popes, 7:459, Riddle, Papaoe (see Index); Artaux de Montor, Hist. des Souverains Pontifes Romains, s.v.

## Marcellus, Aaron A[[@Headword:Marcellus, Aaron A]]

             a (Dutch) Reformed minister, was born in Amsterdam. N. Y., May 11, 1799; was prepared for college by the Rev. Drs.Van Zandt and Spencer, of Brooklyn, N. Y.; graduated at Union College, N. Y., in 1826, afterwards followed teaching, and for some years had charge of the Female Seminary in Syracuse, and subsequently of Schenectady, N. Y. He removed to New York, and was for a short time superintendent of the Orphan Asylum; but, feeling that his duty pointed in the direction of the ministry, he entered the Theological Seminary of the Reformed (Dutch) Church at New Brunswick, N. J., and graduated in 1830. He was licensed by the New York Classis, and in July, 1830, became pastor of the Reformed (Dutch) Church at Lysander, N. Y.; subsequently of the Church of Schaghticoke; missionary near the Dry Dock, New York; principal of the Lancaster County Academy, Pa.; pastor at Freehold, N. J., in 1839; of the Church in Greenville, N. Y., in 1856; and in 1859 removed to Bergen, N. J., where he labored as a teacher until he died, May 24, 1860. Mr. Marcellus was courteous and refined in manners, an earnest preacher, and an excellent instructor of youth. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1861, p. 252.

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

             a Roman Catholic theologian, who died at Couvin, Belgium, in 1648, is the author of Rationale Evangelizantium (transl. into French by Ricard, Le Rational des Predicateurs de l'Evangile, Paris, 1876, 4 volumes): — Hortum Pastaorum (French, Le Jardin des Pasteurs), a treatise on faith. hope, and charity: — Virga Aaronis Florens (French, La Verge d'Aaron), on the sacerdotal life: — Candelabrum Mysticum, on the seven sacraments. Marchant's works were published in French by Ricard and Berton, in nine volumes. See Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v.; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Marcheshvan[[@Headword:Marcheshvan]]

             (מִרְחֶשְׁיָן, Marcheshvan', of the later Hebrew; Josephus, Ant. Μαρσουάνης, 1:3, 3; the Macedonian Δῖος) is the name of that month which was the eighth of the sacred and the second of the civil year of the Jews, and began with the new moon of our November. There was a fast on the 6th in memory of Zedekiah's being blinded, after he had witnessed the slaughter of his sons (2Ki 25:7). This month is always spoken of in the Old Testament by its numerical designation; except once, when it is called Bul (בּוּל, 1Ki 6:38; Sept. Βαάλ). According to Kimchi, Bul is a shortened form of the Hebrew יבול, “rain,” from יבלThe signification of rain-month is exactly suitable to November in the climate  of Palestine. Others derive it from ב. Benfey, availing himself of the fact that the Palmyrene inscriptions express the name of the god Baal, according to their dialect, by בול(as עגלבול, Α᾿γλιβόλος), has ventured to suggest that, as the months are often called after the deities. Bul may have received its name from that form of Baal (Monatsnamen, p. 182). The rendering of the Sept. might have been appealed to as some sanction of this view. He supposes that Marcheshvain is a compound name, of which the syllable mar is taken from the Zend Amersettf, or its later Persian form Mordad, and that cheshvan is the Persian chezdn, “alutumn,” both of which are names belonging to the same month (1. c. p. 136 sq.). See BUL.

## Marchetti, Francois[[@Headword:Marchetti, Francois]]

             an eminent French writer and archaeologist, was born at Marseilles about the opening of the 17th century; was educated at a college of the “Fathers of the Oratory,” entered their order in 1630, and became one of the ablest members. He died at his native place in 1688. Of his works the following are of particular interest to us: Paraphrase sur les Epjitres de Saeint Pierre (1639), and Traite sur la Messe caec l'explication de ses ceremonies.

## Marchetti, Giovanni[[@Headword:Marchetti, Giovanni]]

             an Italian ecclesiastic of note, was born at Empoli, in Tuscany, in 1753, of humble parentage. After struggling for years to secure the advantages of a thorough education, he entered the priesthood in 1777. Later he took up the pen in defense of the rights of the Roman see. His works, which made him known as a brilliant writer and a learned student, attracted the attention of pope Pius VI, who accorded him a pension and invested him with different offices. In 1798, after Rome had been proclaimed a republic, he was banished. In 1799 he was conducted to Florence, where he endured imprisonment for one month. On his return to Rome (1800) he opened an academy of theology'. When the excommunication of the emperor Napoleon by Pius VII became known (1809), Marchetti and cardinal Mattel, accused of aiding the pope in this violent part, were imprisoned in the castle of St. Angelo. Some time after Marchetti obtained permission to go to his native town. He returned to Rome in 1814; in 1822 was appointed vicar of Rimini; in 1826 became secretary of the Assembly of Bishops, and died Nov. 15, 1829. Among his works, which have been translated into many languages, we find Saggio critico sopra la Storia  Ecclesiastica di Fleury (Rome, 1780, 1.2mo): — Critica della Storia Ecclesiastica e de' discorsi di Fleury (Bologne, 1782, 2 vols. 12mo): — Esceritazioni Ciprianiche circa il battesino degli eretici (Rome, 1787, 8vo): — Del concilio di Sardica (Rome, 1785, 8vo): — I Christianesimo dimonstrabile sopra i suoi libri (Rome, 1795, 8vo): — Strattesnimenti diJfanmillia sulla storia della religione con le sue prove (Rome, 1800, 2 vols. 8vo):La Providenza (Rome, 1797, 12mo): — Metamzorfosi ver” dute da Basilide l'eremita sul terminare del secolo xviii (Florence, 1799, 8vo): — Il si ed il no, parallelo delle doctrine e regole ecclesiastiche (Rome, 1801, 8vo): — Lezioni sacre dall' ingresso del popolo di Dio in Cananea fino alla schiavitiu di Babilonia (Rome, 1803-8, 12 vols. 8vo): — Della Chiesa quanto alto stato politico della citta (Rome, 1817-18, 3 vols. 8vo): — La vita razionale dell' uonzo (Rome, 1828, 8vo). He also contributed many articles to the Generale lecclesiastico (Rome) from 1788 to 1798. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 33:491.

## Marcion[[@Headword:Marcion]]

             (Μαρκίων), founder of the sect of Marcionites, flourished near the middle of the 2d century.. He was a native of Sinope. According to Tertullian, he was a pilot. Some critics have expressed their doubts that so learned a man should have followed such a trade, but nothing proves Marcion having been a very learned man. He seems to have at first connected himself with the Stoics, and, although his father was a bishop (probably of Sinope), he long inquired into the merits of Christianity before becoming a convert to it. He either retained some of his former views, or else indulged in new speculative views which caused him to be excommunicated by his own father. Epiphanius, who states that Marcion was driven out of the Church for having seduced a young girl (not credited any longer by modern scholars, as Beausobre and Neander), affirms that he afterwards endeavored to regain admission into it by affecting to be deeply penitent, but his father refused to admit him again. Marcion now went to Rome, where he arrived, according to Tillemont, in 142, or, according to Lipsius (Zeitschrij für wissenschafil. Theologie, 1847, p. 77), in 143 or 144, but, more probably, in 138, as St. Justin mentions his residence in Rome in his Apology, written in 139. According to St. Epiphanius, Marcion's first step upon reaching Rome was to ask readmission into the Church, but he was refused. The same writer further states that Marcion aimed to succeed pope Hyginus, who had just died, and that his regret at having failed was the cause of his accepting Gnosticism. These Oriental doctrines were then  preached at Rome by a Syrian named Cerdon.

Marcion joined him, and proclaimed his intention of creating an abiding schism in the Christian Church. Quite different is the statement of Epiphanius. Marcion, says he, was at first received into the Church at Rome, and professed at first orthodox views, but being of a speculative turn of mind, his prying, the rising intellect constantly led him into opinions and practices too hostile to .the opinions and practices of the Church to escape opposition, and he was therefore constantly involved in controversies, in which he often espoused heretical views. After repeated warnings, he was finally cut off from communion with the Church, “in perpetuum discidium relegatus.” He continued to teach, still hoping to become reconciled with the Church. Finally he was offered reconciliation on the condition of returning with all his followers, but die. while endeavoring to do so. His disciples were then but few, and did not hold all the doctrines afterwards maintained by the Marcionites, who flourished as a sect, in spite of untold persecution, until the 6th century, particularly in Egypt, Palestine, and Syria. The most distinguished among his disciples and followers were Apelles, Lucanus, Basilus, Blastus, and Potitus.

The fundamental point of Marcion's heresy was a supposed irreconciliable opposition between the Creator and the God of the Christians, or, in other words, between the two religious systems, the Law and the Gospel. His theological system is but imperfectly known. St. Epiphanius accuses him of recognizing three first principles, one supreme, ineffable, and invisible, whom he calls good; secondly, the Creator thirdly, the devil, or perhaps matter, source of evil. According to Theodoret, he admitted three, the good God, the Creator, matter, and evil which governs matter, i.e. the devil. It is proved that Marcion believed in the eternity of matter, but it is uncertain whether he considered the Creator as a first principle, or as, in some degree, an emanation of the good God. At any rate, he considered them as essentially antagonistic.

This conclusion he arrived at because he could not find in the O.T. the love and charity manifested in the Gospel of Christ. He therefore made the Creator, the God of the O.T., the author of evil, “malorum factorem,” by which he meant suffering, not moral evil. The old dispensation was, according to his views, the reign of the Creator, who chose the Jews for his own special people, and promised them a Messiah. Christ is not this Messiah, but is the Son of the invisible, good Go, and appeared upon earth in human form (being, perhaps, but a phantom), to free the soul and overthrow the dominion of the Creator. Marcion also  supposed that when Christ descended into hell, he did not deliver those who in the O.T. are designated as saints, such as Abel, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Moses, David, etc., but rather those who had disobeyed and rejected the Creator, like Cain, Esau, Korah, Dathan, and Abiram. The other doctrines of Marcion were the natural consequences of these principles. He disapproved of marriage, and did not admit married persons to baptism, considering it wrong to propagate a race sulbject to the cruel dominion of the Creator. His disciples, convinced that this world is a prey to evil, hailed deah, even a martyr's, as freeing them from it. They denied the resurrection of the body, and, notwithstanding Epiphanius's assertion, it appears doubtful whether they believed in the transmigration of the soul.

They were in the habit of being baptized several times, as if the sins of every day diminished the effect of that sacrament; but this custom, which is not mentioned by Tertullian, was probably introduced after the death of Marcion. Women were allowed to baptize persons of their sex, and the new converts were admitted to witness the mysteries. To make the Scripture agree with his views, Marcion rejected a large portion of the N.T. He looked upon the O.T. as a revelation of the Creator to the Jews, his chosen people, which not only differed from, but was entirely opposed to Christianity. He admitted but one Gospel, and that a truncated version of Luke's, the first four chapters of which he rejected, making it to commence by the words: In the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Caesar, God came to Capernaum, a town in Galilee, and spoke on the Sabbath. He carefully omitted all the passages in which Christ acknowledged the Creator as his Father. Among the Epistles, he admitted those to the Romans 1 James , 2 d to the Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians , 1 James , 2 d to the Thessalonians, Philemon, and some part of a supposed Epistle of St. Paul to the Laodiceans; but all these Epistles were expurgated and interpolated to suit his views. Marcion also composed a work entitled Antithesis; it is a collection of passages from the O. and the N.T. which he looked upon as contradictory. In reality, the system of Marcion bore a close resemblance to that of Mani (q.v.); it was an attempt to explain the origin of evil. Marcion, as afterwards Mani, thought to solve the problem by supposing two first principles; but there is this essential difference between them, that while Marcion based his system on the Scriptures, interpreted with daring subtility, Mani derived his from Parseeism, without direct reference to Christian dogmas or traditions. See Tertullian, Contra Marcionem, libri v; De Praescriptione haereticorum; Justin, Apologia; Irenasus, Adversus Haeres.; Clement of Alexandria,  Stromata, 3:3; St. Epiphanius, Panariumn; Ittigius, De Haeresiarchis, sect. ii, c. 7; Cave, Historia Litteraria, 1:54; Tillemont, Memoires Eccles. 2:266; Beausobre, Hist. cdu Manzicheisme, lib. iv, c. vs viii; Lardner, ITist. of Heretics, vol. ii, c. x; Esnig, Darstelluan des marcionitischeen Systems, from the Armenian by Neumann, in the Zeitschriftfiur hist. theol. 1834; Hahn, Antithesis Marcionlis (1823); id. De canone Marcios2is and/nozi (1824); Becker, Examen critique de l'evangile de Marcion (1837); Ritschl, Das Evangelium Marcion's u. d. Evangel. des Lukas (1846); Hilgenfeld, Krit. Untersuchungen 2:d.Evangel. Justinius d. clement. liom. u. Mars cion's (1852); Heim, Marcion, sa doctrine et son evangile (1862); Schaff, Ch. Hist. 1:245; Milman, Ilist. of Latin Christianity; Donaldson, Literature; Werner, Gesch. d. apologet. u. polenr. Literatur; Hagenbach, lIist. of Doctrines, 1:58 sq., 85, 190,198; Zeitschrf.f. Wissensch. theol. 1860, 2:285; Stud. u. Krit. 1855, 2:296; Am. Presb. Rev. 1860 (May), p. 360; Neander, Ch. Hist. 2:458 sq.; id. Christian Dogmas (see Index); Baur, Dogmengesch. vol. ii (see Index); Bayle, Dict. Hist. and Crit.; Dict. des Sciences philosophiques; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 33:505; Smith, Dict. Gr. and Romans Biog. s.v. SEE TRINITY.

## Marcionites[[@Headword:Marcionites]]

             SEE MARCION. (above).

## Marcites Or Marcitze[[@Headword:Marcites Or Marcitze]]

             a sect of heretics in the 2d century, who also called themselves the Perfecti, and made profession of doing everything with a great deal of liberty, and without fear. This doctrine they borrowed from Simon Magus, who, however, was not their chief; for they were called Marcites, from one Marcus, who conferred the priesthood and the administration of the sacraments on women.

## Marck, Johann Van[[@Headword:Marck, Johann Van]]

             a distinguished Dutch theologian, was born Dec. 31, 1655, at Sneek, in Friesland, and educated at the University of Leyden. His early reputation was such that before the completion of his twenty-first year he was appointed to the professorship of theology at Franeker. In 1682 he removed to Groningen as professor primarius of theology and university preacher. In 1690 he accepted a theological chair at Leyden, and in 1720 succeeded the younger Spanheim as professor of ecclesiastical history. He  died Jan. 30, 1731. He wrote several works on dogmatic theology, which are highly esteemed in the Reformed Church, and made various valuable contributions to the interpretation of the Scriptures. His principal works are, De Sybyllinis carminibus (Frankf. 1682, 8vo): — In Apocalysm Commentaria sea analysis exegetica (Lugd. Bat. 1689, ed. auct. 1699, 4to): — In Canticum Salomonis Commentarius seu analysis exegetica cum analysi Psalm xly (Lugd. 1703, 4to): — In praecipiias quasdam partes Pentateuchi Commentarius, sea ultinorunm Jacobi, reliquorunz Bilhami et novissimorum Mosis analysis exegetica (Lugd. 1713, 4to): — Commentarii sea analysis exegetica in Prophetas minores (Amsterd. 1696-1701, 5 vols. 4to). This is a very complete and carefully-executed work. Walch characterizes it as one of the best of the commentaries on the minor prophets: — Sylloge dissertationum philologico-exegetictarus u ad selectos quosdam textus N.T. (Rotterd. 1721, 4to): — Compendiunz theologicae Christianae didactico-elencticum (Amsterd. 1722, 4to): — Fasciculus dissertationunm philologico-exegeticarum ad selectos textus V. et N. Testamenti (Lugd. 1724-27, 2 vols.), etc. A selection from his works was published at Groningen in 1748, in 2 vols. 4to. See Kitto, Cyclop. of Bibl. Lit. vol. 3, s.v.; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. vol. 2, s.v.

## Marckius[[@Headword:Marckius]]

             SEE MARCK.

## Marcomanni[[@Headword:Marcomanni]]

             a Germanic tribe of the Suevic branch, dwelt from the Helvetian border to the Main, and from the Rhine to the Danube. They are first mentioned by Julius Caesar in his Gallic wars (1:51), who reckons them among the forces  of Ariovistus, king of the Suevi. The conquests of the Romans brought them into dangerous proximity to the Marcomanni, and induced the latter to seek a new home in modern Bohemia. They were led by Marobodhus, a man of noble rank among them, trained in the Roman armies, and he became their king after the conquest of Bohemia. The Marcomanni quickly acquired influence, and were greatly strengthened by alliances with all the neighboring tribes, so that their power became threatening to the empire. Tiberius concluded a treaty of peace with them, which secured the empire against an attack, but turned against them the hatred of the remaining Germanic tribes. Led by Arminius, these enemies defeated the Marcomanni in A.D. 17, after which date their history presents an almost uninterrupted succession of conflicts. They defeated the emperor Domitian (Dio Cassius, 57, 7), and in A.D. 164 advanced to Aquileia, in Italy. The fruits of a decisive victory over them, won by the generals of M. Aurelius, were lost by a treaty which the emperor Commodus concluded with them (A.D. 180), and they continued to make frequent irruptions into the neighboring provinces of the empire, penetrating in A.D. 270 even to Milan, besieging Ancona, and threatening Rome itself. Their name gradually disappears from history during the 5th century, when the migration of more distant barbarians brought a succession of new peoples into their land.

It is not definitely known how or when they became acquainted with Christianity. Their frequent incursions into the empire doubtless brought them into contact with its disciples, some of whom must have been among their prisoners of war. A statement in the life of St. Ambrose, by Paulinus — which, however, is not confirmed by any contemporaneous author — relates that in the time of that bishop an Italian Christian had visited the Marcomanni, and had awakened the interest of their queen in Christianity to an extent that led her to apply to Ambrose for instruction. He sent, in compliance with her request, a work in the form of a catechism, by which both she and the king were led to embrace Christianity towards the close of the 4th century. See Schrickh, Kirchengesch. 7:347; Hefele, Gesch. d. Einfuhrung des Christenthuums im süd-westl. Deutschland, vol. 7; Tacitus, Annals; Dio Cassius, Hist. Romans 1, 54, and Greek and Roman historians of this period. See also Herzog, Real-Encyklopädie, 9:112; Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lex. s.v. (G. M.)

## Marconville Or Marcouville, Jean De[[@Headword:Marconville Or Marcouville, Jean De]]

             a French writer of note, who flourished in the second half of the 16th century at Paris, is the author of several works of interest to the theological student. Among them the following deserve special mention: L'oriqine des temples des Juifs, Chretiens, et Gentiles (Paris, 1563, 8vo): — La diversites des opinions de l'homme (1563, 8vo): — Chretien avertissement aux refroidis et ecartes de la vraie et ancienne Eglise Catholique (1571, 8vo), a work in which Marconville, though displaying great attachment to the Roman Catholic Church, condemns her conduct towards the Protestants. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 32:509.

## Marcosians Or Colobarsians[[@Headword:Marcosians Or Colobarsians]]

             an ancient sect in the Church, making a branch of the Valentinians. Irenaeus speaks at large of the leader of this sect, Marcus, who, it seems, was reputed a great magician. The Marcosians had a great number of apocryphal books, which they held as canonical, and of the same authority with ours. Out of these they picked several idle fables touching the infancy of Jesus Christ, which they circulated as authentic histories. Many of these fables are still in use and credit among the Greek monks. SEE VALENTINIANS.

## Marcus[[@Headword:Marcus]]

             (Col 4:10; Phm 1:24; 1Pe 5:13). SEE MARK.

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

             a Scotch prelate, was a native of Galloway, in Scotland, and was promoted to the see of the Isles in 1275, and consecrated the same year. He was also lord high-chancellor of Scotland. He held a synod at Kirk-Bradden in March, 1291, where thirty-nine canons were made. He died in 1303. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 300.

## Marcus Aurelius[[@Headword:Marcus Aurelius]]

             SEE AURELIUS.

## Marcus Bishop Of Otranto[[@Headword:Marcus Bishop Of Otranto]]

             probably of the 8th century. Allatius says he was oeconomus or steward of the great Church of Constantinople before he became bishop, which seems to be all that is known of him. He wrote Τῷ μεγάλῳ σαββάτῳ ἡ ἀκροστιχίς, [Hymnus Acrostichus in Mllagnume Sabbatun, s. In Magno Sabbato Capita Versuum, published by Aldus Manutius, with a Latin version, in his editions of Prudentius and other early Christian poets (Venice, 1501, 4to). A Latin version of the hymn is given in several editions of Biblitheca Patrum. — Fabricius, Bibl. Graec. 11:177, 677; Cave, Hist. Litt. ad ann. 750, 1:630; Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol. . v.

## Marcus Eugenycus[[@Headword:Marcus Eugenycus]]

             SEE EUGENICUS.

## Marcus Of Alexandria[[@Headword:Marcus Of Alexandria]]

             a patriarch of Alexandria, flourished early in the 13th century, and was particularly well versed in ecclesiastical law. He proposed certain questions for solution on various points of ecclesiastical law or practice. Sixty-four of these questions, with the answers of Theodorus Balsamon, are given in the Jus Orientale of Bonefidius, p. 237, etc. (Paris, 1573, 8vo), and in the Jus Graeco-Ronmanums of Leunclavius, 1:362-394 (Frankfort, 1596, fol.). Some MSS. contain two questions and solutions more than the printed  copies. Fabricius suggests that Mark of Alexandria is the Marcus cited in a MS., Catena in Mastthci Evangelium, of Macarius Chrysocephalus, extant in the Bodleian Library at Oxford. — Cave, Hist. Litt. ad ann. 1203, 2:279 (ed. Oxford, 1740-42); Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Romans Biog. and Mythol. s.v.

## Marcus Of Arethusa[[@Headword:Marcus Of Arethusa]]

             a bishop in the Eastern Church, was one of three prelates sent to Rome, A.D. 342, by the emperor Constantius II, to satisfy the Western emperor Constans of the justice and propriety of the deposition of Athanasius of Alexandria and Paulus of Constantinople. Marcus and his fellow-prelates are charged with having deceived Constans by presenting to him as their confession of faith, not the Arian or Eusebian confession, lately agreed on at the Synod of Antioch, but another confession of orthodox complexion, yet not fully orthodox, which is given by Socrates. Marcus appears to have acted with the Eusebian or Semi-Arian party, and took part on their side, probably in the Council of Philippopolis. held by the prelates of the East after their secession from Sardica (A.D. 347), and certainly in that of Sirmium (A.D. 359), where a heterodox confession of faith was drawn up by him. The confession which is given as Marcus's by Socrates is believed by modern critics not to be his. They ascribe to him the confession agreed upon by the Council of Ariminum, A.D. 359, and also given by Socrates. During the short reign of Julian, Marcus, then on old man, was cruelly tortured in various ways by the heathen populace of Arethusa, who were irritated by the success of his efforts to convert their fellow-townsmen to Christianity. He appears to have barely survived their cruelty. His sufferings for the Christian religion seem to have obliterated the discredit of his Arianism, for Gregory Nazianzen has eulogized him in the highest terms, and the Greek Church honors him as a martyr. See Athanasius, De Synodis, c. 24, s.v.; Socrates, Hist. Eccles. 2:18, 30, 37, with the notes of Valesius; Sozomen, Hist. Eccles. 3:1.0: 4:17; v. 10; Theodoret, Hist. Ecc 3:7; Gregorius Naz. Oratio iv; Bolland, Acta Sanctor. Mart. 3:774, etc.; Tillemont, Memoires, vol. vi and vii; Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol. s.v.; Neander, Hist. of Chr. Ch. 2:51, 61.

## Marcus Of Gaza[[@Headword:Marcus Of Gaza]]

             the biographer of St. Porphyry of Gaza, lived in the 4th and 5th centuries; was probably a native of Proconsular Asia, whence he traveled to Palestine, there became acquainted with Porphyry, and then lived at Jerusalem some time before A.D. 393. Porphyry sent him to Thessalonica to dispose of his property in those parts, and after his return Marcus appears to have been the almost inseparable companion of Porphyry, by whom he was ordained deacon, and sent (A.D. 398) to Constantinople to obtain of the emperor Arcadius an edict for destroying the heathen temples at Gaza. He obtained an edict to close, but not to destroy them. This, however, was not effectual for putting down heathenism; and Porphyry went in person to Constantinople, taking Marcus with him, and they obtained an imperial edict for the destruction both of the idols and the temples of the heathen. Marcus afterwards returned with Porphyry to Gaza, where he probably remained till his death, of which we have no account. He wrote the life of Porphyry, the original Greek text of which is said to be extant in MS. at Vienna; it has never been published. A Latin version, Vita St. Porphyrii Episcopi Gazensis, was published by Lipomanus in his Vitae Sanctorum; by Surius, in his De Probatis Sanctorume Vitis; and by the Bollandists, in the Acta Sanctorume Februar. 3:643 sq., with a Commentarius Praevius and notes by Henschenius. It is given also in the Bibliotheca Patrum of Galland, 9:259 sq. See Fabricius, Biblioth. Graeca, 10:316; Cave, Hist. Litt. ad ann. 421, 1:403; Oudin, De Scriptor. Eccles. i, col. 999; Galland, Bibl. Patrum, Proleg. ad ix, c. 7; Smith, Dict. of Gr. land Romans Biog. and Mythol. s.v.

## Marcus The Heresiarch[[@Headword:Marcus The Heresiarch]]

             sometimes called the Gnostic, a teacher of Gnosticism in the 2d century, thought by Jerome to be a native of Egypt; by Lardner, of Proconsular Asia; and by Neander, of Palestine. That Jerome's conjecture is correct, seems probable from the statement of Irenoeus that Marcus was a disciple of Valentinus. The followers of Marcus were called Marcosians. His  peculiar tenets were founded on the Gnostic doctrine of aeons; professing to derive his knowledge of these aeons, and of the production of the universe, by a revelation from the four primal emanations in the system of aeons, who descended to .him from the region of the ineffable and invisible in the form of a female. He set forth his system in a poem, in which he introduced the divine aeon discoursing in liturgical forms, and with gorgeous symbols of worship. He prominently developed in his system the idea of a λόγος τοῦ ὄντος, of a word manifesting the hidden divine essence in the creation-creation being a continuous utterance or becoming expressed of the ineffable. See Irenaeus, Adv. Haeres. 1:8-18; Epiphanius, Haeres. 34, s. ut alii, 14; Tertullian, De Prescrip. liceret. c. 50 sq.; id. Adv. Valent. c. 4; id. De Resurrect. Carnsis, c. 5; Theodoret, Haereticarum Fabularum Compend. c. 9; Eusebius, I.E. 4:11; Philastrius, De lcaresib. post Christum, c. 14; Predestinatus, De Haeresib. 1:14; Augustin. De Iacres, c. 15; Jerome, Comm. ad Ist. 64:4, 5; Ep. ad Theod. 29; Ittigius, De Haeresiarchis, lect. ii, c. 6, § 4; Tillemont, Memoirs, 2:291; Lardner, Hist. of Heretics, book ii, e. 7; Neander, Hist. of the Christ. Ch. 1:440; Mosheim, Eccles. Hist. 1:147; Smith, Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog. and Mythol. s.v. SEE MARCOSIANS; SEE VALENTINIANS.

## Marcus The Heretic[[@Headword:Marcus The Heretic]]

             (sometimes confounded with MARCUS THE HERESIARCH), a native of Memphis, in Egypt, flourished in the 4th century. He is said by Isidore of Seville, and Sulpicius Severus in Hist. Sacra, to have been a skillful magician — a Manichaean, perhaps personally a disciple of Manes, and the originator of the doctrine of the Priscillianists. SEE PRISCILLIANISTS. He traveled to Spain, and is said to have disclosed his doctrines to Elpidius, a rhetorician, and to his wife Agape; from them the doctrines were communicated to Priscillian, SEE PRISCILLIAN, who, by embodying them in systematic form and giving them spread, became the founder of the sect. — Smith, Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog. and Mythol. s.v.; Neander, Ch. Hist. 2:710.

## Marcus, Diadochus[[@Headword:Marcus, Diadochus]]

             who flourished probably in the 4th century, was the author of a short treatise entitled τόυ μακαρίου Μάρκου του Διαδόχου κατὰ Α᾿ρειανῶν λόγος, Beati Marci Diadochi Sermo contra Arianos, published with a Latin version by Jos. Rudolph. Wetstenius, subjoined to his edition of Origen, De Oratione (Basle, 1694, 4to; reprinted with a new Latin version in the Bibliotheca Patsrumn of Galland, v. 242). See Fabricius, Bibl. Graeca, 9:266 sq.; Cave, Hist. Litt. ad ann. 356, 1:217; Galland, Biblioth. Patrum, Proleg. ad vol. v, c. 14; Smith, Dict. of Greek and Romans . Biog. and Mythol. s.v.

## Marcus, Eremita[[@Headword:Marcus, Eremita]]

             (οΕ῾᾿ρημίτης, the Ascetic, called also Μόναχος, Α᾿ββᾶς , and Α᾿σκητής, or Excercitator), a disciple of Chrysostom, and contemporary of Nilus and Isidore of Pelilsium, was a celebrated Egyptian hermit of the Scythian deserts, who lived at the close of the 4th and the beginning of the 5th century. From early manhood he was noted for his piety, meekness, and ascetic virtues, and for his exact acquaintance with the holy Scriptures, the whole of which he had committed to memory; and in his old age he enjoyed the repute of an especial sanctity and wonder-working power. Palladius, who visited him in person about A.D. 395, Sozomen, and the Greek menologies relate many of his miracles; but some of them are elsewhere attributed to Macarius (q.v.). Indeed, the writings of Palladius and the monkish traditions seem frequently to confound the names of Marcus and Macarius; and, as both names were common among monks, it is difficult to decide whether the scattered notices of a prominent saint of this name that have reached us refer to one person or to several. There are traces of a younger Marcus, living early in the 5th century, and of others living in the 9th and 10th centuries. Bellarmine attributes the nine or ten tracts of Marcus Eremita which still exist, and are classed among the most interesting relics of the mystico-ascetic literature of the Greek Church, to a monk of the 9th century; but trustworthy authorities assign to them a much earlier date. Photius (‘ 891) mentions nine tracts of Marcus (Bibl. cod. 200, p. 519, edit. Bekker), which are identical with ours. Maximus Confessor, in the 7th century, furnishes a work by Marcus (ed. of Combefis, 1:702 sq.); and Dorotheus cites expressions from him in the 6th century (comp. Tillemont, 10:801; Ceillier, 17:504). Besides, the contents of these tracts are so related to what is found in Chrysostom, Macarius,  and to some extent in Jovinian (comp. Neander, Ch. Hist. 2:390), that we are compelled to recognize in their author a contemporary of Chrysostom. The only remaining question is, whether the author of the tracts be identical with the Marcus of Palladius and Sozomen, or a younger contemporary. The preponderance of authority points decidedly to the former (see Prolegomnena in Galland's Bibl. Patr. 8:3 sq.; and works on Church history and history of literature, especially Du Pin, Nouv. Bibl. 3:8, 2 sq.; Oudin, Comm. de scr. eccl. 1:902 sq.; Ceillier, Auteurs eccl. 17:300 sq.; Cave, Script. eccl. hist. bibl. 1:372 sq.; Tillemont, Memoires, vols. 8 and 10). The Roman Catholic Church historians generally ignore him. Marcus Eremita is said to have died about A.D. 410, aged more than a hundred years. The Greek Church surnamed him the wonder-worker, and commemorated him on the 25th of March; a day in October was formerly observed in his honor by a portion of the Latin Church.

The nine tracts of Marcus are, in brief, as follows:

1. Περὶ νόμου πνευματικοῦ, De lege spiritualis. de paradiso, “Profitable for those who have chosen an ascetic life.” It comprises an introduction, which is followed by two hundred separate propositions designed to comment on the scriptural expression νόμος πνευματικός. The leading thoughts are: All good centers in God; without his aid men can neither believe nor do good. Hence humility is necessary to obedience, and its expression is to be found in restraining our passions rather than in an ascetic hatred of God's creatures.

2. Περὶ τῶν οἰομένων ἐξ ἔργων δικαιοῦσθαι, De his qui putant se ex operibus justficari, seems originally to have formed part of the first, and comprises two hundred and eleven capita or propositions, treating mainly of justification by faith. Saving faith must be accompanied by works of righteousness, but heaven cannot be earned. The kingdom of God is of grace, which God has provided for his faithful servants. Such as do good for a reward, serve not God, but their own will.

3. Περὶ μετανοίας τῆς πάντοτε πᾶσι προσηκούσης, De penitentia cunctis necessaria. Repentance consists of three parts: purification of our thoughts, persistent prayer, and patient endurance of tribulation. None can be saved except they continually repent, and none are damned except they despise repentance.  4. Of baptism; a series of questions and answers relating to the worth and effects of baptism. It is represented as the channel through which Christ imparts gracious aid, rather than as an agency that works perfection in its subject.

5. Salutary precepts, addressed to the monk Nicholas, and showing how to lead a Christian life, and especially how to restrain anger and fleshly lusts. Ascetic exercises are rejected as a means, and looking to Jesus is recommended as pre-eminently the way to virtue and true Christianity. Annexed is a reply from Nicholas, returning thanks for this counsel.

6. Brief reflections of a pious and mystical character, generally bearing on some passage or expression of the Scriptures, treated in the freest style of allegorical interpretation. A state of mystical ecstasy, in which the soul is lost to all created things, and in an ecstasy of love is wholly absorbed in God, is characterized as the most exalted spiritual condition, and ascetic duties are accorded only a secondary value. Another tract, upon the subject of fasting, is wanting in the older editions, and was first published in 1748 by Remondini. It possibly formed a part of 6, which closes abruptly.

7. General questions of Christian morality; a disputation with a jurist as to the possibility of reconciling capital punishment with Christian principles, and a discussion of the nature and use of prayer, of the various ways to honor God, of the desire to please men, etc.

8. A mystical dialogue between the soul and spirit concerning sin and grace, chiefly remarkable because of its decided rejection of the doctrine of original sin, and of its clear and pointed statement of the doctrines of the Greek fathers respecting sin and human freedom. We are to seek the source of our sinfulness neither in Satan, Adam, nor other men. No power can compel us to good or evil, but rather the condition of every person is that which he has chosen from the time of his baptism. The same passions which seduced Adam and Eve still exist in human nature, and produce a like result in every soul that, in the exercise of its freedom, submits to their control. The conflict with sin is therefore a struggle against our own will, in which Christ aids us when we keep his commandments to the extent of our power.

9. Christ's relation to Melchisedek. This tract is directed against a class who regarded Melchisedek as a divine being; probably the Origenistic sect founded in Egypt by Hieracas, who were said to regard Melchisedek as the  holy Spirit or an incarnation of the Spirit. While combating such views, the tract reveals a tendency to Monophysitism, in ascribing to the human nature of Jesus all the attributes of the Godhead. These tracts of Marcus Eremita reveal to us the memorials of a partly ascetic, partly ecstatic mysticism, which was especially cultivated among the Egyptian monks, and which aimed to spiritualize the practices of Monachism. In its excess of pious feeling over dogmatic conceptions, it contained the seeds of many diverse systems of dogmatics and ethics. Monophysitism had essentially its root in the mysticism of the Egyptian monks; and in these writings are found, in curious juxtaposition, Pelagianism and Augustinism, the strongest assertion of human freedom and of the sole efficiency of grace in the work of salvation, the evangelical view of justification by faith and the Roman Catholic doctrine of works. Hence Bellarmine and other Roman Catholics supposed that modern heretics had forged these writings, while Protestant writers have remarked their Pelagian cast. The tracts of Marcus were in the 17th century placed in the Index, as “caute legenda.” They are chiefly important as a connecting link between the mysticism of Macarius and that of the Areopagite and Maximus Confessor.

Eight of the above mystical treatises are (λόγοι ὀκτά, “equal to the number of the universal passions.” A Latin version of all together was prepared by Joannes Picus (Paris, 1563, 8vo; later editions in Bibl. Patr.); a Greek version by Guillaume Morel, with the Antirrhetica of Hesychius of Jerusalem (Par. 1563, 8vo). Both versions were reprinted in the first volume of the Auctarium of Ducxeus (Paris, 1624, folio), in the eleventh volume of Bibl. Patrum (Paris, 1654, folio), and in the eighth volume of the Bibl. Patrum of Galland. Marcus Eremita was probably the author also of the tract Περὶ νηστείας, De Jejunio; Latin version by Zinus (Venice, 1574, 8vo). Two of Marcus's tracts — the first and second, viz. Περὶ νόμου πνευματικοῦ,, De Lege Spirituali, and Περὶ τῶν οἰομένων ἐξ ἔργων δικαιοῦσθαι, Dejus quiputant se Operibusjustificari, were published together by Vincentius Opsopeous, with a Latin version (Haguenau, 1531, 8vo). The first was reprinted in the Alicro presbyticon (Basle, 1550), and in the Orthodoxographa (Basle, 1555). The tract De Jejunio. and another, De Alelchizedek, were first published by B. M. Remondinus (Rome, 1748). See Fabricius, Biblioth. Grceca, 9:267; Cave, Histor. Litt. ad ann. 401, 1:372; Oudin, De Scriptor. Eccles. i, col. 902 sq.; Tillemont, Memoires, 10:8)01; Galland, Biblioth. Patrum, Proleg. ad viii,  c. 1; Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol. s.v.; and especially Wagenmann, in Herzog, Real-Encyk. 20:85-91. (G. M.)

## Marcus, Hieromonichus[[@Headword:Marcus, Hieromonichus]]

             said by Oudin to have been a monk of the convent of St. Saba, near Jerusalem, flourished in the opening of the 11th century. He wrote Σύνταγμα εἰς τὰ ἀπορούμενα τοῦ τυπικοῦ, De .Dubiis quae ex Typico oriuntur, contained in the Typicum, or ritual directory of the Greek  Church (Τυπικὸνσὺν θεῷ ἀγίῳ παρεῖχον πᾶσαν την διάταξιν τῆς ἐκκλεσιαστικῆς ἀκολουθίας τοῦ χρόνου ὅλου, Typicum, favents Deo, continens integrum Officii Ecclesiastici Ordinem per totum Annum). See a description of the work in Cave, Hist. Litt. vol. ii; Dissert. 2:38. This commentary is adapted to the arrangement of the Typicum., ascribed to St. Saba, but which Oudin supposes to have been drawn by Marcus himself, and produced by him as the work of St. Saba, in order to obtain for it an authority which, had it appeared in his own name, it would not have secured. A Life of Gregory of Agrigentum is supposed to be by the same author as the Typicum. See Cave, Hist. Litt. vol. ii; Dissert. 1:13; Oudin, De Scriptorib. Eccles. ii, col. 584, etc.; Fabricius, Bibl. Graec. 10:232, 678; Smith, Dict. of Biog. and Mythol. s.v.

## Marcus, Pope[[@Headword:Marcus, Pope]]

             one of the early bishops of Rome, succeeded Sylvester Jan. 18, 336; but little is known either of his life or administration. Anastasius states that by him the bishop of Ostia was first appointed to ordain the bishop of Rome. He died October 7 of the same year in which he had been chosen and was buried in the cemetery of Balbina, which was thenceforth called after his name. “His body,” says Bower, “has since been worshipped in the church of St. Lawrence at Florence, though no mention has been made by any writer of its having been translated thither.” Novaes relates that Marcus bore the title of cardinal before his election, and that with him originated this dignitary of the Church of Rome. He is also by some writers believed to have been the first pontiff to order the reading of the Nicene confession of faith, after the Gospels, in the celebration of mass. See Bower, History of the Popes, 1:114; Shepherd, Hist. of the Church of Rome to Damasus (A.D. 384), p. 77.

## Mardochaeus[[@Headword:Mardochaeus]]

             (Μαρδοχαῖος). the Sept. or Greek equivalent of MORDECAI SEE MORDECAI (q.v.), in the Apocrypha; namely,

(a.) the uncle of Esther, in the apocryphal additions (Esther 10:1; 11:2, 12; 12:1-6; 16:13; 2Ma 15:36). The 14th of the month Adar, on which the feast of Purim was celebrated, is called in the last passage “Mardochaeus's day” (ἡ Μαρδοχαϊκὴ ἡμέρα).

(b.) A Jew who returned with Zerubbabel and Joshua (1Es 5:8; comp. Ezr 2:2).

## Mardochai[[@Headword:Mardochai]]

             a name borne by many rabbins and Jewish savans. The most renowned of them are the following:

1. MARDOCHAÏ ASHKENASI, a fanatical adherent of Sabbathai Zewi, flourished very near the middle of the 17th century. A man of prepossessing appearance, and remarkably talented as a pulpit orator, he traveled through Hungary, Moravia, and Bohemia, everywhere preaching the Sabbathical doctrines, and declaring himself a prophet, insisted upon the duty of his people to welcome Sabbathai Zewi as the veritable Messiah. The persecutions which were so frequent at that time in Germany, France, and Spain had softened the hearts of the poor Jews, and they were anxiously looking for relief from some quarter. Finding that his declarations were favorably received, Mardochai finally announced that he himself was the risen Zewi, who had been dead three years, and actually found many adherents, especially in Italy and in Poland. He is said to have lost his reason, and to have died, a poor and forsaken wretch, somewhere in Poland, about 1682. See Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden, 10:334 sq.; and 42, in Appendix.

2. MARDOCHAÏ BEN-ELEASAR COMINO (or Comiano) flourished in the second half of the 15th century (1460-1490) first at Constantinople, later at Adrianople. A thorough master of mathematics and astronomy, he fell in with the writings of Aben-Ezra (q.v.), and became one of his most ardent admirers and devoted followers. He commented on the sacred writings, and by his generous ways secured the love and admiration of both Karaites and Rabbinites. He also studied the Aristotelian philosophy, introduced by the works of Moses Maimonides, and thus as a philosopher secured no mean reputation. He wrote כתר תורה, a Commentary on the Pentateuch (1460); a Commentary on Aben-Ezra's יסוד מוזא; a Commentary on Ezra's ספר השם; a Commentary on Ezra's ספר האחד; a Commentary on Maimonides's Logik, and other logical writings, etc.

3. MARDOCHAI BEN-HILLEL, a German rabbi, who, while a resident of Nuremberg, was accused of insulting the Christian faith and defending the cabalistic writers, and was visited with the death penalty for his hasty conduct in 1310. He wrote Mardochai Magnus, a commentary on Alphesius's Compendiumm Talmudicum (Riva, 1559, 4to; Cracow, 1598, folio, and often): — De Ritibus mactationis (Venice, 8vo). See Auerbach,  Benit A braham, p. 15; Wiirfel, Hist. N'achricht von der Judengemeinde in Nürnbesry.

4. MARDOC-HA- BEN-NISSAN, a Polish rabbi, flourished at Crosni-osthro, in Galicia, in the second half of the 17th century. He wrote , דוד מרדכי, or “the friend of Mardochai” (Hamb. 1714 and 1721, 4to, with a Latin transl. by Wolf, in Notitia Karaiorum), a work which contains a complete expose of the doctrines of the Karaites. Mardochai was himself a Karaite, and wrote this work by special request of the learned Trigland, who afterwards translated this valuable contribution to the history of the Karaite Jews. Mardochai ben-Nissan wrote also לבוש מלכות(published by Neubauer), another work on Karaism. See Wolf, Bibl. iebsr.; Fürst, Bibl. Judaica; Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden, 10:301, and note 5 in the Appendix.

5. MARDOCHAÏ, ISAAC NATHAN, an Italian rabbi, flourished at Rome near the middle of the 11th century. He was the author of Concordantiae Hebraicae (Basle, 1581, fol.; Cracow, 1584, 4to, with a German transl.; Rome, 1622, fol., with additions by Mario de Calasio; London, 1747-49, 4 vols. fol.); a Latin translation was published at Basle in 1556.

6. MARDOCHAI, JAPHE SCHLESINGER, a noted rabbi and learned cabalist, flourished at Prague, in Bohemia, near the opening of the 17th century. He was a pupil of the celebrated Isserles (q.v.), when the latter lived at Cracow. He was a native of Prague, and was born, according to Gritz (Gesch. d. Juden, 9:485), about 1530, and lived in the capital of Bohemia until the persecutions against the Jews made his stay impossible; he went first to Venice, and later returned to Poland, where he was successively rabbi at Grodno, Lukin, Krzemnitz (1575-1592), and, in a good old age, found a refuge in his native place. He died at Prague about 1612, as rabbi of his people. He wrote לבוש יקרות, a cabalistic treatise, divided into six books. which is believed to have been completed about 1560. It has been frequently published at Cracow (1594-1599, 4 vols. fol.), Prague (1609, 1623, 1688, 1701), and Venice (1622, fol.).

7. MARDOCHAI IBN-ALCHARBIJA. SEE SAAD ADDANLA. (J. H.W.)

## Marechal, Ambroise[[@Headword:Marechal, Ambroise]]

             D.D., a Roman Catholic prelate, was born at Ingre, near Orleans, France, in 1769, and was educated at the seminary of St. Sulpice. He came to Baltimore in 1792; returning to France, he was from 1803 to 1811  professor in the seminaries of St. Fleur, Aix, and Lyons; afterwards became coadjutor to the archbishop of Baltimore, whom he succeeded on his decease, Dec. 14,1817. He visited Rome in 1821-2, to procure aid for his Church in Baltimore. He died Jan. 29 1.S28.

## Marechal, Bernard[[@Headword:Marechal, Bernard]]

             a noted French writer, was born at Rethel in 1705, and, after completing his studies under the guidance of the congregation of the Benedictines of St. Maur, toosi the vows in 1721; in 1755 he became prior of Beaulieu, in Aragon. After this we know of him only as a writer. He died at Metz July 19, 1770. He wrote Concordance des Saints Peres de l'Elise, Grecs, et Latins, ou l'on se propose de meostrer leurs sentiments sur le dogme, la morale, et la discipline, etc. (Paris, 1739, 2 vols. fol.; in Latin, Strasb. 1769, 2 vols. fol.); the work comprehends the fathers of the Church of the first three centuries. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 33:522; Francois, Biblioth. de l'ordre de Saint-Benoit, 2:367.

## Marechal, Pierre Sylvain[[@Headword:Marechal, Pierre Sylvain]]

             a noted French atheist, was born at Paris, Aug. 15, 1750, and was destined by his father to the mercantile profession. Preferring a literary life, his father educated him for the profession of law. Pierre, however, was determined to get a livelihood from his friends, and eschewed all personal care. When inclined to work, he would write something for the daily press, and, endowed with great facility of the pen and a vivid imagination, he soon gained great notoriety for his excellences as a writer. Had he remained within his legitimate channels, his name would have had no interest for us; but Pierre, believing that popularity must be gained at the expense even of manhood and morality, courted the tendency of his age, and became a scoffer of religion and decency. In imitation of Lucretius, he published the fragments of a moral (!) poem, which denies the existence of a God. Not sufficing to provoke public attention to him, he next attacked the Bible, parodied the prophetical writers, and applied himself to all manner of work to further the interests of atheism. Sad, indeed, was the life of such a being as Pierre Sylvain Marechal, and as his life so was his death. When the hour of his departure had arrived, Jan. 18, 1803 (at Montrouge, near Paris), he was heard to exclaim, “Mes amis, la nuit est venue pour moi.” His works are noticed in detail in Hoefer's Nouv. Biog. Generale, 32:522 sq. See also Lalande, Notice sur S. Marechal (1803). (J. H.W.)

## Mareshah[[@Headword:Mareshah]]

             (Hebrew Mareshah', מִרֵשָׁה, fully , מִרֵאשָׁה, Jos 15:44; 1Ch 2:42; 1Ch 4:21; Sept. Μαρισά and Μαρησά, but in 1Ch 2:42, Μαρισάς), the name of one or two men, and also of a place, possibly settled by one of them.

1. A person named as the “father” of Hebron among the descendants of Judah, but it is only left to be inferred that he was the brother of Caleb's son Mesha, with whom the Sept. confounds him (1Ch 2:42). B.C. prob. ante 1612.

2. In 1Ch 4:21, a person of the name of Mareshah is apparently mentioned as the son of Laadah, of the family of Shelah, perhaps as being the founder of the city of the same name (B.C. cir. 1612); possibly identical with the foregoing.

3. A town in the tribe of Judah, “in the valley,” enumerated with Keilah and Achzib (Jos 15:44), rebuilt (comp. 2Ch 4:21) and fortified by Rehoboam (2Ch 11:8). The Ethiopians under Zerah were defeated by Asa in the valley of Zephathah, near Mareshah (2Ch 14:9-13). It was the native place of Eliezer ben-Dodavah, a prophet who predicted the destruction of the ships which king Jehoshaphat had built in conjunction with Ahaziah of Israel (2Ch 20:37). It is included by the prophet Micah among the towns of the low country which he attempts to rouse to a sense of the dangers their misconduct is bringing upon them (Mic 1:15). Like the rest, the apostrophe to Mareshah is a play on the name: “I will bring your heir (yoresh) to you, O city of inheritance” (Mareshah). The following verse (16) shows that the inhabitants had adopted the heathen and forbidden custom of cutting off the back hair as a sign of mourning. In the time of the Maccabaeans it was occupied by the Idumseans (2Ma 12:35), but it was laid desolate by Judas on his march from Hebron to Ashdod (1Ma 5:65-68; Josephus, Ant. 12:8, 6). Only a few years later it is again reckoned to Idumaea; and Hyrcanus I took it and compelled its inhabitants to practice circumcision (Josephus, Ant. 13:9, 1). Josephus mentions it among the towns possessed by Alexander Jannsmus, which had been in the hands of the Syrians (Ant. 13:15, 4); but by Pompey it was restored to the former inhabitants, and attached to the province of Syria (ib. 14:1, 4). Maresa was among the towns rebuilt by Gabinius (ib. 14:5, 3), but was again destroyed  by the Parthians in their irruption against Herod (ib. 14:13, 9). A place so often mentioned in history must have been of considerable importance; but it does not appear that it was ever again rebuilt (see Reland, Palest. p. 888). The site, however, is set down by Eusebius and Jerome (Onomast. s.v. Morasthi) as within two miles of Eleutheropolis, but the direction is not stated. Dr. Robinson (Bibl. Researches, 2:422) found, at a mile and a half south of the site of Eleutheropolis, a remarkable tel, or artificial hill, with foundations of some buildings. As there are no other ruins in the vicinity, and as the site is admirably suited for a fortress, this, he supposes, may have been Mareshah. According to Schwarz (Palest. p. 104) these ruins are still known by the Arabs by the name Marasa, probably the Marash described by Tobler (Dritte Wand. p. 129, 142) as lying on a gently swelling hill leading down from the mountains to the great western plain, from which it is but half an hour distant (Van de Velde, Memoir, p. 333).

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

             The ruined site, Khurbet Merash, is three quarters of a mile south-west of Beit-Jibrin, and consists merely of “6 traces of ruins, cisterns, and caves" (Memoirs to Ordnance Survey, 3:284).

## Maresius[[@Headword:Maresius]]

             (Des Marets), Samuel, a noted French Reformed theologian, was born at Oisemond, Picardy, in 1599; was educated at Geneva and at Paris; studied theology at Saumur and Geneva, entered the ministry in 1620, and was settled at Laon by the Synod of Charenton. His experience in this place was rather of a peculiar nature. He was stabbed one night, and this attack on his life is charged to the Jesuits, because he had violently opposed them, and had, in a pamphlet defending the Protestant faith, severely criticized their conduct. In 1624 he accepted a call to Sedan, both as pastor and theological instructor in the school of theology situated in this place, lately so celebrated in history. Before he entered upon this new position he went to Leyden, and there secured the degree of D.D. in July, 1625. Having made a small tour into England, he returned to Sedan. In 1632 he was called as pastor to Maestricht; in 1636 he removed to Herzogenbusch as minister and professor at the Schola illustris; in 1640 he had an invitation to a professorship at Franeker, and to another at Groningen in 1642. This last he accepted, and from that time to his death did such great services to that university that it was reckoned one of the most flourishing in the Netherlands. The magistrates of Bearn, well informed of his abilities and learning, offered him, in 1671, the professor of divinity's chair at Lausanne; and in 1673 the University of Leyden invited him to a like professorship there. He accepted this last, but died before he had taken possession of it (May 18, 1673). Maresius's literary activity was very great, and his ability as a writer equal to that of any man of his day. He was an able polemic, and wrote much against the Roman Catholics. the Socinians, the Millenarians, and the Arminians, and even against many of his own confession. Indeed, Maresius was quite a literary pugilist. His contest with Voetius, the UItrecht professor, is famous. SEE VOETIUS. His ablest work is his Systemna theologiae (Gron. 1673), in the appendix of which is found a list of all the productions from his pen. Their number is prodigious, and the variety of their subjects shows an unbounded genius. He designed to collect all his works into a body, as well those which had been already  published as those which were in MS. He revised and augmented them for that purpose, and had materials for four volumes in folio, but his death prevented the execution of that project. The first volume was to have contained all those works which he had published before settling at Groningen. The second his Operac theologicct didacfica. The third his Opera theologica polemicac. The title of the fourth was to have been Impietals triumnphacta. Its contents were to have been the “Hydra Socinianismi expugnata,” one of the ablest works against the Socinians, the “Biga fanaticorum eversa,” and the “Fabula preadamitarum refuttat,” three works which had been printed at different times. Marets's system of divinity was found to be so methodical that it was made use of at other academies; indeed, his reputation procured him so much authority in foreign countries as well as his own that a person in Germany who had published some severe censures against Marets received orders to suppress his book. See Genesis Biog. Dict. vol. 9, s.v.; Bayle, Dict. Hist. s.v. larets; Effigies et Vitae professorumn Groning.; Herzog, Real-Encyklopädie, vol. 9, s.v. (J. H.W.)

## Maresius Or Marets, Jean De[[@Headword:Maresius Or Marets, Jean De]]

             a most remarkable character in French history, flourished in the 17th century. In his youth he was an infidel. He has himself left us a picture of his morals in early life, which is by no means an advantageous one; for lie owns that, in order to triumph over the virtue of such women as objected to him the interest of their salvation, he made no scruple to lead them into atheistical principles. “I ought.,” says he, “to weep tears of blood, considering the bad use I have made of my address among the ladies; for I have used nothing but specious falsehoods, malicious subtleties, and infamous treacheries, endeavoring to ruin the souls of those I pretended to love. I studied artful speeches to shake, blind, and seduce them; and strove to persuade them that vice was virtue, or, at least, a thing natural and indifferent.” But after his conversion Marets ran into as great extremes in the opposite direction. In short, he became at last a visionary and a religious fanatic, dealing in nothing but inward lights and revelations. Among other things, he promised the king of France, upon the strength of some prophecies, whose meaning, he tells us, was imparted to him from above, that he should overthrow Moharmmedanism and become the promoter of Christian unity, under the leadership of the pope of Rome. But Maresius deserves our attention especially for the relation he sustained to the Jansenists. Appointed inquisitor, he became one of the severest persecutors of Jansenism, and was bent upon the extirpation of this heresy from French ground. In Delices de l'esprit, one of his productions, he  seriously boasts that “God, in his infinite goodness, had sent him the key of the treasures contained in the Apocalypse, which was known but to few before him;” and that, “by the command of God, he was to levy an army of 144,000 men, part of which he had already enlisted, to make war upon the impious and the Jansenists” (p. 76). He died in 1676. See Genesis Biog. Dict. vol. 9, s.v.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, vol. 33, s.v.

## Marets[[@Headword:Marets]]

             SEE MARESIUS.

## Marezoll, Johann Gottlob[[@Headword:Marezoll, Johann Gottlob]]

             a German theologian, was born at Plauen, grand-duchy of Saxe-Weim. — Eis., Dec. 25, 1761; studied theology at the University of Leipsic from 1779 to 1783; became then tutor for three years in a private family; in 1789 became preacher of the University of Gottingen, with the dignity of professor extraordinary of divinity, and lectured with success on moral philosophy and homiletics; in 1794 was honored by the University of Helmstadt with the doctorate of divinity, and in the same year also accepted a call to Copenhagen as pastor primarius of the German St. Peter's Church, where he was allowed much time for study; but the northern climate injuring his health, he obtained in 1802, by Herder's influence, a position at Jena as superintendent and pastor of the town church, and at the same time commenced lectures on homiletics at the university of that place. He died Jan. 15, 1828. Marezoll was a child of the rationalistic times in which he flourished; but still, with a strong desire to preach and spread abroad the teachings of the Gospel, and gifted with a spirited language and animating mode of delivery, he became a blessing to  many thousands of hearers, and an example and a subject of imitation to thousands of students. His productions were repeatedly reprinted, and translated into several languages, and effected much good. He is justly styled one of Germany's greatest preachers of the 19th century. He wrote Das Christenthum ohne Gesch. u. Eisklein dumng (1787): — Bestimmunmg des Kanzelredners (1793), besides his sermons, published in 1790-1, 1806, 1811, 1829, etc.: — Prediten zur Esrinnerung an die fortdauernde Wirksamkeit der Reformation (Jena, 1822): — Homilien (1828): — Nachgelassene Predigten (1852, and since). See Herzog, Real- Encyklopädie, vol. 20, s.v.; Doring, Kanzelredner d. 18ten u. 19ten Jahrh. s.v.

## Margaret[[@Headword:Margaret]]

             ST., the name of several Roman Catholic saints.

I. The latest of these was canonized through the influence of the Dominicans, who manifested a special interest in her, both before and after her death; she is patronized, however, simply in the neighborhood of her native village, San Severin, in the duchy of Ancona. From the former name of that place, she was called Septenmpeda; the practice of such virtues as are common among saints, and which she cultivated during her widowhood, gave her the surname Vidua; and since, in her humility, she would never wear shoes, she received the appellation Discalceata. The only inheritance left to her daughter comprised a pair of shoes and the soles of her feet, which became loosened in death and assumed the form of shoes, and which were the principal relics exhibited in her memory by the Dominicans. She died in 1395.

II. The merely beatified saints, SEE BEATIFICATION, of this name belong, without exception, to the monastic orders; and in their legends the fancy and the jealousy of the monks are equally apparent. The more celebrated are:

1. A beautiful Italian from the neighborhood of Perugia, who had up to her twenty-fifth year led a grossly licentious life, but afterwards, having been awakened by a startling incident, distinguished herself by turning to a life of the severest penance in the convent of the Franciscans at Cortona (hence called Margaret de Cortona). Her confessor, however, resisted her desire to revisit the scenes of her former shame, accompanied only by an old woman. She is usually represented with the instruments of torture, because  in spirit she experienced the entire passion of the Savior, who refused to designate her his handmaiden, but honored her as his friend. Her conversations with Christ and the Virgin Mary served to endorse the more lenient treatment of the Spiritualists (Act. SS., 1. c., p. 648). When she died, in 1297, the Franciscans claimed that they saw her soul ascend from purgatory to heaven. In 1623 Urban VIII permitted them to pay her religious honors.

2. As an offset to Margaret de Cortona, the Dominicans raised up one of their tertiaries, a blind girl of Urbino, in whose heart were found, after death, three wondrous stones, bearing the image of the Virgin Mary with the child in the manger (Act. SS., April 13; beatified Oct. 19,1609).

Other Margarets, including a royal princess of Hungary, who died a Dominican, Jan. 28, 1271, are obscure. They are found in the Act. SS. under Jan. 23; Feb. 11; March 5 7, 13, and 22; April 12 and 30; May 15, 18, and 23; and June 4, 10, and 13. — Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 9:54; Wetzer und Welte, Kirchen-Lex. 6:835.

## Margaret (Or Marguerite) Of Orleans[[@Headword:Margaret (Or Marguerite) Of Orleans]]

             duchess of Alenuon and afterwards queen of Navarre, occupies an important place in the history of French Protestantism. She was born at Angouleme April 11, 1492, and was brought up at the court of Louis XII. Her brother, afterwards Francis I, after he had ascended the throne, employed her in numerous important affairs, and she went to Madrid to attend to him when he was a prisoner there. In 1509 she was married to duke Charles of Alenlon, but he dying in 1525, she in 1527 again married, this time Henry d'Albret, king of Navarre, and from this marriage was born Jeanne d'Albret, mother of Henry IV. Henry d'Albret died in 1544, and Margaret continued to govern the kingdom with great wisdom. She died  Dec. 21, 1549. She was very handsome and highly talented, and her court was the refuge of all persecuted for the sake of their religious belief; yet veryr different opinions have been advanced concerning her personal views. Some consider her a fervent Protestant, whilst others look upon her as a very orthodox Roman Catholic, and still others as a free-thinker.

The fact seems to be that she observed Roman Catholic practices, although firmly believing in the doctrine of justification by faith in Christ only; she protected the Protestants, without herself leaving the Roman Church; she loved poetry and even pleasure, although strictly moral and truly pious. All these apparent contradictions find a natural explanation in her inclination towards mysticism, verging even on quietism, and resulting in indifference towards the mere externals of religion — a tendency common also to a number of the most distinguished theologians of that time, and one that helps us to understand many otherwise obscure points in the early history of the Reformation in France. Her private character was the object of many attacks, yet none of these accusations have been substantiated; they were all made by her enemies. Margaret of Orleans wrote 1 Miroir de l'dme pecheresse (1533), which was condemned by the Sorbonne, as it made no mention either of the saints or of purgatory: — L'Heptameron des nouvelles, a collection of tales after the manner of Boccaccio, but intended as moral lessons; they have since been used as illustrating the supposed immorality of her life. The work was first published under the title Histoires des amants fortunes (Paris, 1558; afterwards by Gruget, Paris, 1559, 2 vols.; Amsterd. 1698; Berne, 1780, 3 vols.; Leroux de Lericy, Paris, 1853, 3 vols.; Lacroix, Paris, 1857; in English dress it is published in Bohn's collection, extra volumes): — fragments published after her death by Jean de la Haye, under the title Mtarguerites de la marnguerite des Princesses (Lyon, 1547; Par. 1554). Her Correspondance was published by Geinin (Par. 1842); also Nouvelles letties de la Reine de Netarre (Par. 1842). The Hist. de L. (le Valois, etc., published at Amsterdam (1693, 2 vols.), is a mere novel. In the library of Rouen there is to be found a MS. of the 17th century, entitled Intrigues secretes de la reyne Marguerite pour etlablir les erreurs et les nouveautes le Calvin et de Luther dans son royaume de Beamn et de Navarre. See Bayle, Dict. Hist.v.; Polenz, Gesch. des franzosischen Calvinismus, 1:199 sq.; Haag, La France Protestante, 7:228 sq.; Victor Durand, Marguerite de Valois et la Cour de Francis I (1848, 2 vols. 8vo); Miss Freer, Life of Marguerite, Queen of Navarre (1855); Herzog, Real-Encykclop. 9:55 sq.; Pierer, Universal-Lexikon, 10:867; Foreign Quar. Rev. (October, 1842).

## Margaret Of France[[@Headword:Margaret Of France]]

             duchess of Berry and Savoy, daughter of Francis I, was born in 1523, and received a superior education. She was a patroness of the sciences and learned men; and after the death of her father gained a high reputation by her beauty, piety, learning, and amiable qualities. She married Philibert, duke of Savoy, in 1559, and died in 1574, aged fifty-one. The most illustrious of the literati contended who should praise her best, and her subjects called her the Mother of her People.

## Margaret Of Scotland[[@Headword:Margaret Of Scotland]]

             daughter of king Edward III, fled to Scotland with her brother, Edgar Edelings, when William the Conqueror invaded England, and in 1070 there married king Malcolm, who afterwards died fighting against William II of England, she following him only four days later to the grave (Nov. 16,1093). She was canonized by Innocent IV in 1251, and in 1673 Clement X made her the patron saint of Scotland. According to the statement of her confessor Theodoric, Margaret of Scotland was very active, generous, and even lavish in helping the poor. She had regularly 300 persons dependent on her charity, and did much towards softening the native rudeness of the Scottish nobility. She founded a number of churches, working herself in adorning them, and gained her place in the Martyrologium Romanum by her efforts to unite the Church of Scotland with that of Rome, and to civilize the country. She had worked no miracles, but her children were accounted such; among them was David I, ‘splendor generis,” who Romanized Scotland. In after times her cathedral was destroyed by the Puritans, and her relics were scattered; such portions as were subsequently collected were transferred by Philip II to the Escurial. The “toast of Margaret” is named after her; pope Eugenius IV in 1430 attached to it an indulgence of forty days. but with the express condition that this toast should be the last. Margaret is commemorated June 16 by, the Church of Rome. — Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 9:54. (J. N. P.)

## Margarit (Or Marguerit), Juan Dei[[@Headword:Margarit (Or Marguerit), Juan Dei]]

             a Spanish cardinal, was born at Girona about 1415. He belonged to an ancient and illustrious house of Catalonia; one of his ancestors, Beranger, distinguished himself at the siege of Tyre. Margarit became doctor of theology at Girona; in 1453 he was elevated to the episcopal see of Elna. The king of Aragon, Alfred V, employed him in several important diplomatic missions to Naples, and he was so successful that he was made ambassador to pope Pius II. In 1461 Margarit became chancellor at Girona, and in this office mediated peace between Sixtus IV and the king of Naples, Ferdinand I. For his services to the holy see he was honored with the cardinal's hat towards the close of 1443. He died at Rome in 1444. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 33:543.

## Margarita[[@Headword:Margarita]]

             (μαργαρῖτις , margaritum), the pearl, was the name given in the Greek Church to the vessel in which the consecrated host was kept. Margaritue, on the other hand, designated the pieces of the host which the priests preserved in a special vessel for the use of the sick. These pieces were dipped in consecrated wine, and given to the sick with a spoon. See Du Fresne, Gloss. Latin. 2:510.

## Margetson, James, D.D[[@Headword:Margetson, James, D.D]]

             an Irish prelate, was born in 1600, at Drighlington, in Yorkshire, and received his education in Peterhouse College, Cambridge; was promoted to the parish of Watlas; in 1635 was advanced to the deanery of Waterford; in 1637 to that of Derry, and in 1639 was made dean of Christ Church, Dublin. Throughout the troubled period of 1641 his charity and benevolence to the sufferers were singularly eminent. In July 1647, he joined in a remonstrance to the commissioners of the English Parliament, praying liberty for the use of the common prayer in their respective churches, and rejecting the directory ordered to be used instead. Soon after, the war obliged him to flee to England, where he was thrown into prison. He finally was released, and sought refuge in London. When  Charles II was restored to the throne, Margetson was selected to fill the metropolitan chair of the province of Dublin, and was consecrated January 27, 1660. In 1662 he enforced the principle of jurisdiction and control over the pulpits of his diocese. About this time Margetson was one of the spiritual peers who voted for the third reading of the Act of Settlement. During the time he presided over the see of Dublin he liberally contributed to the repair of both its cathedrals. In 1663 he was translated to the province of Armagh. He was also afterwards chosen vice-chancellor of Trinity College, Dublin. He died in August 1678. See D'Alton, Memoirs of the Archbishops of Dublin, page 275.

## Margil, Jesus De[[@Headword:Margil, Jesus De]]

             (Feather Antonio), an early Franciscan missionary to Texas, was born at Valencia Aug. 18, 1657, and died in Mexico Aug. 6,1726. He was the author of El Peregrino Septentrional Atlante (Valencia, 1742). He is styled “Notario Apostolico,” “Commissario del Santo Oficio,” “Fundador y ex Guardian de tres Coligios,” and “Prefecto de has Missiones de Piropagande Fide en todas has Indias Occidentales.” See Hist. Mag. June, 1864, s.v.; Drake, Dict. Amer. Biog. s.v.

## Margoliouth, Moses, Ph.D., LL.D[[@Headword:Margoliouth, Moses, Ph.D., LL.D]]

             a minister of the Church of England, was born of Jewish parentage in 1818, at Suwalki, in Poland. In 1837 he arrived in England, and in the year following openly professed Christianity. In 1840 he entered Trinity College, Dublin, and, after completing his studies, was ordained in 1844. He held various positions in the Episcopal Church, and at the time of his death, Feb. 25,1881, he was vicar of Little Linford, near Newport Pagnell, Bucks, Enigland. He is the author of many works: — Fundamental Principles of Modern Judaism Investigated (Lond. 1843): — The Jews in Great Britain (ibid. 1846): — A Pilgrimage to the Land of mny Fathers (ibid. 1850, 2 volumes): — History of the Jews in Great Britain (1851, 3 volumes): — Abyssinia, its Past, Present, and Future (1866): — The Spirit of Prophecy (1864): — Sacred Minstrelsy: A Lecture on Biblical and Post-Biblical Hebrew Music (1863): — The Oracles of God and their Vindication (1870): — Vestiges of the Historic Anglo-Hebrews in East Anglia (eod.): — The Poetry of the Hebrew Pentateuch (1871): — The Lord's Prayer no Adaptation of Existing Jewish Petitions (1876). Besides, he left a great many works in MS. (B.P.)

## Marguerite Of Valois[[@Headword:Marguerite Of Valois]]

             SEE MARGARET OF ORLEANS.

## Margunius, Maximus[[@Headword:Margunius, Maximus]]

             an Eastern theologian, was born in Crete in 1522; studied divinity at Padua and Venice; became a monastic; in 1589 bishop of Cythera (Cerigo); and died at Crete in 1602. He published Μηνολόγιον and Βίοι ἁγίων, as well as a collection of sacred poems in Old Greek (Leyden, 1592). and῎ ῾Υμνοι Α᾿νακρεόντιοι. — Regensburger Real- Encyklopädie, vol. 9, s.v.

## Marheineke, Philip Konrad[[@Headword:Marheineke, Philip Konrad]]

             an eminent German theologian and writer, was born at Hildesheim May 1, 1780. He studied theology at Göttingen, where he was made a professor in 1805. He afterwards became successively professor in the University of Heidelberg in 1807, and professor in the university, and, in 1810, minister of the Trinity Church of Berlin, as colleague of the renowned Schleiermacher. He died in the capital of Prussia, May 31, 1846.  Marheineke's studies were especially directed towards Christian symbolics and dogmatics, which he treated from the speculative stand-point of Daub and Hegel. He was, indeed, the head of that fraction of the Hegelian school which asserted the coincidence of the Hegelian philosophy with Christianity. He was equally distant from the strict orthodox views held by the Lutheran, as from Rationalism, or from the old supernaturalism. He wrote Gesch. d. christlichen Moral seit d. Anfange d. Reformation (Nuremb. 1805): — Universalhistorie d. Christenthums (Erlangen, 1806): — Christliche Symbolik (Heidelb. 1810-13, 3 vols.): — Grundriss d. Homiletik (Hamb. 1811; 2d edit. 1827): — institutiones symbolicae (1812; 3d edit. 1830): — Aphorismen z. Erneuerung d. Kirchlichen Lebens (1814): — Predigten (1814-18): — Geschichte d. deutschen Reformation (Berl. 1816, 2 vols.; 2d edit. 1831-34, 4 vols.): — Grutndlehren d. christlichen Dogmatik (Berl. 1819; other edit. 1827): — Ottomar. Gespriche 2: — Fireiheit d. Willens u. gittliche Gnade (Berl. 1821): — Lehabuck d. christl. Glaubens u. Lebens (Berl. 1823; 2d edit. 1836): — Betrachtungen u. d. Lebe d. Lehre d. Welterlssers (Berl. 1823): — Ueber d. wahre Stelle d. liturgischen Rechtes (1825): — Katechismus d. christlichen Lehre (1825; 2d edit. 1840): — Entlwurl' d. praktischen Theolqie (Berl. 1837): — Predigten z. Vertheidigu g d. evangelischen Kirche gegen d. papstliche (1839): — Einleitung in d. ojfentl. Vorlesungen 2:s. Bedeutvng d. Degelschen Philosophie in d. christl. Theologie (Berl. 1842): — Das gottesdienstliche Leben d. Christen (Magdeb. 1842): — Zur Kritik der Schellinyschen Ofenbarungs philosophie (Berl. 1843): — Der Erzbishop Clemens August als Friedenstifter zwischen Staat u. Kirche (Berl. 1843): — Die Reform der Kirche durch den Staat (1844): — Kurze Erzahlung d. Refornzation (1846). After his death his lectures were published under title Vlorlesungen uber die christliche Dogmatik (1847); iiber die theologqische Moral (1847); iuber die christliche Symbolik (1848); and über die Dogmsengeschichte (1849). See Saintes, list. of German Rationalism, p. 284; Kahnis, Mod. German Protestantisnm, p. 244 sq.; Morell, Hist. of Mod. Philos. 2:199, 203; Bretschneider, Dogmatik, 1:115 sq.; Farrar, Crit. Hist. of Free Thought, p. 265; and the excellent articles in Wagner, Staats- Lexikon, s.v.; Pierer, Universal-Lexikon, 10:871; Herzog, Real- Encyklopädie, 9:62.

## Maria Angelica, De S. Magdalena[[@Headword:Maria Angelica, De S. Magdalena]]

             is the name by which Jaqueline, one of the daughters of Anthony Arnauld (q.v.), was known after she became the prioress of the noted convent of Port Royal. “She at first led a very dissolute life, such as was common at that time in the French nunneries; but in 1609 the fear of God came upon her, and she entered upon a very different course of life; and afterwards becoming intimate first with Francis de Sales, and then, in 1623, with the abbot of St. Cyran, she conformed both herself and her convent to their views and prescriptions.... . The consecrated virgins inhabiting it followed with the utmost strictness the ancient, severe, and almost everywhere abrogated rule of the Cistercians; nay, they imposed on themselves more rigors and burdens than even that rule prescribed.” Dr. Murdoch's Mosheim, Eccles. s. is. bk. iv, cent. xvii, sec. ii, pt. i, ch. i, § 46. SEE PORT ROYAL. The relation which this retreat sustained to the Jansenists has been detailed in the article JANSENIUS, CORNELIUS (2).

## Maria Theresa[[@Headword:Maria Theresa]]

             empress of Austria and Germany. the daughter of Charles VI, was born at Vienna May 13, 1717, and succeeded to the throne, by the “Pragmatic Sanction,” Oct. 21, 1740. With her secular history we have nothing to do here, but as to her influence on the interests of Romanism and Protestantism, we must add here a few particulars to the article on Austria. Although herself a zealous Roman Catholic, she maintained the rights of her crown against the court of Rome, and endeavored to correct some of the worst abuses in the Church. She prohibited the presence of priests at the making of wills, abolished the right of asylum in churches and convents, suppressed the Inquisition in Milan, and in 1773 the Order of Jesuits. She also forbade that any person, male or female, should take monastic vows before the age of twenty-five years. She did nothing, however, to ameliorate the treatment of the Protestants in her dominions. She professed personal sympathy with their oppressed condition, but pretended to be unable to do anything for them on account of her coronation oaths and the laws of the country. This was especially the case in Hungary. Alaria Theresa died Nov. 29,1780, leaving as her successor to the throne Joseph II, who is noted for his generous efforts in behalf of his Protestant subjects. See Duller, M. Theresia u. Joseph II (Wiesbaden, 1844); Ramshom, M. Theresia u. ihre Zeit (Lpz. 1859 sq.); Wolf, Oestereich unter Maria Theresa (1855); Coxe, House of Austria, 3:189 sq., 241 sq.; Vehse,  Memoirs of the Court of Austria, 2:164 sq. SEE AUSTRIA; SEE BOHEMIA; SEE HUNGARY.

## Maria, De Liincarnation[[@Headword:Maria, De Liincarnation]]

             a French female missionary, whose original name was Guyard, was born at Tours in 1599. She early joined the Ursuline nuns; visited Canada in 1639, where she made many converts among the Indians; and founded a conlvent  of her order. She died in 1672. See Charlevoix, Vie de la Mere Marie de l'Incarnation; Biographie Universelle, s.v.

## Mariales, Xantis[[@Headword:Mariales, Xantis]]

             an Italian theologian, was born at Venice at the close of the 16th century. He belonged to a patrician family of the Pinards. He was appointed lecturer at Padua, and afterwards inspector of the schools. These offices he filled till 1624, when he retired in order to give his whole time to politics. His zeal for Rome and his hatred towards France caused his expulsion from his native country twice. He retired to Boulogne, afterwards obtained his recall from banishment, and died in April, 1660. We give him place here mainly on account of his many theological productions. The most important are Controversie ad universan summam Theologiae St. Thomae Aquinatis (Venice, 1624, fol.): — Biblioth. Intepretun ad univ. sum s theol. St. Thomae (Ven. 1660, 4to): — Stravaganze nuovanzente segnite nel Christianissimo regno di Francia (Colossians 1646 4to): — Enormita inaudita nuovamente uscite in luce nel Christianismo regno di Francia, contra il decoro delta sede apostolica Romana in due libri intitolati; l'uno: Dell' arrogante potesta de Papi in difesa della chiesa Gallicana; I'altro Del Dititto della Regalia (Frkf. 1649,4to). — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 33:615.

## Mariamne[[@Headword:Mariamne]]

             (Μαριάμνη, a Greek form of the Heb. Miriam), the name of several females of the Herodian family, whose history is detailed by Josephus, especially the two following (see Smith, Dict. of Class. Biog. s.v.):

1. The daughter of Alexander, son of Aristobulus, and of Alexandra, daughter of Hyrcanus, high-priest of the Jews, was the most beautiful princess of her age. She married Herod the Great, by whom she had two sons, Alexander and Aristobulus, and two daughters, Salampso and Cypros; also a son called Herod, who died young, during his studies at Rome. Herod was excessively fond of Mariamrne, who but slightly returned his passion, and at length cherished a deadly hatred towards him. Herod had her put to death, but afterwards his affection for her became stronger than ever. Josephus mentions a tower that Herod built in Jerusalem, which he named Marianne. SEE HEROD.

2. A daughter of the high-priest Simon, and likewise wife of Herod the Great; by him she had a son called Philip, who married first the infamous Herodias, afterwards paramour of Herod Antipas, and the instigator of the death of John the Baptist. SEE HERODIAN FAMILY.

## Mariana, Juan[[@Headword:Mariana, Juan]]

             a distinguished Spanish Jesuit, was born at Talavera, in the diocese of Toledo, in 1537. In 1554 he joined the Jesuits, and soon acquired great reputation for his historical, theological, and philological learning. In 1561 he taught theology at Rome (where the celebrated Bellarmine was one of his pupils), and in 1565 in Sicily; in 1569 he went to Paris, where he remained five years, and lectured on Thomas Aquinas. In 1574 he returned to Spain on account of his health, and died there in 1624. Among Mariana's works we notice De rege et regis institutione (Toledo, 1598), written at the request of Garcia de Loayso, and dedicated to Philip III. In this work he expresses his views on royalty with the greatest freedom, even going so far as to maintain that, under certain circumstances, it may be legitimate to put a king to death. The sixth chapter of the first book is entirely taken up with the question whether it is allowable to assassinate a tyrant, and he concludes affirmatively. Mariana begins by an account of the murder of Henry III, and quotes the divers opinions expressed by others on this event, but it is easy to perceive that he approves of the deed. From this individual fact he passes to the general theory, which he bases on the principle that regal power is intrusted to a king by his people under certain conditions, and that the nation therefore retains the supreme right of making kings accountable for their conduct, and revoking them if need be. From this principle, that sovereignty resides essentially in the nation, he deduces the following consequences:

1, according to theologians and philosophers, every citizen has a right to kill a prince who has usurped sovereign authority without the consent of the nation (“perimi a quoconque, vita et principatu spoliari posse”);

2, if a prince regularly elected, or who has regularly come on the throne by succession, seeks to overthrow religion or the laws, and refuses to listen to the remonstrances of the nation, he is to be got rid of by the surest possible means;  3, the surest way is to assemble the states-general, who will depose him, and, should he resist, proclaim him an enemy of the country, and treat him accordingly;

4, the states-general have the right to condemn to death a prince declared the enemy of the country, and every citizen has then a right to kill him;

5, if it is impossible to assemble the states-general, and yet it is the wish of the nation that the tyrant perish, then a citizen is not guilty who accomplishes this general wish (“qui votis publicis favens eum perimere tentavit haudquaquam inique eum fecisse existimabo”). Mariana, however, puts one restriction to the exercise of this terrible right he declares that the judgment of one or several citizens is not sufficient; that the general wish of the nation must have been clearly expressed, and that the advice of serious and well-informed men should also be taken. After thus justifying the assassination of kings under certain circumstances, Mariana examines the means by which it may be accomplished. All means, he thinks, are allowable, but such as will be least likely to commit the nation or the individual are to be preferred. He shows some partiality for poison, yet maintains that it should not be administered in the food, but rather placed in things of daily use, such as the clothes, etc. The appearance of this work created quite a sensation in France. The Sorbonne and Parliament informed against his book; the Jesuits' congregation of the province of France condemned Mariana, and the condemnation was approved by general Aquaviva (Mariana had formerly opposed him in Spain) until the book should be revised. SEE JESUITS.

After the murder of Henry IV the Parliament condemned the book to be publicly burned, July 8, 1610, and his treasonable doctrines, as they were called, continued during the whole of that age of loyalty and part of the following to furnish a common subject of animadversion, and a chief ground of accusation against the Jesuits. It is, however, but just to add here that like doctrines were taught also by Protestant contemporaries of Mariana, and that by no means should the Society of Jesus be held accountable for the propagation of such views (Compare Hallam, Literary History, 3:130-140). The Jesuits have, indeed, occasionally supported the claims of the people against their rulers, but always with a view to the interests of their own body only. Mariana, on the contrary, discussed this subject on better and higher grounds. Mankind occupied his thoughts, and had a much stronger hold on his affections than the interests and plans of his order. When Leon de Castro questioned the orthodoxy of Arias Montanus for introducing rabbinical readings and  commentaries into the Plantina Regia or Philippina Polyglot, a new edition of the Conplutensis which Montanus had undertaken at the command of Philip II, Mariana silenced the noisy polemic by his historical, ecclesiastical, and Biblical lore, as well as by the fair and candid tone of his discussion; but by this step he lost all chance of preferment, which, however, he was glad to exchange for learned leisure and the gratification of his love of historical research. Mariana published next, in 1599, his imperfect work, De Ponderibus et Mensuris, a subject which his countrymen Lebrija, or Nebrija, Diego Covarrubias, Pedro Ambrosio Morales, and Arias Montanus had treated before, and which Eisenschmidt, Freret, Paucton, etc., have pursued much further since.

Observing that the sudden rise and ascendancy of Spain excited a general interest and curiosity abroad, while its origin and causes were either unknown or misunderstood, and that the Spanish historians, though numerous, were at that time little read, and some of them hardly known, he came forward with a History of Spain (in twenty books, under the title Historiae de rebus Hispaniae, Toleti. 1592, lib. xx, fol., but subsequently extended to thirty books, in the complete edition of 1605, publ. at Mayence). This is a compact and lucid exhibition of an unbroken chronological narrative, from the origin of the Spanish nation to the death of Ferdinand the Catholic (a period of twenty- five centuries at least), and embraces the history of all the Spanish kingdoms, which had hitherto been treated separately. A subject so extensive, expressed in classical Latin, met with universal favor and acceptance. A Spanish translation soon became necessary, and fortunately Mariana accomplished the task himself, and carried the work through four successive Spanish editions in his lifetime. Mariana has been charged with credulity; but traditions held sacred in times past, although rejected in the present ageprodigies which formed part of history, and which Mariana could not dismiss with the disdainful smile of modern criticism, are spots which will never obscure the brilliancy of his digressions on some of the most important events of the world-events which appear as great causes when so admirably interwoven with those peculiarly belonging to the history of Spain.

The manly feelings of the historian, his noble indignation against crimes, his bold exposure of the misdeeds of princes and their abettors, deserve still higher commendation. Yet he, as well as Ferreras and Masdeu more recently, has spared a gross instance of queen Urraca's licentious conduct; but, on the other hand, the defense of queen Blanca's honor is highly creditable to Mariana. It is true also that Mariana did not always examine all the original authorities, as Ranke observes in the Kritik  neueere Geschichtsschreiber; but to institute an inquiry into every minor detail, to comprehend a wide field of inquiry, and yet to open new and to disdain all trodden paths, would have required the perusal of whole libraries, and a single life would not have been sufficient to complete the undertaking. And if others had been invited to join in the labor of the investigation, a motley compilation might have been the only result of so much research, which it is almost impossible ever to combine into one harmonious whole. Mariana's portraits of lords and favorites were found too original and faithful by the living, as in the case of the detestable Fernandez Velasco, of Castile, and his worthy secretary Pedro Mantaono. The secretary, after having been a panegyrist of the new historian, tried to serve his master by his attack on Mariana, entitled Advertencias a la Historia de Marsians. He was discovered, however, and roughly treated by Tamayo Vargas in La Defensa de Mariana. Probably to this criticism may be traced many improvements in Mariana's second Spanish edition of his history, which appeared at Madrid in 1608. It is on this edition, and the various readings selected from the editions of 1617 and 1623, that the edition of Valencia is based, which contains ample notes and illustrations (1783-96, 9 vols. 8vo). This edition also closes, like the original, with the reign of Ferdinand the Catholic (1515-16). There have subsequently been published at Madrid —

1. The continuation of Mariana by Mifiana, translated from the Latin by Romero (1804, fol.);

2. A complete Mariana, continued down to the death of Charles III, 1788, by Sabau y Blanco (1817-22, 20 vols. 4to);

3. Another by the same, brought down to the year 1808 (9 vols. 8vo, with portraits).

The profound erudition of Mariana is also displayed in another publication, his Tractastus Septem (Cologne, 1609). The second of these treatises, De Editione Vulgatta, is an epitome. of his report on the fierce controversy between Ariastloiltanus and Leon de Castro. The fourth, De Mutatione Monetae, provoked the indignation of the duke of Lerma and his partners in the system of general peculation and frauds which Mariana exposed. He foretold the calamities which threatened the Spanish nation; and his words, which had been disregarded, were remembered when the opportunity was gone. As a reward for proclaiming such unwelcome truths, at the age of seventy-three he suffered a whole year of judicial trickery, humiliations,  and confinement in the convent of St. Francis at Madrid. In searching his papers another exposure was found, entitled Del Gobierno de lea Comnpania, or on the defects of his order, in which he also pointed out the means of correcting them. Copies of this MS. had multiplied so alarmingly that, the year after the author's death, the general of the Jesuits, Vitaleschi, issued a circular, dated Rome, July 29, 1624, enjoining the collection of such papers in order to be burned. Still that measure did not prevent its being printed at Bordeaux in 1625, and reprinted elsewhere in several languages.

This curious circular was found in the archives of the Jesuits of Valencia at the time of their sudden expulsion from the Spanish dominions in 1767. After his persecution he made an epitome of the Bibliotheca of Photius, translated some homilies, revised his History of Spain, and published a supplement, or, rather, a summary, of concise annals of Spain from 1515 to 1612. At the age of eighty-three he published his Scholia on the Old and New Testament, availing himself of the best Hebrew commentaries, and some valuable and very early MSS., which dated from the age of the ancient Gothic dominion in Spain. This work, though written at this advanced stage of life, “displays a degree of vigor and of learning which might well provoke the admiration of modern Biblical students.” It secured for him a place among the best commentators in the Histoire Critique du Vieux Testament of the hypercritical father Simon, who is usually unfavorable to Spaniards. Bayle, in his Dictionary, supposes Mariana to be also author of a work Republica Christiana, but neither Alegambe nor Nicolas Antonio, both of them Spaniards, mentions it. Stevens, the English translator of Mariana's history, misstates some particulars of the author's life, and very unaptly compares him with Raleigh. Mariana left MSS. of at least twice the extent of all his publications. He died Feb. 6, 1623, in the eighty-seventh year of his age and the forty-ninth of his retirement to Toledo. See Mondejar, Advertencias a Mariana; Juicio y Noticia de los Historiadores de Ispana; Andrade, Vidas de Mcariana; Acosta,Vida de Marina; Andr. Schot., Ilispsan. Illustrat.; Baronius, Annal. Ecclesiast.; Bernard. Gerald., Pro Senatu Veneto, quoted in Colomesius, Hispavnia Orientalis; Rene Rapin, Reflexions sur Histoire.; Nicolas Antonio, Bibliotheca Hispanonova; Saaveelra, Republica Literalria; Tamayo de Vargas, Vidan del P. Julai Marianat; Alegambe, Biblioth. script. societatis Jesu; Bayle, Hist. Dict. s.v.; Prosper Marchand, Dictionnaire: Freher, Theatrumn Virorum claorum, 1:347; Woltmann, Gesch. u. Politik, 1801, 1:265; Sismondi, Litterature du Middle. l'Europe, 4:100; Bouterweck, Hist. de la  Litterature Espagnole, 1812, vol. ii; Ticknor, History of Spanish Literature, 3:143; Ranke, Zur Kritik neuerer Geschichtsschreiber (1824); Herzog, Real-Encyklopadie, 9:105 sq.; Pierer, Universal-Lexikon, 10:884; Engl. Cyclopaedia, s.v.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 33:618 sq. (J. N. P.)

## Marianists[[@Headword:Marianists]]

             an order of knighthood. SEE KNIGHTHOOD; SEE TEUTONIC KNIGHTS.

## Marianus Scotus[[@Headword:Marianus Scotus]]

             a noted ecclesiastic, was born in Ireland or Scotland A.D. 1028; became a monk; traveled on the Continent in 1058, especially in Germany, and frequented the German monasteries of Cologne, Fulda, and Mentz, and died A.D. 1086. Marianus Scotus was the first to correct the inaccurate chronologies of the chronicles in his Chronicon (3 vols. to 1084; continued by Dodechin up to 1200). It is published among the Scriptores rerum Germanlicarun by Struve and others. The most valuable is the 3d volume, treating of the Carlovingian and following emperors. See Hansen, De antiquiss. codice chronici Mariani Scoti (Frankfort-on-the-Oder, 1782).

## Mariastein[[@Headword:Mariastein]]

             a noted place of pilgrimage in the Swiss canton of Solothurn, is annually visited by some 60,000 persons. The pilgrimages to this place began in the Middle Ages, and continue unabated to our day. During the first and second French Revolutions the place was ransacked by the French soldiers, but the monastics of the adjoining convent repaired and rebuilt it each time. See Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lex. 12:767.

## Mariazell[[@Headword:Mariazell]]

             a famous place of pilgrimage in Austria, situated on the north border of the crown-land of Styria, twenty-four miles north of Bruck. It consists of a number of inns or lodging-houses, and contains 1200 inhabitants. It is visited by 300,000 pilgrims annually, who come hither to pay homage to an image of the Virgin believed to possess the power of working miracles, which was brought to Mariazell about 1157 by the Benedictine St. Lanmbrecht. A pilgrim chapel was first erected there about. 1200 by margrave Henry I of Moravia. King Louis I of Hungary built a pilgrim  church in 1343. The large pilgrim church now standing was built near the end of the 17th century; the miracleworking image is within a chapel, closed by a heavy gate of solid silver. During the great annual procession from Vienna, the greater part of the pilgrims of both sexes spend the night in the woods in drinking, singing, and general riot anid debauchery. See Hillbach, Der Pilger u. Tourist nach Maria Zell (Vienna, 1857, 8vo).

## Marie (Madeleine) De La Trinity[[@Headword:Marie (Madeleine) De La Trinity]]

             the founder of a religious order, was born June 3, 1616, at Aix, in Provence. She was the daughter of a soldier, and having resolved at the age of fifteen never to marry, placed herself under the direction of a Capuchin, Yvan, who composed for her a book, entitled Conduite a la Perfection Chretienne. With his assistance she founded, in 1632, the order of La Misericorde. This order, beginning in 1637, at Aix, had considerable difficulties, being much opposed by the archbishop of that place, but  approved by the bishop of Avignon, and sustained by the Jesuits. She died at Avignon, February 20, 1678. The order of La Misericorde was approved, in 1642, by pope Urban VIII, and followed the rule of St. Augustine. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Marie, A Li, Coque[[@Headword:Marie, A Li, Coque]]

             a visionary, whose real name was Margaret, was born July 22, 1647, at Lauthecour. in the diocese of Autun, France. She boasted of religious transports, and heavenly visions and revelations, besides which she is reported to have worked manifold wonders. She evinced a deep aversion to all evil in her infancy, and from her fourth year maintained an intimate communion with God. On the death of her father, which took place in the eighth year of her age, she entered a convent. Attributing the cure of a disease that had afflicted her during four years to the Virgin Mary, she gratefully adopted the name “Marie,” and always used it by preference. She entered the Order of Salesians on the 27th of August, 1671, as a novice, and on the 6th of November. 1672, took the veil. From this time she claimed to be constantly favored with visions and revelations, and is said to have performed many miracles; such were her transports that she carved in large letters the name of Jesus on her breast. She had knowledge of the time when she should die, and prepared for that event in deep retirement, closing her life Oct. 17, 1690. She left a small work of a mystical character, entitled La derotion au coeur de Jesus, and others of a similar nature. Her life was published by Jean Joseph Languet under the title La vie de la venerable mere Afarsquerite Marlie; but her memory has been kept alive chiefly through the four songs, -ler-Vet, in OEuvres de M. Gresset (Amsterd. 1748), 1:9-45. On the 4th of February, 1836, the advocate of the pontifical consistory addressed the pope, for the first time, on the process of her beatification; but Talleyrand, as bishop of her native diocese, had already sought to effect her canonization during the last decennials of the 18th century. — Herzog, Real-Encyclop. 20:92 sq.

## Marietiu[[@Headword:Marietiu]]

             a celebrated Hindu sage or demi-god, was, according to one account, the son of Brahma-according to another, the son of Bhrigu. He was the father of Kasyapa. By some he is considered as the god of “light,” which appears to be the etymological signification of his name. See Moor, Hindu Pantheon; Institutes of Manu, chap. i; Thomas, Dict. of Biog. and Mythology, s.v.

## Mariette, Auguste Ferdinand Francois[[@Headword:Mariette, Auguste Ferdinand Francois]]

             a French archaeologist, was born at Boulogne-sur-Mer, February 11, 1821. While yet a very young man he was intrusted with the task of arranging the papers of his deceased cousin, Nestor l'Hote, the companion of Champollion in Egypt from 1827 to 1829. Thenceforth Auguste Mariette became inspired with an eager interest in Egyptian archaeology, and devoted his attention to the study of hieroglyphic and Coptic literature. In 1849 he received a post in the Egyptian department of the Louvre, and was shortly afterwards sent to Egypt for the purpose of seeking and purchasing Coptic MSS. in the monasteries of that country. Soon after his arrival at Cairo he made the great discovery of the long-lost Serapeum, or burial- place of the sacred bulls. This, together with other undertakings, is graphically described in his own narrative, Le Serapeum de Memphis (Paris, 1857). He had not long returned to France when he was offered and accepted the appointment cf conservator of monuments to the Egyptian government. In this position he undertook a long series of important excavations in various parts of Egypt. The magnificent temples of Denderah and Edfu were completely disinterred, and hundreds of thousands of valuable inscriptions were brought to light. The Sphinx was laid bare; the mysterious building known as the Temple of the Sphinx was discovered; extensive works were proceeded with at Karnak, Deir el- Bahari, Medinet Habu, andt Abydos; but we cannot catalogue his archaeological achievements. The Bulak Museum, and the many magnificent volumes in which he has recorded the results of his labors, are, after all, the noblest monuments to his memory. His Denderah (1873-75, 5 volumes): — his Monuments Divers (1872): — his Abydos (1870): — his magnificent Karnak (1875): — Deir el-Bahari (1877): Liste Geographique des Pylones de Karnak (1875), etc., bear witness to his extraordinary industry, and would alone be enough work and honor for any one man. He died at Cairo, January 19, 1881. (B.P.)

## Marillac, Charles De[[@Headword:Marillac, Charles De]]

             a noted prelate of the Church of Rome, was born at Auvergne, in France, about 1510. He was advocate in the Parliament of Paris when, perceiving himself suspected of Lutheranism, he followed John de la Forest, ambassador of France to Constantinople, and thus avoided persecution from the inquisitors. He afterwards became abbot of St. Pere and archbishop of Vienne; also counselor in the privy council when the assembly of notables convened at Fontainebleau in 1560, and in it advocated the calling of a national council and a meeting of the states- general, but without much effect. He endeavored to take measures to prevent the mischiefs threatening the country at that time, but, despairing of success, he became melancholic, was preyed upon by disease, and died at his abbey of St. Pere, in December, 1560.

## Marimoth[[@Headword:Marimoth]]

             (2Es 1:2), the Latin form of MEREMOTH SEE MEREMOTH (q.v.).

## Marin, Michel Ange[[@Headword:Marin, Michel Ange]]

             a French ecclesiastical writer, was born of a noble family at Marseilles in 1697. In 1714 he was admitted to the order of the Minimes; was employed in their schools, and four times filled a provincial office. He possessed not only a liking for theology and natural history, but also a natural taste for belles-lettres. His style is a little diffuse, and sometimes weak and incorrect, without being entirely void of elegance. He died April 3, 1767, at Avignon. Hlis works are mainly in the department of practical religion. We note Lei desastres de Barbacan chin errant dizs Aviqlnoun (Avignon, 1722, 1759, 16mo; Aix. 1744): — Conduite Spirituelle de le soeur Violet (Avignon,  1740, 12mo): — Adelaide de Witsbury ou. la Pieuse pensionnaire (Avignonu, 1744,12mo): — La Parfaite Religieuse (Avign. 1752, 12mo): — Viri inie, ou la virge Chrietiesze, histoire Sicilienne (Avignon, 1752, 2 vols. 12mo): — Vies des Peres des deserts d'Orient, avec leur doctrine spirituelle et leur discipline monastique (Avignon, 1761-64, 3 vols. 4to. or 9 12mo; Lyons, 1824, 9 vols. 8vo): — Le Barons de Van Hesden, ou la republique des incredules (Toulouse, 1762, 5 vols. 12mo): — Agnes de Saint-Amour, ou la fervente novice (Avignon, 1762, 2 vols. 12mo; Marseilles, 1829): — Theodule ou l'enfint le la beUenliction (Avignon, 1762, 12mo): — Farfalla, ou la commendienne convertie (Avignon, 1762, 12mo): — Agelique (Avignon, 1766, 2 vols. 12mo; Marseilles, 1830): — La Marquise de los Valientes, ov, la Damue Chretienne (Avignon, 1765, 2 vols. 12mo): Lettres ascetiques et morales (Avignon, 1769, 2 vols. 12mo). — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Marina De Escobar[[@Headword:Marina De Escobar]]

             SEE ESCOBAR.

## Mariner[[@Headword:Mariner]]

             (מִלָּח, nmallach', a seat man, comp. Gr. ἁλιεύς, Eng. “an old salt;” Eze 27:9; Eze 27:27; Eze 27:29; Jon 1:5; שָׁטַים, shatim', Eze 27:8, “rowers,” as in Eze 27:26), a sailor. SEE SHIP.

## Marini, Giovanni Filippo[[@Headword:Marini, Giovanni Filippo]]

             an Italian Jesuit and missionary, was born near Genoa in 1608; resided fourteen years at Tonking, Japan, and died in that country in 1677. He published .Della Missione de padri della comp. di Giesu nella provincia di Giappone e particolarmente di quella di Tunchino (Rome, 1663, 4to); and A New and Cursious Account of the Kingdoms of Tonquin and Laos (1666), considered quite valuable. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Marino[[@Headword:Marino]]

             or SAN MARINO, one of the most ancient and most limited republican states of Europe, consists of a craggy mountain 2200 feet in height, situated amid the lesser ranges of the Apennines. and encircled by provinces formerly belonging to the pontifical states. It possesses a total area of twenty-one miles, and comprises a town of the same name, and  several villages in the adjacent territory. The climate is healthy, but, owing to its exposure, high winds and frequent rains prevail. ‘The inhabitants, who are reckoned at 8000, are noted for their hospitality, sobriety, industry, and general morality. They are sensitively jealous of their rights, and cling with tenacity to their territorial and legislative independence. The religion of the country is Roman Catholic. The early history of the republic is very obscure. During the mediaeval wars of Italy, Marino had its pigmy feuds and factions, which seem to have been none the less envenomed from the pettiness of the arena in which they were enacted. In 1740 the democratical form of government was securely guaranteed against further assault. The rights of this miniature state were scrupulously respected by Napoleon during his Italian campaign. The government. designated the Sovereign Grand Council (Generale Consiglio Principe), is composed of sixty members, of whom one third are nobles. From this number are selected the smaller “Council of Twelve” (two thirds from the town and the rest from the country),who, with the assistance of a jurisconsult, decide in questions of the second and third instance. The representatives of the state are termed captains-regent (capitani reggenti). They are chosen, the one from the party of the nobles, the other from the bourgeoisie. They each hold office only for six months. The army, or rather the militia of the republic, numbers 1189 men.

## Marinus[[@Headword:Marinus]]

             a martyr of the second half of the 3d century, is mentioned by Eusebius in Hist. Ecc 7:15. According to this authority, Marinus was of a high family, served in the army, and was about to be appointed centurion by Gallienus (266-268) when he was denounced as a Christian by one of his fellow- soldiers. Brought before judge Achaeus, he acknowledged his Christian faith, and was given three hours to recant. During this respite he was taken to church by bishop Theoteknos, who, presenting him a sword with one hand and the Gospel with the other, bade him choose between them. Marinus joyfully chose the latter, returned to the judge, to whom he declared his choice, and was at once executed. A Roman senator, Asterius, who was a witness of the execution, carried away the body upon his own shoulders, laid him out in fine clothes, and buried him (see Acta Sanct. ap. Bolland, t. 1, 3d of March). SEE MARTIN II and III.

Another St. Marinus is commemorated on the 4th of September. He was a native of Dalmatia, and worked on the bridge of Rimini, when his piety  attracted the notice of bishop Gaudentius of Brescia, who persuaded him to enter the Church, and made him deacon. Marinus retired on the mountain of Titano, where he erected a hermitage, and died towards the close of the 4th century. According to the legend, the miracles wrotught at his tomb attracted a number of pilgrims to the place, who settled there, and this gave rise to his saintship. Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 9:108; Pierer, Universal-Lexikos, 10:893; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 33,769.

## Mariolatry[[@Headword:Mariolatry]]

             (Gr. Μαρία, Mary, and λατρεία, adorations) is the technical term given by the Protestant world to the worship which Romanists render to the Virgin Mary. Romanists themselves term this worship Hyperdulia (q.v.), to distinguish it from the worship paid to God, which they term Latria (q.v.), and adoration paid to saints, Dulia (q.v.). In our articles SEE HYPERDULIA, SEE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION, and SEE INVOCATION OF SAINTS, we have already pointed out the great difficulty of bringing distinctions so refined within the comprehension of the common mind, so as to prevent the multitude from worshipping the creature instead of the Creator. “As mother of the Savior of the world,” says Dr. Schaff (Ch. Hist. 2:410), “the Virgin Mary unquestionably holds forever a peculiar position among all women and in the history of redemption;” and, from this point of view, he remarks that it is “perfectly natural, nay, essential to sound religious feeling, to associate with Mary the fairest traits of maidenly and maternal character, and to revere her as the highest model of female purity, love, and piety.... But, on the other hand, it is equally unquestionable that she is nowhere in the N.T. excepted from the universal sinfulness and the universal need of redemption, nor represented as immaculately holy, or as in any way an object of divine veneration.” Roman Catholics, however, have insisted upon the adoration, as they term worship in this instance, of the mother of Jesus, holding that Mary has been assumed in the Trinity, so as to make it a Quaternity; that “Mary is the complement of the Trinity” (Pusey, Eirenicon, 2:167), and that the intercession of Mary is needed for the salvation of the followers of Jesus Christ. We quote the words of Liguori himself: “We most readily admit that Jesus Christ is the only Mediator of Justice, and that by his merits he obtains us all grace and salvation; but we say that Mary is the Mediatrix of Grace; and that receiving all she obtains through Jesus Christ, and because she prays and asks for it in the name of Jesus Christ, yet all the same, whatever graces we receive, they come to us through her intercession”  (Glories of Mary, p. 124).

There is certainly not a word in the Bible, nor in the creeds of the Apostolic Church, nor even in the writings of the Church fathers of the first five centuries, to warrant any Christian in assigning such a position to Mary, the mother of Jesus, as the Catholic Church, both Latin and Greek, has dared to bestow upon her. One of the accepted interpreters of the Church of Rome, Liguori, in commenting on the exalted position which the Virgin Mary should hold in the estimation of Latin communicants, says that she is Queen of Mercy (p. 13); that she is the Mother of all mankind (p. 23); that she offered her Son to the Father on Mount Calvary (p. 23); that she is especially the Mother of repentant sinners (p. 42); that she is our Life (p. 52); that God was reconciled with sinners by the humility and purity of Mary (p. 56); that she obtains us perseverance (p. 59); that she renders death sweet to her clients (p. 68); that she is our Protectress at the hour of death (p. 71); that she is the Hope of all (p. 79); that she is our only Refuge, Help, and Asylum (p. 81); that she is the Propitiatory of the whole world (p. 81); that she is the one City of Refuge (p. 89); that it is her office to withhold God's arm from chastising sinners until he is pacified (p. 93); that she is the Comfortress of the world, the Refuge of the unfortunate (p. 100); that we shall be heard more quickly if we call on the name of Mary than if we call on the name of Jesus (p. 106); that she is our Patroness (p. 106); that she is Queen of heaven and hell, of all saints, and all evil spirits, because she conquered the latter by her virtues, and the devil by her fair humility and holy life (p. 110); that she protects us from the divine justice and from the devil (p. 115); that at the name of Mary every knee bows and hell trembles (p. 116); that she is the Ladder of paradise, the Gate of heaven, the most true Mediatrix between God and man (p. 121); that her intercession is necessary for salvation (p. 122); that she is the Mediatrix of grace (p. 124); that in her is all hope of life and virtue, all grace of the Way and Truth (p. 125); that in her we find eternal salvation (p. 125); that no one can enter heaven except by her (p. 127); that all graces of the spiritual life are transmitted by Mary (p. 127); that all gifts, virtues, graces are dispensed by her, to whomsoever, when, and as she pleases (p. 128); that from her the world receives every good (p. 128); that she is the Helper of the Redemption (p. 133); that she and her Son redeemed the world (p. 133); that she is the Co-operator in our justification (p. 133); that the way of salvation is open to none otherwise than through Mary (p. 135); that God says, “Go to Mary,” when we seek for grace from him (p. 136); that the salvation of all depends on the favor and protection of Mary (p. 136); that the other saints intercede  with her (p. 138); that she is a tender Advocate; that all power is given unto her in heaven and earth (p. 145); that God obeys the command of Mary (p. 146); that Mary is omnipotent (p. 146); that the whole Church is under the dominion of Mary (p. 146); that what she wills is necessarily done (p. 147); that her prayers have something of a command in them (p. 151); that Jesus Christ is under an obligation to her to grant all she asks (p. 152); that she is the singular Refuge of the lost (p. 156); that she is the Advocate of the whole human race (p. 161); that her chief office in the world is to reconcile fallen souls with God (p. 167); that she is the great Peace-maker who obtains reconciliation, salvation, pardon, and mercy (p. 165); that in her is established the seat of God's government (p. 179); that she delivers her clients from hell (p. 183); that her clients will necessarily be saved (p. 184); that she has sent back many from hell to earth who have died of mortal sins (p. 188); that she consoles, relieves, and succors her clients in purgatory (p. 195); that she delivers her clients from purgatory by applying her merits (p. 195); that she carries away from purgatory all who wear the Carmelite scapulary on the Saturday after they die, provided they have been chaste and have said her office (p. 196); that she does not suffer those who die clothed in the scapulary to go to hell (p. 185); that Mary leads her servants to heaven (p. 198); that she has the key of the gate of paradise (p. 199); that she is the Way of our salvation (p. 200); that it is for the love of Mary and on account of her merits that God is more merciful under the New than under the Old Dispensation (p. 214); that her powerful intercession sustains the world (p. 214); that she is the Throne of grace to which St. Paul bids us fly (p. 215); that Christ has promised that all who invoke the holy name of Mary with confidence shall have perfect sorrow for their sins, atonement for their crimes, strength to attain perfection, and shall reach the glory of paradise (p. 226), etc.

We will also cite for the benefit of our readers some passages from the writings of Liguori bearing more directly on the field of doctrinal theology. Mary is not only titled by him “Queen, Mother, and Spouse of the King: to her belongs dominion and power over all creatures” (p. 12); “She is Queen of Mercy, as Jesus Christ is King of Justice” (p. 13). “If Jesus is the Father of souls. Mary is also their Mother. On two occasions, according to the holy fathers, Mary became our spiritual Mother. The first, according to blessed Albert the Great, was when she merited to conceive in her virginal womb the Son of God. This was revealed by our Lord to S. Gertrude. who was one day reading the above text, and was perplexed, and could not  understand how Mary, being only the Mother of Jesus, could be said to have brought forth her first-born. God explained it to her, saying that Jesus was Mary's first-born according to the flesh, but that all mankind were her second-born according to the Spirit.... The second occasion on which Mary became our spiritual Mother, and brought us forth to the life of grace, was when she offered to the eternal Father the life of her beloved Son on Mount Calvary with such bitter sorrow and suffering” (p. 23). “Thus it is that in every engagement with the infernal powers we shall always certainly conquer by having recourse to the Mother of God, who is also our Mother, saying and repeating again and again, ‘We fly to thy patronage, O holy Mother of God; we fly to thy patronage, O holy Mother of God!' Oh, how many victories have not the faithful gained over hell by having recourse to Mary with this short but most powerful prayer! Thus it was that that great servant of God, sister Mary, the crucified, of the Order of S. Benedict, always overcame the devils” (p. 26). “‘ Since the very tigers,' says our most loving Mother Mary, ‘cannot forget their young, how can I forget to love you, my children?'“ (p. 30). “Our Blessed Lady herself revealed to sister Mary, the crucified, that the fire of love with which she was inflamed towards God was such that, if the heavens and earth were placed in it, they would be instantly consumed; so that the ardors of the Seraphim, in comparison with it, were but as fresh breezes” (p. 31). “Let us love her like a S. Francis Solano, who, maddened as it were (but with holy madness) with love for Mary, would sing before her picture, and accompany himself on a musical instrument, saying that, like worldly lovers, he serenaded his most sweet Queen” (p. 38). “Let us love her as so many of her servants have loved her, and who never could do enough to show their love. Father Jerome of Texo, of the Society of Jesus, rejoiced in the name of slave of Mary; and, as a mark of servitude, went often to visit her in some church dedicated in her honor. On reaching the church, he poured out abundant tears of tenderness and love for Mary; then prostrating, he licked and rubbed the pavement with his tongue and face, kissing it a thousand times, because it was the house of his beloved Lady” (p. 38). “Mary is the Mother of repentant sinners” (p. 42). “When Mary sees a sinner at her feet imploring her mercy, she does not consider the crimes with which he is loaded, but the intention with which he comes; and if this is good, even should he have committed all possible sins, the most loving Mother embraces him, and does not disdain to heal the wounds of his soul” (p. 45). “‘ My God,' she says, ‘I had two sons — Jesus and man; man took the life of my Jesus on the cross, and now thy justice would condemn the guilty  one. O Lord! my Jesus is already dead; have pity on me; and if I have lost the one, do not make me lose the other also!' And most certainly God will not condemn those sinners who have recourse to Mary, and for whom she prays, since he himself commended them to her as her children” (p. 47). These passages are taken almost at random from Liguori's Glories of Mary, chapter 1, which is a paraphrase of the words Hail, holy Queen, Mother of Mercy! Yet these claims are moderate compared with those set up in the fifth chapter, entitled, Of the Necessity of the Intercession of Mary for our Salvation. “S. Lawrence Justinian asks, ‘How can she be otherwise than full of grace who has been made the Ladder to paradise, the Gate of heaven, the most true Mediatrsix between God and man?”(p. 121). “That which we intend to prove here is that the intercession of Mary is now necessary to salvation; we say necessary— not absolutely, but morally. This necessity proceeds from the will itself of God that all graces that he dispenses should pass by the hands of Mary, according to the opinion of S. Bernard, and which we may now with safety call the general opinion of theologians and learned men. The author of The Reign of Mary positively asserts that such is the case. It is maintained by Vega, Mendoza, Pacciuchelli, Segnori, Poire, Crasset, and by innumerable other learned authors” (p. 122).

Now what have we in holy Scripture to warrant such a position as is here taken by Liguori? Comparison, as distinct from contrast, requires the existence of some similitude, but take any passage in which Mary is mentioned, from the salutation down to the period after the ascension, and there is nothing in any way similar. It only remains, therefore, to contrast instead of comparing. But our readers are so well acquainted with holy Writ that we remit the task to them, only begging them to remember four things:

1. That Mary is represented as she is, and not otherwise in the Gospels;

2. That she is not mentioned at all in the Acts after the first chapter, or in the Epistles, although St. Paul has entered so minutely into the economy of the Christian scheme of salvation;

3. That all that prophet and apostle has said of our Lord is by Romanists transferred to Mary;

4. That all those passages which speak of one Mediator between God and man not only ignore, but exclude the modern doctrine, pronounced  by Dr. Schaff “one of the principal points of separation between Graeco-Roman Catholicism and evangelical Protestantism” (Ch. Hist. 2:411).

Lest the charge should be brought to our door that we have attributed to the Church of Rome the doctrines held by only a part of her communicants, or even only one of her priests, we continue our quotations from some of her most eminent writers, affording ample proof of the manner in which the Roman Catholic is taught to look upon the Virgin: “O thou, our Governor and most benignant Lady, in right of being his Mother, command your most beloved Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, that he deign to raise our minds from longing after earthly things to the contemplation of heavenly things” (from the Crown of the Blessed Virgins, Psalter of Bonaventura). “We praise thee, Mother of God; we acknowledge thee to be a virgin. All the earth doth worship thee, the Spouse of the eternal Father. All the angels and archangels, all thrones and powers, lo faithfully serve thee. To thee all angels cry aloud, with a neverceasing voice, Holy, holy, holy, Mary, Mother of God.... he whole court of heaven doth honor thee as queen. The holy Church throughout all the world doth invoke and praise thee, the Mother of divine Majesty... Thou sittest with thy Son on the right hand of the Father.... In thee, sweet Mary, is our hope; defend us forever more.

Praise becometh thee; empire becometh thee; virtue and glory be unto thee forever and ever” (from a Parody on the Te Deum., by the same writer). “Whosoever will be saved, before all things it is necessary that he hold the right faith concerning Mary; which faith, except one do keep whole and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly... He (Jesus Christ) sent the Holy Spirit upon his disciples, and upon his Mother, and at last took her up into heaven, where she sitteth on the right hand of her Son, and never ceaseth to make intercession with him for us, This is the faith concerning the Virgin Mary, which, except every one do believe faithfully and firmly, he cannot be saved” (from a Parody on the Athanasian Creed, by the same writer). “During the pontificate of Gregory the Great, the people of Rome experienced in a most striking manner the protection of the Blessed Virgin. A frightful pestilence raged in the city to such an extent that thousands were carried off, and so suddenly that they had no time to make the least preparation. It could not be arrested by the vows and prayers which the holy pope caused to be offered in all quarters, until he resolved on having recourse to the Mother of God. Having commanded the clergy and people to go in procession to the church of our Lady, called St.  Mary Major, carrying the picture of the Holy Virgin, painted by St. Luke, the miraculous effects of her intercession were soon experienced: in every street as they passed the plague ceased, and before the end of the procession an angel in human form was seen on the Tower of Adrian, named ever since the Castle of St. Angelo, sheathing a bloody sabre. At the same moment the angels were heard singing the anthem, ‘Regina Caeli,' ‘‘Triumph, O Queen,' Hallelujah. The holy pope added, ‘Ora pro nobis Deum,' ‘Pray for us,' etc. The Church has since used this anthem to salute the Blessed Virgin in Easter time” (from Alphonsus Ligruori's The Glories of Mary). Gabriel Biel, Supuer Casaonens Mllisse, says “that our heavenly Father gave the half of his kingdom to the most Blessed Virgin, Queen of heaven; which is signified in the case of Esther, to whom Ahasuerus promised the half of his kingdom. So that our heavenly Father, who possessed justice and mercy, retained the former, and conceded to the Virgin Mary the exercise of the latter.” Antoninus, archbishop of Florence, goes further yet than Gabriel Biel.

We hesitate to record the profane blasphemies which are found in the writings of various popes, prelates, and divines on this subject. Stories of the Middle Ages, many ludicrous, many trivial, one or two sublime, are all penetrated with this single thought, that from Mary, and Mary alone, could heart worship, and repentance, and prayer, in the very second of death, in the very act of sin, without the Eucharist, without the priest, at sea, in the desert, in the very home of vice, obtain instant and full remission; but, with Elliott (Delineation of Romanism, p. 754), “we refuse even to name the vulgar preaching and rude discourses of friars and priests who induct the multitude into this worship, as being too indelicate for the ears of even an intelligent Romanist.” The following we take from a Prayer of St. Bernard: “Remember, O most Holy Virgin Mary, that no one ever had recourse to your protection, implored your help, or sought your mediation without obtaining relief. Confiding, therefore, in your goodness, behold me, a penitent sinner, sighing out my sins before you, beseeching you to adopt me for your son, and to take upon you the care of my eternal salvation. Despise not, O Mother of Jesus, the petition of your humble client, but hear and grant my prayer.” “Prayer. — O God of goodness, who hast filled the holy and immaculate heart of Mary with the same sentiments of mercy and tenderness for us with which the heart of Jesus Christ, thy Son and her Son, was always overflowing; grant that all who honor this virginal heart may preserve until death a perfect conformity of sentiments and inclinations with the sacred heart of Jesus Christ, who, with thee and the  Holy Ghost, lives and reigns one God, forever and ever. Amen.” “Aspiration. — O Mary:! Thou art light in our doubts. consolation in our sorrows, and protection in our dangers! After thy Son, thou art the certain hope of faithful souls! Hail, hope of the desponding and refuge of the destitute, to whom thy Son has given such power that whatever thou evillest is immediately done!” From the Breviary: “O Holy Mary. succor the miserable, help the faint-hearted, comfort the afflicted, pray for the people, intercede for the clergy, make supplication for the devout female sex; let all be sensible of thy help who celebrate thy holy commemoration.”... “Grant, we beseech thee, O Lord God, that we, thy servants, may enjoy perpetual health of mind and body, and, by the glorious intercession of Blessed Mary, ever virgin, may be delivered from present sorrows, and come to eternal joy, through our Lord Jesus Christ.” The Litany of the Sacred Heart of Mary deserves to be added:

“Lord have mercy on us! Son of God, have mercy on us! Holy Ghost, have mercy on us! Jesus Christ, hear us! Jesus Christ, graciously hear us! God, the Father of heaven, have mercy on us! God, the Son, Redeemer of the world, have mercy on us! God, the Holy Ghost, have mercy on us! Holy Trinity, one God, have mercy on us! Heart of Mary, conceived without the stain of sin! Heart of Mary, full of grace! Heart of Mary, sanctuary of the Trinity! Heart of Mary, tabernacle of the incarnate Word! Heart of Mary, after God's own heart! Heart of Mary, illustrious throne of glory! Heart of Mary, perfect holocaust of divine love! Heart of Mary, abyss of humility! Heart of Mary, attached to the cross! Heart of Mary, seat of mercy! Heart of Mary, consolation of the afflicted! Heart of Mary, refuge of sinners! Heart of Mary, advocate of the Church, and mother of all faithful! Heart of Mary, after Jesus, the most assured hope of the agonizing! Heart of Mary, queen of angels and the saints! Lamb of God, who takest away the sins of the world, spare us! Lamb of God, who takest away the sins of the world, hear us, O Lord!  Lamb of God, who takest away the sins of the world, have mercy on us, O Lord! O most sacred and amiable heart of Mary, Mother of God, pray for us! That our hearts may be inflamed with divine love.”

The following is an extract from the encyclical letter addressed by Gregory XVI to all patriarchs, primates, archbishops, and bishops, bearing date Aug. 15, 1832, affording ample evidence that the same doctrine was approved by the highest authorities of the Romish Church even prior to the promulgation of the dogma of immaculate conception (q.v.): “Having at length taken possession of our see in the Lateran Basilica, according to the custom and institution of our predecessors, we turn to you without delay, venerable brethren; and, in testimony of our feelings towards you, we select for the date of our letter this most joyful day, on which we celebrate the solemn festival of the most Blessed Virgin's triumphant assumption into heaven; that she, who has been through every great calamity our patroness and protectress, may watch over us writing to you, and lead our mind by her heavenly influence to those counsels which may prove most salutary to Christ's flock... . But, that all may have a successful and happy issue, let us raise our eyes to the most Blessed Virgin Mary, who alone destroys heresies, who is our greatest hope, ya, the entire ground of our hope.” (Comp. here Kitto, Journal Sacred Lit. 9:25; 15:211; English Review, 10:350 sq.; Christ. Remembrancer, 1855 [Oct.], p. 417 sq.; especially p. 443 and 449.) In view of such a document emanating from the head of the Church, what account can we make of the declaration of the Romish vicars apostolic in Great Britain that “Catholics do solicit the intercession of the angels and saints reigning with Christ in heaven; but in this, when done according to the principles and spirit of the Catholic Church, there is nothing of superstition, nothing which is not consistent with true piety. For the Catholic Church teaches her children not to pray to the saints as to the authors or givers of divine grace, but only to solicit the saints in heaven to pray for them in the same sense as St. Paul desired the faithful on earth to pray for him;” except to consider it as a document well calculated for a Protestant latitude, but liable to be looked upon in Rome as semi-heretical? “What ideas also are we to entertain of the candor or veracity of those Romanists who cease not. after Bossuet and others, to affirm that ‘they only pray to saints to intercede for them ?' Here is the head of their Church performing a solemn act of worship to the deified Mary, on a day dedicated to her presumed assumption, invoking her, as his patroness and protectress, in a time of great calamity, entreating her to aid him by her heavenly influence to that which would be salutary for the  Church.

Is this only to pray to her to undertake for us? The leader in this act of devotion is the supreme earthly oracle; the visible, living, speaking guide of the Church. If this be not idolatry, then idolatry exists only in name” (Elliott, p. 754). Nor do we find in the present pontiff less devotion to the Virgin, if we may base our knowledge on the official documents issued in his name. In the decree of Dec. 8, 1854, Pins IX urges all Catholics, colere, invocare, exorare beatissimnam Dei genitricem, translated as follows by the Tablet (Jan. 27): “Let all the children of the Catholic Church most dear to us hear these words; and, with a most ardent zeal of piety and love, proceed to worship, invoke, and pray to the most Blessed Virgin Mary, Mother of God, conceived without original sin” — the head of the Roman Catholic Church urging on his subjects a greater zeal and ardor in the worship of Mary than that which St. Alfonso had displayed. In the same decree he states that “the true object of this devotion” is Mary's “conception.” How that act can be an object of devotion, it is difficult intelligently to imagine. But such is Mariolatry. Not only do we now find the adoration of the Mother of God permitted, but actually commanded. “The devout Roman Catholic,” says Cramp (p. 400) justly, “pays Mary the most extravagant honor and veneration. The language adopted in addressing the ‘Queen of heaven' cannot be acquitted of the charge of blasphemy, since prayers are offered directly to her as if to a divine being, and blessings are supplicated as from one who is able to bestow them. In all devotions she has a share. The Ave Maria accompanies the Pater Noster. ‘Evening, morning, and at noon,' said the Psalmist, ‘will I pray unto thee, and cry aloud;' the pious Roman Catholic transfers these services to the Virgin. In tender childhood he is taught to cherish for her the profoundest reverence and the highest affection; throughout life she is the object of his daily regard, and five solemn festivals, annually observed to her honor, call forth his ardent love and zeal, and in the hour of death he is taught to place reliance on her mercy. To the ignorant devotee she is more than Christ, than God; he believes that she can command her Son, that to her intercession nothing can be denied, and that to her power all things are possible.” But if the Latin Church be adjudged guilty of Mariolatry, it must not be forgotten that the same sentence of condemnation should fall still more heavily on the Greek Church; for “it cannot be denied,” says Pusey (Eirenicon, 2:425), “that the orthodox Greek Church does even surpass the Church of Rome in exaltation of the Blessed Virgin in their devotions.”  Mariolatry likewise appears in the favorite prayer to Mary, the angelic greeting, or the Ave Maria, which in the Catholic devotions runs parallel with the Pater Noster, and of which we had occasion to speak above. It takes its name from the initial words of the salutation of Gabriel to the Holy Virgin at the annunciation of the birth of Christ. It consists of three parts:

(1) The salutation of the angel (Luk 1:28): Ave Maria, gratiae plena, Dominius tecuhl!

(2) The words of Elizabeth (Luk 1:42): Benedicta tu in mnulieribus, et benedictusfructus ventris tui, Jesus.

(3) The later unscriptural addition, which contains the prayer proper, and is offensive to the Protestant and all sound Christian feeling: Sancta Maria, mater Dei, ora pro nobis peccatoribus, nunc et in hora mortis. Amen. (For the English, etc., SEE AVE MARIA. ) “Formerly this third part, which gave the formula the character of a prayer, was traced back to the anti-Nestorian Council of Ephesus in 431, which sanctioned the expression mater Dei, or Dei genitirix (θεοτόκος); but Roman archaeologists (e.g. Mast, in Wetzer und Welte [Romans Cathol.], Kirchen-Lexikon, 1:563) now concede that it is a much later addition, made in the beginning of the 16th century (1508), and that the closing words, nunc et in hora mortis, were added even after that time by the Franciscans. But even the first two parts did not come into general use as a standing formula of prayer until the 13th century. From that date the Ave Mairia stands in the Roman Church upon a level with the Lord's Prayer and the Apostles' Creed, and with them forms the basis of the rosary” (Schaff, Ch. Hist. 2:424, 425).

The chief festivals of the Virgin, common to the Western and Eastern churches, celebrating the most important facts and fictions of her life, and in some degree running parallel with the festivals of the birth, resurrection, and ascension of Christ, are the Conception (q.v.), the Nativity (q.v.), the Purification (q.v.), the Annunciation (q.v.), the Visitation (q.v.), and the Assumption (q.v.). All these festivals are observed also in the English Church, but from a quite different standpoint, of course. The Roman Church has, besides these, several special festivals, with appropriate offices-all, however, of minor solemnity. SEE MARY, THE VIRGIN.

Origin of Mariolatry. — We have detailed somewhat at length the views held by the Graeco-Roman theologians on the adoration they consider due  to the Virgin Mary to afford a fair insight into Mariolatrs as now practiced. It remains, however, to examine how the veneration of Mary degenerated into the worship of Mary, a worship which itself “was originally only a reflection of the worship of Christ... designed to contribute to the glorifying of Christ” (Schaff, 2:410).

All unbiassed historians agree in regarding the worship of Mary as an echo of ancient heathenism. Polytheism was so deeply rooted among the non-Israelites of the days of Christ that it reproduced itself even among the followers of Jesus, though it is true it appeared clothed in a Christian dress. “The popular religious want,” says Dr. Schaff, “had accustomed itself even to female deities, and very naturally betook itself first of all to Mary, the highly favored and blessed mother of the divine-human Redeemer, as the worthiest object of adoration.” But, though it is apparent that remnants of ancient heathenism thus laid hold even on the newly-found doctrines, it is quite certain also that during the first ages the invocation of the Virgin and of saints must have held a subordinate place in Christian worship, for there is not a word about it in the writings of the fathers of the first five centuries. “We may scan each page that they have left us, and we shall find nothing of the kind. There is nothing of the sort in the supposed works of Hermas and Barnabas, nor in the real works of Clement, Ignatius, and Polycarp; that is, the doctrine is not to be found in the 1st century. There is nothing of the sort in Justin Martyr, Tatian, Athenagoras, Theophilus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian; that is, in the 2d century. There is nothing of the sort in Origen, Gregory Thaumaturgus, Cyprian, Methodius, Lactantins; that is, in the 3d century. There is nothing of the sort in Eusebius, Athanasius, Cyril of Jerusalem, Hilary, Macarius, Epiphanius, Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, Ephrem Syrus, Gregory of Nyssa, Ambrose; that is, in the 4th century. There is nothing of the sort in Chrysostom, Augustine, Jerome, Basil of Seleucia, Orosius, Sedulius, Isidore, Theodoret, Prosper, Vincentius Lirinensis, Cyril of Alexandria, popes Leo, Hilarus, Simplicius, Felix, Gelasius, Anastasius, Symmachus; that is, in the 5th century.” Nor is there the least trace of Mariolatry among the remains of the Catacombs. Says a writer in the London Qu. Rev. July, 1864, p. 85: “As regards the sacred person of the Virgin, she takes that place only in the art of the Catacombs which the purity of earlier Christianity would lead us to predicate.

She is seen there solely in a scriptural and historical sense — in the subject of the Adoration of the Wise Men who found ‘the young child and his mother.' And this even takes its place among the later productions of classic — Christian art; while the subject of the Nativity, which occurs  on two sarcophagi, evidently belongs to the last decline of that period. With these two exceptions, no trace of a representation of the Virgin can be found in the mural or sculptural art of the Catacombs.” We cannot do better than sum up this portion of our subject in the words of the Rev. E. Tyler, to whose conscientious labors every student of Christian antiquities is so much indebted: “We have examined to the utmost of our ability and means the remains of Christian antiquity. Especially have we searched into the writings of those whose works (A.D. 492) received the approbation of the pope and his council at Rome; we have also diligently sought for evidence in the records of the early councils; and we find all the genuine and unsuspected works of Christian writers — not for a few years, or in a portion of Christendom, but to the end of the first five hundred years and more, and in every country in the Eastern a.nd the Western empire, in Europe, in Africa; and in Asia — testifying as with one voice that the writers and their contemporaries knew of no belief in the present power of the Virgin, and her influence with God; no practice, in public or private, of prayer to God through her mediation, or of invoking her for her good offices of intercession, and advocacy, and patronage; no offering of thanks and praise made to her; no ascription of divine honor and glory to her name. On the contrary, all the writers through those ages testify that to the early Christians God was the only object of prayer, and Christ the only heavenly Mediator and Intercessor in whom they put their trust” (p. 290).

There is not a shadow of doubt that the origin of the worship of Mary is to be traced to the apocryphal legends of her birth and of her death, which, in the course of time, decorated the life of Mary with fantastic fables and wonders of every kind, and thus furnished a pseudo-historical foundation for an unscriptural Mariology and Mariolatry (compare Janus, Pope and Council, p. 34 sq.). It is in these productions of the Gnostics (q.v.) that we find the germ of what afterwards expanded into its present portentous proportions. Some of the legends of her birth are as early as the 2d or 3d century. But to the honor of the Christians of that day be it remembered that they unanimously and firmly rejected these legends as fabulous and heretical. Witness the conduct of the Church towards the Collyridians (q.v.), and the excesses in the opposite direction it gave rise to by the formation of a sect known as the Antidicomarianites (q.v.). “The whole thing,” says Epiphanius, when commenting upon the unwarranted practices of the Collyridians, “is foolish and strange, and is a device and deceit of the devil. Let Mary be in honor. Let the Lord be worshipped. Let no one worship Mary” (Haeret. 89, in Opp. p. 1066, Paris, 1662).  Indeed, down to the time of the Nestorian controversy of A.D. 430, the cultus of the Blessed Virgin, it would appear, was wholly external to the Church, and was regarded as heretical. It was this controversy that first produced a great change of sentiment in men's minds. Nestorius had maintained, or at least it was the tendency of Nestorianism to maintain, not only that our Lord had two natures, the divine and the human (which was right), but also that he was two persons, in such sort that the child born of Mary was not divine, but merely an ordinary human being, until the divinity subsequently united itself to him. This was condemned by the Council of Ephesus in the year 431; and the title θεοτόκος, loosely translated “Mother of God,” was sanctioned.

The object of the council and of the Anti-Nestorians was in no sense to add honor to the Mother, but to maintain the true doctrine with respect to the Son. Nevertheless the result was to magnify the Mother, and, after a time, at the expense of the Son. For now the title θεοτύκος became a shibboleth, and in art the representation of the Madonna and Child became the expression of orthodox belief. Very soon the purpose for which the title and the picture were first sanctioned became forgotten, and the veneration of Mary began to spread within the Church, as it had previously existed external to it. The legends, too, were no longer treated as apocryphal. Neither were the Gnostics any longer the objects of dread. Nestorians, and afterwards Iconoclasts, in turn became the objects of hatred. The old fables were winked at, and thus they universally became the mythology of Christianity among the southern nations of Europe, while many of the dogmas which they are grounded upon have, as a natural consequence, crept into the faith. “Thenceforth the Θεοτόκος was a test of orthodox Christology, and the rejection of it amounted to the beginning or the end of all heresy. The overthrow of Nestorianism was at the same time the victor of Mary- worship. With the honor of the Son, the honor also of the Mother was secured.

The opponents of Nestorius, especially Proclus, his successor in Constantinople († 447), and Cyril of Alexandria († 444), could scarcely find predicates enough to express the transcendent glory of the Mother of God. She was the crown of virginity, the indestructible temple of God, the dwelling-place of the Holy Trinity, the paradise of the second Adam, the bridge from God to man, the loom of the incarnation, the scepter of orthodoxy; through her the Trinity is glorified and adored, the devil and daemons put to flight, the nations converted, and the fallen creature raised to heaven. The people were all on the side of the Ephesian decision, and gave vent to their joy in boundless enthusiasm, amid bonfires, processions,  and illuminations” (Schaff, 2:426). “Yet it is not exactly the fact that the giving of this title (Theotokos) was the cause of the cultus, for some of the fathers before that time had employed the word to express the doctrine of the incarnation, as the two Gregorys did; it was the Nestorian heretics who really drove the Catholic mind to paying her the tribute of devotion; and even then it seems as if the cultus of that time was far more in honor of the Son than of the Mother, more a mode of testifying the belief in the verity of the true doctrine of the incarnation, denied by the heretics, than of giving her an undue worship. When she was addressed as the ‘Mother of God,' when she was represented as the Mother with her infant Son, she appeared, it is true, as the prominent figure; but it was to express clearly the Catholic doctrine of the in, carnation-the two natures in the one person of Christ. We can see how easily the mind of the worshipper would penetrate further, and, from looking at her merely as the Theotokos, would see in the Mother of God one possessed of a mother's influence and power” (Christian Remembrancer, 1868, July, p. 136,137).

From this time the worship of Mary grew apace; it agreed well with many natural aspirations of the heart. To paint the mother of the Savior an ideal woman, with all the grace and tenderness of womanhood, and yet with none of its weaknesses, and then to fall down and worship that which the imagination had set up, was what might easily happen, and did happen. Evidence was not asked for. Perfection was becoming the mother of the Lord, therefore she was perfect. Adoration “was befitting” on the part of Christians, therefore they gave it. Any tales attributed to antiquity were received as genuine, any revelations supposed to be made to favored saints were accepted as true; and the Madonna reigned as queen in heaven, in earth, in purgatory, and over hell. The mother of the Savior soon became the Mother of Salvation, as John of Damascus calls her (Homil. in Annun.), “the common salvation of all in extremity” (ἡ πάντων ὁμοῦ τῶν πεπάτων τῆς γης κοινή σωτηρία). “The alone Mother of God, who art to be worshipped (ἡ προσκυνητή) forever.” Nestorianism lived on, and lives still, when other earlier heresies on the nature of Christ-like Arianism have died; nay, it was once a great ecclesiastical power. Catholics showed their orthodoxy by honoring the Mother of God, their abhorrence of heresy by rendering her worship. Thus arose the story of her assumption, and the festival (Aug. 15) in honor of that supposed event. She then became the Mater Coronata, endued with power both in heaven and earth. Language was addressed to her such as belonged only to God; e.g. Peter Damian, in a  sermon (Isn Natetiv. B. . il.), speaks thus: “Et data est tibi omnis potestas in coelo et in terra: nil tibi impossibile, cui possibile est desperatos in spem beatitudinis relevare. Quomodo enim illa potestas tuse potentiae poterit obviare, quae de carne tua carnis suscepit originem?

Accedis enim ante illud aureum humanae reconciliationis altare, non solum regnans sed imperans, domina non ancilla.” Under such teaching as this we need not wonder at the extent to which her cultus went. “From that time,” says Dr. Schaff,' “numerous churches and altars were dedicated to the holy Mother of God, the perpetual Virgin; among them also the church at Ephesus in which the anti-Nestorian Council of 431 had sat. Justinian I, in a law, implored her intercession with God for the restoration of the Roman empire, and on the dedication of the costly altar of the church of St. Sophia he expected all blessings for church and empire from her powerful prayers. His general, Narses, like the knights in the Middle Age, was unwilling to go into battle till he had secured her protection. Pope Boniface IV, in 608, turned the Pantheon in Rome into a temple of Mary ad martyres; the pagan Olympus into a Christian heaven of gods. Subsequently even her images (made after an original pretending to have come from Luke) were divinely worshipped, and, in the prolific legends of the superstitious Middle Age. performed countless miracles, before some of which the miracles of the Gospel history grow dim. She became almost coordinate with Christ, a joint redeemer, invested with most of his own attributes and acts of grace. The popular belief ascribed to her, as to Christ, a sinless conception, a sinless birth, resurrection and ascension to heaven, and a participation of all power in heaven and earth. She became the center of devotion, cultus, and art, and the popular symbol of power, of glory, and of the final victory of Catholicism over all heresies” (2:424, 425).

In the 6th century the practice became general within the Church, both in the East and in the West, and the writers, commencing with the post-Nicene period, which had brought in this innovation with many others, down to the 16th century, are now found to relate the untold privileges of the Virgin, and with an enthusiasm constantly growing until checked by the opposition of the Reformers, we are told of the efficacy of Mary as a mediator with her Son. This devotional enthusiasm was carried to its greatest height by St. Bernard (q.v.), and still more so by Bonaventura (cited above), who, Dr. Wiseman says, was one of the saints and luminaries of the Roman Catholic Church, and every Roman Catholic prays that he may be enlightened by his teaching and benefited by his prayers. It is Bonaventura who gave the following version of the 51st Psalm: “Have pity upon me, O great Queen, who art called the  Mother of Mercy; and, according to the tenderness of that mercy, purify me from my iniquities.” And so it runs throughout. The 149th Psalm is — “Sing a new song in honor of our Queen. Let the just publish her praises in their assemblies. Let the heavens rejoice in her glory; let the isles of the sea and all the earth rejoice therein. Let water and fire, cold and heat, brightness and light, praise her. Let the mouth of the just glorify her; let her praises resound in the triumphant company of the saints. City of God, place thy joy in blessing her, and let songs of praise continually be sung to her by thy illustrious and glorious inhabitants.”

Promotion of Mariolatry by religious Art. — Ever since the condemnation of Nestorius the popular doctrine had found its ablest support in art. The representation of that beautiful group, since popularly known as the Madonna and Child, became the expression of the orthodox faith. “Every one who wished to prove his hatred of the arch-heretic exhibited the image of the maternal Virgin holding in her arms the infant Godhead, either in his house as a picture, or embroidered on his garments, or on his furniture, or his personal ornaments — in short, wherever it could be introduced” (Mrs. Jameson, Legends of the Madonna, p. 21). With the extension and popularity of the worship of the Virgin, the multiplication of her image, in every form and material, naturally enough spread throughout Christendom, until suddenly checked by the iconoclastic movements of the 8th century, SEE ICONOCLASM, and, descending the Middle Ages, we find Christian art generally at its lowest ebb in the 10th and 11th centuries. The pilgrimages to the Holy Land and the Crusades mark the renaissance, but it was not until the 13th century that Mariolatry received more aid from religious art. Then the popular enthusiasm was kindled anew by the exertions of Bonaventura, and by the formation of many chivalric brotherhoods that vowed her especial service (as the Serviti, who were called in France les esclaves de Marie), and by the action of the great religious communities, at this time comprehending all the enthusiasm, learining, and influence of the Church. These had placed themselves solemnly and especially under the protection of the Virgin. ‘The Cistercians wore white in honor of her purity; the Servi wore black in respect to her sorrows; the Franciscans had enrolled themselves as champions of the immaculate conception; and the Dominicans introduced the Rosary. All these richly endowed communities vied with each other in multiplying churches, chapels, and pictures in honor of their patroness, and expressive of her several attributes. The devout painter, kneeling before his easel,  addressed himself to the task of portraying these heavenly lineaments, which had visited him perhaps in dreams. Many of the professed monks and friars became themselves accomplished artists” (Mrs. Jameson).

Poetry also came to the altar of sacrilege, and made her offering in the person of the immortal Dante, who, “through the communion of mind, not less than through his writings, infused into religious art that mingled theology, poetry, and mysticism which ruled in the Giottesque school during the following century, and went hand in hand with the development of the power and practice of imitation.... His ideas respecting the Virgin Mary were precisely those to which the writings of St. Bernard, St. Bonaventura, and St. Thomas Aquinas had already lent all the persuasive power of eloquence, and the Church all the weight of her authority” (Mrs. Jameson). He hastened to render these doctrines into poetry, and in the Paradiso Mary figures as the Mystic Rose (Rosa mystical and Queen of heaven, with the attendant angels, circle within circle, floating round her in adoration, and singing the Regina Coeli, and saints and patriarchs stretching forth their hands towards her. “Thus,” says Mrs. Jameson (p. 30), “the impulses given... continued in progressive development... the spiritual sometimes in advance of the material influences; the moral idea emanating, as it were, from the soul, and the influences of external nature flowing into it; the comprehensive power of fancy using more and more the apprehensive power of imitation, and both working together till their ‘blended might' achieved its full fruition in the works of Raphael” (q.v.). The Hussite war, and the iconoclastic spirit of the Bohemians, rather strengthened the Churchmen than otherwise, and contributed to the growth of the impulse to worship Mary.

But strange fancies were now as freely interpolated in the productions of the artist, which, though themselves but “the reflex influence of that interpolation of new doctrines which had been going on in the Church for so many centuries” (Hill, Engl. Monasticiszm, p. 320), nevertheless received the disapproval of pious Catholics of that age, who “cried out ‘temerarium, scandalosum, et periculosum,' when they saw the most solemn spectacle in the world's history made the sport of wanton imaginations... the sorrow of the cross made to rest more heavily upon the mother of Christ than upon him” (Hill). The Council of Trent felt itself forced to denounce the impropriety of certain pictures, and it was generally acknowledged that paganized and degenerate influences had overruled spiritual art, that the latter was indeed no more, that “it was dead; it could never be revived without a return to those modes of thought and belief which had at first inspired it” (Mrs. Jameson).  Just at this time “theological art,” as Mrs. Jameson calls it, came to the rescue of Mariolatry. It is true the Reformation at the opening of the 11th century had dealt a severe blow at all the various institutions of Romanism savoring of idolatry and superstition, but this was only an additional reason why the Church of St. Peter should seek to fortify herself the more strongly in the fortress so severely assailed by the enemy. Mariolatry had served her purpose ably, and just now, if ever, needed re-enforcing. Deprived of the aid of “religious art,” the poets and artists no longer wrought up to a wild pitch of enthusiasm to inspire the spirit of worship of the Virgin, the infallible guide of the Church himself came to the rescue, and supplied by “theological art” what was needed. In 1571 the battle of Lepanto was fought. In it the combined fleets of Christendom, led by Don Juan of Austria, were arrayed against the Turks, and achieved a memorable victory over the devout adherents of the prophet of Mecca. Pope Pius V quickly availed himself of this opportunity to attribute the victory “to the special interposition of the Blessed Virgin.”

From a very early period in Mariolatry we find festivals instituted in honor of the “Blessed Virgin,” but now a new festival, that of the Rosary, was added to those already observed, a new invocation added to her litany, under the title of Auxiliam Christianorum, and, more than all, many sanctuaries were declared to be especially sacred to her worship, and thus a prominence was given to her devotion which found its full expression only in our own day. on Dec. 8,1854, when this dogma, conceived in the silence of the cell by the brain of infatuated monks, was canonized by a helpless pontiff, and the doctrine established “that not only did the Virgin Mary immaculately conceive her son Jesus Christ (as Protestants hold), but was as immaculately conceived herself” (Hill, p. 314; comp. Krauth, Conservative Reformation, p. 381 sq.). Well, indeed, may it be said that “the controversy with Rome threatens more and more to resolve itself into the question whether the creed of Christendom is to be based upon the life of Jesus or the life of Mary, upon the canonical or the apocryphal Gospels” (Plumptre, Christ and Christendom [Boyle Lect. 1866], p. 342). Need we wonder, then, that Bishop Bull waxes warm when this abomination presents itself for his comments, and is made to speak in the following severe strain: “We abominate the impious imposture of those who have translated the most humble and holy Virgin into an idol of pride and vanity, and represented her as a vainglorious and aspiring creature; like Lucifer (I tremble at the comparison), thirsting after divine worship and honor, and seeking out superstitious men and women, whom she may oblige to her more special service, and make them her perpetual votaries.

For what greater affront than this could they have offered to her humility and sanctity? How fulsome, yea, how perfectly loathsome to us are the tales of those that have had the assurance to tell us of the amorous addresses of the Blessed Virgin to certain persons, her devout worshippers, choosing them for her husbands, bestowing her kisses liberally on them, giving them her breasts to suck, and presenting them with bracelets and rings of her hair as love-tokens ‘The fables of the Jewish Talmudists, yea, of Mohammed, may seem grave, serious, and sober histories, compared to these and other such impudent fictions. Insomuch that wise men have thought that the authors of these romances in religion were no better than the tools and instruments of Satan, used by him to expose the Christian religion, and render it ridiculous, and thus introduce atheism. And, indeed, we are sure that the wits of Italy, where these abominable deceits have been and are chiefly countenanced, were the first broachers and patrons of infidelity and atheism in Europe, since the time that Christianity obtained in it.” “We honor the Virgin Mary,” says Mr. Endell Tyler ( Worship, p. 391), one of the latest and most critical students of early Church history and Christian antiquities, “we love her memory, we would, by God's grace, follow her example in faith and humility, meekness and obedience; we bless God for the wonderful work of salvation, in effecting which she was a chosen vessel; we call her a blessed saint and a holy Virgin; we cannot doubt of her eternal happiness through the merits of him who was ‘God of the substance of his Father before the world, and man of the substance of his mother born in the world.'

But we cannot address religious phrases to her; we cannot trust in her merits, or intercession, or advocacy, for our acceptance with God; we cannot invoke her for any blessing, temporal or spiritual; we cannot pray to God through her intercession, or for it. This in us would be sin. We pray to God alone; we offer religious praise, our spiritual sacrifices, to God alone; we trust in God alone; we need no other mediator, we apply to no other mediator, intercessor, or advocate, in the unseen world, but Jesus Christ alone, the Son of God and the Son of man. In this faith we implore God alone, for the sake only of his Son, to keep us steadfast unto death; and, in the full assurance of the belief that this faith is founded on the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief cornerstone, we will endeavor, by the blessing of the Eternal Shepherd and Bishop. of souls, to preserve the same faith, as our Church now professes it, whole and undefiled, and to deliver it down, without spot or stain of superstition, to our children's children, as their best inheritance forever.”  Literature. — Bonaventura, Opera, vol. 1, part ii, p. 466473 (Mogunt. 1609, folio); Canisius (R. C.), De Maria Virgine libri quinque (Ingolst. 1577); Lambertini (R. C.), Comment. duce de J. Christi, matrisque ejusfestis (Petav. 1751); Perrone (R. C.), De Immaculata B. V. Iars-ice conceptu (Romans 1848) (in defense of the new papal dogma of the sinless conception of Mary); The Glories of Mary, Mother of God; transl. from the Italian of blessed Alphonsus Liguori, and carefully revised by a Catholic priest (John Coyne, Dublin, 1833); Horme, Marliolatry, or Facts and Evidences, etc. (Lond. 1841); Townsend, Travels in Spain; Abstract of the Douay Catechism, p. 76; The Garden of the Soul; Jowett, Christian Researclhes in the Mediterranean; Roman Catholic Missal for the Use of the Laity; Gilly, Tour in Piedmzont; Graham, Three Months' Residence in the Mountains East of Rome; Laity's Directory, 1833; Greg. P. XVI Epist. Ency. 18 Kalend. Sept. 1832; S. Antonini Suznmic Theol. pars iv, tit. xv, p. 911-1270; Farrar, Eccles. Dict.; Elliott, Delineation of Romanism, bk. iv, p. 754 sq.; Hook, Church Dict.; Cramp, Text-Book of Popery, p. 400 sq.; Schaff, Ch. Hist. 2:409 sq.; Mrs. Jameson, Legends of the Madonna, especially the Introduction; Tyler, Worship of the Blessed Virgin Mary (Lond. 1844); Mozley, Moral and Devotional Theol. Ch. of Rome (Lond. 1857); Lord Lindsay, Christian Art (London. 1847), vol. i: Miss Twining, Symbols of Early Christian Art; F. W. Genthe, Die Jungfrau Maria, ihre Evangelien u. ihre Wunder (Halle, 1852); Bible and Missal, p. 1, 35; Christian Remembrancer, July, 1852, p. 200; 1854; Oct. 1855, art. vi; July, 1868, art. vii; Conteip. Rev. Nov. 1868, p. 454; Brit. und For. Ev. Rev. Oct. 1866, p. 729. Comp. also the elaborate, article Maria, Mutter des Herrn, by Steitz, in Herzog's Real-Encyklop. 9:74 sq.; and the article Maria, die heil. Junqfrau, by Reithmayr (R. C.), in Wsetzer und Welte, Kirch.-Lex. 6:835 sq.; also the Eirenicon controversy between Pusey and Newman (1866). (J. I. W.)

## Marion, Elie[[@Headword:Marion, Elie]]

             a prophet of the Cevennes, was born in 1678 at Barre. Being destined for the bar by his family, he studied for that profession till October, 1701, when he became possessed with the religious fanaticism of the Camisards, and returned to his native country in order to take part in the movement already began there. He shortly after announced himself a prophet. He joined a troop of Camisards and became their leader, but soon capitulated to marshal Villars (Nov. 1704), and was expelled from the kingdom. After a brief stay in Geneva and Lausanne, he yielded to the solicitations of  Flottard, and returned to France with more Camisards. Not succeeding in the enterprise which he meditated, he obtained a new capitulation, and returned to Geneva in August, 1705. The following year he went to England. A great number of refugees hastened part way to meet him. The sensation which they produced was profound, and their feigned inspiration was the cause of a lively controversy. SEE FRENCH PROPHETS.

Marion having publicly denounced both episcopacy and royalty, the government obliged him to leave England. He then went to Germany, where he found a few adherents. His works are Avertissements prophetiques d'Elie Marion, ou discours prononces par sa bouche, sous l'inspiration du Saint-Esprit et fidelement regus dans le temps qu'il parlait (Lond. 1707, 8vo): — Cri d'Alarme, ou alvertissement aux nations qui sortent de Babylone (London, 1712, 8vo): — Quand vous aurez saccage, vous serez saccages (Lond. 1714, 8vo): — Plan de la justice de Dieu sur le terre dans ces dernliersjours (Lond. 1714, 8vo). Letters signed by Allut, Marion, Fatio and Pourtales, translated into Latin, were published by Fatio (1714, 8vo). See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Gener. vol. 33:791.

## Maris[[@Headword:Maris]]

             a name of frequent occurrence among the Orientals, and especially in Syria and Persia.

1. The later Nestorians circulated a legend concerning a person of this name, whom they claimed to have been one of the seventy-two disciples of Christ, a disciple of Thaddueus, colaborer with Thomas, and founder and first bishop of the Church at Seleucia-Ctcsiphson. This legend is connected with that of Abgarus (q.v.), and deserves no credit. The Chaldaean Christians class him with their principal saints as the Apostle of Mesopotamia, and ascribe to him the composition of their liturgy in part.

2. A second Maris, better known in the West, is noted solely because to him is addressed the letter of Ibas, president of the theological school at Edessa, which is preserved in Mansi (t. ix, col. 298-300), among the acts of the fifth oecumenical council held at Constantinople in 553, and which the Nestorians afterwards regarded as a kind of confession of faith.

3. Another Maris as was surnamed Bar-Tobi. He became patriarch of the Persian Nestorians in 987, and is remarkable as the first patriarch who derived his authority from the caliphs.  4. A fourth of this name, distinguished by the name of Solomon's son, lived in the 12th century, and wrote a history in Arabic of the Nestorian patriarchs, of which Assemani (Bibliotheca Orient. 3:554 sq., 581 sq.) furnishes an epitome.

5. Finally, Theodoret (q.v.) narrates an anecdote of still another Maris, which is noteworthy chiefly because of the light which it throws on the views of that bishop, and of the use which Romanists have made of it. Maris was a hermit, who had long desired to see “the most sacred, mysterious sacrifice” offered, and Theodoret joyfully complied with his wish. The sacred vessels were taken to his retreat, the hands of the deacons served as an altar, “and thus,” says the bishop, “I offered the mysterious, divine, and saving sacrifice” in his presence. Romish writers find in these words of the distinguished father and historian of the 5th century an argument in favor of the Mass. See Theodoret, Religiosa historia, c. 2; Wetzer und Welte, Kirchen-Lex. 12:769. SEE NESTORIUS.

## Marisa[[@Headword:Marisa]]

             (Μαρισά), the Graecized form (2Ma 12:35) of MARESHA (q.v.).

## Marius, Aventicus[[@Headword:Marius, Aventicus]]

             a Swiss prelate, was born of a noble French family of Autun, near the middle of the 6th century. From childhood he was destined for the Church, and his literary remains furnish evidence that he received a careful training. He was made bishop of Aventicum, now Avenches, in the canton Waadt, in 573, or, as some state, in 580. The times were tumultuous, the population depleted, the country impoverished. In these circumstances he distinguished himself by a praiseworthy frugality, and a devotion to agricultural pursuits that furnished the means for a lavish liberality. He was bounteous to the poor, and generous to the Church. In honor of Mary θεοτόκος, he rebuilt the town of Payerne (Paterniacum) on his own lands, and dedicated its church to her; he also donated to this church many of his adjoining lands, on condition, however, that the chapter of Lausanne should derive its tithes from Payerne and two neighboring towns. In the specific work of the episcopal office he was tireless model ecclesiastic for the times. Serving his God with reverence and in humility, he was an impartial judge, a protector of the oppressed, and a devoted shepherd to his flock. Towards the close of his life he translated his see to Lausanne, which from that time gave its name to the diocese. The only additional fact  connected with his life that has come to our knowledge is that he was present at the Synod of Macon in 585, which was convened by Guntram, a son of Chlotar, to attempt the purification of the Church in his dominions by executing justice on unworthy members of the clergy. Marius is supposed to have died in 593, and was commemorated at first on the 31st of December, but now on the 4th of February. His Annals, a continuation of the work of Prosper Aquit., are the only writings of his that have reached our time which may justly be ascribed to him. They were published at Paris, in the collections of Du Chesne and Dom Bouquet; at Venice, in the Bibliotheca veter. patruma; and, the best manual, by Rickly, in the Memoires et documens publics par la societe d'histoire de la Suisse Romansde, ton. 13:See Zurlauben, Memoire sur Marius, in the Meims. de I'A cad. roy. des inscript. (Paris, 1770); Herzog, Real-Encyklcop. 9:108 sq.; Wetzer und Welte, Kirchen-Lexikon, 6:891.

## Marius, Mercator[[@Headword:Marius, Mercator]]

             a layman in the Church of the 4th century, flourished at Constantinople after 421. Dr. Murdock, the editor of Mosheim, says that Marius Mercator “ was undoubtedly a layman, a friend and admirer of Augustine, and an active defender of his doctrines from A.D. 418 to the year 451.” Dr. Schaff (Ch. Hist. vol. iii), however, speaks of Marius Mercator first as a layman (p. 716), and later (p. 784) mentions him as a learned Latin monk in Constantinople (A.D. 428-451). Marius Mercator was, so supposes his biographer Baluze (Prafat. in Mercat. p. 7), an African by birth, who went to Rome about 417, when Julius and the other Pelagian chiefs were disputing in the Eternal City, and then and there produced a work against the Pelagian heresy, which is probably the Hypognosticon, printed in the Appendix of vol. 10 of the works of St. Augustine (comp. Ceillier, Hist. des Aut. Stc. 8:498 sq.). Ceillier gives us 421 (p. 501) as the date of Marius Mercator's arrival at Constantinople, and as the date of his decease 449 (p. 507); and says, “On ne voit pas qu'il ait ete employe dans le ministere ecclesiastique, et il ne. prend d'autre qualite dans ses ecrits que celle de serviteur de Jesus-Christ.” Marius Mercator's works as collected are almost wholly translations from the Greek fathers, particularly Nestorius, Theodosius of Mopsuestia, Cyril of Alexandria, Proclus, Theodoret, etc., accompanied with prefaces and notes or strictures by the translator. Himself one of the most bitter opponents of Pelagianism (q.v.), his writings are all designed to confute either the Pelagian or Nestorian errors. They were edited, with notes, by Joh. Garnier (Paris, 1673, folio), and still better  by Stephen Baluze (Opera, Stephanus Baluzius ad fidem veterum codicum MSS. emendavit, et notis illustravit, Paris, 1684, 8vo). (J. H. W.)

## Mark[[@Headword:Mark]]

             (Μάρκος, from the frequent Latin surname Marcus, as the word is Anglicized only in Col 4:10; Phm 1:24; 1Pe 5:13), the evangelist, is probably the same as “John whose surname was Mark” (Act 12:12; Act 12:25). Grotius indeed maintains the contrary, on the ground that the earliest historical writers nowhere call the evangelist by the name of John, and that they always describe him as the companion of Peter and not of Paul. But John was the Jewish name, and Mark, a name of frequent use among the Romans, was adopted afterwards, and gradually superseded the other. The places in the N.T. enable us to trace the process. The John Mark of Act 12:12; Act 12:25, and the John of Act 13:5; Act 13:13, becomes Mark only in Act 15:39; Col 4:10; 2Ti 4:11; Phm 1:24. The change of John to Mark is analogous to that of Saul to Paul; and we cannot doubt that the disuse of the Jewish name in favor of the other is intentional, and has reference to the putting away of his former life, and entrance upon a new ministry. No inconsistency arises from the accounts of his ministering to two apostles. The desertion of Paul (Act 13:13) may have been prompted partly by a wish to rejoin Peter and the apostles engaged in preaching in Palestine (Benson; see Kuinol's note), and partly from a disinclination to a perilous and doubtful journey. There is nothing strange in the character of a warm impulsive young man, drawn almost equally towards the two great teachers of the faith, Paul and Peter. Had mere cowardice been the cause of his withdrawal, Barnabas would not so soon after have chosen him for another journey, nor would he have accepted the choice.

John Mark was the son of a certain Mary, who dwelt at Jerusalem, and was therefore probably born in that city (Act 12:12). He was of Jewish parentage (Col 4:10). He was the cousin (ἀνεψιός) of Barnabas (Col 4:10). It was to Mary's house, as to a familiar haunt, that Peter came after his deliverance from prison (Act 12:12), and there found “many gathered together praying;” and probably John Mark was converted by Peter from meeting him in his mother's house, for he speaks of “Marcus my son” (1Pe 5:13). This term has been taken as implying the natural relation by Bengel, Neander, Credner, Hottinger, Tholuck, Stanley (Serm. on the Apost. Age, p. 95), but this is contrary to  the view of the earlier writers (Origen, ap. Eusebius, H. E., 6:25; Eusebius, H. E. 2:15; Jerome, De Vir. h. c. 8). The theory that he was one of the seventy disciples is without any warrant. Another theory, that an event of the night of our Lord's betrayal (A.D. 29), related by Mark alone, is one that befell himself (Olshausen, Lange), must not be so promptly dismissed. “There followed him a certain young man, having a linen cloth cast about his naked body; and the young men laid hold on him: and he left the linen cloth, and fled from them naked” (Mar 14:51-52).

The detail of facts is remarkably minute; the name only is wanting. The most probable view is that Mark suppressed his own name, while telling a story which he had the best means of knowing. Awakened out of sleep, or just preparing for it, ill some house in the valley of Kedron, he comes out to see the seizure of the betrayed Teacher, known to him and in some degree beloved already. He is so deeply interested in his fate that he follows him even in his thin linen robe. His demeanor is such that some of the crowd are about to arrest him; then, “fear overcoming shame” (Bengel), he leaves his garment in their hands and flees. We call only say that if the name of Mark is supplied, the narrative receives its most probable explanation. John (Joh 1:40; Joh 19:26) introduces himself in this unobtrusive way, and perhaps Luke the same (Luk 24:18). Mary the mother of Mark seems to have been a person of some means and influence, and her house a rallying point for Christians in those dangerous days (Act 12:12). A.D. 44. Her son, already an inquirer, would soon become more. Anxious to work for Christ, he went with Paul and Barnabas as their “minister” (ὐπηρέτης) on their first journey; but at Perga, as we have seen above, turned back (Act 12:25; Act 13:13). On the second journey Paul would not accept him again as a companion, but Barnabas his kinsman was more indulgent; and thus he became the cause of the memorable “sharp contention” between them (Act 15:36-40). Whatever was the cause of Mark's vacillation. it did not separate him forever from Paul, for we find him by the side of that apostle in his first imprisonment at Rome (Col 4:10; Phm 1:24). A.D. 56. In the former place a possible journey of Mark to Asia is spoken of. Somewhat later he is with Peter at Babylon (1Pe 5:13). Some consider Babylon to be a name here given to Rome in a mystical sense — surely without reason, since the date of a letter is not the place to look for a figure of speech. Of the causes of this visit to Babylon there is no evidence. It may be conjectured that he made the journey to Asia Minor (Col 4:10), and thence went on to join Peter at Babylon. On his return to Asia he seems to have been with  Timothy at Ephesus when Paul wrote to him during his second imprisonment, and Paul was anxious for his return to Rome (2Ti 4:11). A.D. 64.

When we desert Scripture we find the facts doubtful, and even inconsistent. If Papias be trusted (quoted in Eusebius, II.E. 3:39), Mark never was a disciple of our Lord, which he probably infers from 1Pe 5:13. Epiphanius, on the other hand, willing to do honor to the evangelist, adopts the tradition that he was one of the seventy-two disciples who turned back from our Lord at the hard saying in John 6 (Cont. Haer. 51:6, p. 457, Dindorf's recent edition). The same had been said of Luke. Nothing can be decided on this point. The relation of Mark to Peter is of great importance for our view of his Gospel. Ancient writers with one consent make the evangelist the interpreter (ἑρμηνευτής) of the apostle Peter (Papias in Eusebius, H. E. 3:39; Irenaeus, Haer. 3:1; 3:10, 6; Tertullian, c. Marc. 4:5; Jerome, ad Ifedib. vol. ix, etc.). Some explain this word to mean that the office of Mark was to translate into the Greek tongue the Aramaic discourses of the apostle (Eichhorn, Bertholdt, etc.); while others adopt the more probable view that Mark wrote a Gospel which conformed more exactly than the others to Peters preaching, and thus “interpreted” it to the Church at large (Valesius, Alford, Lange, Fritzsche, Meyer, etc.). The passage from Eusebius favors the latter view; it is a quotation from Papias. “This also [John] the elder said: Mark, being the interpreter of Peter, wrote down exactly whatever things he remembered, but yet not in the order in which Christ either spoke or did them; for he was neither a hearer nor a follower of the Lord's, but he was afterwards, as I [Papias] said, a follower of Peter.” The words in italics refer to the word interpreter above, and the passage describes a disciple writing down what his master preached, and not an interpreter orally translating his words. SEE MARK, GOSPEL OF.

The report that Mark was the companion of Peter at Rome is no doubt of great antiquity. Clement of Alexandria is quoted by Eusebius as giving it for “a tradition which he had received of the elders from the first” (παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνέκαθεν πρεσβυτέρων, Eusebius, H. E. 6:14; Clem. Alex. Hyp. p. 6). But the force of this is invalidated by the suspicion that it rests on a misunderstanding of 1Pe 5:13, Babylon being wrongly taken for a typical name of Rome (Eusebits, H. E. 2:15; Jerome, De Vir. ill. c. 8). Sent on a mission to Egypt by Peter (Epiphanius, Haer. 2:6, p. 457, Dindorf; Eusebius, H. E. 2:16), Mark there founded the Church of Alexandria (Jerome, De Vir. ill. c. 8),  and preached in various places (Nicephorus, H. E. 2:43), then returned to Alexandria, of which Church he was bishop, and suffered a martyr's death (Nicephorus, ibid. and Jerome, De Vir. ill. c. 8) in the eighth year of Nero. According to the legend, his remains were obtained from Alexandria by the Venetians through a pious stratagem, and conveyed to their city, A.D. 827. Venice was thenceforward solemnly placed under his protection, and the lion, which mediaeval theology had selected from the apocalyptic beasts as his emblem, became the standard of the republic. The place of the deposition of his body having been lost, a miracle was subsequently wrought for its discovery, A.D. 1094, which figures in many famous works of art. Where his remains now lie is, according to the Roman Catholic Eustacius, “acknowledged to be an undivulged secret; or, perhaps, in less cautious language, to be utterly unknown.

## Mark On The Person[[@Headword:Mark On The Person]]

             (in this sense תָּו, tav, Eze 9:4; Eze 9:6; χάραγμα, Revelation 13 sq.), a brand or other character fixed upon the forehead (q.v.), hand, etc., usually of slaves, for the purpose of identifying them. SEE SLAVE.

In the case of Cain (Gen 4:15), a special token (אוֹת, sign, as elsewhere rendered) was assigned him in assurance of safety. SEE CAIN.

## Mark, (Mark), Georg Joachim[[@Headword:Mark, (Mark), Georg Joachim]]

             a German theologian, was born at Schwerin March 1,1726; was educated at the University of Kiel; in 1745 entered the ministry; and in 1747 was appointed a member of the philosophical faculty of his alma mater. In 1752 he accepted a call as librarian to the prince Louis of Mecklenburg- Schwerin; in 1758, as professor ordinary of divinity to the University of Kiel; in 1766 he was honored with the degree of doctor of divinity. He died March 5, 1774. Gifted with a quick perception and a good memory, Mirk acquired great learning, particularly in theology and philosophy. By his indefatigable diligence as an author he kept the press almost constantly busy. Of his works the following have special interest for us: Aleditationes de Sapientia sanctissima rite colenda (Kiel, 1762, 4to): — Primcelince juris divini evangelici (ibid. 1763, 4to): — Diss. de divina vocatione honinum miserorum ad fidem et salutem (ibid. 1767, 4to): — Causa Dei et sub ipso imuperlantium contra theologiam Jesuitarun (ibid. 1767, 4to). — Döring, Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands, s.v.

## Mark, Gospel Of[[@Headword:Mark, Gospel Of]]

             the second of the evangelical narratives in the N.T. Although the shortest of the four Gospels, its treatment is beset with difficulties in some respects peculiar to itself. SEE NEW TESTAMENT.

I. Authorship. — The voice of the Church with one consent assigns our second Gospel to Mark, the “son” (1 Peter 5:17) and “interpreter” (Papias, ap. Eusebius, H. E. 3:39) of Peter. The existence of this ascription is the best evidence of its truth. Had not Mark been its author, no sufficient reason can be given for its having borne the name of one so undistinguished in the history of the Church. His identity with the “John Mark” of the Acts and Epistles has usually been taken for granted, nor (see last article) is there any sufficient ground for calling it in question. It must, however, be acknowledged that there is no early testimony for the fact-as there is none against it — which appears first in the preface to the Commentary on the evangelist usually attributed to Victor of Antioch, cir. A.D. 407 (Cramer, Catena, 1:263), and in a note of Ammonius (ibid. ii, iv), where it is mentioned with some expression of doubt τάχα ουτός ἐστιν Μάρκος ὁ εὐαγγελιστής...πιθανὸς δὲ ὁ λόγος (Westcott, Introd. p. 212). An argument in favor of their identity has been drawn with much acnteness by Tregelles (Journ. of Philol. 1855, p. 224; Horne's Introd. to N.T. p. 433) from the singular epithet “stump-fingered,” κολοβοδάκτυλος, applied to the evangelist in the Philosophumena, 7:30, as illustrated by the words of the Latin preface found in some MSS. “at least nearly coeval with Jerome,” “amputasse sibi post fidem pollicem  dicitur ut sacerdotio reprobus haberetur;” as if, by his desertion of the apostles (Act 13:13), he had become figuratively a “pollice truncus” — a poltroon.

II. Source of this Gospel. — The tradition of the early Church asserts that Mark wrote his Gospel under the special influence and direction of the apostle Peter. The words of John the presbyter, as quoted by Papias (Eusebius, H. E. 3:39), are explicit on this point: “This, then, was the statement of the elder: Mark, having become Peter's interpreter (ἑρυηνευτής), wrote accurately all that he remembered (ἐμνημόνευσε); but he did not record the words and deeds of Christ in order (οὐ μέν τοι τάξει τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἣ λεχθέντα ἣ πραχθέντα), for he was neither a hearer nor a follower of our Lord, but afterwards, as I said, became a follower of Peter, who used to adapt his instruction to meet the requirements of his hearers, but not as making a connected arrangement of our Lord's discourses (ἀλλ᾿ οὐχ éσπερσύνταξιν τῶν κυριακῶν ποιούμενος λόγων); so Mark committed no error in writing down particulars as he remembered them (ἔνια γράψας ώς ἀπεμνημόνευσεν), for he made one thing his object — to omit nothing of what he heard, and to make no erroneous statement in them.” The value of this statement, from its almost apostolic date, is great, though too much stress has been laid upon some of its expressions by Schleiermacher and others, to discredit the genuineness of the existing Gospel of Mark. In addition to Peter's teaching having been the basis of the Gospel, we learn from it three facts of the greatest importance for the right comprehension of the origin the he Gospels: “The historic character of the oral Gospel, the special purpose with which it was framed, and the fragmentariness of its contents” (Westcott, Introd. p. 186). The testimony of later writers is equally definite, though probably to a certain extent derived from that of Papias. Justin quotes from the present Gospel under the title τὰ ἀπομνημονεύματα Πέτρου. Irenseus (H. E. 3:1) asserts that Mark “delivered in writing the things preached by Peter;” and Origen (ibid. 6:25) that he “composed it as Peter directed him” (ὡς Πέτρος ὑφηγήσατο αὐτῷ ποιήσαντα). Clement of Alexandria enters more into detail, and, according to Eusebius's report of his words (H. E. 6:14; 2:15), contradicts himself. He ascribes the origin of the Gospel to the importunity of Peter's hearers in Rome, who were anxious to retain a lasting record of his preaching from the pen of his ἑρμηνευτής, which, when completed, the apostle viewed with approbation, sanctioning it with his authority, and  commanding that it should be read in the churches; while elsewhere we have the inconsistent statement that when Peter knew what had been done “he neither forbade nor encouraged it.” Tertullian's testimony is to the same effect: “Marcus quod edidit evangelium Petri affirmatur” (Adv. Marc. 6:5); as is that of Eussebius (H. E. 3:5) and Jerome (De Vir. ill. c. 8; ad hedib. c. 2), who in the last passage writes, “Cujus (Marci) evangelium Petro narrante et illo scribente compositum est.” Epiphanius says that, immediately after Matthew, the task of writing a Gospel was laid on Mark, “the follower of Peter at Rome” (Haer. 51).

Such, so early and so uniform, is the tradition which connects, in the closest manner, Mark's Gospel with the apostle Peter. To estimate its value we must inquire how far it is consistent with facts; and here it must be candidly acknowledged that the Gospel itself supplies very little to an unbiased reader to confirm the tradition. The narrative keeps more completely to the common cycle of the Synoptic record, and even to its language, than is consistent with the individual recollections of one of the chief actors in the history; while the differences of detail, though most real and important, are of too minute and refined a character to allow us to entertain the belief that Peter was in any way directly engaged in its composition. Any record derived immediately from Peter could hardly fail to have given us far more original matter than the slender additions made by Mark to the common stock of the Synoptical Gospels It is certainly true that there are a few unimportant passages where Peter is specially mentioned by Mark, and is omitted by one or both of the others (Mar 1:36; Mar 5:37; Mar 11:20; Mar 13:3; Mar 16:7); but, on the other hand, there are still more numerous and more prominent instances which would almost show that Mark was less intimately acquainted with Peter's life than they. He omits his name when given by Matthew (Mat 15:15; comp. Mar 7:17); passes over his walking on the sea (Mat 14:28-31; comp. Mar 6:50-51), and the miracle of the tribute-money (Mat 17:24-27; comp. Mar 9:33), as well as the blessing pronounced on him by our Lord, and his designation as the rock on which the Church should be built (Mat 16:17-19; comp. Mar 8:29-30). Although Peter was one of the two disciples sent to make ready the Passover (Luk 22:8), his name is not given by Mark (Mar 14:13). We do not find in Mark the remarkable words, “I have prayed for thee,” etc. (Luk 22:31-32). The notice of his repentance also, ἐπιβαλών ἔκλαιε (Mar 14:72), is tame when contrasted with the ἐξελθὼν ἔξω ἔκλαυσεν πικρῶς of Matthew  and Luke. Advocates are never at a loss for plausible reasons to support their preconceived views, and it has been the habit from very early times (Eusebius, Chrysostom) to attribute these omissions to the modesty of Peter, who was unwilling to record that which might specially tend to his own honor — an explanation unsatisfactory in itself, and which cannot be applied with any consistency. Indeed, we can hardly have a more striking proof of the readiness with which men see what they wish to see, and make the most stubborn facts bend to their own foregone conclusions, than that a Gospel, in which no unbiassed reader would have discovered any special connection with Peter, should have yielded so many fancied proofs of Petrine origin.

But while we are unable to admit any considerable direct influence of Peter in the composition of the Gospel, it is by no means improbable that his oral communications may have indirectly influenced it, and that it is to him the minuteness of its details and the graphic coloring which specially distinguish it. are due. While there is hardly any part of its narrative that is not common to it and some other Gospel, in the manner of the narrative there is often a marked character, which puts aside at once the supposition that we have here a mere epitome of Matthew and Luke. The picture of the same events is far more vivid; touches are introduced such as could only be noted by a vigilant eye-witness, and such as make us almost eye-witnesses of the Redeemer's doings. The most remarkable case of this is the account of the demoniac in the country of the Gadarenes, where the following words are peculiar to Mark: “And no man could bind him, no, not with chains: because that he had often been bound with fetters and chains, and the chains had been plucked asunder by him, and the fetters broken in pieces: neither could any man tame him. And always night and day he was in the mountains crying and cutting himself with stones. But when he saw Jesus afar off, he ran,” etc. Here we are indebted for the picture of the fierce and hopeless wanderer to the evangelist whose work is the briefest, and whose style is the least perfect. He sometimes adds to the account of the others a notice of our Lord's look (Mar 3:34; Mar 8:33; Mar 10:21; Mar 10:23); he dwells on human feelings and the tokens of them; on our Lord's pity for the leper, and his strict charge not to publish the miracle (Mar 1:41; Mar 1:44); he “loved” the rich young man for his answers (Mar 10:21); he “looked round” with anger when another occasion called it out (Mar 3:5); he groaned in spirit (Mar 7:34; Mar 8:12).

All these are peculiar to Mark, and they would be explained most readily by the theory that one of  the disciples most near to Jesus had supplied them. To this must be added that while Mark goes over the same ground for the most part as the other evangelists, and especially Matthew, there are many facts thrown in which prove that we are listening to an independent witness. Thus the humble origin of Peter is made known through him (Mar 1:16-20), and his connection with Capernaum (Mar 1:29); he tells us that Levi was “the son of Alphaus” (Mar 2:14), that Peter was the name given by our Lord to Simon (Mar 3:16), and Boanerges a surname added by him to the names of two others (Mar 3:17); he assumes the existence of another body of disciples wider than the twelve (Mar 3:32; Mar 4:10; Mar 4:36; Mar 8:34; Mar 14:51-52); we owe to him the name of Jairus (v. 22), the word “carpenter” applied to our Lord (Mar 6:3), the nation of the “Syro- Phoenician” woman (Mar 7:26); he substitutes Dalmanutha for the “Magdala” of Matthew (8:10); he names Bartimeus (10:46); he alone mentions that our Lord would not suffer any man to carry any vessel through the Temple (Mar 11:16); and that Simon of Cyrene was the father of Alexander and Rufus (Mar 15:21). Thus in this Gospel the richness in subtle and picturesque touches, by which the writer sets, as it were, the scene he is describing before us in all its outward features, with the very look and demeanor of the actors, betoken the report of an eye- witness; and with the testimony of the early Church before us, which can hardly be set aside, we are warranted in the conclusion that this eye- witness was Peter. Not that the narrative, as we have it, was his; but that when Mark, under the Holy Spirit's guidance, after separation from his master, undertook the task of setting forth that cycle of Gospel teaching to which — from grounds never yet, nor perhaps ever to be satisfactorily explained — the Synoptists chiefly confine themselves, he was enabled to introduce into it many pictorial details which he had derived from his master, and which had been impressed on his memory by frequent repetition.

III. Relation to Matthew and Luke. — The question of priority of composition among the Synoptic Gospels has long been the subject of vehement controversy, and to judge by the diversity of the views entertained, and the confidence each appears to feel of the correctness of his own, it would seem to be as far as ever from being settled. (For monographs under this head, see Volbeding, Index, p. 3; Danz, Worterbuch, s.v. Marcus.)  The position of Mark in relation to the other two has, in particular, given rise to the widest differences of opinion. The independence of his record was maintained up to the time of Augustine, but since his day three theories have been entertained.

(a.) That father conceived the view, which, however, he does not employ with much consistency, that Mark was merely “tanquam pedissequus et breviator” of Matthew (De Consens. EV. 1:4); and from his day it has been held by many that Mark deliberately set himself to make an abridgment of one or both the other Synoptists. Griesbach expressed this opinion most decidedly in his Commentatio quo Marci Evangeliumn totumn a Matthtei et Lucae conmmentariis decemptunm esse monstratur (Jena, 1789-90; also in Velthuysen, Comment. 1:360 sq.); and it has been stated in a more or less modified form by Paulus, Schleiermacher, Thiele, De Wette, Delitzsch, Fritzsche, and Bleek, the last two named adding John's Gospel to the materials before him. Nor can it be denied that at first sight this view is not devoid of plausibility, especially as regards Matthew. We find the same events recorded, and apparently in the same way, and very often in the same words. Mark's is the shorter work, and that principally, as it would seem, by the omission of the discourses and parables, which are a leading feature in the others. There are in Mark only about three events which Matthew does not narrate (Mar 1:23; Mar 8:22; Mar 12:41), and thus the matter of the two may be regarded as almost the same. But the form in Mark is, as we have seen. much briefer, and the omissions are many and important. The explanation is that Mark had the work of Matthew before him, and only condensed it. But many would make Mark a compiler from both the others (Griesbach, De Wette, etc.), arguing from passages where there is a curious resemblance to both (see De Wette, Handbuch, § 94 a). Yet, though this opinion of the dependence, more or less complete, of Mark upon the other Gospels, was for a long time regarded almost as an established fact, no very searching investigation is needed to show its baselessness. Instead of Mark's narrative being an abridgment of that of Matthew or of Luke, it is often much fuller. Particulars are introduced which an abridger aiming at condensation would have been certain to prune away if he had found them in his authority; while the freshness and graphic power of the history, the life-like touches which almost put us on the stage with the actors, and his superior accuracy as regards persons, words, times, and places, prove the originality and independence of his work.

(b.) Of late, therefore, opinion has been tending as violently in the opposite direction, and the prevailing view among modern critics is that in Mark we have the primitive Gospel, “Urevangelium,” from which both those of Matthew and Luke awere derived. This is held by Weisse, Wilke, Ewald, Lachmann, Hitzig, Reuss, Ritschel, Thiersch, Meyer, etc., and has lately been maintained with considerable ingenuity in Mr. Kenrick's Biblical Essays.

(c.) Hilgenfeld again adopts an intermediate view, and considers Mark to have held a middle position both as regards form and internal character; himself deriving his Gospel from Matthew, and in his turn supplying materials for that of Luke; while doctrinally he is considered to hold the mean between the Judaic Gospel of the first, and the universal Gospel of the third evangelist.

Many formidable difficulties beset each of these theories, and their credit severally is impaired by the fact that the very same data which are urged by one writer as proofs of the priority of Mark, are used by another as irrefragable evidence of its later date. We even find critics, like Baur, bold enough to attribute the vivid details, which are justly viewed as evidences of the independence and originality of his record, to the fancy of the evangelist; thus importing the art of the modern novelist into times and works to the spirit of which it is entirely alien.

So much, however, we may safely grant, while maintaining the substantial independence of each of the Synoptical Gospels — that Mark exhibits the oral tradition of the official life of our Lord in its earliest extant from, and furnishes the most direct representation of the common basis on which they all rest. “In essence, if not in composition,” says Mr. Wescott, Introd. p. 190 (the two not being necessarily identical, the earlier tradition being perhaps possibly the latest committed to writing), “it is the oldest.” The intermediate theory has also so much of truth in it, that Mark does actually occupy the central position in regard to diction; frequently, as it were, combining the language of the other two (Mar 1:32; comp. Mat 8:16; Luk 4:40; Luk 1:42; comp. Mat 8:3; Luk 5:13; Luk 2:13-18; comp. Mat 9:9-14; Luk 5:27-33; Luk 4:30-32; comp. Mat 13:31-33; Luk 13:18-21), as indeed would naturally be the case if we consider that his Gospel most closely represents the original from which all were developed. In conclusion we may say, that a careful comparison of the three Gospels can hardly fail to convince the unprejudiced reader that,  while Mark adds hardly anything to the general narrative, we have in his Gospel, in the words of Meyer (Comment.), “a fresher stream from the apostolic fountain,” without which we should have wanted many important elements for a true conception of our blessed Lord's nature and work.

If now we proceed to a detailed comparison of the matter contained in the Gospels, we shall find that, awhile the history of the conception, and birth, and childhood of our Lord and his forerunner have no parallel in Mark, afterwards the main course of the narrative (Luk 9:51 to Luk 18:14, being of course excepted) is on the whole coincident; and that the difference is mainly due to the absence of the parables and discourses, which were foreign to his purpose of setting forth the active ministry of Christ. Of our Lord's parables he only gives us four: “the sower,” “the mustard seed,” and “the wicked husbandmen” — common also to Matthew and Luke; and one, “the seed growing secretly,” Mar 4:26-29 (unless, indeed, it be an abbreviated and independent form of the “tares”), peculiar to himself. Of the discourses, he entirely omits the sermon on the mount, the denunciations against the Scribes and Pharisees, and almost entirely the instructions to the twelve; while of the other shorter discourses he only gives that on fasting (Mar 2:19-22), the Sabbath (Mar 2:25-28), the casting out devils by Beelzebub (Mar 3:23-29), on eating with unwashen hands, and corban (Mar 7:6-23), and divorce (Mar 10:5-9). That on “the last things” (chap. 13) is the only one reported at any length. On the other hand, his object being to develop our Lord's Messianic character in deeds rather than words, he records the greater part of the miracles given by the Synoptists. Of the twenty-seven narrated by them, eighteen are found in Mark, twelve being common to all three; three — the Syro-Phcenician's daughter, the feeding of the four thousand, and the cursing of the fig tree — common to him and Matthew; one — the daemoniac in the synagogue — to him and Luke; and two — the deaf stammerer (Mar 7:31-37), and the blind man at Bethsaida (Mar 8:22-26) (supplying remarkable points of correspondence, in the withdrawal of the object of the cure from the crowd, the use of external signs, and the gradual process of restoration) — peculiar to himself. Of the nine omitted by him, only three are found in Matthew, of which the centurion's servant is given also by Luke. The others are found in Luke alone. If we suppose that Mark had the Gospels of Matthew and Luke before him, it is difficult to assign any tolerably satisfactory reason for his omission of these miracles, especially that of the centurion's servant, so  kindred to the object of his work. On the contrary hypothesis, that they copied from him, how can we account for their omitting the two remarkable miracles mentioned above?

The arrangement of the narrative, especially of our Lord's earlier Galilaean ministry, agrees with Luke in opposition to that of Matthew, which appears rather to have been according to similarity of subject than order of time.

According to Norton (Genuineness of Gospels), there are not more than twenty-four verses in Mark to which parallels, more or less exact, do not exist in the other Synoptists. The same painstaking investigator informs us that, while the general coincidences between Mark and one of the other two amount to thirteen fourteenths of the whole Gospel, the verbal coincidences are one sixth, and of these four fifths in Mark occur in the recital of the words of our Lord and others; and only one fifth in the narrative portion, which, roughly speaking, forms one half of his Gospel.

Additions peculiar to Mark are, “the Sabbath made for man” (Mar 2:27); our Lord's friends seeking to lay hold on him (Mar 3:21); many particulars in the miracles of the Gadarene daemoniac (Mar 5:1-20); Jairus's daughter, and the woman with issue of blood (Mar 5:22-43); the stilling of the tempest (Mar 4:35-41), and the lunatic child (Mar 9:14-29); the salting with fire (Mar 9:49); that “the common people heard him gladly” (Mar 12:37); the command to watch (Mar 13:33-37); the young man with the linen cloth about his body (Mar 14:51); the want of agreement between the testimony of the false witnesses (Mar 14:59); Pilate's investigation of the reality of Christ's death (Mar 15:44), and the difficulty felt by the women as to the rolling away the stone (Mar 16:3-4). Mark has also preserved several words and phrases, and entire sayings of our Lord, which merit close attention (Mar 1:15; Mar 4:13; Mar 6:31; Mar 6:34; Mar 7:8; Mar 8:38; Mar 9:12; Mar 9:39; Mar 10:21; Mar 10:24; Mar 10:30; Mar 11:17; Mar 13:32; Mar 14:18-37; Mar 16:7 [15-18]).

The hypothesis which best meets all these facts is, that while the matter common to all three evangelists, or to two of them, is derived from the oral teaching of the apostles, which they had purposely reduced to a common form, our evangelist writes as an independent witness to the truth, and not as a compiler; and the tradition that the Gospel was written under the sanction of Peter, and its matter in some degree derived from him, is made probable by the evident traces of an eye-witness in many of the narratives. The omission and abridgment of our Lord's discourses, and the sparing use  of O.T. quotations, might be accounted for by the special destination of the Gospel, if we had surer data for ascertaining it; since it was for Gentiles, with whom illustrations from the O.T. would have less weight, and the purpose of the writer was to present a clear and vivid picture of the acts of our Lord's human life, rather than a full record of his divine doctrine. We may thankfully own that, with little that is in substance peculiar to himself, the evangelist does occupy for us a distinct position, and supply a definite want, in virtue of these traits.

IV. Characteristics. — Though this Gospel has little historical matter which is not shared with some other, it would be a great error to suppose that the voice of Mark could have been silenced without injury to the divine harmony. The minute painting of the scenes in which the Lord took part, the fresh and lively mode of the narration, the very absence of the precious discourses of Jesus, which, interposed between his deeds, would have delayed the action, all give to this Gospel a character of its own. It is the history of the war of Jesus against sin and evil in the world during the time that he dwelt as a Man among men. Our Lord is presented to us, not as in Matthew, as the Messiah, the Son of David and Abraham, the theocratic King of the chosen people; nor, as in Luke, as the universal Savior of our fallen humanity; but as the incarnate and wonderworking Son of God, for whose emblem the early Church justly selected “the lion of the tribe of Judah.” His record is emphatically “the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God” (Mar 1:1), living and working among men, and developing his mission more in acts than by words. The limits of his narrative and its general character can hardly be better stated than in the words of his apostolic teacher, Act 10:36-42. Commencing with the Baptist preaching in the wilderness, and announcing the “Mightier One” who was at hand, he tells us how, at his baptism, “God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power,” and declared him to be his “beloved Son:” gathering up the temptation into the pregnant fact, “He was with the wild beasts;” thus setting the Son of God before us as the Lord of nature, in whom the original grant to man of dominion over the lower creation was fulfilled (Maurice, Unity of the N.T. p. 226; Bengel, ad loc.; Wilberforce, Doctrine of Incarnation, p. 89. 90). As we advance, we find him detailing every exercise of our Lord's power over man and nature distinctly and minutely — not merely chronicling the incidents, as is Matthew's way, but surrounding them with all the circumstances that made them impressive to the bystanders, and making us feel how deep that impression was; how  great the e a and wonder with which his mighty works and preaching were regarded, not only by the crowd (Mar 1:22; Mar 1:27; Mar 2:12; Mar 6:2), but by the disciples themselves (Mar 4:41; Mar 6:51; Mar 10:24; Mar 10:26; Mar 10:32); how the crowds thronged and pressed upon him (Mar 3:10; Mar 5:21; Mar 5:31; Mar 6:33; Mar 8:1), so that there was scarce room to stand or sit (Mar 2:2; Mar 3:32; Mar 4:1), or leisure even to eat (Mar 3:20; Mar 6:31); how his fame spread the more he sought to conceal it (Mar 1:45; Mar 3:7; Mar 5:20; Mar 7:36-37); and how, in consequence, the people crowded about him, bringing their sick (Mar 1:32-34; Mar 3:10); and whithersoever he entered into villages, or cities, or country, they laid the sick in the streets, and besought that they might touch if it were but the border of his garment: and as many as touched were made perfectly whole” (Mar 6:56); how the unclean spirits, seeing him, at once fell down before him and acknowledged his power, crying, “Thou art the Son of God” (Mar 1:23-26; Mar 3:11); how, again, in Peter's words, “He went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil, for God was with him.”

But while the element of divine power is that which specially arrests our attention in reading his Gospel, there is none in which the human personality is more conspicuous. The single word ὁ τέκτων (Mar 6:3) throws a flood of light on our Lord's early life as man in his native village. The limitation of his knowledge is expressly stated (Mar 13:32, οὐδὲ ὁ Υἱός); and we continually meet with mention of human emotions-anger (Mar 3:5; Mar 8:12; Mar 8:33; Mar 10:14), wonder (Mar 6:6), pity (Mar 6:34), love (Mar 10:21), grief (Mar 7:34; Mar 8:12); and human infirmities — sleep (Mar 4:38), desire for repose (Mar 6:31), hunger (Mar 11:12).

In Mark we have no attempt to draw up a continuous narrative. His Gospel is a rapid succession of vivid pictures loosely strung together (usually by καί καὶ πάλιν , or εὐθέως), without much attempt to bind them into a whole, or give the events in their natural sequence. This pictorial power is that which specially characterizes this evangelist; so that, as has been well said, “if any one desires to know an evangelical fact, not only in its main features and grand results, but also in its most minute and, so to speak, more graphic delineation, he must betake himself to Mark” (Da Costa, Four Witnesses, p. 88). This power is especially apparent in all that concerns our Lord himself. Nowhere else are we permitted so clearly to behold his very gesture and look; see his very position; to read his feelings and to hear his very words. It is Mark who reveals to us the comprehensive  gaze of Christ (περιβλεψάμενος, Mar 3:5; Mar 3:34; Mar 5:32; Mar 10:23; Mar 11:11); his loving embrace of the children brought to him (ἐναγκαλισάμενος, Mar 9:36; Mar 10:16); his preceding his disciples, while they follow in awe and amazement (Mar 10:32). We see him taking his seat to address his disciples (καθίσας, Mar 9:34), and turning round in holy anger to rebuke Peter (ἐπιστραφείς, Mar 8:33); we hear the sighs which burst from his bosom Mar 7:34; Mar 8:12), and listen to his very accents (“Talitha cumi,” v. 41; “Ephphatha,” Mar 7:34; “Abba,” Mar 14:36). At one time we have an event portrayed with a freshness and pictorial power which places the whole scene before us with its minute accessories — the paralytic (Mar 2:1-12), the storm (Mar 4:36-41). the demoniac (Mar 5:1-20), Herod's feast (Mar 6:21-29), the feeding of the 5000 (Mar 6:30-45), the lunatic child (Mar 9:14-29), the young ruler (Mar 10:17; Mar 10:22), Bartimeus (Mar 10:46-52), etc. At another, details are brought out by the addition of a single word (κύψας, Mar 1:7; σχιζομένους, Mar 1:10; σπλαγχνισθείς, Mar 1:41; τοῖς ἔξω, Mar 4:11; προσωρμίσθησαν, Mar 6:53; ἔσωθεν, ἔξωθεν, Mar 7:21; Mar 7:23; κράξας, σπαράξάς, Mar 9:26; στυγνάσας, Mar 10:22; συντρίψασα, Mar 14:3; ἐμβλέψασα, Mar 14:67), or by the substitution of a more precise and graphic word for one less distinctive (ἐκβάλλει, Mar 1:12; ἐξίστασθαι, Mar 2:12; γεμίζεσθαι Mar 4:37; ἐξηράνθη i, Mar 5:29; ἀποταξάμενος, Mar 6:46; ἀθετεῖτο, Mar 7:9; ἐκθαμβεῖσθαι, Mar 14:33). It is to Mark also that we are indebted for the record of minute particulars of persons, places, times, and number, which stamp on his narrative an impress of authenticity.

(1.) Persons. — Mar 1:20; Mar 2:14; Mar 3:5; Mar 3:17; Mar 3:32; Mar 3:34; Mar 4:11; Mar 5:32; Mar 5:37; Mar 5:40; Mar 6:40; Mar 6:48; Mar 7:1; Mar 7:25-26; Mar 8:10; Mar 8:27; Mar 9:15; Mar 9:36; Mar 10:16; Mar 10:23; Mar 10:35; Mar 10:46; Mar 11:21; Mar 11:27; Mar 13:1; Mar 13:3; Mar 14:20; Mar 14:37; Mar 14:65; Mar 15:7; Mar 15:21; Mar 15:40; Mar 15:47; Mar 16:7.

(2.) Places. — Mar 1:28; Mar 4:1; Mar 4:38; Mar 5:11; Mar 5:20-21; Mar 6:55; Mar 7:17; Mar 7:31; Mar 8:10; Mar 8:27; Mar 9:30; Mar 11:4; Mar 12:41; Mar 14:66; Mar 15:16; Mar 15:39; Mar 16:5.

(3.) Time. — Mar 1:32; Mar 1:35; Mar 2:1; Mar 2:26; Mar 4:35; Mar 5:2; Mar 5:18; Mar 5:21; Mar 6:2; Mar 11:11; Mar 11:19-20; Mar 14:1; Mar 14:12; Mar 14:17; Mar 14:30; Mar 14:68; Mar 14:72; Mar 15:1; Mar 15:25; Mar 15:33-34; Mar 15:42; Mar 16:1-2.

(4.) Number. — Mar 5:13; Mar 5:42; Mar 6:7; Mar 8:24; Mar 14:30; Mar 14:72. Other smaller variations are continually occurring.

Here a single word, there a short parenthesis, sometimes an apparently trivial accession — which impart a striking air of life to the record; e.g. Zebedee left with the hired servants (Mar 1:20); our Lord praying (Mar 1:35); the paralytic borne of four (Mar 2:3); the command that a ship should wait on him (Mar 3:9); “thy sisters” (Mar 3:32); our Lord taken “even as he was in the ship” (Mar 4:36); “other little ships with them” (ibid.); Jairus's daughter ‘walked” (Mar 5:42); “divers came from far” (Mar 8:3); only “one loaf” in the ship (Mar 8:14); “so as no fuller on earth can white” (Mar 9:2); the danger of trusting in riches (Mar 10:24); “with persecutions” (Mar 10:30); “no vessel suffered to be carried through the Temple” (Mar 11:16); “a house of prayer for all nations” (Mar 11:17); “she hath done what she could” (Mar 14:8); Barabbas, one of a party of insurrectionists all guilty of bloodshed (Mar 15:7).

We cannot conclude our remarks on this head better than in the words of Mr. Westcott (Introd. p. 348) — that “if all other arguments against the mythic origin of the evangelic narratives were wanting, this vivid and simple record, stamped with the most distinct impress of independence and originality, would be sufficient to refute a theory subversive of all faith in history.”

V. Style and Diction. — The style of Mark may be characterized as vigorous and abrupt. His terms of connection and transition are terse and lively; he is fond of employing the direct for the indirect (Mar 4:39; Mar 5:8-9; Mar 5:12; Mar 6:23; Mar 6:31; Mar 6:37; Mar 9:25; Mar 9:33; Mar 12:6), the present for the past (Mar 1:25; Mar 1:40; Mar 1:44; Mar 2:3-5; Mar 3:4-5; Mar 3:13; Mar 3:20; Mar 3:31; Mar 3:34; Mar 4:37, etc.), and the substantive instead of the pronoun; he employs the cognate accusative (Mar 3:28; Mar 7:13; Mar 13:19; Mar 4:41; Mar 5:42), accumulates negatives (οὐκέτι οὐδείς, Mar 7:12; Mar 9:8; Mar 12:34; Mar 15:5; ουκέτι οὐ μή, Mar 14:25; μηκέτι μηδείς, Mar 11:14), and for sake of emphasis repeats what he has said in other words, or appends the opposite (Mar 1:22; Mar 1:45; Mar 2:27; Mar 3:26-27; Mar 3:29; Mar 4:17; Mar 4:33-34), and piles up synonymes (Mar 4:6; Mar 4:8; Mar 4:39; Mar 5:12; Mar 5:23; Mar 8:15; Mar 13:33; Mar 14:68), combining this forcible style with a conciseness and economy of expression consistent with the elaboration of every detail.  Mark's diction is nearer to that of Matthew than to that of Luke. It is more Hebraistic than the latter, though rather in general coloring than in special phrases. According to Davidson (Introd. 1:154), there are forty-five words peculiar to him and Matthew, and only eighteen common to him and Luke. Aramaic words, especially those used by our Lord, are introduced, but explained for Gentile readers (Mar 3:17; Mar 3:22; Mar 5:41; Mar 7:11; Mar 7:34; Mar 9:43; Mar 10:46; Mar 14:36; Mar 15:22; Mar 15:34). Latinisms are more frequent than in the other Gospels: κεντυρωίν, Mar 15:39; Mar 15:44-45; σπεκουλάτωρ, Mar 6:27; τὸ ἱκάνον ποιῆσαι, Mar 15:15; ξέστης, Mar 7:4; Mar 7:8, are peculiar to him. Others δηνάριον, κῆνσος, λεγίων, πραιτώριον, φραγελλόω, κοδράντης — he has in common with the rest of the evangelists. He is fond of diminutives — θυγάτριον, κοράσιον, κυνάρια, ὡτάριον — but they are not peculiar to him. He employs unusual words and phrases (e.g. ἀλαλάζειν, ἐπισυντρέχειν, κωμόπολις, μεγιστᾶνες, νάρδος πιστική, νουνεχῶς, παιδιόθεν, πλοιάριον, προμεριμνᾶν, τρυμαλία, ὑπολήνιον, στοιβάς, σμυρνιζόμενος οινος; συνθλίβειν, ἐνειλεῖν). Of other noticeable words and expressions we may remark, ἀκάθαρτον πνεῦμα, eleven times, Matthew six, Luke three; ἤρξατο λἐγειν, κράζειν, twenty-five times; διεστείλατο, and στέλλετο, five times, Matthew once; compounds of πορεύεσθαι: e.g. εἰσπορ., eight times, Matthew once, Luke four; ἐκπορ., eleven times, Matthew six, Luke three; παραπορ., four times, Matthew once; προσπορ. The verb ἐπερωτάω occurs twenty-five times, to eight times in Matthew and eighteen in Luke; εὐαγγέλιον, eight times, Matthew four, but the verb not once; εὐθέως, forty times, Matthew fifteen, Luke eight. Other favorite words are, κηρύσσειν, fourteen, Matthew nine, Luke nine; μακρόθεν, five, Matthew two, Luke four; οὐκέτι and μηκέτι, ten, Matthew three, Luke four; περιβλέρω, six times, Luke once; πιστεύω, fourteen, Matthew eleven, Luke nine; πρωϊv, six times, Matthew twice, John once; φέρω, thirteen, Matthew four, Luke four times. Of words only found in Mark, as compared with Matthew and Luke, we may mention-ἁνάρτημα, ἀναθεματίζω, ἐξάπινα. εὔκαιρος and ρως, εὐσχήμων, ἡδωές, θαμβεῖσθαι, θυρωρός, κτίσις, κυλίομαι, μογ.λαλος, μορφή, παραβάλλειν, παραδέχεσθαι, παρόμοιος, προστρέχω, συμπόσια, συστασιαστής, στίλβειν, σκώληξ. Words not found at all, or found less frequently in Mark, are — ἀγαθός, only twice, in the same context (Mar 10:17-18), Matthew sixteen, Luke fifteen times; νόμος, παῖς, στόμα, éσπερ, ἀνοίγω, ἄξιος, κελεύω, μεριμνάω, μακάριος, ὀφείλω, καλέω only three times, to  Matthew twenty-six, Luke forty-two; πέμπω, only once; Χριστός, seven, Matthew sixteen, Luke thirteen. Publicans are only mentioned twice, Samaria and its inhabitants not once.

VI. Persons for whom the Gospel was written. — A dispassionate review of the Gospel confirms the traditional statement that it was intended primarily for Gentiles, and among these the use of Latinisms, and the concise abrupt character: suitable for the vigorous intelligence of a Roman audience” (Westcott, Introd. p. 348), seem to point out those for whom it was specially meant. In consistency with this view, words which would not be understood by Gentile readers are interpreted: Boanerges (Mar 3:17); Talitha cumi (Mar 5:40); Corban (Mar 7:11); Bartimaus (Mar 10:46); Abba (Mar 14:36); Eloi lama sabachthani (Mar 15:34); two mites “make a farthing” (Mar 12:42); Gehenna is “unquenchable fire” (Mar 9:43). Jewish usages, and other matters with which none but Jews could be expected to be familiar, are explained, e.g. the washing before meals (Mar 7:3-4); in the days of unleavened bread the Passover was killed (Mar 14:12); at the Passover the season of figs had not come (Mar 11:13); the preparation is “the day before the Sabbath” (Mar 15:42); the Mount of Olives is over against the Temple” (Mar 13:3); Jordan is a “river” (Mar 1:5; Mat 3:6); the Pharisees, etc., “used to fast” (Mar 2:18; Mat 9:14); the Sadducees' worst tenet is mentioned (Mar 12:18); and explanations are given which Jews would not need (Mar 15:6; Mar 15:16). All reference to the law of Moses is omitted, and even the word νόμος does not occur; the Sabbath was appointed for the good of man (Mar 2:27); and in the quotation from Isa 56:7 he adds “of all nations.” The genealogy of our Lord is likewise omitted. Other matters interesting chiefly to the Jews are similarly passed over, such as the reflections on the request of the Scribes and Pharisees for a sign (Mat 12:38-45); the parable of the king's son (Mat 22:1-14); and the awful denunciation of the Scribes and Pharisees (Matthew 23). Matter that might offend is omitted, as Mat 10:5-6; Mat 6:7-8. Passages, not always peculiar to Mark, abound in his Gospel, in which the antagonism between the pharisaic legal spirit and the Gospel come out strongly (Mar 1:22; Mar 2:2; Mark 5; Mar 8:15), which hold out hopes to the heathen of admission to the kingdom of heaven even without the Jews (Mar 12:9), and which put ritual forms below the worship of the heart (Mar 2:18; Mar 3:1-5; Mar 7:5-23). Whilst he omits the invective against the Pharisees, he indicates by a touch of his own  how Jesus condemned them “with anger” (Mar 3:5). Mark alone makes the Scribe admit that love is better than sacrifices (Mar 12:33). In conclusion, the absence of all quotations from the O.T. made on his own authority, with the exception of those in the opening verses from Mal 3:1; Isa 40:3 (Mar 15:28 being rejected as interpolated), points the same way. The only citations he introduces are those made by our Lord, or by those addressing him.

VII. Citations from Scripture. — The following are the only direct citations:

Of these,

(a) is the only one peculiar to Mark. In

(b) we have the addition of a few words to the Synoptical quotation. We have also references to the O.T. in the following passages:

VIII. Time and Place of Composition. — On these points the Gospel itself affords no information, except that we may certainly affirm, against Baur, Hilgenfeld, Weisse, etc., that it was composed before the fall of Jerusalem, since otherwise so remarkable a fulfillment of our Lord's predictions could not but have been noticed. Ecclesiastical tradition is, as usual, vacillatory and untrustworthy. Clement, as quoted by Eusebius (uit sup.), places the composition of the Gospel in the lifetime of Peter; while Irenaeus, with much greater probability, asserts that it was not written till after the decease (ἔξοδον, not “departure from Rome,” Mill, Grabe, Ebrard) of Peter and Paul. Later authorities are, as ever, much more definite. Theophylact and Euthym. Zigab., with the Chron. Pasch., Georg. Syncell., and Hesychius, place it ten years after the Ascension, i.e. A.D. 40; Eusebius, in his Chronicon, A.D. 43, when Peter, Paul, and Philo were together in Rome. It is not likely that it dates before the reference to Mark in the Epistle to the Colossians (4:10), where he is only introduced as a relative of Barnabas, as if this were his greatest distinction; and this Epistle was written about A.D. 57. If, after coming to Asia Minor on Paul's sending, he went on and joined Peter at Babylon, he may have then acquired, or rather completed that knowledge of Peter's preaching, which tradition teaches us to look for in the Gospel, and of which there is so much internal evidence; and soon after this the Gospel may have been  composed. We may probably date it between Peter's martyrdom, cir. A.D. 63, and the destruction of Jerusalem, A.D. 70.

As to the place, the uniform testimony of early writers (Clement, Eusebius, Jerome, Epiphanius, etc.) is that the Gospel was written and published in Rome. In this view most modern writers of weight agree. Chrysostom asserts that it was published in Alexandria, but his statement is not confirmed — as, if true, it must certainly have been — by any Alexandrine writer. Some (Eichhorn, R. Simon) maintain a combination of the Roman and Alexandrine view under the theory of a double publication, first in one city and then in the other. Storr is alone in his view that it was first made public at Antioch.

IX. Language. — There can be no reason for questioning that the Gospel was composed in Greek. To suppose that it was written in Latin — as is stated in the subscription to the Peshito, and some early Greek MSS., ἐγράφη Ρωμαϊvστι ἐν Ρώμῃ — because it was intended for the use of Roman Christians, implies complete ignorance of the Roman Church of that age, which in language, organization, and ritual was entirely Greek, maintaining its character in common with most of the churches of the West as “a Greek religious colony” (Milman, Lat. Christ. 1:27). The attempt made by Baronius, Bellarmine, etc., to strengthen the authority of the Vulgate by this means was therefore, as one of their own Church, R. Simon, has shown, entirely futile; and the pretended Latin autograph, said to be preserved in the library of St. Mark's at Venice, turned out to be part of an ancient Latin codex of the four Gospels, now known as Codex Forojuliensis.

X. Contents. — The Gospel of Mark may be divided into three parts:

(1.) The occurrences previous to the commencement of the public ministry of our Lord, including the preaching and baptism of John, our Lord's baptism and temptation (Mar 1:1-13).

(2.) Our Lord's ministry in Galilee, including that in Eastern Galilee (Mar 1:14 - Mar 7:23); that in Northern Galilee (Mar 7:24 - Mar 9:37); that in Persea, and the journeyings towards Jerusalem (Mar 9:38 - Mar 10:52).

(3.) His triumphant entry, passion, death, resurrection, and ascension (Mar 11:1 to Mar 14:8 [20]).

XI. Genuineness and Integrity. — The genuineness of Mark's Gospel was never doubted before Schleiermacher, who, struck by an apparent discrepancy between the orderly narrative we now possess and the description of Papias (ut sup.), broached the view followed by Credner, Ewald, and others, that the Gospel in. its present form is not the work of Mark the companion of Peter. This led to the notion, which has met with much acceptance among German critics (Baur, Hilgenfeld, Kostlin, etc.), of an original, precanonical Mark, “the Gospel of Peter,” probably written in Aramaic, which, with other oral and documentary sources, formed the basis on which some unknown later writers formed the existing Gospel. But even if, on other grounds, this view were probable, all historical testimony is against it; and we should have to account for the entire disappearance of an original document of so much importance without leaving a trace of its existence, and the silent substitution of a later work for it, and its acceptance by the whole Church. If ordinary historical testimony is to have any weight, we can have no doubt that the Gospel we now have. and which has always borne his name, was that originally composed by Mark. We can have no reason to think that either John the presbyter or Papias were infallible; and if the ordinary interpretation of οὐ τάξει was correct, and the description of the Gospel given by Papias was really at variance with its present form, it would be at least equally probable that their judgment was erroneous and their view mistaken. There can, however, be little doubt that the meaning of τάξει has been strained and distorted, and that the words do really describe not Mark's alone, but all three Synoptic Gospels as we have them; not, that is, “Lives of Christ” chronologically arranged, but “a summary of representative facts” given according to a moral and not a historic sequence, following a higher order than that of mere time.

As regards the integrity of the Gospel, Ewald, Reuss, and others have called in question the genuineness of the opening verses (Mar 1:1-13). But the external evidence for them is as great as that for the authenticity of any part of the Gospels. Internal evidence is too subtle a thing, and varies too much with the subjectivity of the writer, for us to rely on it exclusively.

The case is different with the closing portion (Mar 16:9-20), where the evidence, both external and internal, is somewhat strong against its having formed a part of Mark's original Gospel, which is thought to have broken off abruptly with the words ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ (for various theories to account for this, the death of Peter, that of Mark, sudden persecution,  flight, the loss of the last leaf, etc., see Hug, Mieyer, Schott). No less than twenty-one words and expressions occur in it, some of them repeatedly, which are never elsewhere used by Mark. This alone, when we remember the peculiarities of diction in the pastoral epistles, as compared with Paul's other writings, would not be sufficient to prove that it was not written by the same author; though when taken in connection with the external evidence, it would seem to show that it was not composed at the same time. On this ground, therefore, we must conclude that if not the ‘work of another hand, it was written at a later period than the rest of the Gospel. The external evidence, though somewhat inconsistent, points, though less decidedly, the same way. While it is found in all codices of weight, includings A, C, D, and all versions, and is repeatedly quoted, without question, by early writers from the time of Irenaeus (Haer. 3:10, 6), and appears in the very ancient Syriac recension published by Cureton, it is absent from the Vatican and Sinaitic MSS. (in the former of which, after the subscription, the greater part of the column and the whole of the next are left vacant, a phenomenon nowhere else found in the N.T. portion of that codex), while in several MSS. that contain it, it is noted that it is wanting in others, and those the most accurate copies. Jerome (ad Hedib. 4:172) speaks of it as being found in but few copies of the Gospels, and deficient in almost all the Greek MSS. Eusebius (ad Marin. quaest. I) states that it is wanting “in nearly all the more accurate copies,” while the canons that bear his name and the Ammonian sections do not go beyond v. 8. Of later critics, Olshausen and De Wette pronounce for its genuineness. The note of the latter may be consulted, as well as those of Alford and Meyer, who take the other side, for a full statement of the evidence for and against. See also Burgon, The last twelve Verses of Mark vindicated (Lond. 1871).

XII. Canonicity. — The citation of v. 19 as Scripture by Irenaeus appears sufficient to establish this point. With regard to other passages of Mark's Gospel, as it presents so few facts peculiar to himself, we cannot be surprised that there are but few references to it in the early fathers. The Muratorian canon, however (cir. A.D. 170), commences with words which evidently refer to it. It is mentioned by Papias. Justin Martyr refers to it for the name Boanerges (Trymph. 106), as the “Memoirs of Peter.” Irenaeus, as rwe have seen above, quotes from it, and in the 19th Clementine Homily (ed. Dusseldorf, 1853) a peculiar phrase of Mark (Mar 4:34) is repeated verbally. The fact also recorded by Irenenus (Haer. 3:11, 7), that  the Docetic heretics preferred the Gospel of Mark to the others, affords an early proof of its acceptance in the Church.

XIII. Commentaries. — The following are the special exegetical helps on the entire Gospel of Mark; to a few of the most important we prefix an asterisk: Victor of Antioch, In Marcum (Gr. ed. Matthai; also in the Bibl. Max. Patr. 4:370); Jerome, Expositio (in Opp. [Suppos.], 11:758); also Commentarius (ibid. 11:783); Possinus,Catena Gr. Patrum (Romans 1673, fol.); Bede, Expositio (in Opp. v. 92; Works, 10:1); Aquinas, Catena (in Opp. iv; also in vol. ii of Engl. transl.); Albertus Magnus, Conmmentarius (in Opp. ix); Gerson, Lectiones (in Opp. 4:203); Zwingle, Annotationes (in Opp. 4:141); Brentius, Homilics (in Opp. v); Myconius, Commnentrius (Basil. 1538, 8vo); Hegendorphinus, Annotationes (Hag. 1526, 1536, 8vo); Sarcer, Scholia (Basil. 1539, 1540, 8vo); Bullinger, Commentaria (Tigur. 1545, fol.); Hofmeister, Commentarius [includ. Matthew and Luke] (Lovan. 1562, fol.; Par. 1563; Colon. 1572, 8vo); Danaeus, Questiones (Genev. 1594. 8vo); Gualther, tomilimc (Heidelb. 1608, fol.); Winckelmann, Commentarius (Francof. 1612,8vo); Del Pas, Commentaria (Romans 1623, fol.); Novarinus, Expensio (Lugd. 1642, fol.); Petter, Commentary (London, 1662, 2 vols. fol.); Heartsocker, A antekeningeen (Amsterd. 1671, 4to); De Veiel, Explicatio [includ. Matt.] (Lend. 1688, 8vo); Dorche, Commentacrius (Kilon. 1690, 4to); Heupel, Notce (Argent. 1716, 8vo); Klemm, Exercitia (Tiibing. 1728, 4to); \*Elsner, Commentarius (Traj. 1773, 4to); Cunningham, Thoughts (Lond. 1825,12mo); Hinds, Manual (Lond. 1829, 8vo); Bland, Annotations (Lond. 1830, 8vo); \*Fritzsche, Commentarii (Lips. 1830, 8vo); For(d, Illustrations (Lond. 1849, 1864, 8vo); Hilgenfeld, D. Marcus — evangelium (Halle, 1850, 8vo); Cumming, Readings (Lond. 1853, 8vo); \*Alexander, Explanation (N.Y. 1858,12mo); Klostermann, D). Markus- evangeliunm (Gitting. 1867, 8vo); Goodwin, Notes (Lond. 1869, 8vo). SEE GOSPELS.

## Market[[@Headword:Market]]

             (מִעֲרָב, maarab'), a mercantile term, found only in Ezekiel 27 (rendered “merchandise,” except in Eze 27:13; Eze 27:17; Eze 27:19; Eze 27:25), in several senses:

(a) properly barter, and so trade, traffic (Eze 27:9; Eze 27:27);

(b) place of barter, zmart (Eze 27:12-13; Eze 27:17; Eze 27:19);

(c) gain, wealth, acquired by traffic (Eze 27:27; Eze 27:34; plur. Eze 27:33, perh. precious wares), like סִחִר, “merchandise,” and עַזָּבוֹן, “fair,” “ware.” In the N. Test. the word agora (ἀγορά), thus rendered (“market-place” in Mat 20:3; Mar 12:38; Luk 7:32; Act 16:19), denotes generally any place of public resort in towns and cities where the people came together; and hence more specially it signifies

(a) a public place, a broad street, etc. (Mat 11:16; Mat 20:3; Mat 23:7; Mar 6:56; Mar 12:38; Luk 7:32; Luk 11:43; Luk 20:46);

(b) ajo ruin or market-place, where goods were exposed for sale, and assemblies or public trials held (Act 16:19; Act 17:17). In Mar 7:4 it is doubtful whether ἀγορά denotes the market itself, or is put for that which is brought from the market; but the known customs of the Jews suggest a preference of the former signification. From this is derived the term  agorceus (ἀγοραῖος), properly signifying the things belonging to, or persons frequenting the agora; improperly rendered “in law” in Act 19:38, where it is applied to the days on which public trials were held in the forum; and in Act 17:5 (where it is rendered “baser sort”) it denotes idlers, or persons lounging about in the markets and other places of public resort. There is a peculiar force in this application of the word, when we recollect that the market-places or bazaars of the East were, and are at this day, the constant resort of unoccupied people, the idle, and the newsmongers.

In very early periods markets were held at or near the gates of cities, sometimes within and sometimes without the walls. Here commodities were exposed for sale, either in the open air or in tents (2Ki 7:18). It is still not unusual in the East for the wholesale market for country produce and cattle to be held (for a short time in the early part of the morning) at the gates of towns; but manufactured goods and various sorts of fruits are retailed in the bazaars within the towns. In the time of our Savior, as we learn from Josephus, the markets were enclosed in the same manner as the modern Eastern bazaars, which are shut at night, and contain traders' shops disposed in rows or streets; and in large towns the dealers in particular commodities are confined to certain streets. That this was also the case in the time of the prophet Jeremiah, we may infer from his expression, “the bakers' street” (Jer 37:21). That a close connection existed between those of the same craft, we learn incidentally from Neh 3:32. In rebuilding Jerusalem after the exile, “the goldsmiths and the merchants” acted together in repairing the walls. Josephus calls the valley between Mounts Zion and Moriah the ‘Tyropoeon (τυροποιῶν), i.e. the valley “of the cheesemakers.” In like manner there is mentioned the valley of Charashim, or “the craftsmen” (1Ch 4:14; Neh 11:35). Josephus also mentions a street of the meat- dealers. The streets of Eastern cities are generally distinguished from each other, not by the separate names which they bear, but by the sort of traffic or business carried on in them. Thus at Cairo and other large Oriental cities we hear of the market of the butchers, of the fruit-dealers, the copper-ware sellers, the jewelers, and so on; each consisting of a row of shops on each side of the street devoted to that particular kind of trade (Hackett, Illustra. of Script, p. 61). SEE BARGAIN; SEE BAZAAR; SEE COMMERCE; SEE MERCHANT.

## Markham, William, D.C.L[[@Headword:Markham, William, D.C.L]]

             archbishop of York, was born in Ireland in 1719, but was brought to England in his infancy, and at an early age entered Westminster School. He was afterwards sent to Christ Church College, Oxford, where he obtained the degree of M.A. in 1745. In 1750 he was appointed to the office of high master of Westminster School, the duties of which be discharged with great industry and success for about fourteen years. In 1759 he was made a prebendary of Durham, in 1764 resigned his mastership of Westminster, and in the following year was preferred to the deanery of Rochester, which, in 1767, he vacated for that of Christ Church. In 1771 he was consecrated bishop of Chester, and in 1777 translated to the archiepiscopal see of York, from which he was removed by death, November 3, 1807. The virtues of this distinguished prelate were of a most benevolent and amiable kind. With great learning he was modest; and though raised to the highest station he was meek and humble. See (Lond.) Annual Register, 1807, page 789.

## Marklin, Johann Friedrich[[@Headword:Marklin, Johann Friedrich]]

             a German theologian, was born at Reichenbach, in Würtemberg, Feb. 6, 1732; was educated at the University of Tübingen; in 1755 became archdeacon at Waiblingen; in 1760 lectured at his alma mater; in 1767, archdeacon; in 1786 was raised to the dignity of professor of divinity, the department of exegesis of the Old Test. and Oriental literature falling to him. In 1797 he was made general superintendent of the churches of Wtirtemberg, and died May 13, 1804. He was a distinguished interpreter of the O.-T. Scriptures. Of his productions we only mention Diss. inaug. de Sermone Dei ad ioh. 28, 29 ejusque Scopo (Tubingae, 1754, 4to): — Diss. de religione, imprimbis Christiana, magno in oficiis, etc. (ibid. 1786, 4to). — Doring, Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands, s.v.

## Marks, Richard T.[[@Headword:Marks, Richard T.]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Louisville, Ga., Sept. 24,1809. He was educated a printer. In 1827 he removed to Columbus, Ga., and united with Mr. Larmar in establishing the Columbus Inquirer, the first paper started in the western part of Georgia. Soon after, feeling called to the ministry, he commenced the study of theology under Thomas Goulding, D.D.; was licensed in 1837, and ordained in 1839. He labored as a minister mostly in missionary fields, or where the destitution was so great that unrequited labor had to be given. He preached in the following places, all in Georgia: Muscogee, Greenville, West Point, Hamilton, Columbus, Emmaus, Americus, Mount Tabor, Ephesus, and White Sulphur Springs. He died Dec. 6, 1867. Mr. Marks was a ready writer, an excellent preacher, and an editor of great power and influence. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1868, p. 342.

## Marks, St., Day[[@Headword:Marks, St., Day]]

             the 25th of April, observed at least since the 6th century, in commemoration of St. Mark, the evangelist. It is celebrated in most parishes of the Romish Church by a solemn, supplicatory procession, mentioned as early as pope Gregory the Great. Walafrid Strabo states (De reb. eccl. c. 8) that it was instituted by that pope at the commencement of his pontificate, with a view to supplicate God for deliverance from a pestilence which was devastating Rome; and it is certain that Gregory held a procession in A.D. 590, in order to avert the pestilence. But the two ceremonies are clearly not identical. The latter was held in August, and  continued during three days; and while, in the procession of St. Mark, the faithful issued from seven separate churches, in this they all proceeded from a single sanctuary. In churches of which St. Mark is the patron, a mass is celebrated in connection with the procession, in which the color used is blue, indicative of the penitential feeling which predominates in the ceremony. An occasional removal of the festival to another day does not set aside the procession, which is always held on the 25th of April, unless Easter Sunday falls on that date. — Wetzer und Welte, Kirchen-Lex. 6:832.

## Marks, St., Liturgy[[@Headword:Marks, St., Liturgy]]

             SEE LITURGY.

## Marlatt, Archibald G.[[@Headword:Marlatt, Archibald G.]]

             a noted educator and minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Warren County, N. J., in 1829, and educated at Dickinson College (class of 1850); was junior preacher on Carlisle Circuit in 1851; was the following year appointed to Lock Haven Circuit, where a bronchial affection developed itself, which compelled him to locate in 1854. In this same year he was appointed professor of a high literary institution in Washington City, where he remained until 1856, when he accepted the presidency of the newly-founded Irving Female College, and to this institution he devoted his energy and talents until Jan. 2,1865, when he “fell asleep in Jesus.” “The personal character of our brother may be included in the comprehensive title ‘a Christian gentleman,' the highest style and type of manhood. As a gentleman, a scholar, and a minister of truth, his was a noble candor.... In everything that bore upon truth or purity he was a decided man. Of his mental power and literary culture it may be safely said that he possessed a clear intellectual perception; rapid insight, coupled With careful analysis and broad power of generalizing; a vivid sensibility of nature, a keen discrimination of character, a large acquaintance with ancient and modern belles-lettres; and from the college under his presiulency have been sent forth those that shall shine brightly in the literary world.” — Conf. Minutes, 1865, p. 12.

## Marlay, Michael, D.D.[[@Headword:Marlay, Michael, D.D.]]

             a noted Methodist minister, was born, of Roman Catholic parentage, in Berkeley County, Va., June 21, 1797. In the year 1818 he migrated to the  State of Ohio, and settled near Dayton. In 1821 he united it the Methodist Episcopal Church, and was soon after appointed a class-leader. The Church, recognizing his gifts and graces, speedily licensed him as an exhorter, and afterwards as a local preacher. In the fall of 1831 he was received on trial as a traveling preacher by the Ohio Conference. He quickly rose to a commanding position in the ministry, and was widely known as a sound theologian, an able preacher, and a skillful administrator of discipline. So great was his reputation as an executive officer, that more than half of his ministry of thirty-five years was spent in the office of presiding elder. He was twice an active and influential member of the General Conference, by which body he was appointed, in 1852, one of the commissioners of the Methodist Episcopal Church to manage the suit in the then pending trial for the property of the Western Book Concern. In 1860 he received the degree of D.D. from the Indiana State University. He died of cholera, while in attendance upon the session of the Cincinnati Conference, at Ripley, Ohio, Sept. 2, 1866. The late bishop Thomson thus spoke of Dr. Marlay shortly after his decease (Christian Advocate, N. Y., vol. 41, No. 43): “His strong frame of medium size, fine proportion, and high health, admirably fitted him for itinerant labors; his benignant countenance, amiable spirit, and gentle manners rendered him a welcome guest wherever he went. His fine head indicated great intellectual power; his habits of study seemed to render certain his constant improvement, while his clear call to the ministry insured his unwavering devotion to its duties.... In Biblical science, as well as in theoretical, practical, and experimental divinity, he was a master... He was a great man in private as well as in public life; and one of the strongest proofs of his high moral worth is the fact that, of a large family which he leaves behind him, every one is an ornament to society.... He expired in the arms of his brethren, and they buried him, feeling that they could lay in the tomb no man to whom the Methodist Church in Ohio has been more indebted.” See also Ladies' Repository, 1866, Jan.; Conf. Minutes, 1866, p. 262. (J. F. M.)

## Marlorat(Us), Augustine[[@Headword:Marlorat(Us), Augustine]]

             a French Protestant theologian, was born at Bar-le-Duc in 1506. At an early age he was put in an Augustine convent, and took the vows in 1524. He soon acquired great reputation as a preacher. Having been appointed prior of a convent of his order at Bourges, he commenced to entertain Protestant views, as is evinced in the sermons he delivered after 1533 at Bourges, Poitiers, and Angers. He was designated to preach during the  Lenten season at Rouen, when he openly separated from the Church. Pursued as a heretic, he sought refuge at Geneva, where he lived for a time by correcting proofs for the printers. He then went to Lausanne, to perfect his knowledge of theology. In 1549 he was appointed pastor at Crissier, and afterwards at Vevay. The consistory of Geneva sent him in 1559 to Paris, and in the beginning of the year following he was called to take charge of the Reformed Church at Rouen. His talents and his personal qualities now had a fair opportunity for display, and soon gained him great influence in that city, and brought many converts to the Church. In 1561 he went to the Colloquy of Poissy, where, next to Theodore de Beza, he stood at the head of the Protestants, and on the 15th of May he presided over the provincial synod assembled at Dieppe. The opposition of the government towards all expression of religious opinion adverse to Roman Catholicism, and more particularly the bloody deeds of Vassy on March 1, 1562, had greatly exasperated the Protestants, SEE HUGUENOTS; and the latter, feeling that there was only one alternative for them, either to fight for their conscience sake or abjure their honest convictions, took to arms all over France. The opening scene had been made at Paris. At Rouen the Protestants were in the majority (if we may follow Beza; according to Floquet [Rom. Cath.], however, they only constituted one fifth of the population), and, anxious to secure the city for the armies of Conde, made themselves masters of the place by stealth in the night of April 15 to 16. An independent government was established, and unbounded religious toleration exercised towards non-Protestants.

The masses, however, in the hour of excitement behaved madly. A spirit of iconoclasm took hold upon them, and within twenty-four hours they destroyed some of the most valuable works of art in fifty churches. For this and other outrages the Protestant leaders, of whom Marloratus was one, were not responsible either directly or indirectly. Yet, when the Roman Catholics succeeded in retaking the city, he was one of the first accused, and, though he had done no more than simply battle for the grant of religious freedom, he was arrested Oct. 26, 1562, brought before the bar of the Parliament, which had re-entered Rouen with the Roman Catholic forces, and condemned, as a traitor and heretic, to be drawn on a hurdle through the streets of the town, and then hung in front of his own church. After the execution, which took place Nov. 1, 1563, his head was severed from the trunk, and exposed on the bridge of the town. The Huguenots revenged this outrage by the execution of two leading Romanists in their hands. The widow and  five children of Marloratus fled to England, where they were for a long time maintained by the French Protestants.

As a writer Marloratus figures very prominently also. His exegetical works are numerous and valued, because of the accuracy and scholarship which they evince in the author. “They may be best described as painstaking and not injudicious selections of the interpretations of other writings” (Kitto). His earliest production is Remonstrances i la reyne mere par ceux qui sont persecutes pour la parole de Dieu (1561, 12mo; 2d ed. 1561, 8vo); but one of his most important productions is his Novi Testamenti catholica expositio, etc. (Geneva, 1561, fol.; 2d ed. 1605, fol.). This is a valuable work, containing Erasmus's Latin version of the N.T., with the expositions of the fathers of the Church, and of Bucer, Calvin, Erasmus, Muscululs, Melancthon, Sarcerius, Brentius, Bullinger, Zwginlius, Vitus Theodorus, etc. His object seems to have been to prove to Romanists the identity of the Protestant and the Apostolic Church, and the essential oneness of the two Protestant parties. He himself leaned towards Calvinism. Parts of it were translated into English, and published under the following titles: A Catholike and Ecclesiastical Exposition of the holy Gospell after S. Mathewe. Translated out of Latine into Englishe by Thomas Tymnze, in lynister (Lond. 1570, fol.); A Catholike and Ecclesiastical Exposition upon the Apocalyps of S. John the Apostle. Translated (black letter, Lond. 1574, 4to). Translations have also been published of his Exposition of St. Mark (1583, 4to); St. John (1574, 4to); St. Jude (1584, 4to), etc. He also wrote Genesis, cum cattholica Expositione, etc. (Geneva, 1562, fol., often reprinted); In CL Psalmos et aliorum S. S. Prophetarum — Expositio ecclesiastica, etc., Item Cantica sacra ex divinis Bibliorumn locis cum simili expositione (Geneva, 1562, fol., often reprinted; and in English under the title Prayers in the Psalms, Lond. 1571, 16mo); etc. See Haag, La France Protestante; Chevrier, Menm. pour servir a l'histoire des honmmes illustres de la Lorraine; Notice sur Aug. Marlorat, in the Bulletin de la Societ de l'Hist. du Protestantisme ‘Frangais, une annue, p. 109; Augustin Marlorat, sa vie et sa mort (Caen, 1862, 8vo); Floquet's Beza, Histoire Ecclesiastique, passim, and especially 2:610 sq.; Schott, in Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 20:92-96; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 33:858; Darling, Cyclopaedia Bibliographica, 2:1965; Middleton, Ev. Biog. 2:82. (J. H.W.)

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

             a Church of England divine, was born near London, in November 1758. He was educated at Merchant Taylor's School, from which he was elected to a scholarship at St. John's College in the eighteenth year of his age. He was admitted actual fellow in 1779; took the degree of B.A. April 5, 1780; that of M.A. February 11, 1784; and became B.D. in April, 1789, being the vicar of St. Giles's, in the suburbs of Oxford, and tutor of the college. In March 1795, he was unanimously elected president of St. John's, and presented by the society to the rectory at Handborough, near Woodstock. He took the degree of D.D. on March 24 of the same year; served the office of vice-chancellor of the university during four years, viz. from Michaelmas term, 1798, to the same term, 1802; and was preferred to the prebendal stall of Canterbury in 1808. He was nominated one of the select preachers of the university in 1805, and again in 1817; was likewise a delegate of accounts, one of the commissioners of sewers, and curator of the Sheldonian Theatre. He died February 16, 1828. See (Lond.) Annual Register, 1828, page 222.

## Marmontel, Jean Francois[[@Headword:Marmontel, Jean Francois]]

             a celebrated French critic, and a leader in the Φρενχη school of infidelity which flourished under the guidance of Diderot, Holbach, and Voltaire, was born at Bort, in Limousin, in 1723, of humble parentage. He was educated at the Jesuits' college at Mauriac, but, not inclining towards asceticism, went to Paris finally (1746), and there became intimate with the great freethinkers of the 18th century. Marmontel wielded an able pen, and largely devoted himself to authorship, producing both original works and translations of valuable English writers. By intercession of Madame Pompadour, he secured a secretaryship at Versailles in 1753. Later he became editor of the Mercure, for which he wrote, in part, his celebrated Contes Moraux, afterwards published in book form (Paris, 1761, 2 vols.). These Moral Tales were received with extraordinary favor, and were translated into most of the languages of Europe. Though written with great elegance and animation, their morality is rather questionable, and, appearing at a time when literature was unusually weighed down by freethinkers and atheists, the French clergy declaimed against the Contes Moraux. The opposition of the clergy became more decided against Marmontel in 1767, when he published his Belisaire, a political romance. A chapter of it treats on toleration. This part of the work was specially objected to by the doctors of the Sorbonne “as heretical and blasphemous,” and quickly the cry resounded through the pulpits of the capital, and thence into those of the inland towns, until the excitement became general. Belisaire was condemned by the archbishop of Paris. Voltaire could hardly say enough in its praise, and the empress Catharine II honored it by a special order for its immediate translation into Russian. Marmontel himself came off victor in this contest with the Sorbonne and the clergy, and gained the honorable appointment of historiographer of France. To the Encyclopedie (s.v.) he contributed “Elements de Litterature” (1787, 6 vols. 8vo); he had charge, moreover, of its departments of poetry and general literature. During the Revolution he retired to the country, and died at the village of Abloville, near Evreux, December 31, 1799. An edition of his (Euvres Completes was published by himself in 17 vols.; another in 18 vols. (Paris, 1818); a third in 7 vols. (Paris, 1819-20). See Saint-Surin, Notice sur Marmontel (1824); Sainte-Beuve, Causeries du Lundi, vol. iv; Morellet, Eloge de Marmontel (1805); Villenave, Notice sur les Ouvrages de Marmontel (1820); Edinb. Rev. 1806 (Jan.); Schlosser, Gesch. d. 18'en  u. 19en Jahrhunderts, 2:2, § 1; Thomas, Diet. of Biog. and Mythol. s.v.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v. (J. H. W.)

## Marmoth[[@Headword:Marmoth]]

             (Μαρμωθί), a less correct form (1Es 8:62) of the Heb. name MEREMOTH (1 Ezr 8:33).

## Marne, Jean-Baptiste De[[@Headword:Marne, Jean-Baptiste De]]

             a Flemish ecclesiastic and historian, was born at Douai in 1699. He entered the Society of Jesus in 1619; was appointed minister to Namur, after having taught belles-lettres and theology in many cities, and filling different missions. Afterwards he was called to Liege, and became confessor to John-Theodore of Bavaria, and synodal examiner of the diocese. Ten years later he retired to Liege. He died Oct. 9, 1756. Marne wrote Martyr du secret de la confession, ou la Vie de Saint Jean Nepourneine (Paris, 1741,12mo; Avignon, 1820, 18mo). See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 33:907.

## Marnix, Philippe Van, De Ste. Aldegonde[[@Headword:Marnix, Philippe Van, De Ste. Aldegonde]]

             occupies a distinguished place in the history of the Netherlands during the Reformation period. He was born at Brussels in 1538, of parents thoroughly identified with the interests of their country, and was carefully educated at home, and later at Geneva under Calvin and Beza. After returning to his home in 1560, he spent six years in retirement, but became known, notwithstanding his seclusion, as a careful observer of events, and respected as a patriot and a man of honor. His devotion to the cause of the Reformation, whose influence he steadily endeavored to extend, could not remain concealed; nor could his learning, his keen understanding, and his power as a writer escape recognition. He was soon in intimate relations with the leaders of the nation, and the rapid progress of events forced him into prominence. He is universally held to be the author of the so-called compromise (about 1565-66) by which the nobles and others pledged themselves to resist, by all lawful means, the introduction of the Inquisition. The league soon attained such proportions that it dared to present (April 5, 1566) a petition to the regent for the suppression of the institution. Soon after, when Protestant field-preaching was introduced, he placed himself at the head of the movement, and insisted that the Protestants should be permitted to worship in Antwerp itself.

On the 19th  of August an iconoclastic mob destroyed the many works of art that adorned the churches, etc., of Antwerp, and the regent, in alarm, permitted Protestant worship in specified places; and under this sanction the first synod of the Walloon churches assembled in Antwerp Oct. 26, 1566. Marnix presided, and by his influence contributed to the adoption of the reformed confession, by which event the Calvinists acquired a pre- eminence that still continues. The government now adopted more energetic measures to restrain the Protestants, by placing garrisons in important towns, and even besieging such as refused to admit them. This was the case at Valenciennes; and Marnix, while seeking to aid the beleaguered city, was defeated, his brother killed, himself banished, and his property confiscated. During his exile he was influential in converting William of Orange and Nassau to the Protestant faith, and formed a connection with him that was only dissolved by death. In the mean time, however, Marnix had entered the service of the Palatine Frederick III, and fixed his residence at Heidelberg, where he was largely engaged in theological investigations; but, with the consent of the elector, he was often employed in the affairs of his own country, under the direction of the prince of Orange, being present at the defeat of Louis of Nassau at Jemmingen in July, 1568, etc. He attended the synod of the exiled clergy at Wesel in November, 1568, and his influence is seen in the constitution of the Church then adopted. A second important synod was held at Emden, Oct. 4 to 14, 1571, at which Marnix was also present, and which selected him to write a history of recent events in the Netherlands; but the needs of his country prevented the execution of this task. In July, 1572, he was sent by the prince of Orange to confer with the delegates of Holland, who were assembled at Dort, and succeeded in inducing them to pledge their readiness to make every sacrifice to throw off the Spanish yoke. Thenceforward his activity was incessant. He was taken prisoner by the Spaniards in November, 1573, but his life was spared, as the prince of Orange had threatened to retaliate. and Requesens, successor to the duke of Alba, employed him in an attempt to negotiate a peace, which was defeated by the sagacity of Orange. A similar office, undertaken after his exchange on the order of the prince of Orange, likewise failed, as did his mission to induce queen Elizabeth of England to accept the sovereignty of the Netherlands.

He assisted in the negotiations that resulted in the “Pacification of Ghent” in November, 1576, and in the formation of the second union between the provinces at Brussels in December, 1577. In May, 1578, he represented the Netherlands at the Diet of Worms, and prevailed on the German states to remain neutral in the  contest with Spain. In the mean time religious intolerance had led to grioss outrages among his countrymen, and the bitter feeling between the parties threatened ruin to the union that had been secured with so much effort. An attempt to reconcile these differences, in which he was engaged on his return, failed, and several of the Roman Catholic provinces withdrew, and placed themselves and their religion under Spanish protection. An alliance with France was now thought of, and Marnix exerted his influence successfully to induce the states-general to offer the crown to Francis, duke of Anjou-Alenon. This prince reached Antwerp on Feb. 19, 1572; but an attempt to seize Antwerp and other important towns led to his expulsion from the land before he had reigned a year, and both Orange and Marnix were suspected of connivance with the French. In consequence, Marnix retired from public life; but the progress of the Spaniards, under the duke of Parma, induced William of Orange to recall him, and he was appointed to the office of first burgomaster of Antwerp, in order that he might direct its defense. He entered on its duties Nov. 15, 1583, and a few days later the siege began. It was continued until Aug. 17, 1585, when the city honorably capitulated.

With this event his political career was ended, and he retired to his estates, devoting himself' mainly to theological studies. In 1596, having been appointed by the states-general to translate the Bible into Dutch, he removed to Leyden, in order to avail himself of its library, and of the assistance of his friends Scaliger, Lipsius, Jeunius, and others. He only lived, however, to complete the book of Genesis. He died Dec. 15, 1598. “He was.” says Motley, “a man of most rare and versatile genius- scholar, theologian, diplomatist, swordsman, orator, pamphleteer; he had genius for all things, and was eminent in all.” The theological works of Van Marnix were chiefly of a polemical character. The principal one, The Bee- hive, is a satire after the manner of Von Huttsen, and written in the style of Rabelais. It was probably intended to promote a reconciliation between the Romish an thee Protestant provinces of his country. Another able contribution is his Tableau des differences de la religion (1669, and often). A complete edition of his works, in 8 vols., was published at Brussels, 1857-60, under the title (Euvres de Philippians de Marnix de Ste. Aldegonde; vol. iv contains a brief memoir, and a notice bibliographique. His life has been frequently written; among others, Th. Juste has treated it in connection with his studies of the Netherlands (1858). Motley's Rise of the Dutch Republic, and Hist. of the United Netherlands, vol. 1, chap. 3, are valuable aids to the study of this career. See also Prins, Leven van P. v. Marznix (1782); Dresselhuis, F. v. Marnix  (1832); Broes, F. v. Marnix (1838-40, 2 vols. 8vo); Herzog, Real- Encyklop. 20:96 sq.; Edgar Quinet, in the Revue des deux Mondes, 1854.

## Marokki, Samuel[[@Headword:Marokki, Samuel]]

             SEE MOROCCO, SAMUEL.

## Maron, Johannes[[@Headword:Maron, Johannes]]

             a noted Eastern patriarch, supposed to be the founder of the Maaronites, was born at Sirum, near Antioch, in Syria, about the middle of the 7th century; studied at Constantinople, and became monk and priest in the convent of St. Maron. Elevated to the bishopric of Botoys in 676, according to some, by the papal legate, he brought, if we may follow Romish authority, all the Christians of Lebanon within the communion of the Church of Rome; was then made patriarch of Antioch, and confirmed by pope Honorius; and died in 707. See however, MARONITES. (below)

## Maronites[[@Headword:Maronites]]

             a community or sect of Christians, numbering some 150,000, in Syria, particularly in the northern part of Mount Lebanon, and said to be of very ancient origin.

I. History. — Considerable controversy has arisen as to the real origin of this most peculiar Christian people; the most probable account represents them as descendants of a remnant of the honothelites (q.v.), who, fleeing from the repressive measures of the emperor Anastasius II, in the early part of the 8th century, settled on the slopes of the Lebanon, and gradually yielded their distinctive Monothelite views. According to Mosheim (Eccles. Hist. 1:457; 3:127), many Monothelites, after the Council of Constantinople, found a refuge among the Mardaites, signifying in Syriac rebels, a people who took possession of Lebanon A.D. 676, and made it the asvlum of vagabonds, slaves, and all sorts of rabble; and about the conclusion of the 7th century these Monothelites of Lebanon were called Maronites, after Maro, their first bishop. None, he says, of the ancient writers give any certain account of the first person who converted these mountaineers to Monothelitism; it is probable, however, from several circumstances, that it was John Maro, whose name they have adopted; and that this ecclesiastic received the name of Maro from his having lived, in the character of a monk, in the famous convent of St. Maro, upon the borders of the Orontes, before his settlement among the Mardaites of Mount Libanus.

Gieseler (Eccles. Hist. 2:419), however, takes exception  to this identification of the Maronites with the Mardaites, and, by authority derived from the writings of Anquetil Duperron (Recherches sur les migrations des Mardes, in the Mellr. de l'Acad. des Inscript. 1:1), holds that “the Mardaites or Mards, a warlike nation of Armenia, were placed as a garrison on Mount Libanus by Constantine Pogonatus, A.D. 676 (Theophanes, p. 295), and were withdrawn as early as 685 by Justinian II (Theophanes, p. 302). Madden (Turkish Empire, 2:154), upon the authority of the learned Benedictine St. Maur (Histoire Maonastique de l'Orient, p. 348), holds that the Maronites were founded by St. Maro, a patriarch of Syrian Christians in the 5th century, and that they existed under that name in the 7th century, when the Saracens ravaged the country, and were afterwards persecuted as Mardaites (comp. here Churchill, Mount Lebanon, 3:58). There is certainly much in favor of this argument, not the least of which is the fact that, “at the commencement of the 7th century, the entire range of mountains from Antioch to Jerusalem was in the hands of the Syrian Christians, who formed a political power under chiefs or emirs, exercising a hereditary government” (Churchill). But, however great may be the darkness surrounding their earliest history, one thing is certain, from the testimony of William of Tyre and other unexceptionable witnesses, as also from the most authentic records, namely, that the Maronites retained the opinions of the Monothelites until the 12th century, when, abandoning and renouncing the doctrine of one will in Christ, they were readmitted into the communion of the Roman Church. Jacques de Vitry, bishop of Acre in the 12th century, thus speaks of the Maronites in his Historia Hierosolymitanza, drawn up at the request of pope Honorius III: “Men armed with bows and arrows, and skillful in battle, inhabit the mountains in considerable numbers, in the province of Phoenicia, not far from the. town of Biblos. They are called Maronites, from the name of a certain man, their master, Maron, a heretic, who affirmed that there was in Jesus but one will or operation. The Christians of the Lebanon, dupes of this diabolical error of Maron remained separate from the Church nearly five hundred years. At last, their hearts being turned, they made profession of the Catholic faith in presence of the venerable father Amaury, patriarch of Antioch, and adopted the traditions of the Roman Church.” The most learned of the modern Maronites have left no method unemployed to defend their Church against this accusation; they have labored to prove, by a variety of testimonies, that their ancestors always persevered in the Catholic faith, and in their attachment to the Roman pontiff, without ever adopting the doctrine of the Monophysites or  Monothelites (compare Churchill, Mount Lebanon, 3:51). But all their efforts are insufficient to prove the truth of these assertions, and the testimonies they allege appear absolutely fictitious and destitute of authority.

There can be no doubt that the Maronites were brought back to the communion of Rome by the influence of the Crusaders. Even in our day the Maronites, “warranted, indeed, both by historical and traditional records, allude in terms of pride and satisfaction to the service done by their ancestors to the armies of the Crusaders, and estimate in round numbers 50,000 of their population as having fallen under the standards of the Cross” (Churchill). During the early part of the 12th century the communications between the Maronite patriarch and the papal see were of frequent recurrence, and thus the way was easily paved for reunion. But though the Maronites joined the communion of Rome in this very age, it required three centuries more before the sturdy mountaineers could be brought to acknowledge Rome's supremacy in matters of ecclesiastical discipline, and we are afforded a picture of a Christian Church existing for three centuries, “popish in all its forms and doctrines, saving the cardinal point of submission to the pope.”

They had entered the Romish communion on the establishment of the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem in the 12th century, but they did not enter into a formal act of union with Rome until the Council of Florence in 1445, and only formally subscribed to the decrees of the Council of Trent in 1736. Mosheim observes that the subjection of the Maronites to the spiritual jurisdiction of the Roman pontiff was agreed to with this express condition, that neither the popes nor their emissaries should pretend to change or abolish anything that related to the ancient rites, moral precepts, or religious opinions of this people; so that, in reality, there is nothing to be found among the Maronites that savors of popery, if we except their attachment to the Roman pontiff. It is also certain that there are Maronites in Syria who still hold the Church of Rome in the greatest aversion and abhorrence (Schaff, Church Hist. 3:783); nay, what is still more remarkable, great numbers of that nation residing in Italy, even under the eye of the pontiff, opposed his authority during the 17th century, and threw the court of Rome into great perplexity. One body of these non-conforming Maronites retired into the valleys of Piedmont, where they joined the Waldenses; another, above six hundred in number, with a bishop and several ecclesiastics at their head, flew into Corsica, and implored the protection of the republic of Genoa  against the violence of the inquisitors.

Their union with Rome gave the Maronites the protection of European powers, especially that of the devoted Frank; but when the Franks were expelled from Syria, in 1300, by Malek Ashraf, the Maronites were compelled to defend their independence against the Mameluke sovereigns, and the greater part of them became mixed up with the Druses, still keeping up, however, their connection with Rome. In the 17th century they placed themselves under the direct protection of France, Louis XIV and Louis XV granting them “Letters of Protection;” and for some time the French consul at Beirut exercised almost regal sway over them, the Maronites regarding themselves as “the French of the East.” In the early part of the 18th century the Druses called the Mohammedan family of the Shehabs to govern Lebanon, and in 1713 the Turks made the first attempt to bring the inhabitants under the direct rule of a pacha. They resisted successfully, defeating the Turks in the battle of Aindara; but in 1756 several emirs became Maronites, and, incited by the Maronits clergy, showed great favor to their new brethren, thereby displeasing the Druses, and provoking a feeling of ill-will between the Druses and the Maronites, which has not yet subsided. The pachas of Acre, since Jezzar, carefully promoted this misunderstandinug, for they felt that the tribes of Lebanon, fully united under an enterprising chief, would become dangerous to the Porte. Yet there was no feeling of religious animosity between the two nations at this early date, and, whenever political troubles broke out, Druse and Maronite sided indiscriminately with both parties. Emir Beshir Shehab (1789-1840), although in secret a Maronite, was always surrounded by the most important among the Druses, and, whenever he needed help, asked it of them rather than of the Maronites. Thus the Druses and the Christians were living peaceably side by side until 1831, when Syria passed under the rule of Mohammed Ali, and he commissioned his son, Ibrahim Pacha, to govern the province.

Carrying out his father's enlightened views, Ibrahim Pacha applied himself to the improvement of the condition of his Christian subjects, and, in spite of the opposition of the Mohammedans, they were raised to civil and military offices. The Syrians, however, accustomed to the indolent Turkish rule, revolted against this energetic and active Egyptian management, and it was some time before the insurrection was quelled, the Druses being the last to submit. They had asked the Maronites to join them, and the latter, who had held back when there was some chance of success, now rose under the most frivolous pretenses. In the mean time, in 1840, the allied fleet of England, Austria, and Turkey were employed to secure the  restoration of Syria to Turkey. Turkish agents were busy among the Maronites, fanning the flame of rebellion; most of these wretches were Englishmen. Finally, France not upholding Egypt, Syria was returned to Turkish rule. The position of the Christians now became worse than ever, and their merchants were obliged to invoke the protection of the European consuls against the spoliation of the Turks. Lord Stratford of Redcliffe interfered in their behalf at Constantinople, and quiet was for a while restored. The Turkish government wished to appoint a Turkish governor over Lebanon, but the English finally succeeded in obtaining the appointment of emir Beshir Kassim Shehab, a Christian. The Druses, however, took exception to this arrangement, and when subsequently the Maronite patriarch attempted to confiscate all civil authority for the benefit of the Maronites, they became exasperated. Colonel Rose, the English consul-general, wrote on that occasion, “The Maronite clergy show a determination to uphold their supremacy in the mountains at the risk of a civil war.” And a civil war was the result of this obstinacy. The patriarch (for his functions among the Maronites, see below, under III. Religious Status. — 1. Clergy) at the same time, by his mismanagement, excited the jealousies of the Turks, and displeased the English, whom the Druses hailed as their friends.

On Sept. 14,1841, a first affray took place between the Druses and the Christians at Deir el-Kamar; it was repressed by the efforts of colonel Rose. The Druses rose again, however, on Oct. 13, 14, and 15, and the entire destruction of the town was only prevented by the arrival from Beiruit of colonel Rose and Ayieb Pacha on the 16th. But the war had commenced, and the Druses, assisted by the Turks, who willfully and purposely promoted the hateful strife, soon got the better of the Christians, and, had it not been for the interference of the English consul, Turkish fanaticism would have extinguished every Christian life on and near Mount Lebanon.

Quiet was restored, however, only for a season. See DRUSES. On Aug. 30, 1859, an affray took place at Bate-mirri, three hours from Beirut, originating in a quarrel between a Druse and a Christian boy, in which the Druses were defeated; but the next day, Sunday, they renewed the fight in greater numbers, and were victorious. The Druses now commenced burning the Maronite villages; the Turks fearing the power of European governments, Kurchid Pach put an end to the disturbance, yet without punishing the offenders. The Maronites, perceiving or believing that a secret understanding existed between the Druses and the Turks,  promptly commenced arming. In April, 1860, Kurchid Pacha received despatches from Constantinople; soon afterwards Seid Bev Jumblatt assembled a Druse divan at Muchtara, and great agitation commenced to pervade the Druse districts; Christians were murdered either singly or in small parties, and a great number of them, leaving their villages, fled to the stronger places of Zachle and Deir el-Kamar. On May 4 some Druses broke into the convent of Amik, near Deir el-Kamar, and murdered the superior in his bed. The Maronites still sought to obtain peace, but found that they would be compelled to meet force with force. Three thousand men from Zachle attacked the Druse village of Aindara, but were beaten by a much smaller force, their arrangements, and especially their discipline, being much inferior to that of the Druses. Kurchid Pacha had a Turkish camp in the immediate vicinity of Beiriut, and commanding the plain, but he did not interfere now as he had done on the former occasion. On the contrary, after encouraging the Maronites by promising them his protection against the Druses, he gave the signal of their massacre on May 30.

One hundred Turkish soldiers and the irregular Turkish cavalry joined the Druses in cutting down the Maronites. The Druses would have pushed on to Beirat had they not been prevented by the Turks. The European consuls now attempted to interfere; they were met with fine protestations by the Turkish authorities, and nothing was done to repress the outrages. At the end of May the Druses blockaded Deir el-Kamar, and on June 1 it was attacked by 4000 of them. The city surrendered the next day. The pacha, after entering the city, upbraided the Maronites as traitors, rebels, etc., because they had thought it wise to defend themselves against the Druses. At the same time 2000 Druses, commanded by Seleb Bev Jumblatt, took Jezin, and murdered the inhabitants. Roman Catholic convents shared the same fate as those of the Maronites, being sacked, plundered, and burned: in that of Meshmfisy alone thirty monks had their throats cut; the plunder was enormous. Ali Said Bey's district was given up to fire and the sword. Sidon was only saved by the timely arrival of captain Maunsell, with his English ship the Firefly, on June 3. In the Anti-Lebanon, Said Bev's sister followed her brother's example and instructions, causing the Christians of Hasbeya and Rasheva to be inveigled into the serail of the former place, under promise of their being taken safely to Damascus; they were there murdered in cold blood by the Druses, without distinction of age or sex, on June 10. The Turkish soldiers crowded into the serail to enjoy the sight, and some of them even took part in the butchery. On June 14 Zachle was invested and taken and on the 19th Deir el-Kamar met with the same fate.

The entire male population was ruthlessly massacred, and the city given a prey to the flames. The surviving widows and children fled to the coasts. On June 22 a disturbance broke out at Beirut, in which even the Europeans were assailed, but it was repressed with the aid of general Kmety (Ismail Pacha). The purely Maronite districts of Lebanon now became greatly alarmed, the more as Turkish soldiers were quartered there under the pretense of protecting them. The European consuls advised together, and drew up a remonstrance to the Druse chiefs, which a Mr. Grahamr was sent to deliver to them. Said Bey Jumblatt, however, when appealed to, declared only his respect for England and his willingness to see this struggle end, but added that he had no power over it, and that the Druses would not obey him. Most of the Druse sheiks contrived to avoid Mr. Graham, and those he did meet gave him but evasive answers. Finally, on July 10, the Mohammedans of Damascus rose against the Christians, of whom there were some 25,000 in the city.

The Christian quarter was soon a heap of smoldering ruins, beneath which numberless corpses were buried. Women, married and unmarried, were wandering through the streets, and were seen to cry for assistance, with heads uncovered and feet naked, appealing to the murderers for mercy. Many were sold as slaves for a few piastres, or taken away to the desert. The streets were crowded with fanatics, who shouted continually, “Death to the Christians! Let us slaughter the Christians! Let not one remain!” Every church and convent was plundered and afterwards burned. The silver plate, jewelry, and gold coin taken from these sanctuaries “were not allowed to be plundered by the rabble, but were removed by soldiers.” These are the words of the British consul, Mr. Brant. The consulates of France, Russia, Austria, Belgium, Holland, and the United States were all burned. Those of England and Prussia escaped, as they were not situated in the Christian quarter, and they became an asylum for as many as were able to reach them. Others were saved in great numbers in the house of Abd-el-Kader, and in the citadel; but the governor, Ahmed Pacha, was an unmoved witness of the devastation, or an accomplice in the lawless deeds of the plundering rabble (Lond. Rev. 1860, Oct., p. 160). As has already been stated in the article DRUSES SEE DRUSES (q.v.), the French and English governments were obliged to come to the rescue of the Syrian Christians, and the Porte was forced to inflict punishment upon those whom the Turkish officers had made pliant tools for the destruction of the Maronites. On Aug. 3 a conference of the great powers — Britain, Austria, France, Prussia, Russia, and Turkey as well-met, but the meeting was closed without accomplishing  any real good. All that was secured was the promise that the Sublime Porte had endeavored and would continue to do its duty; but what this duty consisted in, it has been hard to determine to this day. Only a few weeks previously the Christian emirs had been compelled by the Turkish pacha to testify that the conduct of the Turks was irreproachable, when the emirs felt constrained afterwards to acknowledge their extorted perjury. In October, finally, the international conference of the plenipotentiarics of European powers convened at Beirut, and crowned their labors successfully, June 9, 1861, by a special treaty concerning the administration of the Lebanon. SEE DRUSES.

II. Social Position. — The nation may be considered as divided into two classes, the common people and the sheiks, by whom must be understood the most eminent of the inhabitants, who, from the antiquity of their families and the opulence of their fortunes, are superior to the ordinary class. They all live dispersed in the mountains, in villages, hamlets, and even detached houses, which is never the case in the plains. The whole nation consists of cultivators. Every man improves the little domain he possesses, or farms, with his own hands. Even the sheiks live in the same manner, and are only distinguished from the rest by a bad pelisse, a horse, and a few slight advantages in food and lodging; they all live frugally, without many enjoyments, but also with few wants, as they are little acquainted with the inventions of luxury. In general, the nation is poor, but no one wants necessaries; and if beggars are sometimes seen, they come rather from the sea-coast than the country itself. Property is as sacred among them as in Europe; nor do we hear of robberies and extortions so frequently committed by the Turks. Travelers may journey there, either by night or by day, with a security unknown in any other part of the empire, and the stranger is received with hospitality, as among the Arabs: it must be owned, however, that the Maronites are less generous, and rather inclined to the vice of parsimony. Conformably to the doctrines of Christianity, they have only one wife, whom they frequently espouse without having seen, and always without having been much in her company. Contrary to the precepts of that same religion, however, they have admitted, or retained, the Arab custom of retaliation, and the nearest relation of a murdered person is bound to avenge him. From a habit founded on distrust, and the political state of the country, every one, whether sheik or peasant, walks continually armed with a musket and poniards. This is, perhaps, an inconvenience; but this advantage results  from it, that they have no novices in the use of arms among them when it is necessary to employ them against the Turks. As the country maintains no regular troops, every man is obliged to join the army in time of war; and if this militia were well conducted, it would be superior to many European armies. From accounts taken in late years, the number of men fit to bear arms amounts to 35,000.

III. Religious Status. — Although the Maronites are united with Rome, and though they are perhaps the most ultramontane people in the world, they nevertheless retain their distinctive national rites and usages.

1. Clergy. — The most peculiar of all their institutions is undoubtedly the clerical. As we have seen above, it is supposed that the folunder of the Maronites constituted himself a patriarch, and this position remains the highest dignity among them. It is true they admit the supremacy of Rome, but for the home government of the Church the patriarch is the highest authority. and in his election, as well as in the selection of all the clergy, the Maronite exercises his own private judgment, independent of the papal power at Rome. Here it may not be improper to state that the patriarch is at present expected to furnish every tenth year a report of the state of his patriarchate. Associated with the patriarch in the ecclesiastical government of the Maronites are twelve bishops, but of the latter four are titular, or inpartibus. The patriarch himself is chosen by the bishops in secret conclave, and by ballot. “‘The debates usually last for many days, and even weeks; at last, when the choice is made, the bishops present kneel down and kiss the new patriarch's hands; the patriarch immediately writes letters to all the chief nobles of the mountain informing them of his nomination. The latter lose no time in assembling to pay him their respects and make their obeisance. A pelisse of honor shortly afterwards arrives for the patriarch from the governor of Lebanon. Fires, and rejoicing, and illumination extend throughout the whole range of the Maronite districts; a petition is now drawn up to be sent to the pope, praying him to confirm the choice which has just been made, and signed by the principal chiefs. It is open, however, to the clergy, or any party, to protest against the nomination. . . The pope, however, never fails at once to confirm a selection which has the support of the feudal aristocracy and principal clergy of Lebanon” (Churchill 3:78).

In true puerile affectation and presumptuous inference, the patriarch of the Maronites, who is styled the Patriarch of Antioch, usually takes the name of Peter, intended to denote an official descent from the apostle Peter. “His power,” says Churchill, “is  despotic, and from his decision there is no appeal, either in temporal or spiritual affairs; even the pope's legate, who resides constantly in Lebanon, and is supposed to superintend all the ecclesiastical proceedings of the Maronite Church, has no influence over the patriarch beyond what may be obtained by personal superiority of character.... The income of the patriarch may amount to about £5000 a year, derived principally from lands set apart exclusively for the office. He obtains likewise a sixth of the revenue of the bishops.” “The patriarch of the Maronites,” says Madden (Turkish Empire, 2:160), “formerly exercised very extensive power not only of a religious, but of a civil kind, for the protection of his people, who in those times possessed many important immunities and franchises, which, since 1842, have been either abrogated or assimilated to the privileges enjoyed by the Roman Catholic subjects of the Porte. But the Maronites still, in all great emergencies and dangers at the hands of their old and constant enemies the Druses, are wont to look for counsel and guidance to their patriarch rather than to the emir, their nominal civil protector.

The patriarch, in the winter, resides ordinarily at Kesruan, and in the summer at the monastery of Canobin, in the valley of Tripoli, supposed to be, on very insufficient grounds, where the venerated Maron had fixed his abode.” The eight regular bishoprics of the Maronite Church are Aleppo, Tripoli, Jebail, Baalbek, Damascus, Cyprus, Beirut, Tyre, and Sidon. Thle incumbents of this, the second office, are, like the patriarch, possessed of stated revenues, that enable them to live in comparative affluence. Their election takes place as follows: “When a bishop dies, the patriarch writes to the principal people of the village under the jurisdiction of the deceased prelate, requesting them to assemble together and nominate a priest to the vacant see; should there be a unanimity of voices, the patriarch confirms their selection; if; on the contrary, they cannot agree, he desires them to send him the names of three priests, and from this list he selects one for the bishopric.” The inferior clergy of the Maronites, who have no fixed sources of income, subsist on the produce of their masses, the bounty of their congregations, and, above all, on the labor of their hands, i.e. they exercise trades, or cultivate small plots of ground, and are thus industriously employed for the maintenance of their families: it is one of the peculiar characteristics of the Eastern clergy that they are not strangers to the married state. The Maronite priests marry as in the first ages of the Church, but their wives must be maidens, and not widows; nor can they marry a second time.  The poverty to which the Maronite clergy is doomed is, however, recompensed to them by the great respect the people award them. “Their vanity is incessantly flattered; whoever approaches them, whether rich or poor, great or small, is anxious to kiss their hands, which they fail not to present.... It is perhaps to the potent influence of the clergy that we must attribute the mild and simple manners generally prevailing among the Maronites, for violent crimes are extremely rare among them. Retribution immediately follows every offense, however slight, and the clergy are rigorous in preventing every appearance of disorder or scandal among the members of their flocks. Before a young man can marry he must obtain the consent of his pastor and of his bishop. If they disapprove of the marriage they prohibit it, and the Maronite has no remedy. If an unmarried girl become a mother, her seducer is compelled to marry her, whatever be the inequality of their conditions; if he refuses he is reduced to obedience by measures of severity, fasting, imprisonment, and even bastinadoing. This influence of the clergy extends to every detail of civil and domestic life. The Maronite who should appeal from the decision of the clergy to the civil authority of the emirs would not be listened to by them, and the act would be regarded by the appellant's bishop as a transgression to be visited with condign punishment” (Kelly). The number of Maronite priests is said to be 1200, and the number of their churches 400.

2. Monastics. — Of the more than 200 convents scattered through Lebanon, nearly one half belong to the Maronites, and contain from 20,000 to 25,000 inmates, who all wear a distinctive costume, and follow the rule of St. Anthony. They are divided into three different congregations those of St. Isaiah, those of the Alipines, and those of the Libanese or Baladites; besides which there are also a number of nunneries. Their dress, like that of all Greek monastics, consists of a black frockcoat, reaching to the knees, confined round the waist by a leathern girdle, and surmounted by a hood, which call be drawn over the head. This attire is called a “cacooly.” The temporal affairs of the convents are directed by a superior monk, called Reis el-Aam, a sort of accountant-general, who regulates all the disbursements of his fraternity. “Lest the monks should form any particular local attachments, they are removed from convent to convent every six months, in a kind of rotation. They are, in general, exceedingly ignorant, but skillful in such trades as are necessary for their own wants and necessities.” “The monks, by the rules of their order, are not allowed to smoke or eat meat. The latter, however, is permitted in case of sickness, by  the order of the physician and the consent of the superior. In making long journeys the bishop may give the same permission, provided they shall not indulge in it on the days in which its use is forbidden by the canons of the Church. Much stress is laid on the nunneries being built at a distance from the convents; and no nun or woman is allowed to enter a convent, nor a monk to enter a nunnery, except on occasions of great necessity, and with strict limitation. The monks are employed in their prayers, and in various occupations of industry; the lay-brothers tilling the lands of the convents, making shoes, weaving, begging, etc.; and the priests applying themselves to study, copying books, and other matters befitting the dignity of their office. The nuns are taught to read and sew. Both the monks and nuns vow the three conditions of a monastic life — namely, chastity, poverty, and obedience; and, taken as a whole, both are extremely ignorant and bigoted.”

IV. Peculiar Religious Usages. — Like the Bohemians and the (Greek Christians, the Maronites administer the sacraments in both kinds, dipping the bread in wine before its distribution. “The host is a small round loaf, unleavened, of the thickness of a finger, and about the size of a crown- piece. On the top is the impression of a seal, which is eaten by the priest, who cuts the remainder into small pieces, and putting it into the wine in the cup, administers to each person with a spoon, which serves the whole congregation” (Kelly, Syria and the Holy Land, as compiled from Burckhardt. etc., p. 92). They also keep up public nightly prayers, which are attended by women as well as by men; have a peculiar commemoration of the dead in the three weeks preceding Lent, and their whole office during Lent is of immense length and peculiar to themselves. Indeed their ritual and liturgy differ in many respects from those of the Latin Church. The mass is recited in the Syriac language, with the exception of the Epistle and Gospel, and some prayers, which are recited in Arabic, the only language understood by the people, the Syriac being simply used in the services of the Church and the offices of the priests.

V. Educational Status. — The Maronite clergy had formearly lands at Rome, the revenues of which were appropriated to keeping up a seminary for the education of young Christians from the Lebanon; and from this high school came forth some illustrious Romanists, e.g. Gabriel Sionita, Abr. Echellensis, the Assemani, etc. The resources of this appropriation were confiscated by the French during the first revolutionary war. Since then the  court of Rome has granted them a hospitium at Rome, to which they may send several of their youth to receive a gratuitous education. It would seem that this institution might introduce among them the ideas and arts of Europe; but the pupils of this school, limited to an education purely monastic, bring home nothing but the Italian language, which is of no use, and a stock of theological learning from which as little advantage can be derived; they accordingly soon assimilate with the rest. Nor has a greater change been operated by the three or four missionaries maintained by the French Capuchins at Gazir, Tripoli, and Beirat. Their labors consist in preaching in their church, in instructing children in the Catechism, Thomas a Kempis, and the Psalms, and in teaching them to read and write. Formerly the Jesuits had two missionaries at their house at Antura, but the Lazarites have now succeeded them in their mission. The most valuable advantage that has resulted from these labors is that the art of writing has become more common among the Maronites, and rendered them, in that country, what the Copts are in Egypt, that is, they are in possession of all the posts of writers, intendants, and kaiygas among the Turks, and especially of those among their neighbors, the Druses. “But, though the ability to read and write be thus general among the Maronites, it must not be inferred that they are a literary people. Far from it; the book-learning of all classes, both clergy and laity, can hardly be rated too low. There are native printing-presses at work in some of the monasteries, but the sheets they issue are all of an ecclesiastical kind-chiefly portions of the Scripture or mass-books in Syriac, which few even of the clergy understand, though they repeat them by rote” (Kelly, p. 97).

The American Protestant churches, so ably represented by the Rev. W. M. Thomson and others, have done already a noble work for Syria. The MaIronite, of course, has not been forgotten, and his educational disadvantages it has been sought to ameliorate by bringing the influence of American schools to his very door. Tristram (Land of Israel [Lond. 1865], p. 22), who cites the opinion of the noteli pacha Daid Oghli, writes the following as from the mouth of the illustrious Mussulman ruler of Mount Lebanon: “He spoke with much warmth and interest of the American mission-schools; and it was gratifying to hear his independent testimony to the importance and solid nature of the work they are carrying on, especially among the Maronites, with whom he considered they have met with greater success than with any any other sect.”  See Churchill, Mount Lebanon (Lond. 1853, 3 vols. 8voa, iii, chap. v-viii; id. Druse and Maronite (Lond. 1864, 8vo); Kelly, Syria, and the Holy Land (compiled from Burckhardt and others), chap. viii; Guys, leir-ut et le Liban (Par. 1860); Madden, Turkish Empire, ii, ch. vi; Ritter, Erdkutnde, 17:744; Robinson, Palestine, 2:572; Comte de Paris, Dumas et le Liben, p. 75-78; Neale, Hist. of East. Ch. (Introd.), 1:153 sq.; Cowper, Sects in Syria (Lond. 1860); Schnurrer, De eccl. Spurmit. (Tub. 1810 and 1811); Silbernagl Verfassung u. gegenwartiger Bestand sammtlicher Kiechen des Orients (Landshut, 1865); Foulkes, Christendom's;Divisions. ii, ch. ix; New-Englander, 1861, p. 32; Westminster Review, 1862 (July).

## Marot, Clement[[@Headword:Marot, Clement]]

             a French poet, known in the theological world for his translation of the Psalms into French verse, was born at Chalons in 1495. At an early age he commenced writing poetry, and at the recommendation of Francis I became a member of the household of Margaret, duchess of Alenson. He afterwards accompanied Francis I to Italy, and was wounded and taken prisoner at the battle of Pavia. On his return to France he wrote poetry for Diana of Poitiers, the king's mistress, who showed him favor; but, having presumed too much upon his familiarity with her. she discarded him, and he was soon after put in prison, through her agency as some have believed, in 1525. Margaret procured his release; and it appears likely that Marot's intercourse with that princess caused him to incline towards the Reformation, although he is not known to have openly embraced it. When, in 1533, Gerard Roussel preached in Paris, after the dismissal of the fanatic Sorbonnist Beda, satirical verses against the Protestants were posted on the walls; Marot answered in the same tone; and when the persecution broke out, in the spring of 1534, prohibited books being found in his dwelling, Marot was compelled to flee to Beam, whence lie afterwards proceeded to Ferrara, the residence of the duchess Renata of Este. In 1536 Francis I recalled him to his court. It is said that he had recanted, but this is not proved.

In 1538 he commenced, with the aid of the learned Vatablus, the translation of the Psalms, which was very warmly received; it became the fashion at court to sings them, and Charles V himself gave Marot a reward of two hundred doubloons. The Sorbonne, however, condemned the book, while the pope caused it to be reprinted at Rome in 1542. Marot, in the mean time, was, on account of the condemnation of the Sorbonne, obliged, in 1543, to flee to Geneva, where he was well received by Calvin, and invited to continue his translation of the Psalms, which was first used  in public worship at Granson, Switzerland, Dec. 1, 1540. Geneva, however, did not long please Marot, accustomed to the gayety of the French court; and, after remaining a while at Charnbery, he went to Turin, where he died in 1544. The first known edition of Marot's translation appeared towards the end of the year 1541; it contained thirty psalms, a poetical translation of the Lord's Prayer, etc. A second edition, containing thirty psalms, with the music, and the liturgy of Geneva, was published by Calvin in 1542. The next year another edition appeared, containing twenty more psalms, dedicated “to the ladies of France,” and accompanied by the well-known preface of Calvin; this, as well as the subsequent editions, contains the liturgy; the catechism, the reformed confession of faith, and prayers were at sundry times added to others. The remainder of the Psalms was translated by Beza (1550-52), and in 1552 appeared the first complete Psalter, with Beza's eloquent appeal “to the Church of our Lord.” The popularity of these Psalms was so great that, after the Colloquy of Poissy, on Oct. 19, 1561, Charles IX gave the Lyons printer, Anton Vincent, the privilege of printing them. In the 17th century the translation was revised by Conrart, first secretary of the French Academy, and the learned Anton Labastide. This revision, approved by the Synod of Charenton in 1679, was admitted in the churches of Geneva, Neufchatel, and Hesse, while the ancient text remained in use in the French villages. In 1701 Beausobre and Lenfant, at Berlin, undertook a revision, which was much opposed, especially by country congregations. SEE LENFANT.

The modern revision was accepted without difficulty. Originally, the Psalms of Marot were sung to popular tunes; but when they came to be used in the Church it was found necessary to adapt a more solemn music to them. William Frank, however, who is considered the original composer of the tunes, wrote only a few. The Lyons edition of 1561 contains some by Louis Bourgeois; those of 1562 and 1565 have some by Claude Goudimel, the teacher of Palestrina, in four voices. See Anguis, Vie de Marot, prefixed to his (Euvres (1823, 5 vols. 8vo); Jan Suet, Leven en Bedriff von C. Marot (1655); Sainte-Beuve, Tableau de la Poesie Frianaise au siximee siecle; Christian Review, vol. ix; Paleario, Life and Times, 2:92 sq.; Herzog, Real-Encyklopddie, 9:115; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Gener. 33:924. (J. N. P.)

## Maroth[[@Headword:Maroth]]

             (Heb. laeroth', מָרוֹת, bitter fountains; Sept. ὀδύναι, Vulg. a emaritudines), a place apparently not far from Jerusalem, on the route of  the invading Assyrian army from Lachish (Mic 1:12; see Henderson, Comment. ad loc.). Schwarz (Palest. p. 107) conjectures it was identical with Maarath (Jos 15:59); but this name is very different in the Hebrew.

## Marouf[[@Headword:Marouf]]

             SEE MARÛF.

## Marozia[[@Headword:Marozia]]

             a Roman lady of noble birth, but of infamous reputation in the scandalous chronicles of her age, slaughter of the equally notorious Theodora (q.v.), was born near the close of the 9th century. On the dissolution of all the moral ties of public and private life which the war of factions occasioned in Rome in the 10th century, Marozia, by her beauty and her intrigues, contrived to exercise great influence. She was married three times, and, according to Luitprand, had skill and address enough to procure the deposition and death of the pope, John X, and the elevation of her son, the fruit, it is alleged, of adulterous intercourse with pope Sergius III, to the pontificate, under the name of John XI. This testimony of Luitprand, who wrote some time after the period, is considered doubtful by Muratori and by Dr. Pertz. See, however, our articles JOHN X SEE JOHN X and JOHN XI SEE JOHN XI . In her latter years Marozia suffered the punishment of her early crimes. She was imprisoned by her own son Alberic, and died in prison at Rome in 938.

## Marperger, Bernhard Walther[[@Headword:Marperger, Bernhard Walther]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Hamburg, May 14, 1682. He studied at Altdorf and other universities, was in 1705 preacher at Nuremberg, in 1724 court-preacher at Dresden, and died March 29, 1746, a doctor of divinity. He wrote, Auslegung der ersten Epistel Johannis (Nuremberg, 1710): — Diss. Inauguralis de Nexu Veritatis cum Pietate (Altdorf, 1724; Germ. transl. by Graff, Leipsic, eod.): — De Agno ad Arcm Cornua Ligando, ad Illustr. Psa 98:8 (Dresden, 1734), etc. See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:341; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

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

             The Marquesan is a dialect spoken in the Marquesas or Washington group of islands, situated about nine degrees south of the equator, at a distance of nine hundred miles north-east of Tahiti. Ever since 1797 various efforts have been made at different intervals to proclaim the glad tidings of the gospel in these islands. For a long period these attempts were rendered abortive, till at length, in 1834, the Reverend Messrs. Rodgerson, Stallworthy, and Darling, agents of the London Missionary Society, met with some encouragement in their endeavors to instruct the people, and reclaim them from idolatry. Mr. Darling devoted himself to the translation of the Scriptures, or, rather, to the adaptation of the Tahitian version to the Marquesan dialect. Single extracts of Scripture were published, but the first complete book of the New Test. the gospel of Johnwas not published till 1866. This is up to date the only gospel printed by the British and Foreign Bible Society. See Bible of Every Land, page 380. (B.P.)

## Marquesas Isles[[@Headword:Marquesas Isles]]

             frequently applied to the whole Mendania Archipelago, refers strictly only to the southern group of the Mendafia Archipelago, in Polynesia, the northern group bearing the name of the Washington Islands. They are situated in lat. 7° 30'-109 30' S., long. 138°-140° 20' W., have an area of 500 English square miles, and a population of 6011, and were discovered by Mendana de Neyra, a Spanish navigator, in 1596 (the Washington Isles were discovered in 1791 by Ingraham, an American). The isles were named after the viceroy of Peru, Marquesas de Mendoza. They are of volcanic origin, and are in general covered with mountains, rising in some cases to about 3500 feet above the sea-level; the soil is rich and fertile, and the climate hot, but healthy. The coasts are difficult of access, on account of the surrounding reefs and the sudden changes of the wind. Cocoa-nut,  bread-fruit, and papaw trees are grown, and bananas, plantains, and sugar- cane are cultivated.

The inhabitants are of the same race as those of the Society and Sandwich islands. They are well proportioned and handsome, but degraded in their religion and in many of their customs. They exhibit some confused notion of a divine being, whom they call Etooa; but they give the same name to the spirit of a priest, of a king, or any of his relations, and generally to all Europeans, as superior beings. The principal appearance of a religious feeling is found in their reverence for anything pronounced to be “taboo” or sacred, which a priest only can extend to any general object, but which every person may effect upon his own property by merely declaring that the spirit of his father, or of some king, or of any other person, reposes in the spot or article which he wishes to preserve. They have a universal belief in charms (which they name “kaha”) which kill, by imperceptible means and slow degrees, those against whom they are directed, and which the priests chiefly are understood to be able to render effectual. Some reference to a future life appears in their funeral rites. The corpse is washed, and laid upon a platform under a piece of new cloth; and, to obtain a safe passage for the deceased through the lower regions, a great feast is given, by the family to the priests and the relations. The body continues to be rubbed for several months with coconut oil, till it becomes quite hard and incorruptible; and a second feast, exactly twelve months after the first, is then given to thank the gods for having granted to the deceased a safe arrival to the other world. The corpse is then broken in pieces, packed in a box, and, deposited in the morai or burying-place, which no woman is permitted to approach upon the pain of death.

On some of the islands there are missionary stations; but, although cannibalism has been abolished, the efforts; of the missionaries have not otherwise met with much success. The Gospel was introduced in the Marquesas: Isles by the “London Missionary Society” in 1797. The first missionary was William Crook, a man of great zeal and untiring energy. Though greatly discouraged by the ignorance and rudeness of the natives, he pushed the good work, and accomplished much, notwithstanding his failure to secure converts. In 1825, when three teachers came to his aid, it was found that the natives had destroyed many of their idols, and were improving in morals. In 1828 the mission was abandoned; but in 1831 Mr. Darling, then a missionary to Tahiti, visited the isles, and gave the home society such glowing accounts of the improvements that had been wrought  by their earlier efforts, that the mission was re-established in 1833 by Mr. Darling, assisted by Messrs. Rodgerson and Stallworthy, and four natives from Tahiti; but in 1841 the work was again abandoned. The Romanists gained a footing in 1838; and when in 1842 the isles were placed under French protection, the Roman Catholics secured most favorable terms for their missionaries. Their work, however, remains thus far without fruit. See Aikman, Cyclop. of Christian Missions, p. 68.

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

             a celebrated French Roman Catholic missionary and discoverer, was born in 1637, at Laon, in Picardy; entered the Order of the Jesuits; became a missionary, and traveled and labored several years in Canada and other regions. He was a member of the first exploring party to the Mississippi River, and wrote a narrative of the expedition (Paris, 1681). “He writes,” says professor Sparks, “as a scholar, and as a man of careful observation and practical sense. In every point of view, this tract is one of the most interesting among those that illustrate the early history of America.” On his return from the Mississippi he resumed his missionary labors among the Miamis on Lake Michigan, and died there, May 18,1675. — Charlevoix, Histoire de la Nouvelle France, s.v.; Moréri, Dictionnaire Historique, s.v.; Bacqueville de la Potheric, Hist. de l'Amerique Septentrionale (Paris, 1872, 4 vols. 12mo); Sparks. Amer. Biog. vol. 10:1st series, s.v.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 33:942.

## Marquez, Juan[[@Headword:Marquez, Juan]]

             a Spanish theologian, was born at Madrid in 1564; studied at the University of Salamanca; joined the Augustines of Madrid, and attained to the first dignities of his order. He died at Salamanca Feb. 17, 1621. He has written El gobernador Christiano, lde ducido de has vidos de Moysen y Josue, principes del pueblo a Dios (Salamanca, 1612, 1619, 1634, fol.): — Los dos Estados de la espiritual Gerusalem sobre los Psalmos cxxv y cxxxvi (Medina. 1603, and Salamanca, 1610, 4to): — Origin de los Padros Ermitanos de son Augustin, y su verdadera institucion antes del gran concilio Lateranense (Salamanca, 1618, fol.): — Vida del V. P. F. A lonso de Horozco (Madrid, 1648, 8vo). He left in manuscript some comedies and several theological treatises. — Nicholas Antonio, Bibliotheca Scriptorum Hispanice, 3:734; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, vol. 33, s.v.

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

             a Presbyterian minister, was born near Cross Creek, Pa., Nov. 20, 1815; was educated in Jefferson College. Canonsburg, Pa.; studied divinity in the Western Theological Seminary, Alleghany, Pa.; was licensed by Washington Presbytery in 1844, and ordained by Sidney Presbytery in 1848. During the first ten years of his ministry he labored successively in the churches of Kenton, Mansfield, Shelby, and Ontario, Ohio. In 1858 he removed to Bloomington. Ill., and commenced to labor as presbyterial missionary for the presbyteries of Peoria and Bloomington. In' 1859 he accepted the united charge of the churches of Salem, Brunswick, and Elmawood, which he retained until his death, Feb. 22, 1863. Mr. Marquis was noted for his faithfulness, devotion, and purity of life. He was eminently successful as a pastor; earnest and instructive as a preacher. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1864, p, 171.

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

             a Presbyterian minister, was born near Winchester, Va., in 1753. His early life was subjected to many deprivations. He received an ordinary common- school education, prosecuted his classical studies, amid painful vicissitudes, at Buffalo and Canonsburg, and in April, 1793, was licensed to preach; labored one year as a licentiate, and in 1794 was ordained and installed pastor of the church at Cross Creek, Pa. In 1796 he became an active missionary to the Indians, traveling down the Alleghany, and the lower waters of the Muskingum and Scioto rivers. In 1802 he became a member of the executive committee of the Missionary Board west of the Alleghany Mountains. The remaining twenty years of his ministry were filled up with multiplied labors and varied but unusual success. He died Sept. 27, 1829. Mr. Marquis was a laborious and faithful pastor, eminently wise in counsel, and apt in introducing and enforcing religious duty. As a preacher he was composed and earnest, extremely logical in style, and entirely perspicuous in the expression of thought. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1864, p. 171, Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 4:83-89.

## Marracci[[@Headword:Marracci]]

             an Italian priest, eminent as an Oriental scholar, was born at Lucca in 1612, and for years held the professorship of Arabic in the Collegia della Sapienza in Rome. He died in 1700. His principal work is an excellent edition of the Koran in Arabic, with a Latin version (1698). “This,” says  Hallam, in his Introduction to the Literature of Europe, “is still esteemed the best.”

## Marriage[[@Headword:Marriage]]

             This relation is in a general way represented by several Hebrew words, the most distinctive of which are several forms of חָתִן, chathan', to give in marriage; Gr. γάμος, a wedding. It is very remarkable, however, as well as significant, that there is no single word in the whole Hebrew Scriptures for the estate of marriage, or to express the abstract idea of wedlock, matrimony, as the German Ehe does. It is only in the post-exilian period, when the laws of marriage had gradually developed themselves, that we meet with the abstract אישותand זווג— — ζεῦγος (Jebanoth, 6:5; Kiddushin, 1:2); the former denoting the legal, and the latter the natural side of matrimony. But even then no such definition of marriage is to be found in the Hebrew writings as we find in the Roman law, “Nuptiue sunt conjunctio maris et feminae et consortium omnis vite, divini et humani juris communicatio” (Dig. lib. xxiii, Titus 2, “De ritu nupt.”). In the present article, which treats of marriage as found amongo the Hebrew race, we cover the entire field of matrimonial relations and ceremonies, both ancient and modern. SEE WEDLOCK.

I. Origin, Primitive Relations, and General View of the Married State. —

1. The institution of marriage is founded on the requirements of man's nature, and dates from the time of his original creation. It may be said to have been ordained by God, in as far as man's nature was ordained by him; but its formal appointment was the work of man, and it has ever been in its essence. a natural and civil institution, though admitting of the infusion of a religious element into it. This view of marriage is exhibited in the historical account of its origin in the book of Genesis; the peculiar formation of man's nature is assigned to the Creator, who, seeing it “not good for man to be alone,” determined to form an “help meet for him” (Gen 2:18), and accordingly completed the work by the addition of the female to the male (Gen 1:27). The necessity for this step appears from the words used in the declaration of the divine counsel. Man, as an intellectual and spiritual being, would not have been a worthy representative of the Deity on earth, so long as he lived in solitude, or in communion only with beings either high above him in the scale of creation, as angels, or far beneath him, as the beasts of the field. It was absolutely necessary, not only for his  comfort and happiness, but still more for the perfection of the divine work, that he should have a “help meet for him,” or, as the words more properly mean, “the exact counterpart of himself'“ (עֵזֶר כְּנֶגְדּוֹ, Septuag. βοηθὸς κατ᾿ αὐτόν; Vulg. adjutorium simile sibi, “a help meet for him”) — a being capable of receiving and reflecting his thoughts and affections. No sooner was the formation of woman effected, than Adam recognized in that act the will of the Creator as to man's social condition, and immediately enunciated the important statement, to which his posterity might refer as the charter of marriage in all succeeding ages, “Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife; and they shall be one flesh” (Gen 2:24). From these words, coupled with the circumstances attendant on the formation of the first woman, we may evolve the following principles:

(1) The unity of man and wife, as implied in her being formed out of man, and as expressed in the words “one flesh;”

(2) the indissolubleness of the marriage bond, except on the strongest grounds (compare Mat 19:9);

(3) monogamy, as the original law of marriage, resulting from there having been but one original couple, as is forcibly expressed in the subsequent reference to this passage by our Lord (“they twain,” Mat 19:5) and St. Paul (“two shall be one flesh,” 1Co 6:16);

(4) the social equality of man and wife, as implied in the terms ish and ishshah, the one being the exact correlative of the other, as well as in the words “help meet for him;”

(5) the subordination of the wife to the husband, consequent upon her subsequent formation (1Co 11:8-9; 1Ti 2:13); and

(6) the respective duties of man and wife, as implied in the words “help meet for him.”

2. The introduction of sin into the world modified to a certain extent the mutual relations of man and wife. As the blame of seduction to sin lay on the latter, the condition of subordination was turned into subjection, and it was said to her of her husband, “he shall rule over thee” (Gen 3:16)- a sentence which, regarded as a prediction, has been strikingly fulfilled in  the position assigned to women in Oriental countries; but which, regarded as a rule of life, is fully sustained by the voice of nature and by the teaching of Christianity (1Co 14:34; Eph 5:22-23; Timothy 2:12). The evil effects of the fall were soon apparent in the corrupt usages of marriage: the unity of the bond was impaired by polygamy, which appears to have originated among the Cainites (Gen 4:19); and its purity was deteriorated by the promiscuous intermarriage of the “sons of God” with the “daughters of men,” i.e. of the Sethites With the Cainites, in the days preceding the flood (Gen 6:2).

3. For the history of marriage in the later ages. see below. One question may properly be considered here, i.e. celibacy. Shortly before the Christian sera an important change took place in the views entertained on the question of marriage as affecting the spiritual and intellectual parts of man's nature. Throughout the Old Testament period marriage was regarded as the indispensable duty of every man, nor was it surmised that there existed in it any drawback to the attainment of the highest degree of holiness. In the interval that elapsed between the Old and New Testament periods, a spirit of asceticism had been evolved, probably in antagonism to the foreign notions with which the Jews were brought into close and painful contact. The Essenes were the first to propound any doubts as to the propriety of marriage; some of them avoided it altogether, others availed themselves of it under restrictions (Josephus, War, 2:8, § 2, 13). Similar views were adopted by the Therapeutae, and at a later period by the Gnostics (Burton's Lectures, 1:214); thence they passed into the Christian Church, forming one of the distinctive tenets of the Encratites (Burton, 2:161), and finally developing into the system of Monachism. The philosophical tenets on which the prohibition of marriage was based are generally condemned in Col 2:16-23, and specifically in 1Ti 4:3. The general propriety of marriage is enforced on numerous occasions, and abstinence from it is commended only in cases where it was rendered expedient by the calls of duty (Mat 19:12; 1Co 7:8; 1Co 7:26). With regard to remarriage after the death of one of the parties, the Jews, in common with other nations, regarded abstinence from it, particularly in the case of a widow, laudable, and a sign of holiness (Luk 2:36; Luk 2:7; Josephus, Ant. 17:13, 4; 18:6, 6); but it is clear, from the example of Josephus (Vit. 76), that there was no prohibition even in the case of a priest. In the Apostolic Church remarriage was regarded as occasionally undesirable (1Co 7:40), and as an absolute  disqualification for holy functions, whether in a man or woman (1Ti 3:2; 1Ti 3:12; 1Ti 5:9); at the same time it is recommended in the case of young widows (1Ti 5:14).

II. Mode of selecting a Bride, Betrothal, and Marriage price. —

1. Imitating the example of the Father of the Universe, who provided the man he made with a wife, fathers from the beginning considered it both their duty and prerogative to find or select wives for their sons (Gen 24:3; Gen 38:6). In the absence of the father, the selection devolved upon the mother (Gen 21:21). Even in cases where the wishes of the son were consulted, the proposals were made by the father (Gen 34:4; Gen 34:8); and the violation of this parental prerogative on the part of the son was “a grief of mind” to the father (Gen 26:35). The proposals were generally made by the parents of the young man, except when there was a difference of rank; in such a case the negotiations proceeded from the father of the maiden (Exo 2:21), and when accepted by the parents on both sides, sometimes also consulting the opinion of the adult brothers of the maiden (Gen 24:51; Gen 34:11), the matter was considered as settled without requiring the consent of the bride. The case of Rebekah (Gen 24:58) forms no exception to this general practice, inasmuch as the alliance had already been concluded between Eleazar and Laban, and the question put to her afterwards was to consult her opinion, not about it, but about the time of her departure. Before, however, the marriage contract was finally concluded, a price (מהר) was stipulated for, which the young man had to pay to the father of the maiden (Gen 31:15; Gen 34:12), besides giving presents (מתן) to her relations (Gen 24:53; Gen 34:12). This marriage-price was regarded as a compensation due to the parents for the loss of service which they sustained by the departure of their daughter, as well as for the trouble and expense which they incurred in her education. Hence, if the proffered young man had not the requisite compensation, he was obliged to make it up in service (Gen 29:20; Exo 2:21; Exo 3:1). Some, indeed, deny that a price had to be paid down to the father for parting with his daughter, and appeal for support to Gen 31:15, where, according to them, “the daughters of Laban make it a matter of complaint, that their father bargained for the services of Jacob in exchange for their hands, just as if they were strangers;” thus showing that the sale of daughters was regarded as an unjust act and a matter of complaint (Saalschutz, Das Mosaische Recht. p. 733). But, on a closer inspection of the passage in question, it will be seen that Rachel and  Leah do not at all complain of any indignity heaped on them by being sold just as if they were strangers, but, on the contrary, mention the sale to corroborate their statement that they are no longer their father's property, have no more any portion in his possession, and are now regarded by him as strangers, since, according to the usual custom, they have been duly sold to their husband, and hence agree with the latter that it is time for them to depart. Besides, the marriage-price is distinctly mentioned in other passages of Scripture (Exo 22:15-16; 1Sa 18:23; 1Sa 18:25; Rth 4:10; Hos 3:2), and was commonly demanded by the nations of antiquity; as the Babylonians (Herod. 1:196); Assyrians (Elian, V. H. 4:1; Strabo, 16:745); the ancient Greeks (Odyss. 8:318 sq.; Arist. Polit. 2:8; Pausan. 3:12, 2); the Germans (Tacitus, Germ. 18), and still obtains in the East to the present day. In fact, it could not be otherwise where polygamy was practiced. As the number of maidens was under such circumstances less than that of wooers, it called forth competition, and it was but natural that he who offered the highest marriage-price obtained the damsel. There was therefore no fixed marriage-price; it varied according to circumstances. We meet with no dowry given with the bride by her father during the patriarchal age, except a maid-servant (Gen 24:61; Gen 29:24; Gen 29:29).

2. The Mosaic enactments introduced no changes into these usages. The father's power over the child in matters of marriage continued paramount, and he could give his children to any one he pleased without asking their consent. Thus Caleb offers his daughter Achsah (Jos 15:16-17) as wife to any one who will conquer Kirjath-sepher (Jdg 1:12). Saul promises his daughter to him who shall kill the Philistine, and barters his daughter Michal for the prepuces of a hundred slain Philistines (1Sa 17:26-27; 1Sa 18:25-27); and Ibzan takes thirty wives for his thirty sons (Jdg 12:9). The imaginary case of women soliciting husbands (Isa 4:1) was designed to convey to the mind a picture of the ravages of war, by which the greater part of the males had fallen. A judicial marriage-price (הבתולה מהר) was now introduced, which was fixed at fifty silver shekels (Exo 12:16, with Deu 22:29), being the highest rate of a servant (Lev 27:3), so that one had to pay as much for a wife as for a bondwoman. When the father of the maiden was rich and did not want the marriage-price (אין חפוֹ במהר), he expected some service by way of compensation for giving away his daughter (1Sa 18:25). As soon as the bargain was concluded, and the marriage-  price paid, or the required service rendered, the maiden was regarded as betrothed to her wooer, and as sacredly belonging to him. In fact, she was legally treated as a married wontan ( אשת איש); she could not be separated from her intended husband without a bill of divorce, and the same law was applicable to her as to married people. If she was persuaded to criminal conduct between the espousals and the bringing her home to her husband's house, both she and her seducer were publicly stoned to death; and if she was violated, the culprit suffered capital punishment (Deu 22:23-27, with Deu 22:22; and Lev 20:10). With such sacredness was betrothal regarded, that even if a bondmaid who was bought with the intention of ultimately becoming a secondary wife (Exo 21:7-11), was guilty of unchastity prior to her entering into that state, both she and her seducer were scourged, while the latter was also obliged to bring a sin-offering, and. the priest had to pray for the forgiveness of his sin (Lev 19:20-22). Every betrothed man was by the Mosaic law exempt from military service (Deu 20:7).

3. In the post-exilian period, as long as the children were minors-which in the case of a son was up to thirteen, and a daughter to twelve years of age- the parents could betroth them to any one they chose; but when they became of age their consent was required (Maimonides, Hilchoth Ishuth, 3:11, 12). Occasionally the whole business of selecting the wife was left in the hands of a friend, and hence the case might arise which is supposed by the Talmudists (Yebam. 2, § 6, 7), that a man might not be aware to which of two sisters he was betrothed. So in Egypt at the present day the choice of a wife is sometimes entrusted to a professional woman styled a khat'beh; and it is seldom that the bridegroom sees the features of his bride before the marriage has taken place (Lane, 1:209-211). It not unfrequently happened, however, that the selection of partners for life was made by the young people themselves. For this, the ceremonies connected with the celebration of the festivals in the Temple afforded an excellent opportunity, as may be gathered from the following remark in the Mishna: “R. Simeon ben-Gamaliel says. There were never more joyous festivals in Israel than the 15th of Ab and the Day of Atonement. On these the maidens of Jerusalem used to come out dressed in white garments, which they borrowed, in order not to shame those who had none of their own, and which they had immersed [for fear of being polluted]. Thus arrayed, these maidens of Jerusalem went out and danced in the vineyards, singing, Young man, lift up thine eyes, and see whom thou art about to choose; fix  not thine eye upon beauty, but look rather to a pious family; for gracefulness is deceit, and beauty is vanity, but the woman that fears the Lord, she is worthy of praise” (Megilla, 4:8). Having made his choice, the young man or his father informed the maiden's father of it, whereupon the young people were legally betrothed. The betrothal was celebrated by a feast made in the house of the bride (Jebamnoth, 43 a; Taanith, 26 b; Pessachil, 49 a; Kiddushin, 45 b), and is called קידושוֹן, made sacred, for by it the bride was made sacred to her bridegroom, and was not to be touched by any one else. It is also called אירסין, which may be from ארש איס, to betroth. For a betrothal to be legal, it has to be effected in one of the following three modes:

(1.) By money, or money's worth, which, according to the school of Shammai, must be a denar (דיני) = 90 grains of pure gold, or, according to the school of Hillel, a perutah (פרוטה) = half a grain of pure silver, and which is to be given to the maiden, or, if she is a minor, to her father, as betrothal price (כס קידושין);

(2.) By letter or contract (שטר אירוסין), which the young man, either in person or through a proxy, has to give to the maiden, or to her father when she is a minor; or,

(3.) By cohabitations (ביאה, usus), when the young man and maiden, having pronounced the betrothal formula in the presence of two witnesses, retire into a separate room. This. however, is considered immodest, and the man is scourged (Kiddushin, 12 b). The legal formula to be pronounced is, “Behold, thou art betrothed or sanctified to me (את מקודשת לי כדת משה וישראל הנה), according to the law of Moses and Israel” (Kiddushin, 1:1; 4:9; Tosiftha Kethuboth, 4; Kethuboth, 4:8; Maimonides, Hilchoth Ishuth, 3; Eben in Ezer, 32). Though betrothment, as we have seen before, was the beginning of marriage itself, and, like it, could only be broken off by a regular bill of divorcement (גט), yet twelve months were generally allowed to intervene between it and actual marriage (חופה) in the case of a maiden, to prepare her outfit, and thirty days in the case of a widow (Kethuboth, 57 a). The intercourse of the betrothed during this period was regulated by the customs of the different towns (Mishna, Kethuboth, v. 2). When this more solemn betrothment (קידושין) was afterwards united with the marriage ceremony (חופה), engagements (שדוכין) more in our sense  of the word took its place. Its nature and obligation will best be understood by perusing the contents of the contract (תנאים) which is made and signed by the parties, and which is as follows: “May he who declares the end from the beginning give stability to the words of this contract, and to the covenant made between these two parties: namely, between A, bachelor, with the consent of his father B, and C, who is proxy for his daughter D, spinster. The said A, bachelor, engages, under happy auspices, to take the afore-mentioned D, spinster, by marriage and betrothal (חופה וקידושין), according to the law of Moses and Israel. These henceforth are not to conceal anything from each other appertaining to money or goods, but to have equal power over their property.

Moreover, B, the said father of the bridegroom, is to dress his son in goodly apparel before the marriage, and to give the sum of... . in cash; whilst C, father of the said bride, is to give his daughter before the marriage a dowry in cash to the amount of... as well as jewelery to the amount of . . to dress her in goodly apparel corresponding to the dowry, to give her an outfit, and the bridegroom the Talith (עלית), i.e. the fringed wrapper used at prayer, SEE FRINGE, and Kittel (קיטל), i e. the white burial garment, in harmony with his position and in proportion to the dowry. The marriage is to be (D.V.) on the... in the place... at the expense of the said C, the bride's father, and, if agreed to by both parties, may take place within the specified period. Now the two parties have pledged themselves to all this, and have taken upon themselves by an oath to abide by it, oil the penalty of the great anathema, and at the peril of forfeiting half the dowry; but the forfeit is not to absolve from the anathema, nor is the anathema to absolve from the forfeit. The said father of the bride also undertakes to board at his table the newly-married couple for the space of... and furnish them with lodgings for the space of... The surety on the part of the bridegroom is E, sol of F; and on the part of the bride, G, sol of H. The two bridal parties, however, guarantee that these sureties shall not suffer thereby. Further, C, the said father of the bride, is to give his daughter an assurance letter, that, in the event of his death, she is to get half the inheritance of a son (שטר חצי זכר); whilst the bridegroom pledges himself to get his brothers, in the event of his dying without issue, to give her a Chalizuh document [for which see below], without any compensation. But if there should be dispute or delay on the subject, which God forbid, the decision is to be left to the Jewish congregation. We have taken all this in possession from the party and sureties, for the benefit of the other parties, so that everything  aforementioned may be observed, with the usual witness which qualified us to take care of it. Done this day... Everything must be observed and kept. (Signed)... (Comp. Nachlas Shiva, 9 b). This contract, which is written in Rabbinic Hebrew, is used by all orthodox Jews to the present day.

III. Marriage Ceremonies. —

1. In the pre-Mosaic period, when the proposals were accepted, and the marriage-price (מהר), as well as the sundry other gifts (מתן), were duly distributed, the bridegroom (חתן) could at once remove the bride (כלה) from her father's house to his own house, and this removal of the maiden, under the benedictions of her family, but without any definite religious ceremony whatever, and cohabitation, consummated and expressed marriage ( לקח אשה). Thus we are told that Isaac, when meeting Eleazar and Rebekah in the field, as soon as he was informed bv the former of what had transpired, took Rebekah to the tent of his departed mother, and this without further ceremony constituted the marriage, and she thereby became his wife (ותחי לו לאשה, Gen 24:63-67). Under more ordinary circumstances, however, when the bride had not at once to quit her parental roof under the protection of a friend, as in the case just mentioned, but where the marriage took place in the house of the bride's parents, it was celebrated by a feast, to which all the friends and neighbors were invited, and which lasted seven days (Gen 29:22; Gen 29:27). On the day of the marriage, the bride was conducted to her future husband veiled, or, more properly, in an outdoor wrapper or shawl (צעי), which nearly enveloped her whole form, so that it was impossible to recognize the person, thus accounting for the deception practiced on Jacob (Gen 24:65; Gen 29:23) and on Judah (Gen 38:14).

2. With regard to age, no restriction is pronounced in the Bible. Early marriage is spoken of with approval in several passages: (Pro 2:17; Pro 5:18; Isa 62:5), and in reducing this general statement to the more definite one of years, we must take into account the very early age at which persons arrive at puberty in Oriental countries. In modern Egypt marriage takes place in general before the bride has attained the age of sixteen frequently when she is twelve or thirteen, and occasionally when she is only ten (Lane, 1:208). The Mosaic law prescribes no civil or religious forms for the celebration of marriage. The contract or promise made at the payment of the marriage-price, or when the service which was  required in its stead was rendered, constituted the solemn bond which henceforth united the espoused parties, as is evident from the fact pointed out in the preceding sections, that a betrothed maiden was both called a married woman, and was legally treated as such. There can, however, be no doubt that the ancient custom of celebrating the consummation of the marriage by a feast, which lasted seven days (Gen 29:22; Gen 29:27), must have becbme pretty general by this time. Thus we are told that when Samson went to Timnath to take his wife, he made there a feast, which continued for seven days, according to the usage of young men on such occasions (כי כן יעשַו הבחורים), that the parents of the bride invited thirty young men (υἱοὶ τοῦ νυμφῶνος, Mat 9:15) to honor his nuptials, and that to relieve their entertainment, Samson, in harmony with the prevailing custom among the nations of antiquity, proposed enigmas (Jdg 14:10-18). We afterwards find that the bridal pair were adorned with nuptial crowns (Son 3:11; Isa 61:10) made of various materials — gold, silver, myrtle, or olive — varying in costliness according to the circumstances of the parties (Mishna, Sota, 9:14; Gesmara, 49 a and b; Selden, Ux. Ebr. 2:15), and that the bride especially wore gorgeous apparel, and a peculiar girdle (Psa 45:13-14; Isa 49:18; Jer 2:12), whence in fact she derived her name Kallah (כלה), which signifies the ornamented, the adorned. Thus attired, the bridegroom and bride were led in joyous procession through the streets, accompanied by bands of singers and musicians (Jer 7:34; Jer 25:10; Jer 33:11), and saluted by the greetings of the maidens of the place, who manifested the liveliest interest in the nuptial train (Son 3:11), to the house of the bridegroom or that of his father. Here the feast was prepared, to which all the friends and the neighbors were invited, and at which most probably that sacred covenant was concluded which came into vogue during the post-Mosaic period (Pro 2:17; Eze 16:8; Mal 2:14). The bride, thickly veiled, was then conducted to the (חדר) bridal chamber (Gen 29:23; Jdg 15:11; Joe 2:6), where a nuptial couch (חפה) was prepared (Psa 19:5; Joe 2:16) in such a manner as to afford facility for ascertaining the following morning whether she had preserved her maiden purity; for in the absence of the signa virginitafis she was stoned to death before her father's house (Deu 22:13-21).

3. In the period after the exile the proper age for marriage is fixed in the Mishna at eighteen (Aboth, v. 31), and though, for the sake of preserving  morality, puberty was regarded as the desirable age, yet men generally married when they were seventeen (Jebaumoth, 62; Kiddushin, 29). The Talmudists forbade marriage in the case of a man under thirteen years and a day, and in the case of a woman under twelve years and a day (Buxtorf, Syznagog. cap. 7, p. 143). The day originally fixed for marriage was Wednesday for maidens and Friday for widows (Mishna, Kethuboth, 1:1). But the Talmud already partially discarded this arrangement (Gemara, ibid. 3 a), and in the Middle Ages it became quite obsolete (Eben Ha-Ezar, lxv). The primitive practice of the sages, however, has been resumed among the orthodox Jews in Russia, Poland, etc. The wedding-feast was celebrated in the house of the bridegroom (Kethuboth, 8 a, 10 a), and in the evening, for the bridal pair fasted all day, since on it, as on the day of atonement, they confessed their sins, and their transgressions were forgiven. On the day of the wedding, the bride, with her hair flowing, and a myrtle wreath on her head (if she was a maiden, Mishna, Kethuboth, 2:1), was conducted, with music, singing, and dancing, to the house of the bridegroom by her relations and friends, who were adorned with chaplets of myrtle, and carried palm branches in their hands (Kethuboth, 16,17; Sabbath, 110 a; Sota, 49 b).

The streets through which the nuptial procession passed were lined with the daughters of Israel, who greeted the joyous train, and scattered before them cakes and roasted ears of wheat, while fountains freely poured forth wine (Kethuboth, 15 b; Berachoth, 50 b). Having reached the house, the bridegroom, accompanied by the groomsmen, met the bride, took her by the hand, and led her to the threshold. The Kethubah (כתובה) — donatio propter or ante nuptias, or the marriage-settlement, alluded to in the book of Tobit (Tob 7:15), was then written, which in the case of a maiden always promises 200, and in the case of a widow 100 denar (each denar being equal to 90 grains of pure gold), whether the parties are rich or poor (Mishna, Kethuboth, Tob 1:2), though it may be enlarged by a special covenant (תוספות כתובה). The dowry could not be claimed until the termination of the marriage by the death of the husband or by divorce (ibid. v. 1), though advances might be made to the wife previously (9:8). Subsequently to betrothal a woman lost all power over her property, and it became vested in the husband, unless he had previously to marriage renounced his right to it (Tob 8:1; Tob 9:1). The marriage must not be celebrated before this settlement is written (Balbs Kama, 89). The wording of this instrument has undergone various changes in the course of time (Kethuboth, 82 b).

The form in which it is given in the Talmud, by Maimonides, etc., is as follows: “Upon the fourth day of the week, on the...  of the month, in the year... of the creation of the world, according to the computation adopted in this place, A, son of B, said to C, spinster, daughter of E, ‘Be thou my wife according to the law of Moses and Israel, and I will work for thee, honor thee, maintain thee, and provide for thee according to the custom of Jewish husbands, who work for their wives, honor them, maintain them, and provide for them honestly; I also give thee the dowry of thy virginity, 200 silver Sus, which belong to thee by the law, as well as thy food, thy apparel, and whatsoever is required for thy maintenance, and I will go in to thee according to the custom of the whole earth.' And C, the spinster, consented. and became his wife. The dowry which she brought him from the house of her father, in silver, gold, and ornaments, as well as in apparel, domestic utensils, and bedding, amounts to... pure silver, and A, the bridegroom, has consented to add to it from his own property the same sum; and the bridegroom said thus: ‘I undertake for myself and my heirs after me the security for this Kethiubah, this dowry and this addition, so that the same shall be paid from the best and most choice of my possessions which I have under the whole heaven, which I have acquired or shall acquire in real or personal property. All this property is to be mortgaged and pledged, yea, even the coat which I have on is to go in order to pay this Kethubah, this down and this addition, from this day to all eternity.' And the surety of this Kethubah, this dowry and this addition, A, the bridegroom, has undertaken in the strictness of all the Kethubahs and supplement instruments usual among the daughters of Israel, and which are written according to the order of our sages of blessed memory, not after the manner of a mere visionary promise or empty formula. We have taken possession of it from A, the bridegroom, and given it to C, spinster, daughter of E, according to all that is written and explained above, by means of such a garment as is legal in the taking of possession. All this yea and amen. (Signed) . . .”Comp. Maimonides, Jud Ha-Chazaka Hilchoth Jebum Ve-Cheliza, 4:33. Among the more modern Jews it is the custom in some parts for the bridegroom to place a ring on the bride's finger (Picart, 1:239)-a custom which also prevailed among the Romans (Smith, Dict. of Ant. p. 604). Some writers have endeavored to prove that the rings noticed in the O.T. (Exo 35:22; Isa 3:21) were nuptial rings, but there is not the slightest evidence of this. The ring was nevertheless regarded among the Hebrews as a token of fidelity (Gen 41:42), and of adoption into a family (Luk 15:22). According to Selden it was originally given as an equivalent for dowry- money (Uxor Ebraic. 2:14). After the document was handed over to the  bride, crowns, varying in expense according to the circumstances of the parties, were placed upon the heads of the bridal pair (Sota, 49 a, b), and they, with their relations and friends, sat down to a sumptuous repast; the marriage-feast was enlivened by the guests, who sang various songs and asked each other amusing riddles (Berachoth, 31 a; Nedarinim, 51 a), parched corn was distributed among the guests if the bride was a virgin (Keth. ii), and when the meal was concluded with customary prayer of thanksgiving, the bridegroom supplemented it with pronouncing over a cup of wine the seven nuptial benedictions (שבע ברכות) in the presence of at least ten persons (Kethuboth, 7 b), which gave the last religious consecration to the marriage-covenant, and which are as follows:

1. “Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, king of the universe, who hast created everything for thy glory.”

2. “Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, king of the universe, who hast created man.”

3. “Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, king of the universe, who hast created man in thine image, in the image of the likeness of thy own form, and hast prepared for him, in himself, a building for the perpetuity of the species. Blessed art thou, O Lord, the creator of man.”

4. “The barren woman shall rejoice exceedingly, and shout for joy when her children are gathered around her in delight. Blessed art thou, O Lord, “who rejoicest Zion in her children.”

5. “Make this loving pair to rejoice exceedingly, as thou hast made thy creature rejoice in the Garden of Eden in the beginning. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who rejoicest the bridegroom and the bride.”

6. “Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, king of the universe. who hast ordained joy and gladness, bride and bridegroom, delight and song, pleasure and intimacy, love and friendship, peace and concord; speedily, O Lord our God, let there be heard in the cities of Judah and in the streets of Jerusalem the voice of joy and the voice of gladness, the voice of the bridegroom and the voice of the bride, the voice of jubilant bridegrooms under their canopies, and of the young men at the nuptial feast playing music. Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, who makest the bridegroom rejoice with his bride.”

7. “Remove all suffering and anger; then will the dumlb be heard in song; lead us in the paths of righteousness, listen to the benedictions of the children of Jeshurun! With the permission of our seniors and rabbins, and my masters, let us bless our God in whose dwelling is joy, and of whose bounties we have partaken!” to which the guests respond, “Blessed be our God, in whose dwelling is joy, of whose bounties we have partaken, and by whose goodness we live;” and he then answers, “Then let us bless our God, in whose dwelling is joy, of whose bounties we have partaken, and by whose goodness we live” (Kethuboth, 7 b, 8). The married couple were then conducted to an elaborately-ornamented nuptial chamber (חופה, where the bridal couch (thalamus) was carefully prepared; and at the production of the linteum vilrinitatis the following morning (Deu 22:13-21), which was anxiously awaited, the following benediction was pronounced by the bridegroom: “Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, king of the universe, who hast placed a nut in paradise, the rose of the valleys-a stranger must not rule over this sealed fountain; this is why the hind of love has preserved the holy seed in purity, and has not broken the compact. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who hast chosen Abraham and his seed after him!” (see Halachoth Gedoloth, ed. Vienna, 51 [comp. Pliny, Hist. Nat. 15:24], where an explanation will be found of the use of אגוזnut, in this connection). Festivities continued for seven days (Kethuboth, 7 a).

As important religious questions had to be put to the bridal pair which required a learned man to do (Gitrit, 6; Kiddushin, 6, 13), it was afterwards resolved that the marriage-ceremony should be performed by a rabbi, and it is celebrated in the following manner: A beautifully- embroidered silk or velvet canopy, about three or four yards square, supported by four long poles, is held by four men out of doors on the day of the wedding. Under this chupash (חופה), which represents the ancient bridal chamber, the bridegroom is led by his male friends, preceded by a band of music, and welcomed by the joyous spectators with the exclamation, Blessed is he who is now come! (ברוהִבא); the bride, with her face veiled (nuptiae), is then brought to him by her female friends and led three times round the bridegroom, in accordance, as they say, with the remark of Jeremiah, “The woman shall compass the man” (Jer 31:22), when he takes her round once amid the congratulations of the bystanders, and then places her at his right hand (Psa 45:10), both  standing with their faces to the south and their backs to the north. The rabbi then covers the bridal pair with the Talith, or fringed wrapper, which the bridegroom has on (comp. Ruth 3:19; Eze 16:8), joins their hands together, and pronounces over a cup of wine the benediction of affiance (ברכת ארוסין), which is as follows: “Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, king of the universe, who hast created the fruit of the vine.

Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, king of the universe, who hast sanctified us with thy commandments, and hast forbidden to us consanguinity, and hast prohibited us the betrothed, but hast permitted us those whom we take by marriage and betrothal. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who hast sanctified thy people Israel by betrothal and marriage” (Kethuboth, 7 a). Whereupon the bridegroom and bride taste of the cup of blessing, and the former produces a plain gold ring, and, in the presence of all the party, puts it on the bride's finger, saying, “Behold, thou art consecrated unto me with this ring according to the rites of Moses and Israel!” The rabbi then reads aloud, in the presence of appointed witnesses, the Kethubah, or the marriage-settlement, which is written in Syro- Chaldaic, and concludes by pronouncing over another cup of wine the seven benedictions (שבע ברכות), which the bridegroom in ancient times, before the ceremony of marriage became a public act and was delegated to the spiritual head, used to pronounce himself at the end of the meal. The bridegroom and bride taste again of this cup of blessing, and when the glass is emptied it is put oln the ground, and the bridegroom breaks it with his foot, as a symbol to remind them in the midst of their joys that just as this glass is destroyed, so Jerusalem is destroyed and trodden down under the foot of the Gentiles. With this the ceremony is concluded, amid the shouts, May you be happy! (מזל טוב). SEE WEDDING.

IV. Polygamy and Concubinage. — Though the history of the protoplasts — in which we are told that God in the beginning created a single pair, one of each sex — seems to exhibit a standard for monogamy, yet the Scriptures record that from the remotest periods men had simultaneously several wives, occupying either coordinate or subordinate positions. Against the opinion that Lamech, sixth in descent from Adam through Cain, introduced polygamy-based on the circumstance that he is the first who is recorded as having married two wives (Gen 4:19) — is to be urged that  (1.) Lamech is the first whose marriage or taking of a wife is recorded, and consequently it is impossible to say how many wives his five progenitors had;

(2.) The mention of Lamech's two wives is incidental, and is entirely owing to the fact that the sacred historian had to notice the useful inventions made by their respective sons Jabal, Jubal, and Tubal-Cain, as well as to give the oldest piece of rhythmical composition which was addressed to the wives, celebrating one of these inventions; and

(3.) If polygamy had been for the first time introduced by Lamech, the sacred writer would have as distinctly mentioned it as he mentions the things which were first introduced by Lamech's sons. The manner in which Sarah urges Abraham to take her servant Hagar, and the fact that Sarah herself gives the maiden to her own husband (לאשה) to be his wife, the readiness with which the patriarch accepts the proposal (Gen 16:1-4), unquestionably show that it was a common custom to have one or more secondary wives. In fact, it is distinctly mentioned that Nahor, Abraham's own brother, who had eight sons by Milcah, his principal wife, and consequently did not require another wife for the purpose of securing progeny, had nevertheless a secondary wife (פלגש), by whom he had four sons (Gen 22:21-24). Besides, it is now pretty generally admitted that Gen 25:1 describes Abraham himself to have taken another or secondary wife in the lifetime of Sarah, in addition to Hagar, who was given to him by his principal wife, as is evident from Gen 25:6; 1Ch 1:32, and that he could not have taken her for the sake of obtaining an heir. If any more proof be wanted for the prevalence of polygamy in the patriarchal age, we refer to Esau, who, to please his father, married his cousin Mahalath in addition to the several wives whom he had (Gen 28:8-9); and to Jacob, who had not the slightest scruple to marry two sisters, and take two half-wives at the same time (Gen 29:23-30; Gen 30:4; Gen 30:9), which would be unaccountable on the supposition that polygamy was something strange. Though sacred history is silent about the number of wives of the twelve patriarchs, yet there can be little doubt that the large number of children and grandchildren which Benjamin had at so early an age (Gen 46:21; Num 26:38-41; 1Ch 7:6-12; 1Ch 8:1), must have been the result of polygamy; and that Simeon, at all events, had more than one wife (Exo 6:15). The extraordinary rate at which the Jews increased in Egypt implies that they practiced polygamy  during their bondage. This is, moreover, corroborated by the incidental notice that Asher, Judah's grandson, had two wives (1Ch 4:5 with 2:24); that Caleb, Judah's great-grandson, had three principal and two subordinate wives (1Ch 2:9; 1Ch 2:18; 1Ch 2:42; 1Ch 2:46; 1Ch 2:48); that Aharaim, probably Benjamin's great-grandson, had three wives (1Ch 8:8-11); and that Moses had two wives (Exo 2:21; Num 12:1); as well as by the fact that the Mosaic legislation assumes the existence of polygamy (Lev 13:14; Deu 25:5). Still, the theory of monogamy seems to be exhibited in the case of Noah and his three sons (Gen 6:18; Gen 7:7; Gen 7:13; Gen 8:16), of Aaron, and of Eleazar.

In judging of this period we must take into regard the following considerations:

(1.) The principle of monogamy was retained, even in the practice of polygamy, by the distinction made between the chief or original wife and the secondary wives, or, as the A.V. terms them, “concubines”-a term which is objectionable, inasmuch as it conveys to us the notion of an illicit and unrecognised position, whereas the secondary wife was regarded by the Hebrews as a wife, and her rights were secured by law. The position of the Hebrew concubine may be compared with that of the concubine of the early Christian Church, the sole distinction between her and the wife consisting in this, that the marriage was not in accordance with the civil law: in the eye of the Church the marriage was perfectly valid (Bingham, Ant. 11:5, §11). It is worthy of notice that the term pillegesh (פַּלֶּגֶשׁ; A.V. “concubine”) nowhere occurs in the Mosaic law. The terms used are either “wife” (Deu 21:15) or “maid-servant” (Exo 21:7); the latter applying to a purchased wife.

(2.) The motive which led to polygamy was that absorbing desire of progeny which is prevalent throughout Eastern countries, and was especially powerful among the Hebrews.

(3.) The power of a parent over his child, and of a master over his slave (the postestas patsiea and domestica of the Romans), was paramount even in matters of marriage, and led in many cases to phases of polygamy that are otherwise quite unintelligible, as, for instance, to the cases where it was adopted by the husband at the request of his wife, under the idea that children born to a slave were in the eye of the law the children of the mistress (Gen 16:3; Gen 30:4; Gen 30:9); or, again, to cases where it was  adopted at the instance of the father (Gen 29:23; Gen 29:28; Exo 21:9-10). It must be allowed that polygamy, thus legalized and systematized, justified to a certain extent by the motive, and entered into, not only without offense to, but actually at the suggestion of those who, according to our notions, would feel most deeply injured by it, is a very different thing from what polygamy would be in our own state of society.

2. In the case of polygamy, as in that of other national customs, the Mosaic law adheres to the established usage. Hence there is not only no express statute to prohibit polygamy, which was previously held lawful, but the Mosaic law presupposes its existence and practice, bases its legislation thereupon, and thus authorizes it, as is evident from the following enactments:

1. It is ordained that a king “shall not multiply wives unto himself' (Deu 17:17), which, as bishop Patrick rightly remarks, “is not a prohibition to take more wives than one, but not to have an excessive number, after the manner of Eastern kings, whom Solomon seems to have imitated;” thus, in fact, legalizing a moderate number. The Mishna (Sanhedrin, 2:4), the Talmud (Babylon Sanhedrin, 21 a), Rashi (on Deu 17:17), etc., in harmony with ancient tradition, regard eighteen wives, including half' wives, as a moderate number, and as not violating the injunction contained in the expression “multiply.”

2. The law enacts that a man is not to marry his wife's sister to vex her while she lives (Lev 18:18), which, as the same prelate justly urges, manifestly means “that though two wives at a time, or more, were permitted in those days, no man should take two sisters (as Jacob had formerly done) begotten of the same father or born of the same mother;” or, in other words, a man is at liberty to take another wife besides the first, and during her lifetime, provided only they are not sisters.

3. The law of primogeniture (Deu 21:15-17) actually presupposes the case of a man having two wives, one beloved and the other not, as it was with Jacob and his two wives, and ordains that if the one less beloved is the mother of his first-born, the husband is not to transfer the right of primogeniture to the son of his favorite wife, but is to acknowledge him as first-born who is actually Song of Solomon

4. Exo 21:9-10, permits a father who had given his son a bondwoman for a wife, to give him a second wife of freer birth, and prescribes how the first is then to be treated — that she is to have alimony, clothes, and the conjugal duty; and

5. Deu 25:5 expressly enjoins that a man though having a wife already, is to marry his deceased brother's widow.

Having existed before the Mosaic law, and being acknowledged and made the basis of legislation by it, polygamy continued in full force during the whole of this period. Thus, during the government of the judges, we find Gideon, the celebrated judge of Israel, “had many wives, and three score and ten sons” (Jdg 8:30); Jair the Gileadite, also a judge of Israel, had thirty grown-up sons (Jdg 10:4) and a proportionate number of daughters. Ibzan, another judge of Israel, had thirty full-grown sons and thirty full-grown daughters (Jdg 12:9); and Abdon, also a judge of Israel, had forty adult sons and thirty adult daughters-which was utterly impossible without polygamy; the pious Elkanah, father of Samuel the illustrious judge and prophet, had two wives (1Sa 1:2). During the monarchy, we find Saul, the first king of Israel, had many wives and half wives (2Sa 3:7; 2Sa 12:8); David, the royal singer of Israel, “their best king,” as bishop Patrick remarks in his comment on Lev 18:18, “who read God's law day and night, and could not but understand it, took many wives without any reproof; nay, God gave him more than he had before, by delivering his master's wives to him” (2Sa 12:8); Solomon, the wise monarch, had no less than a thousand wives and half wives (1Ki 11:3); Rehoboam, his son and successor, had eighteen wives and three score half wives (2Ch 11:21); Abijah, his son and successor to the throne of Judah, married fourteen wives (2 Chronicles 14:21); and Joash. the tenth king, including David, who reigned from B.C. 378 to 338, had two wives given to him by the godly high-priest Jehoiada, who restored both the throne of David and the worship of the true God according to the law of Moses (2Ch 24:3). A very remarkable illustration of the prevalence of polygamy in private lifqis given in 1Ch 7:4, where we are told that not only did the five fathers, all of them chief men of the tribe of Issachar, live in polygamy, but that their descendants, numbering 36,000 men, “had many wives.” De Wette, indeed, affirms that “the Hebrew moral teachers speak decidedly for monogamy, as is evident from their always speaking of one wife, and from the high notion which they have of a good wedded wife — ‘A virtuous  woman is the diadem of her husband, but a bad wife is like rottenness in the bones' (Pro 12:4); ‘Whoso findeth a wife findeth happiness' (Pro 18:22); ‘A house and wealth are an inheritance from parents, but a discreet wife is from the Lord' (Pro 19:14). Pro 31:10-31 describes an industrious and managing wife in such a manner as one only could be it” (Christl. Sittenlehre, vol. 3, sec. 472). Similarly Ewald: “Wherever a prophet alludes to matrimonial matters, he always assumes faithful and sacred monogamy contracted for the whole life as the legal one” (Die Alterthumer Israels, p. 177 sq.). But we have exactly analogous passages where parental felicity is described: “A wise son is happiness to the father, but a foolish son is the grief of his mother” (Pro 10:1; Pro 15:20); “A wise son heareth his father's instruction” (Pro 13:1); and upon the same parity of reasoning it might be said that the theory of having only one son is assumed by the sacred moralist, because, when speaking of happiness or misery, which parents derive from their offspring, only one son is alluded to. Besides, the facts which we have enumerated cannot be set aside by arguments.

3. As nothing is said in the post-exilian portions of the Bible to discourage polygamy, this ancient practice also continued among the Jews during this period. During the second Temple, we find that Herod the Great had nine wives (Josephus, Ant. 17:1, 3); his two sons, Archelaus the Ethnarch, and Antipas the Tetrarch of Galilee, had each two wives (Josephus, Ant. 17:13, 2; 18:5, 1); and John the Baptist and other Jews, who censured the one for violating the Mosaic law by the marriage of his deceased brother's wife who had children (Josephus, Ant. 18:13, 2), and the other for marrying Herodias, the wife of his half-brother Herod-Philip (Mat 14:3-4; Mar 6:17-18; Luk 3:19), raised no cry against their practicing polygamy; because, as Josephus tells us, “the Jews of those days adhered to their ancient practice to have many wives at the same time” (Josephus, Ant. 17:1; 2). In harmony with this ancestral custom, the post-exilian legislation enacted various statutes to regulate polygamy and protect the rights and settlement of each wife (Mishna, Jebamoth, 4:11; Kethuboth, 10:1-6; Kiddushin, 2:7).

As a striking illustration of the prevalence and legality of polygamy during this period may be mentioned the following circumstance which is recorded in the Talmud: Twelve widows appealed to their brother-in-law to perform the duty of Levir, which he refused to do, because he saw no prospect how to maintain such an additional number of wives and possibly a large increase of children. The case was then brought  before Jehudah the Holy, who promised that if the man would do the duty enjoined on him by the Mosaic law, he himself would maintain the family and their children, in case there should be any, every sabbatical year, when no produce was to be got from the land which was at rest. The offer was accepted by the Levir, and he accordingly married his twelve sisters-in-law; and after three years these twelve wives appeared with thirty-six children before Jehudah the Holy to claim the promised alimony, as it was then the sabbatical year, and they actually obtained it (Jerusalem Jebamoth, 4:12). Rabba ben-Joseph, founder and president of the college at Machuza (A.D. 338-352), taught that a man may take as many wives as he pleases, provided only that he can maintain them all (Jebamoth, 65 a). From the remark in the Mishna, that a Levir may marry his deceased brother's fur widows (Jebamoth, 4:11), the Babylonian Gemara concluded that it recommends a man to have no more than this number (Babyl. Jebamoth, 44 a); and from this most probably Mohammed's injunction is derived (Koran, 4:3). It was Rabanu Gershom ben-Jehudah of France (born cir. 960, died 1028), who, in the 11th century, prohibited polygamy under pains of excommunication, saving in exceptional cases (Graitz, Geschichte der Juden, v. 405-507).

His motive for doing so is a matter of dispute; the older Occidental rabbins say that the prohibition originated in a desire to preserve the peace of the family, while the Oriental rabbins will have it that it was dictated by the governments of Christian countries. His interdict, however, made but slow progress, even in Germany and France, for which it was chiefly designed. Thus Simon ben-Abraham of Sens, one of the most celebrated French Tossaphists, tells us (cir. 1200): “The institution of R. Gershom has made no progress either in our neighborhood or in the provinces of France. On the contrary, it happens that pious and learned men and many other people marry a second wife in the lifetime of the first” (B. Joseph, Eben Ha-Ezar, 1). The practice of marrying a second wife in the event of the first having no issue within ten years also obtained in Italy till about the 15th century-the pope giving a special dispensation for it. The Spanish Jews never recognized R. Gershom's interdict; bigamy was practiced in Castile till the 14th century, while the Christian government of Navarre declared polygamy among the Jews legal, and the law of king Theobald allowed them to marry as many wives as they could maintain and govern, but they were not permitted to divorce ally one of them without sending all away (Kayserling, Geschichte der Juden in Spanien, 1:71). Nor was the said interdict acknowledged by the Jews in the East; and monogamy is there practiced simply because the bride makes a special  agreement, and has a clause inserted in the Kethubah (כתובה), or marriage-settlement, that her husband is not to marry another as long as she lives. An exception, however, is made in case there is no issue. As to the opinion of the Karaites on monogamy and polygamy, the celebrated Jehudah ben-Elia Hadassi. (flourished 1149) remarks, in his famous work against rabbinic Judaism, “The Pentateuch prohibits one to marry two wives with a view to vex one of them (לצרור אחת מהן, Lev 18:18); but he may take them provided he loves them and does not grieve either of them, and treats them both affectionately. If he does not diminish their food, raiment, and conjugal rights (Exo 21:11), he is allowed to take two wives or more, just as Elkanah married Hannah and Peninnah, and as David, peace be upon him, and other kings and judges did” (Eshkol Hacopher, ed. Eupatoria, 1836, p. 129). From this it is evident that polygamy was not prohibited by the Jewish law, nor was it regarded as a sin, and that the monogamy of the Jews in the present day is simply in obedience to the laws of the countries in which they live. There were, however, always some rabbins who discouraged polygamy (A both, 2:7; Jebamoth, 65 a, al.); and the elevated notion which they had of monogamy is seen in the statutes which they enacted that the high-priest is to be the husband of one wife and to keep to her (Jebamoth, 58 a; Maimonides, Hilchoth Issure Bia, 18:13; Josephus, Ant. 3:12, 2); and which the apostle Paul also urges on Christian bishops (1Ti 3:2; Tit 1:16).

V. Proscribed Degrees and Laws of Intermarriage.

1. There were no prescribed degrees within which a man was forbidden to marry in the pre-Mosaic period. On the contrary, the fact that Adam married “bone of his bone and flesh of his flesh,” and that his sons married their own sisters, rather engendered an aversion to marry out of one's own kindred. Hence we find that Abraham married his half-sister (Gen 20:12); Nahor, Abraham's brother, married the daughter of his brother Haran, or his niece (Gen 11:29); Jacob married two sisters at the same time, who were the daughters of his mother's brother (Gen 28:2; Gen 29:26); Esau married his cousin Mahalath, the daughter of Ishmael (Gen 28:8-9); Amram married his aunt Jochebed, his father's sister (Exo 6:20); and Judah married his daughter-in-law, Tamar, the widow of his own son (Gen 38:26-30). This aversion to intermarriage with strangers and other tribes, which made Abraham pledge  his faithful steward by the most sacred oath not to take for his son a wife from the daughters of the Canaanites (Gen 24:2-4); which occasioned such “a grief of mind” to Isaac, because his son Esau married Hittite women (Gen 26:34-35); and which was the cause of great dissatisfaction in the family of Moses when he married a Midianitish woman (Exo 2:21); was afterwards greatly increased on the ground of difference of creed. The same feeling of aversion against intermarriage (ἐπιγαμία) with foreigners prevailed among other nations of antiquity, and may also have been the cause why marriages with the nearest of kin were practiced among them. Thus the Athenians were allowed to marry half-sisters by the fatmer's side (Corn. Nepos, Praef: Cimon, i; Plutarch, Cimon, iv; Themistocl. xxxii); the Spartans married half-sisters by the same mother (Philo, De spec. leg. p. 779); and the Assyrians and Egyptians full sisters (Lucian, Sacrif: 5; Died. 1:27; Philo, De spec. leg. p. 779; Selden, De jure naturali et gentium, v. 11). In later times, when the desire to preserve purity of blood, which was the primary cause for not intermarrying with alien tribes, was superseded by religious motives, the patriarchal instances of epigamy recorded without censure during this period became very inconvenient. Hence means were adopted to explain them away. Thus the marriage of Judah with a heathen woman, the daughter of Shuah, a Canaanite (Gen 38:2). is made orthodox by the Chaldee Paraphrase, the Midrash (Bereshith Rabba. c. lxxxv), the Talmud (Pesachim, 50 a), Rashi (ad loc.), etc., by explaining כנעניto mean תגרא, merchant, as in Job 40:30; Pro 31:24; and the Jerusalem Targum finds it necessary to add that Judah converted her to Judaism (וגיירה). The marriage of Simeon with a Canaanitess (Gen 46:10) is explained away in a similar manner (comp. Bereshith Rabba, c. 80; Rashi on Gen 46:10).

2. The regulations next introduced in this respect are of a twofold nature:

a. The most important change in the Biblical gamology is the Mosaic law about the prohibited degrees among the Israelites themselves. While in the pre-Mosaic period no prohibition whatever existed against marrying one's nearest and dearest relatives, the Mosaic law (Lev 18:7-17; Lev 20:11, etc.) proscribes no less than fifteen marriages within specified degrees of both consanguinity and affinity. In neither consanguinity nor affinity, however, does the law extend beyond two degrees, viz. the mother, her daughter, aunt, father's wife, father's sister, sister on the father's side. wife  of the father's brother, brother's wife (excepting in the case of a Levirate marriage), daughter-in-law, granddaughter, either from a son or daughter, a woman and her daughter, or her granddaughter either from a son or daughter, and two sisters together. The preceding table exhibits these degrees. We must only remark that the squares stand for males, the circles for females, the triangles within the squares for deceased, the numbers refer to the order in which they are enumerated in Lev 18:17, and that the husband and wife, who form the starting-point, are represented by a double square and double circle.

It will be seen from the foregoing table that, while some kindred are proscribed, others are allowed, e.g. a father's sister is forbidden while a brother's daughter is not. This has occasioned great difficulty in tracing the principle which underlies these prohibitions. Philippson is of opinion that it may be deduced from the remarks which accompany the respective vetoes. The stepmother is proscribed because “it is thy father's nakedness” (Lev 18:8); the son's or daughter's daughter because it “is thine own nakedness” (Lev 18:10); the father's or mother's sister because she is the “father's or mother's flesh” (vers. 12, 13); and the brother's wife because “it is the nakedness of thy brother” (Lev 18:16). “From this it is evident,” this erudite rabbi submits, “that, on the one side, son, daughter, and grandchild are identified with the father, while, on the other side, brothers and sisters are identified with each other, because they have one and the same source of life. Accordingly, we obtain the following data. All members proceeding from a common father or mother constitute one issue, because they possess together the same source of life; while the ascendants and the descendants in a straight line form one line, because they have one aifer the other and from each other the same source of life; and hence the law —

(1.) Two members of the same issue, or two members of the same line, are not to intermarry, because they have the same source of life. But inasmuch as the ascending is the primary to each descending issue, and the descending the derived to every ascending, an ascending issue may press forward out of the straight line, or step down into the following, i.e. the primary into the one derived from it; while the succeeding cannot go backwards into the foregoing, i.e. the derived into the primary. Now, as the man is the moving cause in carnal intercourse, hence the law —

(2.) A male member of the succeeding issue must not marry a female member of the preceding issue, while, on the contrary, a male member of  the preceding may marry a female of the succeeding issue, provided they are not both of a direct line. Half-blood and step-relations make no difference in this respect, since they are identified, both in the issue and in the line, because husband and wife become identified. It is for this reason, also, that the relationship, which the wife always assumes in marriage with regard to her husband, is such as a blood relation bears to her; hence it is, for instance, that a brother's wife is proscribed, while the wife's sister is allowed. Thus the principle of the Mosaic proscriptions is a profound one, and is fully borne out by nature. Connubial intercourse has for its object to produce a third by the connection of two opposites; but that which proceeds from the same source of life is merely of the same kind. Hence, when two, originally of the same kind, unite, it is contrary to the true design of copulation, and can only proceed from an overpowering and excess of rude and animal passions. It is a desecration of the nature and morality of man. and the highest defilement” (Israelitische Bibel, 1:588 sq.; 3d. ed. Leipz. 1863).

Different penalties are attached to the infringement of these prohibitions. The punishment of death is to be inflicted for marrying a father's wife (Lev 18:8; Lev 20:11), or a daughter-in-law (Lev 18:15; Lev 20:12); of death by fire for marrying a woman and her daughter at the same time (Lev 18:17; Lev 20:14); of being cut off or excommunicated for marrying a sister on the father's side or on the mother's side (Lev 18:9; Lev 20:17); of not being pardoned for marrying a father's or mother's sister (Lev 18:12-13; Lev 20:19); of not being pardoned and childlessness for marrying a father's brother's wife (Lev 18:14; Lev 20:20); and of childlessness alone for marrying a brother's wife (Lev 18:16; Lev 20:21), excepting the case of a Levirate marriage (Deu 25:5-10). No penalty is mentioned for marrying one's mother (Lev 18:7), granddaughter (Lev 18:10), or two sisters together (Lev 18:18). From this enumeration it will be seen that it only specifies three instances in which capital punishment is to be inflicted.

The grounds on which these prohibitions were enacted are reducible to the following three heads:

(1) moral ropriety;

(2) the practices of heathen nations; and

(3) social convenience.

The first of these grounds comes prominently forward in the expressions by which the various offenses are characterized, as well as in the general prohibition against approaching “the flesh of his flesh.” The use of such expressions undoubtedly contains an appeal to the horror naturalis, or that repugnance with which man instinctively shrinks from matrimonial union with one with whom he is connected by the closest ties both of blood and of family affection. On this subject we need say no more than that there is a difference in kind between the affection that binds the members of a family together, and that which lies at the bottom of the matrimonial bond, and that the amalgamation of these affections cannot take place without a serious shock to one or the other of the two; hence the desirableness of drawing a distinct line between the provinces of each, by stating definitely where the matrimonial affection may legitimately take root. The second motive to laying down these prohibitions was that the Hebrews might be preserved as a peculiar people, with institutions distinct from those of the Egyptians and Canaanites (Lev 18:3), as well as of other heathen nations with whom they might come in contact. Marriages within the proscribed degrees prevailed in many civilized countries in historical times, and were not unusual among the Hebrews themselves in the pre-Mosaic age. For instance, marriages with half-sisters by the same father were allowed at Athens (Plutarch, Cim. 4; Themistocl. 32), with half-sisters by the same mother at Sparta (Philo, De spec. leg. p. 779), and with full sisters in Egypt (Diod. 1:27) and Persia, as illustrated in the well-known instances of Ptolemy Philadelphus in the former (Paus. 1:7, 1), and Cambyses in the latter country (Herod. 3:31). It was even believed that in some nations marriages between a son and his mother were not unusual (Ovid, het. 10:331; Eurip. Androm. 174). Among the Hebrews we have instances of marriage with a half-sister in the case of Abraham (Gen 20:12), with an aunt in the case of Amran (Exo 6:20), and with two sisters at the same time in the case of Jacob (Gen 29:26). Such cases were justifiable previous to the enactments of Moses: subsequently to them we have no case in the O.T. of actual marriage within the degrees, though the language of Tamar towards her half-brother Amnon (2Sa 13:13) implies the possibility of their union with the consent of their father. The Herods committed some violent breaches of the marriage law. Herod the Great married his halfsister (Ant. 17:1, 3); Archelaus his brother's widow, who had children (17:13,1); Herod Antipas his brother's wife (18:5, 1; Mat 14:3). In the Christian Church we have an instance of marriage with a father's wife (1Co 5:1), which St. Paul  characterizes as “fornication” (πορνεία), and visits with the severest condemnation. The third ground of the prohibitions, social convenience, comes forward solely in the case of marriage with two sisters simultaneously, the effect of which would be to “vex” or irritate the first wife, and produce domestic wars.

Besides the proscribed degrees, the Mosaic law also forbids the following intermarriages: 1. No Israelite is to marry the progeny of incestuous and unlawful copulations, or a manner ( ממזר, Deu 23:2). In the absence of any Biblical definition of this much-disputed expression, we must accept the ancient traditional explanation contained in the Mishna, which is as follows: ‘When there is betrothal without transgression of the law about forbidden marriages — e.g. if the daughters of priests, Levites, or Israelites are married to priests, Levites, or Israelites — the chill goes after the father; where there is betrothal, and this law has been transgressed — e.g. if a widow is married to a high-priest, a divorced woman or one who performed the ceremony of chralitsah to an ordinary priest, or a bastardess or a female nethin to an Israelite; or, vice versa, if a Jewess is married to a bastard or nethin— the child goes after the inferior party; where the woman cannot be betrothed to the man, but might legally be betrothed to another person — e.g.,

1. if a man married within any one of the degrees proscribed by the law — the child is a bastard or manner” (Kiddushin, 3:12).

2. Any person who is פצוע דכה, cujus testiculi vulnerati sunt, vel certe unus eorum, or כרות שפכה), cujus membruns virile precissum est, as the Mishna (Jebanoth, 8:2) explains it, is not allowed to marry (Deu 23:1).

3. A man is not to remarry a woman whom he had divorced, and who, after marrying another husband, had become a widow, or been divorced again (Deu 24:2-4).

4. Heiresses are not allowed to intermarry with persons of another tribe (Num 36:5-9).

5. A high-priest is forbidden to marry a widow, a divorced woman, a profane woman, or a harlot, and restricted to a pure Jewish maiden (Lev 21:13-14).

6. Ordinary priests are prohibited from marrying prostitutes and divorced women (Lev 21:7).

b. The proscription of epigamy with non-Israelites is absolute with regard to some nations, and conditional with regard to others. The Mosaic law absolutely forbids intermarriage with the seven Canaanitish nations, on the ground that it would lead the Israelites into idolatry (Exo 34:15-16; Deu 7:3-4); and with the Ammonites and Moabites, on account of national antipathy (Deu 23:4-8); while the prohibition against marriage with the Egyptians and Edomites only extends to the third generation (Deu 23:7-8). The Talmud, which rightly expounds the prohibition to “enter into the congregation of the Lord” as necessarily extending to epigamy (comp. 1Ki 11:2; Kiddushin, 4:3), takes the third generation to mean of those who becamse proselytes, i.e. the grandchildren of an Ammonite or Moabite who professes Judaism (Mishna, Jebamoth, 8:3; Maimonides, lad Ha-Chazaka, Issure Biah, 12:19, 20). This view is confirmed by the fact that the Bible only mentions three intermarriages with Egyptians, and records at least two out of the three to show the evil effects of it. One occurred after the Exodus and in the wilderness, and we are told that the son of this intermarriage, while quarreling with a brother Jew, blasphemed the name of God, and suffered capital punishment (Lev 24:10-14); the second occurred towards the end of the rulership of the judges, and tradition endeavors to show that Ishmael, the murderer of Gedaliah (Jer 41:1-2), was a descendant of Jarha, the Egyptian son-in-law of Sheshan (1Ch 2:34-35; and, Rashi, ad loc.); and the third is the intermarriage of Solomon, which, however, is excepted from the censure in the book of Kings (1Ki 3:1 sq.; 1Ki 11:1-2). Of intermarriages with Edomites not a single instance is; recorded in the O.T.; the Jewish antipathy against: them was transmitted down to a very late period, as we find in the declaration of Jesus, son of Sirach, that his soul hates the inhabitants of Seir (Sir 4:25-26), and in the fact that Judas Maccabaeus carried on a dead.ly war with them (1Ma 5:3; 2 Maccabees 20:15-23).

An exception is made in the case of female captives of war (Deu 21:10-14), which is evidently designed to obviate as far as possible the outrages committed after the evil passions have been stirred up in the conflict. The law, however, most humanely ordains that the captor, before making her his wife, should first allow her to indulge herself  for a full month in mourning for her parents, from whom she is snatched away, and to practice the following customary rites expressive of grief:

1. Cut off the hair of her head, which was the usual sign of mourning both among the Jews and other nations of antiquity (Ezr 9:3; Job 1:20; Isa 15:2;. Jer 7:29; Jer 16:6; Eze 7:18; Eze 27:31; Amo 8:10; Mic 1:16);

2. Cut off her nails, which were stained to form a part of personal adornment; and,

3. Put off the raiment in which she was taken captive, since the women who followed their fathers and husbands to the war put on their finest dresses and ornaments previous to an engagement, in the hope of finding favor in the eyes of their captors in case of a defeat (Ovid, Remied. Amor. 343; Rosenmüller, as alte u. neue Morgenland, 2:308).

The first complaint of epigamy with aliens is, strange to say, made against Moses, the lawgiver himself (Num 12:1). In the days of the Judges the law against intermarriage was commonly transgressed (Jdg 3:6), and from the earlier portions of the book of Proverbs, which ring with repeated denunciations of foreign women (Pro 2:16-17; Pro 5:8-11; Pro 15:17), as well as from the warnings of Isa 2:6, it is evident that intermarriages with foreign women were generally practiced in private life in after times. Of the twenty kings of Israel who reigned from the division of the kingdom to the Babylonian captivity, Ahab is the only one mentioned who married a foreign wife (1Ki 16:31); while of the nineteen kings of Judah after the division none intermarried with aliens. Marriages between Israelitish women and proselyted foreigners were at all times of rare occurrence, and are noticed in the Bible as if they were of an exceptional nature, such as that of an Egyptian and an Israelitish woman (Lev 24:10); of Abigail and Jether, the Ishmaelite, contracted probably when Jesse's family was sojourning in Moab (1Ch 2:17); of Sheshan's daughter and an Egyptian, who was staying in his house (1Ch 2:35); and of a Naphthalite woman and a Tyrian, living in adjacent districts (1Ki 7:14). In the reverse case, viz. the marriage of Israelites with foreign women, it is, of course, highly probable that the wives became proselytes after their marriage, as instanced in the case of Rth 1:16, and probably in that of Solomon's Egyptian wife (Psa 40:10); but this was by no means invariably the case. On the contrary, we find that the Canaanitish wives of Solomon (1Ki 11:4),  and the Phoenician wife of Ahab (1Ki 16:31), retained their idolatrous practices, and introduced them into their adopted countries. Proselytism does not, therefore, appear to have been a sine qua non in the case of a wife, though it was so in the case of a husband: the total silence of the law as to any such condition in regard to a captive, whom an Israelite might wish to marry, must be regarded as evidence of the reverse (Deu 21:10-14), nor have the refinements of rabbinical writers on that passage succeeded in establishing the necessity of proselytism. The opposition of Samson's parents to his marriage with a Philistine woman (Jdg 14:3) leads to the same conclusion.

3. In the post-exilian period, besides the fifteen proscribed degrees enumerated in Lev 18:7-17; Lev 20:11, etc., the Sopherlim, or scribes (B.C. 322-221), prohibited marriage with other relations (Mishna, Jebcamoth, 2:4), . and those prohibitions were afterwards extended still further by R.Chija ben-Abba the Babylonian (A.D. 163-193), and friend of Jehudah I the Holy (Jebamoth, 22. a). ‘The prohibited degrees of the scribes are denominated שניות, i.e. לעריותthe second or subordinate in rank with respect to those forbidden in the Bible, and may be seen in the following list given by Maimonides:

“1. The mother's mother, and this is infinite, for the mother's mother's mother's mother', and so upwards. are proscribed.

2. The mother of his father's mother, and no further.

3. His father's mother, and this is infinite, for even the father's mother's mother's mother, and so upwards, are proscribed.

4. The mother of his father's father only.

5. The wife of his father's father, and this is infinite, for even if she were the wife of our father Jacob, she is forbidden to every one of us.

6. The wife of his mother's father only.

7. The wife of his father's brother by the mother.

8. The wife of his mother's brother, whether by the mother or by the father.

9. His son's daughter-in-law, i.e. his son's son's wife, and this is infinite, for even if she were the son's son's son's son's wife,  descending to the end of the world, she is forbidden, so that, as long as the wife of one of us lives, she is secondary or forbidden to our father Jacob

10. His daughter's daughter-in-law, i.e. her son's wifl only.

11. The daughter of his son's daughter only.

12. The daughter of his son's son only.

13. The daughter of his daughter's daughter only.

14. The daughter of his daughter's son only.

15. The daughter of his wife's son only.

16. The daughter of his wife's daughter's daughter only.

17. The mother of his wife's father's mother only.

18. The mother of his wife's mother's father only.

19. The mother of his wife's mother's mother only.

20. The mother of his wife's father's father only.

Thus, of these secondary prohibitions, there are four which are infinite:

a, the mother's mother and all upwards;

b, the father's mother and all upwards;

c, the grandfather's wife and all upwards; and,

d, the son's son's wife and all downwards” (Hilchoth Ishuth, 1:6).

The principle by which the scribes were guided was to extend the prohibition to the whole line wherever the Mosaic law refers to lineal ascendants or descendants, as well as to those who might easily be mistaken by having a common appellation. Thus mother's mother's mother's mother, ad infinitum, is forbidden, because the Mosaic law proscribes the mother, so also the wife of the grandfather, because the wife's father is forbidden in the Mosaic law; while the mother of the father is proscribed, because the appellation grandmother is used without distinction for both the mother's and father's mother. From Maimonides's list, however, it will be seen that he, like Alfasi, restricts prohibition 2 to  the mother of the grandfather, and prohibitions 12-16, 20, to the son's grandchildren, great-grandmother, and great-grandchildren, but does not extend it to any further ascendants or descendants. The whole subject is extensively discussed in the Talmud (Jebamoth, 21, 22; Jerusalem Jebamoth, 2:4), and by Maimonides (Istel Ha-Chazaka, Hilchoth Ishuth, 1:6, etc.), to which we must refer. It must, however, be remarked that Philo's list of proscribed degrees is much shorter. After explaining why Moses prohibited marriage with one's own mother or sister, he says, “For this reason he has also forbidden other matrimonial connections, inasmuch as he ordained that a man shall not marry his granddaughter (μὴ θυγατριδῆν, μὴ υἱδῆν), nor his aunt on the father's or mother's side, nor the wife of an uncle, son, or brother; nor a step-daughter while in the lifetime of her mother or after her death, because a stepfather takes the place of a father, and a step-daughter is to be looked upon as his own daughter. Neither does he allow the same man to marry two sisters, either at the same time or at different times, even in case one of them had been married to another and is divorced; for he did not consider it pious that one sister should succeed to the place of her unfortunate sister, whether the latter is still cohabiting with him, or is divorced and has no husband. or is married to another husband” (De special. legibus, 780). Still shorter is the list of Josephus, who says, “The law prohibits it as a heavy sin and an abomination to have carnal intercourse with one's mother, step-mother, father's or mother's sister, one's own sister, or a son's wife” (Ant. 3:12, 1). Marriage with a wife's step-mother is allowed by the Babylonian and forbidden by the Jerusalem Talmud; the Spanish Jews follow the former, while the Germano-French communities adopt the latter. Intermarriages between cousins, uncle and niece, entire step-brother and step-sister, are quite legitimate. Indeed, for an uncle to marry a niece, which the English law forbids, has been considered by the Jews from time immemorial as something specially meritorious. The Talmud says that the promise given in Isaiah, “Then shalt thou call and the Lord shall answer” (58:9), refers to that man especially “who loves his neighbors, befriends his relations, marries his brother's daughter, and lends money to the poor in the hour of need” (Jebamoth, 62 b. 63 a).

As to the ethical cause of the proscribed marriages, or the cases specified, including parallels by affinity. the ancient Jews, to whom the oracles of God were committed, and who had to explain and administer the law in practical life, knew nothing about it. The Palestinian doctors regarded the  proscribed degrees as a positive law, the cause of which cannot be divined by human reason (Sifra Kedoshim, 9:12; Talmud, Sabbath, 130 a; Joma, 75 a). The only attempt to rationalize on the subject is on the apparent inconsistency of the Mosaic law in prohibiting marriage with the wife of the father's brother, in case she is divorced or left a widow, and not forbidding the wife of the mother's brother. Upon this the Talmud remarks that a man visits his father's relations more than his mother's (Jebamoth, 21 a; and Rashi on this passage); and it is submitted, and we believe with perfect reason, and based on Num 1:2, that it is the father's relations who constitute the family, and not the mother's. We thus see that up to the time of the Ptolemies, when the Greek loose barriers of consanguinity threatened to fall among the Jewish families, the ancient Hebrews were bound only by the specific proscriptions in the Mosaic law, and that even after the prohibitions were extended by the scribes, the proscription of a male relative by blood did not imply the wife's relatives of the like degree, because of the strong distinction made by them between consanguinity and affinity by marriage; the former being permanent and sacred, and the latter uncertain and vague, as a man might any moment divorce his wife, or take as many as he pleased, and because the husband's family were regarded as the relations, while the wife's were not esteemed beyond those who are especially mentioned.

The proscribed degrees were sacredly avoided by the Jews during this period, and no dispensation could be obtained by any one, no matter how high his position, as Judaism never invested any spiritual functionary with power to absolve, even in extraordinary cases, from the obligations of the law. Hence the outcry against Herod the Great, who married his half-sister (Josephus, Ant. 17:1, 3); against Archelaus, who took his deceased brother's widow when she was the mother of children (ibid. 17:13, 1); and against Herod Antipas, for which John the Baptist had to atone with his life (Josephus, Ant. 18:5, 1; Mat 14:3). So long as foreign epigamy was of merely occasional occurrence no veto was placed upon it by public authority; but when, after the return from the Babylonian captivity, the Jews contracted marriages with the heathen inhabitants of Palestine in so wholesale a manner as to endanger their national existence, the practice was severely condemned (Ezr 9:2; Ezr 10:2), and the law of positive prohibition, originally pronounced only against the Canaanites, was extended to the Moabites, Ammonites, and Philistines (Neh 13:23-25). Public feeling was thenceforth strongly opposed to foreign  marriages, and the union of Manasseh with a Cuthaean led to such animosity as to produce the great national schism, which had its focus in the temple on Mount Gerizim (Josephus, Ant. 11:8, 2) A no less signal instance of the same feeling is exhibited in the cases of Joseph (Ant. 12:4, 6) and Anilaets (Ant. 18:9, 5), and is noticed by Tacitus (Hist. v. 5) as one of the characteristics of the Jewish nation in his day. In the N.T. no special directions are given on this head. but the general precepts of separation between believers and unbelievers (2Co 6:14; 2Co 6:17) would apply with special force to the case of marriage; and the permission to dissolve mixed marriages, contracted previously to the conversion of one party, at the instance of the unconverted one, cannot but be regarded as implying the impropriety of such unions subsequently to conversion (1Co 7:12).

Besides the proscribed degrees, the rabbinic law also enacted —

1. A man must not marry a divorced woman with whom he has committed adultery prior to her divorcement (Sotet, 27), or even if he is only suspected of it (Jebamoth, 24; Maimonides, Sofa, i 12).

2. A man who attested the death of the husband is not allowed to marry the widow, nor is the bearer of a divorce permitted to marry the divorced woman, to avoid suspicion (Jebamoth, 2:9, 10).

3. If a man's wife dies, he must not marry again till three festivals after his wife's death (Moed Katon, 23).

4. A man is not to marry a woman who has lost two husbands (Jebamoth, 64).

5. A father is not to give a young daughter in marriage to an old man, nor is a young man to marry an old woman (Jebamoth, 101; Maimonides, Isure Bia, 21:26).

6. A man is not to marry within thirty days of the death of a near relation (Voed Katon, 23).

7. Widows are not to marry within ninety days of the loss of their husbands. nor are divorced women to marry within ninety days of their being divorced, in order that the paternity of the newly-born child might be distinguished (Jebamoth, 41 a).  8. If a widow or a divorced woman is nursing an infant, she must not marry within twenty-four months of the birth of the baby (Jebamoth, 41; Kethuboth, 60; and Tossafoth, on these passages).

VI. Sanctity of Marriage, and Mutual Rights of Husband and Wife. —

1. Though at the creation the wife occupied an equal position with the husband, being a part of him, yet, as she became the cause of his sin, God ordained it as part of her punishment that the wife should be in subjection to the will of her husband, and that he should be her master, and “rule over her” (Gen 3:16). This dependence of the wife on her husband is henceforth declared by the very Hebrew appellation (באל) for husband (Exo 21:3; Exo 21:22), which literally denotes lord, master, owner, and is seen in the conduct of Sarah, who speaks of her husband Abraham as (אדני) my lord (Gen 18:12), which is commended by Peter as illustrating the proper position of a wife (1Pe 3:6). From this mastery of the husband over the wife arose the different standard of virtue which obtained in married life. The wife, as subject to her husband, her lord and master, was not allowed to practice polyandry; she was obliged to regard the sanctity of marriage as absolute, and any unchastity on her part was visited with capital punishment; while the husband could take any unmarried woman he liked and violate the laws of chastity, as we should view it, with impunity (Gen 38:24). This absolute sanctity of marriage on the part of the wife was also acknowledged by other nations of antiquity, as is gathered from the narratives of the patriarchs. Thus Abraham knew that Pharaoh would not take Sarah from her husband, and we are told that as soon as the Egyptian monarch discovered that she was a married woman, he immediately restored her to her husband (Gen 12:15-19); and this is confirmed by Egyptology, which, based on ancient writers and monuments, shows that he who seduced a married woman received a thousand rods, and that the woman had her nose cut off (Uhlemann, AEgypt. Alterthumsk. 11, sec. 25, 65). The same sanctity was attached to a married woman in Philistia (Gen 20:1-18; Gen 26:9-11).

2. Recognizing the previously-existing inequality of husband and wife, and basing its laws upon the then prevailing notion that the husband is lord over his wife, that he can take as many wives as he likes, and send them away whenever he dislikes them, the Mosaic gamology, as a matter of course, could neither impose the same obligation of nuptial fidelity nor confer the same rights on both. This is evident from the following facts:  1. The husband had a right to expect from his wife connubial chastity, and in case of infidelity could demand her death as well as that of her seducer (Lev 20:10; Deu 22:20-22; Eze 16:40; Joh 8:5).

2. If he became jealous and suspicious of her, even when she had not been unfaithful, he could bring her before the priest and have administered to her the water of jealousy (Num 5:12-31). But if the husband was suspected, or was actually guilty of carnal intercourse with an unmarried woman, no statute was enacted to enable the wife or wives to arraign him for a breach of marriage or infringement of her or their rights. Even when he was discovered with another man's wife, it was the injured husband that had the power to demand the death of the seducer, but not the wife of the criminal.

3. If the wife vowed anything to the Lord, or imposed upon herself voluntary obligations to the Deity, her husband could nullify it (Num 30:6-8).

4. He could send her away or divorce her when she displeased him (Deu 24:14).

The woman, again, is protected by the following laws:

1. When a Hebrew maiden is sold by her father to a man, with the understanding that she is to be his half-wife ( אמה=פילגש, Exo 21:7; Jdg 9:18 with Jdg 8:31), the law enacts that, in case her master and intended husband is displeased with her, and he refuses to redeem his promise —

i, he is not to keep her till the sabbatic year, and then give her her liberty like ordinary servants;

ii, he is not to sell her to any one else as a wife;

iii, he may give her to his son as a wife, and in that case must treat her as a daughter-in-law;

iv, if he gives his son an additional wife, she is to retain — a, her food, b, raiment, and, c, conjugal right as heretofore; and,

v, if these three last-mentioned points are refused to her, she is forthwith to be set at liberty (Exo 21:7-11).

2. If he maliciously impugns her chastity, he is to be scourged, and loses his right over her to divorce her (Deu 22:13-19)

3. If she has children, they must render equal obedience to her as to the father (Exo 20:12; Deu 27:16).

4. The husband must not vex her by marrying two sisters simultaneously (Lev 18:18).

5. He is not allowed to annoy his less-beloved wife by transferring the primogeniture from her son to the child of his favorite wife (Deu 21:15-17).

6. If her husband dislikes her, he is not arbitrarily to dismiss her, but give her a “bill of divorcement” (Deu 24:1), which requires the interposition of legal advisers.

7. When a woman is divorced, or her husband dies, she is free, and at liberty to marry any one she likes, as is evident from the enactments in Lev 21:7-8; Lev 21:13; Deu 24:2-4; Deu 25:5, which are based upon this fact.

3. The notions about sanctity of marriage were loftier during the post- exilian period than in the preceding epochs, as may be judged from the fact that unfaithfulness to a wife is denounced by the prophet Malachi as violating a sacred covenant, to the transaction of which God himself was a witness (Mal 2:14). And though it may be questioned whether the prophet's appeal to God as having been witness to the marriage-contract refers to the above-named seven benedictions (שבע ברכות) which the bridegroom had to pronounce at the marriage-feast, and in which he invoked God's presence and blessing to the compact, as Abrabanel will have it. yet there can be no doubt that marriage is here for the first time expressly described as a covenant (ברית) made in the presence of God. With such a view of the sanctity of marriage, the notion that a wife is a plaything for a leisure hour rapidly disappeared, and the sages who had to expound the law to the people in the time of Christ taught that the declaration “Peace shall be in thy house” (Job 5:24) will be realized by him “who loves his wife as himself, and honors her more than himself, and trains his sons and daughters up in the way of righteousness” (Jebamoth, 62 b). Moreover, marriage was regarded as illegal if the man had not given to his wife the instrument (כתובה), in which he promises his wife, “I will  work for thee, honor thee. maintain thee, and provide for thee, according to the custom of Jewish husbands.” The rabbinic laws both define this promise and insist upon its being fulfilled, as may be seen from the following enactments:

1. A wife is to be kept in proportion to the circumstances of her husband, and have her meals with him at the table; if he ill-treats her and she removes from him, he is obliged to send her maintenance (Jebamoth, 64 b).

2. If the husband goes on a three months' journey without making provision for his wife, the legal authorities of the place are to maintain her from his property (Kethuboth, 48 a, 107).

3. He is obliged to perform the duties of a husband within a stated period (Mishna, Kethuboth, v. 6).

4. If her husband dies, she is to be maintained from his property, or by the children, in the same manner as she was in his lifetime, till she is betrothed to another man, and her rights must be attended to before the claims of any one else (Kethuboth, 43, 51, 52, 68,103; Jerusalem Kethuboth, 4:14).

5. If a woman marries a man of higher rank than herself, she rises with him; but if he is inferior to her. she does not descend to him ( ואינה עולה עמו יורדת[Kethuboth, 48 a, 61 a]). For other rights which the wife possesses we must refer to the Kethubah, or the marriage- instrument given in section 2 of this period. The husband, on the other hand, has a right to expect from his wife chastity which is beyond the reach of suspicion, unreserved obedience, and to do the work of a housewife. Other rights are given in the following section on divorce.

VII. Divorce. —

1. The arbitrary power of the husband over his wife in the patriarchal age is also seen in the fact that he could divorce her at his pleasure. There is but one instance of it recorded, but it is a very significant one. Abraham, though he has a child by Hagar, sends away his half-wife, not requiring any legal or religious intervention (Gen 21:14), but, as in the case of marriage, effecting it by a mere verbal declaration. Wherever marriages are effected by the violent, exercise of the patria. potestas, or without any bon  of f affection between the parties concerned, ill-assorted matches must be of frequent occurrence; and without the remedy of divorce, in such a state of society, we can understand the truth of the apostles' remark that “it is not good to marry” (Mat 19:10). Hence divorce prevails to a great extent in all countries where marriage is the result of arbitrary appointment or of purchase: we may instance the Arabians (Burckhardt's Notes, 1:111; Layard, Nineveh, 1:357) and the Egyptians (Lane, 1:235 sq.).

2. It must be remarked that the Mosaic law does not institute divorce, but, as in other matters, recognizes and most humanely regulates the prevailing patriarchal practice (Deu 24:1-4). The ground on which the law allows a divorce is termed ערות דבר, any shameful thing. What the precise meaning of this ambiguous phrase is, and what, according to the Mosaic gamology, gives a husband the right to divorce his wife, has been greatly disputed in the schools of Shammai and Hillel, which were founded before the advent of Christ, and these discussions are given below. It is, however, certain that the phrase does not denote fornication or adultery, for in that case the woman was not divorced, but stoned (Lev 20:10; Deu 22:20-22; Eze 16:40; Joh 8:5). Moreover, the phrase מצא חן בעיני פלני, with which this statute begins, when used of opposite sexes, as in the case before us, generally denotes favorable i impression which one produces on the other, by graceful manners, or beautiful appearance (Gen 39:4; Rth 2:2; Rth 2:10; Rth 2:13; Eze 5:2 with 8). That it has this sense here seems to be warranted by Eze 5:3, where it is supposed that, the divorced woman marries again, and her second husband also divorces her, and that not on account of immorality, but because he does not like her. The humane regulations which the Mosaic gamology introduced in order to render a divorce legal were as follows:

1. If a man dislikes his wife, or finds that he cannot live happily with her, he is not summarily to send her away by word of mouth as heretofore, but is to give her a formal and judicial bill of divorcement (ספר כריתת), which required the intervention of a legal adviser, and caused delay, thus affording time for reflection, and preventing many a divorce resolved on under the influence of passion.

2. Allowing the parties, even after the dissolution of the marriage, to renew the connection if they wished it, provided the divorced wife had not in the meantime married another husband, and become a widow, or  been again divorced. Not only are bishop Patrick (on Deu 24:4), Michaelis (Law's of Moses, 2:137, English translation), and many other Christian expositors, of this opinion, but it has been so understood and acted upon by those who were charged with the administration of the law from time immemorial. The only exception which the sages made was when a man divorced his wife because of an evil report which he maliciously circulated about her; then he was not allowed to remarry her (Mishna, Gittin, 4:7).

3. If the divorced woman marries again, and the second husband either dies or divorces her, she is not allowed to remarry her first husband: this was to preclude the possibility of procuring the death of, or a divorce from, the second husband, in case the parties wished to be reunited.

4. If a man seduces a maiden, and on this account is legally obliged to marry her, “he may not put her away all his life” (Deu 22:28-29). Or,

5. If he groundlessly impugns her chastity, he also loses the power of ever divorcing her (Deu 22:13-19). This, as well as the preceding benign law, was evidently designed to make men care for those women whom they had either virtually or actually deprived of their moral character, and who, if these men were allowed to desert them, might never be able to get husbands. Thus these laws, while checking seduction, inasmuch as the man knew that he would have all his lifetime to be wedded to and care for the injured woman, also prevented those females who had momentarily fallen from being branded for life, and compelled to give themselves up to prostitution.

6. Though the Mosaic law has no express statute that the wife, under certain circumstances, may demand a divorce from her husband, yet it is undoubtedly implied in the enactment contained in Exo 21:10. For if a bondwoman who became the wife of her master could quit him if he did not fulfill the conditions of a husband, it, is but natural to conclude that a free wife would, under similar circumstances, be able to claim the protection of the same law. A few instances of the violation of the divorce law, between the period of its enactment and the Babylonian captivity, are incidentally recorded without any censure whatever. Thus we are told that Saul took away Michal, his daughter, David's wife, without David's formally divorcing her, and gave her to  Phalti (1Sa 25:44), and that David took back again Michal, who had been united to another husband (2Sa 3:14-16). Still the laws of divorce and of prohibiting reunion after the divorced woman had been married to another husband are alluded to by Jeremiah as well known and commonly observed (Jer 3:1-8).

3. The rather uncertain grounds on which the Mosaic law permits divorce (Deu 24:1-4) were minutely defined during the period after the exile. Though the school of Shammai restricts the phrase ערות דברto unchastity, and the Sadducees too insisted that divorce is not to be tolerated except when the woman is guilty of adultery (Eschol Ba-Copher, Alphab. xcix; Ben-Chonanja, 4:276), yet the Jews as a nation, as well as most Christian expositors, agree with the school of Hillel, (Mishna, Gittin, 9:10) that it denotes faults or deforimities, as the context plainly shows. Now, in stating the grounds on which the Jewish expositors of the law, in the time of Christ and after, regarded dissolution of marriage as justifiable, we must distinguish the cases in which the legal authorities themselves took up the matter, from those in which the married parties asked for divorce.

a. Dissolution of marriage occasioned by the lawful authorities took place —

1. When the woman is guilty of adultery.

2. When the woman carries on secret intercourse with a man after her husband has warned her against it (Sota, 27; Jebamoth, 24).

3. Where, though betrothal had taken place, yet a matrimonial law (matrimonium injustum) is violated, either referring to the proscribed degrees or to other matters enacted by the rabbins.

4. When the husband is infected with leprosy (Kethuboth, 77).

b. It was granted on the demand of the married parties. Thus the husband could effect a dissolution of marriage —

1. When his wife, by violating the Mosaic law, caused him, without knowing it, to be guilty of transgression (Mishna, Kethuboth, 7:6).

2. If the wife violates the bounds of modesty — e.g. by going into the street with uncovered hair, flirting with young men, etc. (ibid.).  3. If the wife is suspected of adultery.

4. If the woman curses her father-in-law in the presence of her husband (Kethuboth, 72).

5. If the wife will not follow her husband to another place (Kethuboth. 110).

6. If the wife refuses her husband the conjugal rights for twelve months.

The wife can demand a divorce —

1. If after marriage the husband contracts a loathsome disease (Mishna, Kethuboth, 7:9, 10).

2. If after marriage he betakes himself to a disgusting business (ibid. the Gemara thereon, 75).

3. If he treats her cruelly (Eben Ha-Ezar, 154).

4. If her husband changes his religion (ibid.).

5. If the husband commits an offense which makes him flee from his country (Eben Ha-Ezar, 9).

6. If he leads a dissolute and immoral life (Eben Ha-Ezar, Gloss on Sects, 11).

7. If he wastes his property and neglects to maintain her (Mishna, Kethuboth, 7:1).

8. If he refuses her connubial rights (Mishna, Kethuboth, v. 6).

There are other grounds on which divorce can be obtained, but for these we must refer to the Mishna, Gittin, as they are too numerous to be detailed. The bill of divorcement must be handed over, either by the husband or a messenger, to the wife or one deputed by her, with the words, “This is thy divorce; thou art henceforth divorced from me, and canst marry whomsoever thou likest” (Mishna, Gittin, 9). It must, however, be remarked that divorce was greatly discouraged by the Talmudists, and it is declared that The who divorces his wife is hated of God. The altar sheds tears over him who divorces the wife and companion of his youth” (Gittin, 90 a).  During the post-exilian period the abuse of divorce continued unabated (Josephus, Life, 76); and under the Asmonaean dynasty the right was assumed by the wife as against her husband, an innovation which is attributed to Salome by Josephus (Ant. 15:7, 10), but which appears to have been prevalent in the apostolic age, if we may judge from passages where the language implies that the act emanated from the wife (Mar 10:12; 1Co 7:11), as well as from some of the comments of the early writers on 1Ti 5:9. Our Lord and his apostles re- established the integrity and sanctity of the marriage-bond by the following measures:

(1) by the confirmation of the;original charter of marriage as the basis on which all regulations are to be framed (Mat 19:4-5);

(2) by the restriction of divorce to the case of fornication, and the prohibition of remarriage in all persons divorced on improper grounds (Mat 5:32; Mat 19:9; Rom 7:3; 1Co 7:10-11); and

(3) by the enforcement of moral purity generally (Heb 13:4, etc.), and especially by the formal condemnation of fornication, which appears to have been classed among acts morally indifferent (ἀδιάφορα) by a certain party in the Church (Act 15:20).

VIII. Levirate Law. —

1. The only power which a woman had over the man during the pre- Mosaic period, in matrimonial matters, was when her husband died without issue. The widow could then claim his next brother to marry her; if the second also died without progeny, she could ask the third, and so on. The object of this Levirate marriage, as it is called, from the Latin, levir, brother-in-law (Hebrew, יבם; Greek, ἐπιγαμβρέω), is “to raise up seed to the departed brother,” which should preserve his name upon his inheritance, and prevent it from being erased from among his brethren, and from the gate of his town (Gen 38:8; Deu 25:6; Rth 4:10); since the Hebrews regarded childlessness as a great evil (Gen 16:4; Gen 19:31), and entire excision as a most dire calamity and awful punishment from God (Deu 9:14; Psa 9:7; Psa 109:15). To remove this reproach from the departed, it was regarded as the sacred duty of the eldest surviving brother to marry the widow, and the first-born son resulting from such an alliance was to all intents and  purposes considered as the representative and heir of the deceased.

Thus we are told that when Er, Judah's eldest son, who was married to Tamar, died without issue, the second son was called upon to marry his deceased brother's widow, and that when he again died, leaving no children, Tamar, the widow, had still a claim upon the only surviving son, for whom she had to wait, as he was not as yet marriageable (Gen 38:6-12; Gen 38:14; Gen 38:26). Ultimately Judah himself had to marry his daughter-in-law, for she inveigled him into it as a punishment for neglecting to give her his third son (Gen 38:26-30); and Pharez, the issue of this Levirate marriage, not only became the founder of a numerous and illustrious family, but was the direct line from which the royal family of David descended, and the channel through which the Messiah was born (Gen 38:29, with Mat 1:3). This Levirate marriage was not peculiar to the Hebrews. It also obtained among the Moabites (Rth 1:11-13), Persians (Kleuker, Zendavesta, 3:226), Indians (Asiatic Researches, 3:35), and still exists in Arabia (Burckhardt, Notes, 1:112; Niebuhr, Voyage, p. 61), among the tribes of the Caucasus (Hanthausen, Trans-caucasia, p. 403), and other nations (comp. Leyser, in Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 8:358, s.v. Leviratsehe).

2. This law, which, as we have seen, existed from time immemorial both among the patriarchs and other nations of antiquity, was at length formally enacted as part of the Biblical gamology. In adopting this law, however, as in the case of other primitive practices incorporated in the Mosaic code, the sacred legislator both prescribes for it definite limits, and most humanely deprives it of the irksome and odious features which it possessed in ancient times. This is evident from the enactment itself, which is as follows: “If brothers dwell together, and one of them die and have no child, the wife of the deceased shall not marry out of the family a stranger; her husband's brother shall go in unto her. and take her as his wife, and perform the duty of a brother-in-law. Her first-born shall then succeed in the name of the deceased brother, so that his name be not blotted out of Israel” (Deu 25:5-6). Accordingly —

1. This law is restricted to brothers who dwell together, i.e. in contiguous properties, as the rabbinical law explains it according to the meaning of the phrase שהת יחדיוin Gen 13:6; Gen 36:7, and elsewhere. If the brothers lived far away, or if the deceased had no brothers at all, it was an understood thing that it devolved upon the nearest of kin to marry the widow, or care for her if she was too old,  when, of course, it passed over from the domain of Leviration into that of Goel or redeemer (Rth 2:20; Rth 3:9; Rth 4:15-16).

2. To cases where no issue whatever is left, as בןis here used in its general sense of offspring and not specifically for son. This is not only confirmed by the Sept. (σπέρμα), Matthew (μὴ ἔχων σπέρμα, 22:5), Mark (Mar 12:19). Luke (ἄτεκνος, 20:28), Josephus (Ant. 4:8, 23), and the Talmud (Jebamoth, 22 b), but is evident from the law of inheritance (Num 27:8-11), in which it is declared that if a man dies without leaving a son, his daughter is to inherit the property. For if his widow could claim the surviving brother to marry her in order to raise up a son to the deceased, the daughter who legally came to the inheritance would either have to lose her possessions, or the son born of the Levirate marriage would have to be without patrimony.

In fulfilling the duty of the Levir in the patriarchal age the surviving brother had to make great sacrifices. He had not only to renounce the perpetuating of his own name through the first-born son (Gen 38:9), and mar his own inheritance (Rth 4:6), but, what was most galling, he was obliged to take the widow whether he had an inclination for any such marriage or not, as the Levir in the patriarchal age had no alternative. Now the Mosaic law removed this hardship by opening to the man a door of escape: ‘But if the man like not to take his brother's wife, then let his brother's wife go up to the gate of the elders and say, My husband's brother refuseth to raise up unto his brother a name in Israel; he will not perform the Levirate duty. And the elders of the city shall call him, and speak unto him. But if he still persist and say, I like not to take her then shall his brother's wife come in to him in the presence of the elders. and loose his shoe from off his foot, and spit in his face and say, So shall it be done unto that man that will not build up his brother's house; and his house shall be called in Israel the house of the barefoot” (Deu 25:7-10). Thus the Mosaic gamology does not impose it as an inexorable law, but simply enjoins it as a duty of love, which the Levir might escape by submitting to censure and reproach. Of this he could hot complain, for he not only neglected to perform towards his deceased brother the most sacred offices of love, but, by refusing to do so, he openly declared his dislike to the widow, and thus publicly insulted her. The symbolic manner in which she took away in the public court his right to her and his deceased brother's possession, has its origin in the fact that the possession of property was claimed by planting the foot on it. Hence, when the transfer of property was effected by an  amicable transaction, the original owner signified the renunciation of his rights by taking off his shoe and giving it to the new possessor (Rth 4:7-8). A similar custom obtained among the Indians (Benary, de Hebraeorum Leviratu, Berol. 1835, p. 14) and the ancient Germans (Grimm, Deutsche Rechtsalterthümer, p. 156). In the case before us, however, where the privilege of possession was not renounced by a mutual understanding, but involved insult both to the deceased brother and the surviving widow, the outraged sister-in-law snatched the right from him by pulling off his shoe.

3. That this patriarchal law-which, as we have seen, was incorporated in the Mosaic gamology — continued in its full force after the Captivity, is evident from Mat 22:25-27, Mar 12:19-23, and Luk 20:28-33. From the question put to our Savior in these passages, it will be seen that it was incumbent upon each surviving brother in succession to perform the duty of the Levir. There were, however, cases where this duty could not be performed, about which the Mosaic law gives no directions whatever — e.g. when the deceased brother's widow was a near relation of the Levir and came within the proscribed degrees, of which the Mishna (Jebaemoth, 1:1) gives fifteen cases; or when the latter was a child when his brother died and left a widow without issue (2:3); and if he were on this or any other account exempt from the obligation to marry one of the widows, he was also from the obligation to marry any of them (1:1); it is also implied that it was only necessary for one brother to marry one of the widows in cases where there were several widows left. The marriage was not to take place within three months of the husband's death (4:10). The eldest brother ought to perform the duty of marriage; but, on his declining it, a younger brother might do it (2:8; 4:5). The chalitstah was regarded as involving future relationship, so that a man who had received it could not marry the widow's relations within the prohibited degrees (4:7). Special rules are laid down for cases where a woman married under a false impression as to her husband's death (10:1), or where a mistake took place as to whether her son or her husband died first (10:3), for in the latter case the Levirate law would not apply; and, again, as to the evidence of the husband's death to be produced in certain cases (cap. 15, 16).

There can, therefore, be no question that the administrators of the law in the time of the prophets and at the advent of our Savior had to define and supplement the Levirate law. As the space of this article does not permit us to enumerate these important definitions and enactments. we must refer to the  Mishna, Tract Jebamoth, which derives its name (יבמות) from the fact that it embodies these laws. These descend into trivial distinctions — e.g. that the shoe was to be of leather, or a sandal furnished with a heel-strap; a felt shoe, or a sandal without a strap, would not do (Yebam. 12:1, 2). The chalitsah was not valid when the person performing it was deaf and dumb (12:4), as he could not learn the precise formula which accompanied the act. The custom is retained by the modern Jews, and is minutely described by Picart (Ceremonuies Religieuses, 1:243). It receives illustration from the expression used by the modern Arabs in speaking of a repudiated wife: ‘She was my slipper. I have cast her off” (Burckhardt, Notes, 1:113). It only remains to be remarked that the fear lest the performance of the duty of Levir should come into collision with the law of consanguinity, made the ancient rabbins declare that (חליצה קודם ליבום) the ceremony of taking off the shoe is preferable to marrying the widow, and thus virtually set aside Levirate marriages. As this ceremony, which is called Chalitsah ( חליצהfrom חלוֹ, to draw out, to pull of), supersedes the ancient law, the rabbins gave very minute orders about the manner in which it is to be performed. The ceremony is performed in the syllagogue after morning prayer, in the presence of three rabbis and two witnesses, attended by others of the congregation as auditors and spectators. The Levir and widow are called forward, and after being questioned by the principal rabbi, and avowing his determination not to marry her, the man puts on a shoe of a peculiar form and made for this purpose, and the woman repeats, “My husband's brother refuseth to raise up unto his brother a name in Israel; he will not perform the duty of my husband's brother.” To which the Levir replies, “I like not to take her.” Upon this declaration the widow unties the shoe with her right hand, takes it off, throws it on the ground, and spits before him, saying in Hebrew, “So shall it be done unto that man that will not build up his brother's house: and his name shall be called in Israel, The house of him that hath his shoe loosed;” when the persons present exclaim three times, “His shoe is loosed!” This concludes the ceremony, and the rabbi tells the widow that she is now at liberty to marry whom she pleases.

IX. In considering the social and domestic conditions of married life among the Hebrews, we must, in the first place, take into account the position assigned to women generally in their social scale. The seclusion of the harem, and the habits consequent upon it, were utterly unknown in early times, and the condition of the Oriental woman, as pictured to us in  the Bible, contrasts most favorably with that of her modern representative. There is abundant evidence that women, whether married or unmarried, went about with their faces unveiled (Gen 12:14; Gen 24:16; Gen 24:65; Gen 29:11; 1Sa 1:13). An unmarried woman might meet and converse with men, even strangers, in a public place (Gen 24:24; Gen 29:9-12; 1Sa 9:2); she might be found alone in the country without any reflection on her character (Deu 22:25-27); or she might appear in a court of justice (Num 27:2). Women not unfrequently held important offices: some were prophetesses, as Miriam, Deborah, Huldah, Noadiah, and Anna; of others advice was sought in emergencies (2Sa 14:2; 2Sa 20:16-22). They took their part in matters of public interest (Exo 15:20; 1Sa 18:6-7); in short., they enjoyed as much freedom in ordinary life as the women of our own country.

If such was her general position, it is certain that the wife must have exercised an important influence in her own home. She appears to have taken her part in family affairs, and even to have enjoyed a considerable amount of independence. For instance, she entertains guests at her own desire (2Ki 4:8) in the absence of her husband (Jdg 4:18), and sometimes even in defiance of his wishes (1Sa 25:14, etc.); she disposes of her child by a vow without any reference to her husband (1Sa 1:24); she consults with him as to the marriage of her children (Gen 27:46); her suggestions as to any domestic arrangements meet with due attention (2Ki 4:9); and occasionally she criticizes the conduct of her husband in terms of great severity (1Sa 25:25; 2Sa 6:20).

The relations of husband and wife appear to have been characterized by affection and tenderness. He is occasionally described as the “friend” of his wife (Jer 3:20; Hos 3:1), and his love for her is frequently noticed (Gen 24:67; Gen 29:18). On the other hand, the wife was the consolation of the husband in time of trouble (Gen 24:67), and her grief at his loss presented a picture of the most abject woe (Joe 1:8). No stronger testimony, however, can be afforded as to the ardent affection of husband and wife than that which we derive from the general tenor of the book of Canticles. At the same time we cannot but think that the exceptions to this state of affairs were more numerous than is consistent with our ideas of matrimonial happiness. One of the evils inseparable from polygamy is the discomfort arising from the jealousies and quarrels of the several wives, as instanced in the households of Abraham and Elkanaah  (Gen 21:11; 1Sa 1:6). The purchase of wives, and the small amount of liberty allowed to daughters in the choice of husbands, must inevitably have led to unhappy unions. The allusions to the misery of a contentious and brawling wife in the Proverbs (Pro 19:13; Pro 21:9; Pro 21:19; Pro 27:15) convey the impression that the infliction was of frequent occurrence in Hebrew households, and in the Mishna (Ketub. 7:6) the fact of a woman being noisy is laid down as an adequate ground for divorce. In the N.T. the mutual relations of husband and wife are a subject of frequent exhortation (Eph 5:22-33; Col 3:18-19; Tit 2:4-5; 1Pe 3:1-7): it is certainly a noticeable coincidence that these exhortations should be found exclusively in the epistles addressed to Asiatics, nor is it improbable that they were more particularly needed for them than for Europeans.

The duties of the wife in the Hebrew household were multifarious. In addition to the general superintendence of the domestic arrangements, such as cooking, from which even women of rank were not exempted (Gen 18:6; 2Sa 13:8), and the distribution of food at meal- times (Pro 31:15), the manufacture of the clothing and the various textures required in an Eastern establishment devolved upon her (Pro 31:13; Pro 31:21-22); and if she were a model of activity and skill, she produced a surplus of fine linen shirts and girdles, which she sold, and so, like a well-freighted merchant-ship, brought in wealth to her husband from afar (Pro 31:14; Pro 31:24). The poetical description of a good housewife drawn in the last chapter of the Proverbs is both filled up and in some measure illustrated by the following minute description of a wife's duties towards her husband, as laid down in the Mishna: “She must grind corn, and bake, and wash, and cook, and suckle his child, make his bed, and work in wool. If she brought her husband one bondwoman, she need not grind, bake, or wash; if two, she need not cook nor suckle his child; if three, she need not make his bed nor work in wool; if four, she may sit in her chair of state” (Ketub. v. 5). Whatever money she earned by her labor belonged to her husband (6:1). The qualification not only of working, but of working at home (Tit 2:5, where οἰκουργούς is preferable to οἰκουρούς), was insisted on in the wife, and to spin in the street was regarded as a violation of Jewish customs (Ketub. 7:6).

The legal rights of the wife are noticed in Exo 21:10, under the three heads of food, raiment, and duty of marriage or conjugal right. These were defined with great precision by the Jewish doctors, for thus only  could one of the most cruel effects of polygamy be averted, viz. the sacrifice of the rights of the many in favor of the one whom the lord of the modern harem selects for his special attention. The regulations of the Talmudists, founded on Exo 21:10, may be found in the Mishna (Ketub. av. 6-9).

X. The allegorical and typical allusions to marriage have exclusive reference to one subject, viz. to exhibit the spiritual relationship between God and his people. The earliest form, in which the image is implied, is in the expressions “to go a whoring,” and “whoredom,” as descriptive of the rupture of that relationship by acts of idolatry. These expressions have by some writers been taken in their primary and literal sense, as pointing to the licentious practices of idolaters. But this destroys the whole point of the comparison, and is opposed to the plain language of Scripture: for

(1) Israel is described as the false wife “playing the harlot” (Isa 1:21; Jer 3:1; Jer 3:6; Jer 3:8);

(2) Jehovah is the injured husband, who therefore divorces her (Psa 73:27; Jer 2:20; Hos 4:12; Hos 9:1); and

(3) the other party in the adultery is specified, sometimes generally, as idols or false gods (Deu 31:16; Jdg 2:17; 1Ch 5:25; Eze 20:30; Eze 23:30), and sometimes particularly, as in the case of the worship of goats (A.V. “devils,” Lev 17:7), Molech (Lev 20:5), wizards (Lev 20:6), an ephod (Jdg 8:27), Baalim (Jdg 8:33), and even the heart and eyes (Num 15:39)-the last of these objects being such as wholly to exclude the idea of actual adultery. The image is drawn out more at length by Ezekiel (chap. 23), who compares the kingdoms of Samaria and Judah to the harlots Aholah and Aholibah; and again by Hosea (chap. 1, 3), whose marriage with an adulterous wife, his separation from her, and subsequent reunion with her, were designed to be a visible lesson to the Israelites of their dealings with Jehovah.

The direct comparison with marriage is confined in the O.T. to the prophetic writings, including the Canticles as an allegorical work. SEE CANTICLES. The actual relation between Jehovah and his people is generally the point of comparison (Isa 54:5; Isa 62:4; Jer 3:14; Hos 2:19; Mal 2:11); but sometimes the graces consequent thereon are described under the image of bridal attire (Isa 49:18; Isa 61:10), and the joy of Jehovah in his Church under that of the joy of a bridegroom (Isa 62:5).

In the N.T. the image of the bridegroom is transferred from Jehovah to Christ (Mat 9:15; Joh 3:29), and that of the bride to the Church (2Co 11:2; Rev 19:7; Rev 21:2; Rev 21:9; Rev 22:17), and the comparison thus established is converted by St. Paul into an illustration of the position and mutual duties of man and wife (Eph 5:23-32). The suddenness of the Messiah's appearing, particularly at the last day, and the necessity of watchfulness, are inculcated in the parable of the Ten Virgins, the imagery of which is borrowed from the customs of the marriage-ceremony (Mat 25:1-13). The Father prepares the marriage-feast for his Son, the joys that result from the union being thus represented (Mat 22:1-14; Mat 25:10; Rev 19:9; comp. Mat 8:11), while the qualifications requisite for admission into that union are prefigured by the marriage-garment (Mat 22:11). The breach of the union is, as before, described as fornication or whoredom in reference to the mystical Babylon (Rev 17:1-2; Rev 17:5).

XI. Literature. — The most important ancient literature on all the marriage questions is contained in the third order (סדד) of the Mishna, five tractates of which treat respectively —

1. On the Levirate law;

2. On the marriage-instrument;

3. On suspicion of having violated the marriage-bond;

4. On divorce; and,

5. On betrothal.

To these must be added the Gemaras or Talmuds on these tractates. Maimonides devotes six tractates of the second volume of his Jad Ha- Chazaka to Biblical and Talmudic gamology, giving an abridgment of the traditional enactments. Jacob ben-Asher occupies the entire third volume of his Tur, called Eben Ha-Ezar, with marriage in its various ramifications, and gives a lucid epitome of the ancient code. Of modern writers are to be mentioned Michaelis, Commentaries on the Laws of Mioses, 1:450 sq.; 2:1 sq.; Saalschütz, Das Mosaiische Recht, 2:735 sq.; by the same author, Archaologie der tlebrder, 2:173 sq.; Ewald, Die Alterthümer der Volkes Israel, p. 218 sq.; Geiger, Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrjft (Frankfort-on-the- Main), 4:36 sq., 345 sq.; Jiidische Zeitschrift (Breslau, 1862), 1:19 sq.,  253 sq.; Stein and Susskind's Israelitischer Volkslehrer, 1:192; 4:282, 301, 315; v. 323; vi,'74; 7:264; 8:73; 9:171; Frankel, Grundlinien des Mosaisch-talmudischen Eherechts (Breslau, 1860); Leopold Law, Ben Chananja, vol. iii-vi. Among the writers on special points we may notice Benary, De Hebr. Leviratu (Berlin, 1835); Redslob's Leiiratsehe (Leipz. 1836); and Kurtz's Ehe des Hosea (Dorpat, 1859). SEE WOMAN.

## Marriage, Christian[[@Headword:Marriage, Christian]]

             The word is derived through the French mnari, from the Latin maritus, “a husband.” Matrimonoy, a synonyme, comes from the Latin mater, “ a mother,” as testimoniumz from testis, “ a witness.” Wedlock, a beautiful word, is of Anglo-Saxon origin, from weddian, “to pledge,” “to covenant;” or wedd, “a pledge,” and lac, “ a gift.” The definition of marriage given by Modestinus, the Roman lawyer and scholar of Ulpian, is as follows: “Nuptiae sunt conjunctio maris et feminae et consortium omnis vitse, divini et humani juris communicatio” (Digest, 18:2, 1). In the Institutes of Justinian we have “nuptiae sive matrimonium est viri et mulieris conjunctio individuam vitse consuetudinemr continens,” that is, a union of a man and a woman which contains in itself an inseparable life-intercourse. These definitions are not entirely definite, nor free from objection; nor is it easy for the law to give a definition of that which transcends the sphere of human rights, and has most important relations to morality and religion.

According to Paley, the public use of the marriage institution consists in its promoting the following beneficial effects:

1. The private comfort of individuals.

2. The production of the greatest number of healthy children, their better education, and the making of due provision for their settlement in life.

3. The peace of human society, in cutting off a principal source of contention, by assigning one or more women to one man, and protecting his exclusive right by sanctions of morality and law.

4. The better government of society, by. distributing the community into separate families, and appointing over each the authority of a master of a family, which has more actual influence than all civil authority put together.

5. The additional security which the state receives for the good behavior of its citizens, from the solicitude they feel for the welfare of their children, and from their being confined to permanent habitations.

6. The encouragement of industry. (See also Dwight's Theology on this topic, and Anderson, On the Domestic Constitution.)

I. The idea of marriage is beautifully expressed in those words of the earliest book of the Bible: “Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife; and they twain shall be one flesh.” Here we have (1) marriage conceived of as a union so close that it separates a man from the union of the family-the closest but this one that can exist; (2) two persons cleave to one another, the word cleave in the original denoting to be glued to, to stick to; (3) the result is that they become one flesh, they unite their personalities together. A text like this points to monogamy as alone answering to the trite conception of marriage; for how can two be one flesh, and one of them be also united to a third person, so as to be one flesh with that one also. Accordingly the union of one man and one woman in the married state, as opposed to polygamy, must be regarded as the state pointed out by our nature for us. This alone preserves the unity, the undivided love and peace of the household. Polygamy is an institution growing out of the servile subjection of the woman to the man, and tout of the indulgence of lewd desire. It is also apparently contrary to the order of things in this. that the sexes, so obviously made for one another. divide between them about equally the numbers of those who are born into the world, there being a slight excess in the number of male children, which is counterbalanced before manhood is reached by the greater risks incurred by that sex. The conditions which secure the interests of morality are thus pointed out by the laws of our physical nature.

The conception of marriage which appears in the writings of Paul has sometimes been said to be a low one, as having respect to the gratification of bodily desires rather than to the true, spiritual, and heart communion of the wedded pair. This charge is founded on such passages as 1Co 7:9 : “It is better to marry than to burn;” and on those verses in the same chapter where there appears to be a certain preference in the apostle's mind of the single to the married life (1Co 7:33; 1Co 7:38, etc.). It must be confessed that if such a passage as 1Co 7:9 were the apostle's only expression of opinion, it would seem as if he saw nothing in marriage but  the prevention of sexual excesses and the satisfaction of sexual longings.

It ought, however, to be considered, first, that in such words he gives us but one side of a manifold subject. Christian, like all true moralists, must take into account the desires which are implanted in our nature for the purpose of securing certain great ends, among which the introduction of new beings into the world is most prominent. If, as men showed themselves to the apostle, the sexual desires needed a certain control, and a certain satisfaction also, it was good sense to say that a reason for marrying lay in the temperament of the particular person, and that he was bound to consider his power of continence when he inquired what his duty was in this respect. But, secondly, the apostle gives us another picture of marriage, from another point of view. The relation (Eph 5:22-33) is like that of Christ to his Church. The husband is to love the wife as if she actually formed one body with him, and with that pure, self-sacrificing affection which Christ had when he “loved his Church, and gave himself for it.” Here marriage is ennobled and glorified by a comparison with the most spiritual of all relations. But, thirdly, neither in the writings of the apostle nor in any other part of the New Testament is there any peculiar sanctity attached to the married life placing it above the single, nor to the single life making it more excellent than the married. The apostle condemns the false teachings of those who forbid men to marry, and command to abstain from meats, “which God has created to be received with thanksgiving” (1Ti 4:3).

His principle would include marriage — for which multitudes give thanks — under this last remark. At the same time the New Testament regards celibacy as equally honorable with marriage (Mat 14:13). Nay more, if a person, for the kingdom of heaven's sake, can lead a life of pure thoughts, undisturbed by any sensual longings, absorbed in spiritual employments and pursuits; he may be said to have a rare nature, or a rare gift to rise above nature; and so he will stand higher in the kingdom of heaven than another, in proportion to the greatness of his self-sacrifice and his consecration. All men are not bound to “forsake houses, or brethren, or sisters,” etc., for Christ's name's sake, but those who have the call to do so and obey “shall receive a hundred-fold.” So those who lead a single life under the same high motive shall have the greater praise from the Master: and, as they show by their self-denial the strength of Christian virtue, they stand higher in the Christian scale than others. But so do they also who show a readiness to undergo, or actually undergo, any great sacrifice with the same spirit. (Comp. Harless, Christl. Ethik, § 44, and especially § 52.)  If the Christian Church had stopped at admiring the continence and rare self-restraint of men who for Christ's sake led unmarried lives, much evil would have been avoided. As it was, the Christian mind passed on from such admiration to an undervaluation of the married life; celibacy was a sign of greater virtue; second marriages were looked on with disfavor; and marriages of clergymen became unlawful. The heretics Marcion and Tatian went even so far as to rail against marriage; as Simon Magus is said, on the other hand, to have taught in his day a plurality of wives, and the Gnostics and Manichaeans rejected marriage altogether. But what was really the view of the early Church is best seen in the canons of the Gangran Synod, held about A.D. 370, where it is decreed: “1. If any one reproach marriage, or have in abomination the religious woman that is a communicant and sleeps with her husband, as one that cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven, let him be anathema. 4. If any one condemn a married presbyter, as if he ought not to partake of the oblation when he performs the liturgy, let him be anathema. 9. If any one live a virgin, or in chastity, as abominating marriage (while he lives ill a retired state), and not for the beauty and sanctity of a virgin life, let him be anathema. 10.

If one of those who live a virgin life for the Lord's sake insult those who are married, let him be anathema. 14. If any woman, abominating marriage, desert her husband, and will become a recluse, let her be anathema.” (See also Isaac Taylor's Ancient Christianity.) At this very same time, however, marriage became a sacrament. One may ask how it came to pass that a kind of life which was looked on as being not the best one, and which had to be renounced in the Western Church if a married man would receive ordination, could come into the category of baptism, the eucharist, and the other acts which, in process of time, took the name of sacraments. Without going into an extended answer to this question, it may be said that the passage of Paul already cited (Eph 5:32) calls it a mystery, which Jerome's Vulgate renders by sacramentum. It was, in fact, peculiarly holy, as symbolizing Christ's union with the Church. But the word sacramnentum had for a long time no definite sense, and marriage was not so called until the time of Augustine. Nay, that great writer had so vague an idea of its religious meaning that he does not hesitate to call the polygamous marriage of the patriarchs in the Old Testament a “sacramentum pluralium nuptiarum” (De boano conjugii, cap. 18), which, he says, “signified a future multitude subject to God in all the nations of the earth, and so the sacrament of a single marriage [i.e. between one pair] in our time signifies the unity of all ours [our Christian Church], which is to be subject to God  in the one celestial city.” The passage itself, however, in the Ephesians, which we have referred to, does not, in a fair interpretation of it, call marriage a mystery, but gives that name only to Christ's leaving the Father and becoming one with his Church. As for the rest, the Catholic theologians have held widely diverse opinions about the matter and form of marriage. One opinion has been that the consent of the parties expressed in words constitute both the matter and the form; another that the bodies or persons of the contracting parties are the matter, and the words expressing consent the form. SEE MATRIMONY.

Marriage being a peculiarly sacred transaction, and having the religious impress put on it, questions relating to its celebration, the persons capable of contracting it, its dissolution, its renewal after the death of one of the parties, and the like, came under the control of the clergy. Accordingly we find in use in the early Church a special ecclesiastical form for the celebration of matrimony. The fathers, Tertullian, e.g., considered marriage contracted without the participation of the Church, as tolerated by the law of Rome, as almost a sin. Later it was sought to make marriage — an exclusively religious institution, and this it finally became, and so continued until the days of the Reformation. The civil law gradually restricted itself to the regulation of the material interests connected with marriage, leaving the Church to regulate the conditions under which it could be contracted. As gradually the religious impress put on it brought to the door of the clergy the settlement of questions relating not only to its celebration, but also to the propriety of its dissolution, its renewal after the death of one of the parties, and the like, the State was content to lend the Church the secular arm for the enforcement of the decisions of the ecclesiastical courts. ‘The principles of the law concerning marriage thus became a part of canon law in the Romish Church, and received final settlement by the Council of Trent, which not only established marriage as a sacrament in the most solemn manner (Conc. Trid. sess. 24, Mat. Song of Solomon 1 “Si quis dixerit, matrimonium non esse vere et proprie unum ex septem legis evangelicae sacramentis a Christo institutum, sed ab hominibus in ecclesia inventum neque gratiam conferre: anath. sit;” see also I, Song of Solomon 7, Cat. Rom. 2, 8, 3, 23, 20 sq.; Conf. orthod. p. 183), but referred the question of its validity exclusively to the Church. The remains of these and similar laws have almost disappeared in Protestant England in our own times; the act of 1857 (cited as 20 and 21 Vict. cap. 85), with its amendments, destroys all jurisdiction of courts ecclesiastical in matters pertaining to marriage, except  so far as marriage licenses are concerned, and constitutes a new court, which is called the court for divorce and matrimonial causes. See Woolsey, Divorce and Divorce Legislation (New York, 1869), p. 174-178.

The Continental Reformers from the first denied the sacramental character of marriage. They acknowledged. indeed, matrimony as holy and instituted of God, yet considered it as partaking more of a civil than of an ecclesiastical character — as an institution which received only a higher consecration by the blessing of the Church. They even required the Protestant civil authorities to legislate on the subject, and thus it passed entirely into the hands of the latter. The sew laws were promulgated in the 16th and 17th centuries, yet all still referred to Scripture, the symbolic books, and canon law as their basis; and, being generally drawn up with the assistance of the clergy, the Church still retained the higher authority over all questions pertaining to matrimony. In all Protestant countries at present, as far as we are informed, marriage is essentially controlled by the law of the state,. although the solemnization of it may be put into the hands of clerical persons. In Catholic countries there is a tendency to establish two kinds of marriage celebrations — one a civil, the other an ecclesiastical one; but all the civil consequences of marriage, in relation to property, legitimation of children, bigamy, etc., grow out of the civil marriage, and the, other (or ecclesiastical) is left to the option of the parties. The Catholic Church endures this with great unwillingness; and in this feeling the Concordat between Austria and the pope did away with the civil contract, which was restored to its former place in the laws in 1869 (comp. Richter, Kirchenr. § 263, 6th ed.). We thus are brought to the question of the relations of the state in right reason to the marriage-contracts of its citizens. Here, before touching the particulars that are within the province of state-law, we wish to make two points in regard to the office of the state:

1. Marriage is a contract, because it. is an agreement between two persons to live together in the condition of life called matrimony. But, while in most other cases the contract creates or specifies the transaction, in the contract of marriage the matter of the contract is presupposed, and the contract has nothing to do except to introduce two persons into a definite specific state. Out of this grows the peculiar state of parentage. This, it seems to us, is one of the greatest points in hand against the institution of “Freelove.” The resultant of the marital relation is of a character that does not admit of the dissolution of the contract when once it has been entered into. The  offspring requires the care of both the contractors, as is clearly seen in the case of second marriages with children from the first contract. Thus there can be no contract to enter into a marriage state which is terminable by the consent of the parties, or dependent on the pleasure of either. There may be partnerships of this kind, as contracts of service or of agency, for the performance of specific acts for a specific time, but there are no such contracts of marriage. This institution is unlike the passing business relations of life, and resembles the Church and State unions more closely, although not entirely. The reason for all this is the moral nature of the institution, and its immense importance as the foundation of the family as well as the origin of the state. In this sense the Roman law correctly proclaimed marriage a;'viri et mulieris conjunctio individuam vitae consuetudinem continens” (to which canon law adds,” i.e. talem se in omnibus exhibere viro, qualis ipsa sibi est, et e converso”), or a “consortium omnis vite, divini et humani juris communicatio.” Quite a different tendency, however, is found in the attempts of some modern philosophers to establish free-marriage, as e.g. the St. Simonites (q.v.), who would overthrow all these laws, and make marriage a mere human convention subject to all the whims of the contracting parties and who have failed hitherto from this very cause, as has also the pretended emancipation of woman which has gone hand in hand with it. The higher nature of marriage over any other human institution at once manifests itself not only in the fact that it has at all times been connected with religion, both as to its contracting and dissolving, but that this view has been in no wise confined to Christendom, but in a great degree has taken a like hold upon heathen communities also.

2. Our other point is that on account of the moral and religious bearings of marriage, State and Church have concurrent power over it; that is, they both may act and lay down principles in regard to matrimonial questions. How are their provinces to be distinguished? In this way, as it seems to us: The State can require nothing which the Word of God forbids in a Christian country, although it may forbid what the Word of God does not forbid. The Church can allow nothing, permitted by the law, which the Word of God forbids. For illustration, we may suppose the State to have very loose divorce laws, or to have no penalty for concubinage during regular marriage; it is evident that the Church must keep its members pure in such respects, until its protest, loud or silent, shall change the current of legislation.  II. These things being premised, we proceed to a brief discussion of some of those points relating to marriage which may be reasonably made the subjects of legislation without violating the feelings of Christians or opposing the authority of the Scriptures.

1. The State may decide who shall be capable of contracting marriage. Thus (a) the age at which, or the state of the will or reason with which a matrimonial engagement may be legally made, is as much within the control of the law as the similar conditions necessary for making business contracts or for exercising political rights. If minors are allowed to enter into this condition, the law ought to provide that their free consent is ascertained beforehand. Thus, too, incapacity to give consent, by reason of immaturity, force on the will, insanity, idiocy, and the like, may be obstacles. But (b) far more important is the control of state-law over the degrees of relationship and affinity which shall incapacitate parties from entering into this close connection. Here we find that, although the children of the first pair must have united in wedlock, it became the very decided feeling of a large part of the human race that such a union is unlawful for brothers with sisters, or for a parent with a child. H. W. J. Thiersch (Das Verbot der Ehe [Nordlingen, 1869], p. 4) remarks that wild heathen tribes in Asia and Africa consider incest a crime. Exceptions to this occurred in Persia and Egypt, where incest was practiced within the reigning families-in the latter country after the example of His and Osiris. At Athens a brother might marry a sister who had not the same mother. and adoption was no obstacle to the union of an adopted brother and sister. The Romans were more strict, but allowed this relation to commence between an adopted brother and his adopted sister, after the adoption was dissolved by emancipation. By Roman law a man could not marry his sister's daughter, but when the emperor Claudius took Agrippina, his brother's daughter, to wife, that relation became permissible (see Gail Instit. i, § 61, 62). By Levitical law the prohibited degrees embraced the direct relatives in the ascending and descending line, whether of full or of half blood, the children who had the same parents or parent, the brothers or sisters of fathers or mothers, brothers' wives, daughters-in-law, a woman and her daughter, or other descendant in the third generation, and the sister of a wife during her lifetime. It would seem that in Leviticus xviii, where these rules are given, the analogy derived from relations there mentioned may be applied to others equally close, of which nothing is said (comp. Saalschiitz, Mos. Recht, cap. 105, § 5). In the Christian Church a stricter system of  prohibited degrees was a part of canonical law, and a sign of the new feeling was that the emperor Theodosius I forbade by law the marriage of first cousins, which was formerly by Roman law permitted. The Roman Catholic and the Greek churches went far beyond this. The Latin Church carried the prohibition of marriage to the seventh degree, that is, to the sixth cousins — counting brothers and sisters as of the first degree, and first cousins as of the second — until Innocent III, in 1216, gave a new rule, that the “prohibitio copulae conjugalis quartun consanguinitatis et affinitatis gradum non excedat” — that is, third cousins might marry; but a little while after Gregory IX so modified Innocent's rule that a marriage between a third and a fourth cousin was allowable. Where pressing reasons demanded, these rules might be suspended. More severe and worthless were the rules prohibiting marriage, on the ground of affinity, which reached to the same degrees with the rules affecting blood-relatives, and were altered together with them. Other restrictions touching spiritual affinities, betrothal, etc., were mitigated by the Council of Trent. According to the canons of the Greek Church, a man may not marry

His second cousin's daughter. His deceased wife's first cousin. His deceased wife's first cousin's daughter. His deceased wife's second cousin. Two brothers may not marry Two sisters. An aunt and a niece. Two first cousins. A man may not marry His wife's brother's wife's sister, i.e. his brother-in law's sister-in-law. His brother-in-law's wife: nor can his own brother marry her.

Godparentage and Adoption constitute impediments to marriage up to the seventh degree. SEE AFFINITY. What was the feeling lying at the bottom of all these prohibitions? It must have been that which led the Roman lawyer Gaius (1. c. § 59) to say that if such persons as parents and children marry one another nefarias atque incestas nuptias contraxisse dicuntur. Incest is the greatest unchastity, from which its Latin name comes, and men early felt this. If the children of the first parent did not partake of this sentiment, there is a parallel in the feelings of little children, whose modesty is developed just at the time of life when it is needed for a moral protection. Besides this moral principle, it might be urged that to marry out of one's near relationship binds families together, and diffuses the feeling of  brotherhood through neighborhoods and tribes. This is urged by Augustine (Civit. Dei, xv, cap. 16). Another consideration is, that the marriage of near relations promotes neither the health nor the multitude of offspring. In a letter imputed to Gregory the Great (A.D. 601), written to his missionary in England, Augustine, he is made to say, while speaking of the marriages of own cousins, “We have learned from experience that from such a marriage offspring cannot grow” (Gratian's Decr. caus. xxxv, quaest. 5, c. 2). This is in conformity with a physical law which governs the issue of animals. Nay, plants themselves, it is now known, are benefited by the pollen of one flower being conveyed to another, and it is the office of insects, such as bees and flies, to mediate in this keeping up the “breeds” of the vegetable kingdom. (c) Besides enacting laws against the marriage of blood-relations, states have sometimes prohibited men from connecting themselves with women who sustain towards them the closest degrees of affinity. Some Protestant countries make it unlawful to marry a wife's sister. There are no valid arguments against such unions from Scripture, but rather, when it is said (Lev 18:18) that a man shall not have two sisters together as his wives, the fair inference is that Jewish law allowed marriage to one of them after the death of the other and preceding wife. Marriage to a brother's widow or deceased husband's brother is more doubtful. Yet in the canonical law, where such unions are forbidden, the pope can probably give a dispensation from the rule. Such was the case of Henry VIII of England, and a canon of the Council of Trent (sess. xxiv, De sacr. matrim. can. iii) ordains that if any one shall say that the Church cannot give a dispensation in the case of some of the prohibitions in Leviticus, ch. 18, “anathema sit” — evidently referring to that very case which blew up such a flame in England.

On the whole, there are no certifies within which the moral feeling and the law — which in this case is more or less controlled by such feeling — can be confined. We have a parallel to this in the definitions of certain rights, where the law has to make the positive and exact metes and bounds. Thus there is a time in the life of a child when he ought to acquire a jural capacity, and so become legally independent of his father; but whether this shall be reached at the age of eighteen or twenty-one, or shall be reached by degrees or all at once, the reason of a state must determine. So the moral feeling of a state must determine within what limits of consanguinity or of affinity parties may contract marriage; and if the Church has another  prevailing sentiment, it must have its own rules prohibiting for its members what the state does not prohibit.

We will just mention, with little or no remark, several other hinderances which either State or Church law have put in the way of wedlock. Such are fraudulent representations of either party, which were leading causes of the contract of marriage; mistakes affecting the identity of the person; and previous crime of one party unknown to the other, especially previous adultery; to which is to be added difference of religious confessions, especially when so great as that between a Jew and a Christian, or a Protestant and a Roman Catholic. Indeed, in the case of mixed marriages (see below), there is still much conflict between the legislation of Church and State. Civil law in countries where slavery was allowed made all marriage unions between freemen and slaves unlawful. In some countries marriage between a noble and an ordinary citizen or peasant has been either forbidden or attended with civil disabilities, such as degradation of rank to the offspring. Here it may not be out of place to allude also to the regulations of the Romish Church in the case of persons who may have taken the vow of celibacy. If any such party have not yet entered the convent, pope Boniface VIII decided that marriage may be contracted; after having once entered the convent, the contract becomes illegal. Among Protestants, however, the taking of the vow of celibacy remains a question of conscience only. Another objection to marriage in the Roman Catholic Church is spiritual relationship, cognatio spiritualis, which prevents marriage between persons who have held one another at the baptismal font. In the 13th century this was made to include both the infant baptized and the children of the sponsors, as well as the sponsors themselves; but it has since been restricted. The Continental Reformers as early as the Smalcald articles declared against this impediment of the sponsors. In the Greek Church, as we have seen above, Godparentage and adoption constitute impediments up to the seventh degree.

2. In order to preserve the purity and peace of married life, the State has often passed rules making all sexual union of either the husband or the wife with a third party penal, and the Church will of course visit such offenses of its members with severe discipline. Some states in their laws have punished the concubinage or illicit intercourse of a husband with an unmarried woman less severely than similar offenses of a wife or, it may be, has let them go unpunished. According to Roman law, adultery was a crime committed only with a married woman; but a wife, displeased with  her husband's morals, could without difficulty obtain a divorce. Under English law adultery has not been treated as a public crime, the dealing with it being left to the ecclesiastical law, and “the temporal courts take no cognizance of it otherwise than as a private injury” (Blackstone's Comment. bk. 4, chap. 4). In our country it is visited with punishment according to law in almost all the states — New York, which has followed English law, and one or two other states, being exceptions: but it is safe to say that prosecutions for the crime of adultery are very rare indeed. The protection afforded by such laws is very small, except so far as they testify that society regards crimes against marriage as deserving of civil penalties.

3. The State, as the guardian of the family, as the protector of the wife's and the children's rights even against the husband and father, is bound, and has in no civilized country refused, to make laws touching the patria postestas — the husband's rights over and obligations towards the wife; his obligations especially to support his wife and children, and the amount of freedom he ought to have in transmitting his property. We do not intend to enter into this large subject, except so far as to say that there lies a feeling of the unity of family life at the foundation of all righteous law on these subjects, whatever may be the specific rules of this or that code. The family being one, the wife ought to be deprived no more than the children of a portion of a deceased husband's effects; so that the right of testament in his case, even if he acquired all his property himself, ought not to be absolutely free.

4. The moral feeling of the importance and sanctity of marriage lies also, in a measure, at the foundation of laws and usages regulating its commencement. Such are betrothal, the formal declaration before a registrar or other officer of an intention of marriage, the publication of the banns, the celebration or solemnization before witnesses and with appropriate formalities. Marriage having a religious side, it has been natural that the ministers of religion should have a part in its initial solemnities. But it is a great grievance that they are obliged — as the law of Prussia, we believe, requires of them to unite in wedlock any persons who may by law be lawfully united, whether the minister's own views touching the lawfulness of marriage after divorce agree with those of the government or not; and it is another grievance when only the ministers of an establishment can solemnize nuptials. Civil marriage, on the other hand, as it exists in some Catholic countries, and marriage before a magistrate or justice of the peace, which is lawful to a great extent through the United States, have  this great evil attending on them: that they look on the civil side of marriage exclusively. Surely that institution which is the foundation of the state, the guardian of children against evil influences until they can act their part in the state; in which, and in which alone love presides over the formation of character; from which, through the sympathies of kindred, chords run in all directions, binding and weaving society together, and where the seeds of religion are sown in the impressible heart — such an institution surely, which pagans feel to have a sacred quality, and place under the protection of their gods, ought to have a solemn beginning, so that the parties to be united in “holy matrimony,” and the witnesses, may feel that it is a deeply serious transaction — a relation not to be lightly assumed without forethought and preparation, and solemn consecration to one another, and earnest prayer to that God — who has said that “they twain shall be one flesh.”

III. When the Church takes a view of divorce different from that taken by the State. it cannot sanction the remarriage of a person whom it regards as bound by Christ's law to a former wife or husband. SEE DIVORCE.

1. Some of these obstacles to marriage are of such a nature that a marriage actually commenced in disregard of or in ignorance of the law ruling in such cases is a nullity. There is, however, a need of some formal proceeding by which the nullity is made manifest. There are others in which the innocent party may continue the marriage, and condone or consent to live with the offender; nor can such consent be afterwards withdrawn in order to make good a claim which has been once waived. Near relationship or affinity, the existence of a previous wife or husband, are instances of the first kind; impotence, mistake, previous misconduct, even fraudulent statements procuring marriage, are instances of the second. In the first case the marriage is void, in the second it is voidable. We are apt to call separations for either reason divorces, and our statutes in many state-codes group them with divorces properly so called; but there is a wide difference between separations on the ground that there had been no lawful marriage, and divorce proper on the ground of some event occurring after actual marriage. In the first case there was a form without the reality of marriage, and the court civil or ecclesiastical — pronounced a decree of nullity, which did not affect the children nor the parties up to the time of the sentence. Being decided to have never been united in wedlock, they were free to enter into this union with third parties. See Woolsey, On Divorce,  etc., p. 123,124, and especially Richter's Kirchenr. § 266-284, 6th ed.; Goschen, in Herzog's Real-Encyklopädie, vol. iii, s.v. Ehe.

2. In regard to the lawfulness of remarriage in general, we must refer to the article on DIVORCE SEE DIVORCE (Christian Law of) in this Cyclopaedia. On the particular point of marrying again after a first wife's or husband's decease, we have room for a few remarks. That this is lawful in itself, and must be left to the conscience and the circumstances of individuals, there can be no question, after what the apostle Paul has said in Rom 7:1-3, and in 1Ti 5:14, in which latter passage “the younger women” evidently refers to the young widows just before spoken of. The apologist Athenagoras (§ 33, p. 172, edit. Otto) is both unscriptural and weak where he says that a second marriage is “decorous adultery,” and applies the words of Christ (Mat 19:9) to such remarriages, adding that he who deprives himself of [or separates himself from] a former wife, even if she be dead, is a covert adulterer who transgresses the direction of God, since in the beginning God made one man and one woman. Similar views are entertained by Tertullian in his treatise De monogamia, which was written after he became a Montanist (comp. esp. cap. 10); while in the treatise Ad uxorem, written before he left the Catholic Church, he does not condemn remarriage, although he praises widowhood. Most of the fathers, while, from the times of Hermas and of Clement of Alexandria, they regard remarriage as no sin, look on widowhood and the state of a widower as capable of higher virtue. Augustine thus expresses both opinions in his little work De bono viduitatis, written at the request of a widow named Juliana, whose daughter had chosen a virgin's life. “As the good thing of virginity which your daughter has chosen does not condemn your one marriage, so your widowhood does not condemn the second marriage of some one else.... Do not so extol your good thing as to accuse that which is not evil belonging to another, as if it were evil, but so much the more rejoice in your good, the more you perceive that not only evils are prevented by it, but that it surpasses some good things in excellence. The evil things are adultery and fornication. Now from these illicit things she is far removed who by a free vow has bound herself, and thus has brought to pass not by the power of law, but by the purpose of love, that for her not even lawful things should be lawful.” SEE DIGAMISTS; SEE CELIBACY.

3. But if the apostle Paul could even advise young widows to marry again, must not this be understood as if he thought this the less of two evils, and  only necessary to save the persons in question from crime? How otherwise can we explain his directions that a bishop, and so also a deacon, must be the husband of one wife? (1Ti 3:2; 1Ti 3:12; Tit 1:6). Some have explained these directions as forbidding polygamy — that is, simultaneous polygamy, to speak technically — which would seem to imply that among the private members of the Church at Ephesus and in Crete such plurality of wives was allowed. But the words in 1Ti 5:9, where the qualification occurs that the aged widow in question must have been the wife of one man, forbid such an interpretation, for ‘otherwise we should have to suppose that polyandry was practiced. The phrases are exactly of the same form in all the four cases, since in the last-mentioned verse the participle Eyovvia is to be joined to “sixty years” (comp. Luk 2:42). The sense, then, must be that the bishop, or deacon, or widow had not been married but once. Now this was a special precept suited to the state of life of the times, for in marrying more than once they might have obtained divorce — in their heathenish condition — or have married divorced persons contrary to the law of Christ. Of these irregularities, if they had married but once, there would be less probability.

IV. Many one-sided and erroneous opinions must arise when marriage is looked at only in one of its aspects or relations. Thus it may be said to exist liberorum quaerendorun causa; but if that is the only side on which we view it, we shall have to say that no marriages ought to be contracted when the woman is past the age of child-bearing. It may be put on the foundation of restraining and moderating those sexual desires which might otherwise irmbrute men. But if this were the only reason for marriage, it would be at the best but a necessary evil. It may be said to be instituted for the happiness of the partners in the union; but if this were all, every disappointed man or woman ought to have an opportunity to place his or her affections on a new object. It may be said to be in idea the highest religious union, but a Christian wife has never felt it to be right for this reason to leave a husband merely because he is unconverted. We must, then, look at marriage on every side; on its jural, moral, and religious aspects; on its relations to sexual differences; to the birth and education of children; to its use in cementing the State together through the ties of kindred; to the love that will almost of course subsist between the married couple; to the field which it affords for the highest social and spiritual well- being of husband, wife, and family. It ought to be added also, as a point of no small importance, that the jural relations of marriage are determined by  the moral convictions of men, and that thus Christianity, by purifying the moral sense, and by giving forth a nobler idea of marriage, has ennobled and strengthened civil law. Those nations have had the best moral habits where the sentiments regarding matrimony and the family were the most pure. Witness the Romans of the earlier ages, to whom divorce was unknown, and among whom the matron was chaste and frugal. The corruption of Roman morals first appeared, according to Horace, in the defilement of married life and the family:

“Fecunda culpae saecula nuptias

Primum inquinavere et genus et domos.”

And so, if our Christianity is destined to decay, the loss will be soon shown in the family relations. Even now a race of women is springing up who seem to have caught their inspiration from some of the high dames —the Fulvias and Julias — of the expiring Roman republic,

The neglect to look at the religious and moral side of marriage is also doing great evil in this country. In fact, a state of things now exists which our fathers hardly dreamed of, and which makes reflecting men tremble for the future. Rash and ill-sorted marriages have always existed; but where divorce laws, so loose as to be opposed to the very idea of marriage, open an easy door to get out of an uncomfortable relation, the tendency is that parties will marry with divorce before their eyes, and that, instead of forbearance and patience, they will magnify their present evils, and give to one another only half a heart. In the old times there were few who did not look upon large families as a blessing; at present it is established beyond doubt that a multitude of women, in one part of the country, regard children as an evil to be prevented or avoided, and do actually use the means for such flagitious ends. SEE INFANTICIDE.

Some of these women are communicants in Christian churches, as physicians assert who profess to know. This shows that the very notion of marriage in many minds is a degraded and a corrupting one — that this union is entered into as an honest way of gratifying the lowest desires of human beings, and for no higher purpose. Nor are there wanting representatives of these base views, who practice upon them in their communities and defend them before the world. Who will question that the extreme of ancient asceticism, which gave to the word chastity the sense of rigid abstinence, as we give to the word temperance the same perverted meaning, was infinitely nearer to the Christian standard, in fact to any respectable pagan standard of morals,  than feelings which can toleratosuch practices? That they can exist and even be common is an alarming sign for the future of our country. The conscience of men and women needs to be enlightened on a point of morals which can hardly be referred to from the pulpit. We ought not to hear Catholics twit the Protestantism of the country with winking at methods of preventing the increase of families. We ought to strike at that extravagance of living and showiness of dress which tempt the less wealthy to such things. We ought to hear from every quarter where the subject can be mentioned that “they who do such things cannot inherit the kingdom of God.” (T. D. W.)

See Grove, Mor. Philippians 2:470; Paley, Mor. Phil. vol. i, chap. viii, p. 339; Leslie, Sermons on Marriage (1702, 8vo); Fordyce, Moral Philos. (1769, 8vo); Delany, Relative Duties (1750, 8vo); Beattie, Elem. Moral Science, vol. ii; Bean, Christian Minister's Advice to a Newmarried Couple (Lond. 1793); Guide to Domestic Happiness; Advantages and Disadvantages of the Married State; Stennett, On Domestic Duties; Jay, Essay on Marriage; Doddridge, Lect. (8vo edit.) 1:225, 234, 265; Ryan, Philosophy of Marriage, in its Social, Moral, and Physical Relations (Lond. 1839, 12mo); Evans, Christian Doctrine of Marriage (Balt., Md., 1860, 8vo); Klee, Die Ehe: eine dogmat. — archceol. Abhandl.; Tradition, ou histoire de l'eglise sur le sacrement de mariage; tiree des monumens les plus authentiques de chaque siecle tant l'orient que de l'occident (Paris, 1725, 3 vols. 4to); Schaff, Ch. Hist. 1:325 sq.; 2:111 sq., 242 sq.; Lea, Sacerdotal Celibacy (see Index); Fry (John), Marriage between Kindred (1773, 8vo); Marriage Rites, Customs, and Ceremonies of the Nations of the Universe (Lond. 1824, 8vo); Wuttke, Ethics (transl. by Prof. Lacroix, N. Y. 1873, 2 vols. 12mo), 2:310 sq.; Brit. and For. Rev. 1844, p. 95 sq.; Engl. Rev. 3:129; Biblical Repository, 2:70 sq.; Biblioth. Sacra, 1:283 sq.; Fraser's Magazine, 41:112 sq.; (Lond.) Quart. Rev. lxxxv. 84 sq.; Lond. Qu. Rev. 10:545; Princet. Rev. 15:182, 420; Meth. Qu. Rev. 1866, p. 137; Christian Remembr. 1, 130; Evangel. Qu. Rev. 1870, p. 482 sq.; North Brit. Review, 12:286, 532; 1870, p. 267 sq.; New Enlgl. 1870 (July), p. 540; Am. Qu. Congreg. Rev. 1871, p. 627; South. Rev. 1871 (Jan.), art. v. See also Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 19:458; 3:666, art. Ehe; and for early literature, Walch, Bibl.; and for English writers, especially sermons on this subject, Malcolm, Theol. Index, s.v. For modern half or left-hand matrimony in Christendom, SEE MORGANATIC MARRIAGE. For marriage as a sacrament, SEE MATRIMONY.

V. Marriage with Believers. — The importance of regulating the conjugal alliance on religious principles was, according to the record of the Old Testament, practically recognized at a very early period. Indeed, the corruption of manners which rendered the Flood necessary is directly traced to such mixed marriages (Gen 6:1-4). The intermixture, by marriage, of the professed servants and worshippers of God, with those by whom his authority was disowned, was first branded. and afterwards positively forbidden by divine authority; being denounced as an evil, the results of which were most injurious to the interests of religion, and which exposed those who fell into it to the condign and awful displeasure of the Most High (Exo 34:16). Now, although there were some circumstances attending the marriages in this manner denounced which do not directly apply to the state of society in our own country (especially the circumstance that the people with whom such intercourse was forbidden were idolaters), yet there is much, as must be evident to every pious observer, that illustrates the sin and danger of forming so intimate and permanent a union in life with the ungodly. The general fact is hence clearly deducible that there is an influence in marriage strongly affecting the character, which demands from those who are anxious for moral rectitude and improvement much of caution as to the manner in which their affections are fixed; and that unequal alliances — alliances where the parties are actuated by different spiritual habits and desires, and where good is made to meet and combine with bad, encountering most imminently the danger of seduction and pollution — are guilty, unnatural, and monstrous. The expression of the divine authority, in application to the Jews, is to be regarded as comprehending the principle of his people in all ages, that here they ought not to walk in the counsel of the ungodly, nor to stand in the way of sinners.

What we thus are enabled to conclude from the Old Testament, will be still more distinctly exemplified from the New. The evangelical writings do not, indeed, frequently offer directions expressly on the subject of marriage, the point appearing rather to be assumed than argued, that in Christian marriage the husband and wife ought both, in the emphatic terms of the apostle Peter, to be and walk as being “heirs together of the grace of life.” In the first Epistle to the Corinthians, the apostle Paul applies himself to a question which seems at that time to have been agitated — whether Christians who, previous to their conversion, had contracted marriages with unbelievers, ought not to be actually divorced from the wives or  husbands remaining in unbelief, because of the evil and peril attending the continuance of the alliance. Such an extreme, advocated by some, he considers as uncalled for (1Co 7:10-17). But, respecting the formation of a new matrimonial connection by a believer (the case taken being that of a believing widow, though the rule, of course, extends to all), this is the direction: “She is at liberty to be married to whom she will, only in the Lord” (1Co 7:39). Here is a simple proclamation, the force of which is permanent, and in submission to which Christians in every period should act. They are to marry “only in the Lord.” They, being themselves “in the Lord” — united to the Lord Jesus by the divine Spirit, and possessing an interest in the redeeming blessings he has purchased are to marry only on Christian principles, and, of course, only such as are thus also “in the Lord” — believer with believer, and with none else. This is the obvious meaning of the passage, which no sophism can evade or fritter away.

It would be easy to employ the attention further, on the general statements contained in the Word of God, respecting the character of separation from the world which ought to be sustained by his Church, the ends for which it is called, and the objects it is bound to perform; statements which all bear on the principle as to marriage, operating to enforce and to confirm it (see especially 2Co 6:14-18; 2Co 7:1). But, without amplifying here, and satisfied that this principle receives, from the testimony already quoted, a convincing and solemn establishment, the reader is requested to ponder a truth, which is as indubitable as it ought to be impressive, namely, that marriages formed by Christians in violation of the religious design of the institute, and of the express principles of their religion, are connected with evils many and calamitous, most earnestly to be deprecated, and most cautiously to be avoided. Is it, indeed, to be expected, on the ground of religion, that an act can be committed against the expressed will of the Most High God without exposing the transgressor to the scourge of his chastisement? Is it to be expected, on the ground of reason, that an alliance can be formed between individuals whose moral attributes and desires are essentially incompatible without creating the elements of uneasiness, discord, and disappointment? Excited imagination and passion may delude with the belief of innocence and hope of escape, but religion and reason speak the language of unchangeable veracity, and are ever justified in the fulfillments of experience and of fact.  The operation of the evil results whose origin is thus deduced, is of course susceptible of modifications from several circumstances in domestic and social life; and, for many reasons, the degrees of public exhibition and of personal pressure may vary.

1. Yet it may be remarked uniformly, respecting these results-they are such as deeply affect the character. A reference has already been made to the moral influence of marriage, and as the marriages stigmatized under the patriarchal, and forbidden and punished under the Jewish dispensation, were obnoxious on account of the contamination into which they led the professed people of God, so are the marriages of Christians with worldlings in this age, a worldly spirit being still the essence of idolatry (Jam 4:4; Col 3:5; 1Jn 2:15-17; Mat 6:24), the objects of censure and deprecation, because of the baneful effect they exert on those who are numbered among the redeemed of the Lord. Such marriages as these present constant and insinuating temptations to seduce Christians to worldly dispositions and pursuits; they enfeeble their spiritual energies; interfere with their communion with God; hinder their growth in the attainments of divine life; check and oppose their performance of duty and their pursuit of usefulness, in the family, the Church, and the world. There has probably never been known a forbidden marriage which, if its original character were continued, did not pollute and injure. Some instances have been most palpable and painful; nor can it be considered other than a truth, unquestionable and notorious, that whoever will so transgress invokes a very blighting of the soul.

2. It may be remarked respecting these results, again, they are such as deeply effect happiness. Christian character and Christian happiness are closely connected if the one be hurt the other will not remain untouched. And who sees not in the unhallowed alliance a gathering of the elements of sorrow? Are there not ample materials for secret and pungent accusations of conscience, that agitate the heart with the untold pangs of self- condemnation and remorse? Is there not reason for the bitterness of disappointment, and the sadness of foreboding fear, because the best intercourse is unknown — the purest affection is impossible — the noblest union is wanting — and the being on whom the spirit would repose is, to all that is the sweetest and most sublime in human sympathies, human joys, and human prospects, an alien and a stranger? And what must be the horror of that anticipation which sets forth the event of a final separation at the bar of God, when, while the hope of personal salvation may be  preserved, the partner of the bosom is seen as one to be condemned by the Judge, and banished with everlasting destruction from his presence and the glory of his power! Oh the infatuation of the folly which leads to unite, where evils like these are created, rather than where God will sanction, and where time and eternity will both combine to bless!

3. Its effects upon what may be regarded as the supreme end of the marriage relation, the religious education of children, is another most distressing consideration. What must it be! What has it ever been! That much injury, therefore, has arisen to the public interests of the Church of Christ from this transgression cannot be doubted. Injury done to individual character is injury done to the community to which the individual is attached. It has always been a fact, that whoever sins in the household of faith, sills not only against himself, but against others; and that this transgression is one peculiarly extended in its influence, operating more than, perhaps, any one else which can be named to bring religion from its vantage ground, to clog its progress, and to retard its triumph. See Cong. Mag. May, 1831; Malcolm on the Christian Rule of Marriage; H. More's Caeleb's in Search of a Wife.

VI. Marriage Ceremonies. — In the early Christian Church marriages were to be notified to the bishop or society, and in the first centuries were solemnized by the clergy, but with very many exceptions. Much was borrowed from the customs of the Roman law. Banns were required about the 12th century. SEE BANNS.

No prescribed form for the solemnization of marriage seems to have existed in early times. Witnesses were required, and the dowry was settled in writing. The sponsalia or betrothal preceded, and tokens or pledges were given or exchanged. The ceremonies were to all appearances not regarded as essential by the early Christians, but were merely considered appropriate and becoming, and when celebrated were observed as follows: “The use of the ring, in the rites both of espousal and of marriage, is very ancient. It is mentioned both by Tertullian and Clement of Alexandria, the latter of whom says, ‘It was given her, not as an ornament; but as a seal, to signify the woman's duty in preserving the goods of her husband, because the care of the house belongs to her.'“ The crowning of the married pair with garlands was a marriage-rite peculiar to many nations professing different forms of religion. Tertullian inveighs against it with all the zeal of a Montanist, but it is spoken of with approbation by the fathers of the 4th and 5th centuries, from whom it appears that the friends and attendants of the bridal pair were adorned in  the same manner. These chaplets were usually made of myrtle, olive, amaranth, rosemary, and evergreens, intermingled with cypress and vervain. The crown, appropriately so called, was made of olive, myrtle, and rosemary, variegated with flowers, and sometimes with gold and silver, pearls, precious stones, etc.

These crowns were constructed in the form of a pyramid or tower. Both the bride and the bridegroom were crowned in this manner, together with the groomsman and the bridesmaid. The bride frequently appeared in church thus attired on the day when proclamation of the banns was made. Chaplets were not worn by the parties in case of second marriage, nor by those who had been guilty of impropriety before marriage. In the Greek Church the chaplets were imposed by the officiating minister at the altar. In the Western Church it was customary for the parties to present themselves thus attired. The wearing of a veil by the bride was borrowed from the Romans. It was also conformable to the example of Rebecca (Genesis 24). From this marriage-rite arose the custom of taking the veil in the Church of Rome. By this act the nun devotes herself to perpetual virginity as the spouse of Christ, the bridegroom of the Church. It appears to have been customary also to spread a robe over the bridegroom and bride, called vitta nuptialis, pallium jugale, etc., and made of a mixture of white and red colors. Torches and lamps were in use on such occasions, as among the Jews and pagan nations. The festivities were celebrated by nuptial processions going out to meet the bridegroom and conducting him home, by nuptial songs and music, and marriage feasts. These festivals were frequently the subject of bitter animadversion by the fathers, especially by Chrysostom, and often called for the interposition of the authority of the Church. At marriage festivals it was customary to distribute alms to the poor. The groomsman had various duties to perform — to accompany the parties to the church at their marriage; to act as sponsor for them in their vows; to assist in the marriage ceremonies; to accompany them to the house of the bridegroom; to preside over and direct the festivities of the occasion.

For a considerable time the observance of a marriage ceremony fell into desuetude among the Christians, to remedy which certain laws enforcing it were enacted in the 8th century. The ceremony now differs in different places. In Scotland, like all other religious services of that country, it is extremely simple, and is performed in the session-house, the residence of the minister, or the private house of some friend of one of the parties. In Lutheran countries it is generally celebrated in private houses. In England,  by the ancient common law, a like custom prevailed as in Scotland until 1757, when, by lord Hardwicke's Act, a ceremony in a church of the state establishment was made necessary, and this continued till 1836, when the Dissenters succeeded in removing this exclusiveness. Persons have now the option of two forms of contracting marriage: it may be with or without a religious ceremony; and, if with a religious ceremony, it may be either in the established church or in a dissenting chapel. If the marriage is to take place in an established church, then there must be either publication of banns of marriage for three preceding successive Sundays, or a license or certificate obtained, which dispenses with such publication; and, in either case, seven or fifteen days' previous residence in the parish by one of the parties is necessary, according as it is a certificate or license respectively which is applied for. The marriage must take place in the church, the marriage-service of the Church of England being read over, and this must be done in canonical hours, i.e. between 8 and 12 A.M., in presence of two witnesses at the altar, before which, in the body of the church, the parties are placed, after having mutually joined hands, and pledged their mutual troth, according to a set form of words, which they say after the minister; the mall gives a ring to the woman, then lays it on the book, with the accustomed duty to the priest and clerk. The priest then takes the ring and delivers it to the man, whom he instructs to put it on the fourth finger of the woman's left hand, and, holding it there, to repeat the words, “With this ring I thee wed, with my body I thee worship, and with all my worldly goods I thee endow. In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.” The minister next joins their right hands together, and, after prayers and blessings, during certain parts of which the man and woman kneel before the altar, they are dismissed with the reading of a part of the Prayer-book, which points out the duties of the marriage state. If the marriage is celebrated in a dissenting chapel (and for that purpose such chapel must be duly licensed and registered), there must be present the superintendent-registrar of the district as one of the witnesses, but the dissenting clergyman may use his own or any kind of form of service. If the marriage is not to be with any religious ceremony, then it must take place in the office of the superintendent-registrar, and in presence of witnesses, the essential thing being that both parties should in the presence of witnesses there exchange a declaration that they take each other for man and wife. The canonical hours must be attended to in all cases, and the condition of previous residence by one of the parties in the district; but the condition of residence is often evaded. In all cases the fact of the marriage  must be entered in a register, which register is kept by a public officer, and ultimately filed and kept in Somerset House, London, where a copy of the certificate of registration of every marriage in England can at all times be had for a small sum.

In the United States of America the customs of the Church of Scotland are followed by the Presbyterian and Congregational churches, and measurably also by the Baptists. The Protestant Episcopal Church adheres closely to the practices of the Church of England, and from the latter the Methodists also, in a somewhat modified form, have copied in this particular. Minor ecclesiastical bodies of the Christian Church follow the practices of one or the other of the churches mentioned. The laws of the several states differ somewhat as to the matter of marriage ceremonies, but they are adapted to the usages of all acknowledged Christian denominations, and recognize the validity of the act whether performed by a clergyman or magistrate, or by a simple contract before witnesses.

Peculiar usages are found in some of the Eastern churches of to-day. In Russia the bride and bridegroom hold a lighted taper in their hands in front of a small altar placed in the center of the church. Rings are placed on their fingers, and, their hands being joined, they are led by the priest three times round the altar. Two highly-ornamented gilt crowns are placed on their heads, and held over them by the groomsman during a part of the service. They drink wine out of a cup three times, and, kissing one another, the ceremony is finished. The married couple then make the tour of the church, crossing themselves at and saluting each saintly image on their way. Weddings generally take place towards evening, so that immediately after the ceremony dinner commences at the house of the bride's father. At a marriage-feast lighted candles are placed in every position and corner possible. No other wine but champagne is drunk, and the quantity of this beverage consumed is remarkable. The dinner is followed by a ball, and the feasting is usually kept up for twenty-four hours. The custom of honeymoon does not exist in Russia. The married couple spend the first few days of their wedded life with the bride's father. Shortly after the marriage the bride and bridegroom must call upon every one of their relations, friends, and acquaintances, and after this ceremony is finished they sink back into their ordinary life (Ivan at Home). For the Roman Catholic view of marriage, SEE MATRIMONY.

## Marriage, Heathen[[@Headword:Marriage, Heathen]]

             Under this head, as being most akin to the ancient Hebrew, and perhaps best representing the general type of Oriental matrimony, we begin with

I. Mohammedan. — The following description of this (condensed from Lane's Modern Egyptians) applies especially to Cairo, but will serve for a general illustration in most Moslem countries. To abstain from marrying when a man has attained a sufficient age, and when there is no just impediment, is esteemed by the Egyptians improper, and even disreputable. Oriental females arrive at puberty much earlier than the natives of colder climates. Many marry at the age of twelve or thirteen years; few remain unmarried after sixteen years of age. An Egyptian girl at the age of thirteen, or even earlier, may be a mother. It is very common among the Arabs of Egypt and of other countries, but less so in Cairo than in other parts of Egypt, for a man to marry his first cousin. In this case the husband and wife continue to call each other “cousin;” because the tie of blood is indissoluble, but that of matrimony very precarious. Most commonly the mother, or some other near female relation of the youth or man who is desirous of obtaining a wife, describes to him the personal and other qualifications of the young women with whom she is acquainted, and directs his choice; or he employs a woman whose regular business it is to assist men in such cases. The parents may betroth their daughter to whom they please, and marry her to him without her consent if she be not arrived at the age of puberty, but after she has attained that age she may choose a husband for herself, and appoint any man to arrange and effect her marriage. In the former case, however, the relations of a girl sought in marriage usually endeavor to obtain her consent to the proposed union.

The bridegroom can scarcely ever obtain even a surreptitious glance at the features of his bride until he finds her in his absolute possession, unless she belong to the lower classes of society; in which case it is easy enough for him to see her face. When a female is about to marry, she should have a deputy to settle the compact and conclude the contract for her with her proposed husband. If she be under the age of puberty this is absolutely necessary; and in this case her father, if living, or (if he be dead) her nearest adult male relation, or a guardian appointed by will or by the magistrate, performs the office of deputy; but if she be of age she appoints her own deputy, or may even make the contract herself, though this is seldom done. After a youth or man has made choice of a female to demand in marriage,  on the report of his female relations, and, by proxy, made the preliminary arrangements before described with her and her relations, he repairs, with two or three of his friends, to her deputy. Having obtained consent to the union, if the intended bride be under age, he asks what is the amount of the required dowry. The giving of a dowry is indispensable. It is generally stipulated that two thirds of the dowry shall be paid immediately before the marriage-contract is made, and the remaining third held in reserve, to be paid to the wife in case of divorcing her against her own consent, or in case of the husband's death. This affair being settled, and confirmed by all persons present reciting the opening chapter of the Koran, an early day (perhaps the day next following) is appointed for paying the money, and performing the ceremony of the marriage-contract; but it is very seldom the case that any document is written to confirm the marriage, unless the bridegroom is about to travel to another place, and fears that he may have occasion to prove his marriage where witnesses of the contract cannot be procured. Sometimes the marriage-contract is concluded immediately after the arrangement respecting the dowry, but more generally a day or two after. On the day appointed for this ceremony the bridegroom, again accompanied by two or three of his friends, goes to the house of the bride, usually about noon, taking with him that portion of the dowry which he has promised to pay on this occasion. It is necessary that there be two witnesses (and those must be Moslems) to the marriage-contract, unless in a situation where witnesses cannot be procured. All persons present recite the same chapter of the Koran, and the bridegroom then pays the money. After this the marriage-contract is performed. It is very simple.

The bridegroom and the bride's deputy sit upon the ground face to face, with one knee upon the ground, and grasp each other's right hand, raising the thumbs, and pressing them against each other. A schoolmaster is generally employed to instruct them what they are to say. Having placed a handkerchief over their closed hands, be usually prefaces the words of the contract with a few words of exhortation and prayer, with quotations from the Koran and Traditions, on the excellency and advantages of marriage. He then desires the bride's deputy to say, “I betroth [or marry] to thee my daughter [or the female who has appointed me her deputy], such a one [naming the bride], the virgin [or the adult virgin], for a dowry of such an amount.” (The words “for a dowry.” etc., are sometimes omitted.) The bridegroom says, “I accept from thee her betrothal [or marriage] to myself, and take her under my care, and bind myself to afford her my protection; and ye who are present bear witness of this.” The deputy addresses the  bridegroom in the same manner a second and a third time, and each time the latter replies as before. They then generally add, “And blessing be on the apostles, and praise be to God, the Lord of all creatures; amen alter which all present repeat the same chapter. It is not always the same form that is recited on these occasions: any form may be used, and it may be repeated by any person; it is not even necessary, and is often altogether omitted. The contract concluded, the bridegroom sometimes (but seldom unless he be a person of the lower orders) kisses the hands of his friends and others there present; and they are presented with sherbet, and generally remain to dinner. Each of them receives an embroidered handkerchief, provided by the family of the bride. Before the persons assembled on this occasion disperse, they settle upon the night when the bride is to be brought to the house of the bridegroom, and the latter, for the first time, is to visit her.

In general, the bridegroom waits for his bride about eight or ten days after the conclusion of the contract. Meanwhile he sends to her, two or three or more times, some fruit, sweetmeats, etc.; and perhaps makes her a present of a shawl, or some other article of value. The bride's family are at the same time occupied in preparing for her a stock of household furniture and dress. The portion of the dowry which has been paid by the bridegroom, and generally a much larger sum (the additional money, which is often more than the dowry itself, being supplied by the bride's family), is expended in purchasing the articles of furniture, dress, and ornaments for the bride. These articles are the property of the bride, and, if she be divorced, she takes them away with her. She cannot. therefore, with truth be said to be purchased. The furniture is sent, commonly borne by a train of camels, to the bridegroom's house. Often among the articles is a chair for the turban or headdress. There are sometimes sent two of these chairs, one for the husband and the other for the wife. The bridegroom should receive his bride on the eve of Friday, or that of Monday; but the former is generally esteemed the more fortunate period. During two or three or more preceding nights the street or quarter in which the bridegroom lives is illuminated with chandeliers and lanterns (q.v.). An entertainment is also given on each of these nights, particularly on the last night before that on which the wedding is concluded, at the bridegroom's house. On these occasions it is customary for the persons invited, and for all intimate friends, to send presents to his house a day or two before the feast which  they purpose or expect to attend: they generally send sugar, coffee, rice, wax candles, or a lamb; the former articles are usually placed upon a tray of copper or wood, and covered with a silk or embroidered kerchief. The guests are entertained on these occasions by musicians and male or female singers, by dancing girls, or by some other performance.

On the preceding Wednesday (or on the Saturday if the wedding is to conclude on the eve of Monday), at about the hour of noon, or a little later, the bride goes in state to the bath. In general the first persons among the bride's party are several of her married female relations and friends, walking in pairs, and next a number of young virgins. The former are dressed in the usual manner, covered with the black silk shawl; the latter have white silk shawls. Then follows the bride, walking under a canopy of silk, of some gay color, as pink, rose-color, or yellow, or of two colors composing wide stripes, often rose-color and yellow. It is carried by four men, by means of a pole at each corner, and is open only in front: and at the top of each of the four poles is attached an embroidered handkerchief. The dress of the bride during this procession entirely conceals her person. She is generally covered from head to foot with a red shawl, or with a white or yellow shawl though rarely. Upon her head is placed a small pasteboard cap or crown. The shawl is placed over this, and conceals from the view of the public the richer articles of her dress, her face, and her jewels, etc., excepting one or two ornaments, generally of diamonds and emeralds, attached to that part of the shawl which covers her forehead. She is accompanied by two or three of her female relations within the canopy; and often, when in hot weather, a woman, walking backwards before her, is constantly employed in fanning her with a large fan of black ostrich feathers, the lower part of the front of which is usually ornamented with a piece of looking-glass. Sometimes one procession, with a single canopy, serves for two brides, who walk side by side. The procession moves very slowly, and generally pursues a circuitous route, for the sake of greater display. On leaving the house it turns to the right. It is closed by a second party of musicians, similar to the first, or -by two or three drummers. The whole bath is sometimes hired for the bride and her party -exclusively. They pass several hours, seldom less than two, occupied in washing, sporting, and feasting; and frequently female singers are hired to amuse them in the bath: they then return in the same order in which they came. Having returned from the bath to the house of her family, the bride and her companions sup together. If singers have contributed to the festivity in the  bath, they also return with the bride to renew their concert. Their songs are always on the subject of love, and of the joyous event which occasions their presence. It is on this night, and sometimes also during the latter half of the preceding day, that the bridegroom gives his chief entertainment. Low farce-players often perform on this occasion before the house, or, if it be large enough, in the court. The other and more common performances by which the guests are amused have been before mentioned.

On the following day the bride goes in procession to the house of the bridegroom. The ceremony usually occupies three or more hours. Sometimes, before bridal processions of this kind, two swordsmen, clad in nothing but their drawers, engage each other in a mock combat; or two peasants cudgel each other with long staves. The bride and her party, having arrived at the bridegroom's house, sit down to a repast. Her friends shortly after take their departure, leaving with her only her mother and sister, or other near female relations, and one or two other women. The bridegroom sits below. Before sunset he goes to the bath, and there changes his clothes; or he merely does the latter at home, and, after having supped with a party of his friends, waits till a little before the time of the night-prayer, or until the third or fourth hour of the night, when, according to general custom, he should repair to some celebrated mosque, such as that of the Hasaneyn, and there say his prayers. The party usually proceeds to the mosque with a quick pace, and without much order. A second group of musicians, with the same instruments, or with drums only, closes the procession. The prayers are commonly performed merely as a matter of ceremony; and it is frequently the case that the bridegroom does not pray at all. The procession returns from the mosque with more order and display, and very slowly; perhaps because it would be considered unbecoming in the bridegroom to hasten home to take possession of his bride. Soon after his return from the mosque, the bridegroom leaves his friends in a lower apartment, enjoying their pipes, and coffee, and sherbet. The bride's mother and sister, or whatever other female relations were left with her, are above, and the bride herself and her companion in a separate apartment. If the bridegroom be a youth or young man, it is considered proper that he, as well as the bride, should exhibit some degree of bashfulness: one of his friends therefore carries him a part of the way up to the room. On entering the bride's apartment he gives a present to her companion, who then retires. The bride has a shawl thrown over her head, and the bridegroom must give her a present of money, which is called the  price of the uncovering of the face,” before he attempts to remove this, which she does not allow him to do without some apparent reluctance, if not violent resistance, in order to show her maiden modesty. The bridegroom now sees the face of his bride for the first time, and generally finds her nearly what he has been led to expect. He remains with her but a few minutes: having satisfied his curiosity respecting her personal charms, he calls to the women (who generally collect at the door, where they wait in anxious suspense) to raise their cries of joy, and the shrill sounds acquaint the persons below and in the neighborhood, and often, responded by other women, spread still further the news that he has acknowledged himself satisfied with his bride: he soon after descends to rejoin his friends, and remains with them an hour or more before he returns to his wife. It very seldom happens that the husband, if disappointed in his bride, immediately disgraces and divorces her; in general he retains her a week or more, even if dissatisfied With her.

Marriages are sometimes conducted without any pomp or ceremony, even in the case of virgins, by mutual consent of the bridegroom and the bride's family, or the bride herself; and widows or divorced women are never honored with a procession on marrying again. The mere sentence, “I give myself up to thee,” uttered by a female to a man who proposes to become her husband (even without the presence of witnesses, if none can easily be procured), renders her his legal wife, if arrived at puberty; and marriages with widows and divorced women, among the Moslems of Egypt, and other Arabs, are sometimes concluded in this simple manner. The dowry of such women is generally one quarter, or third, or half the amount of that of a virgin. Among persons not of the lowest order, though in very humble life, the marriage ceremonies are conducted in the same manner as among the middle orders. But when the expenses cannot by any means be paid, the bride is paraded in a very simple manner, covered with a shawl (generally red), and surrounded by a group of her female relations and friends, dressed in their best, or in borrowed clothes, and enlivened by no other sounds of joy than their shrill cry, which they repeat at frequent intervals. The general mode of processions among the inhabitants of the villages is different from those above described. The bride, usually covered with a shawl, is seated on a camel, and so conveyed to the bridegroom's dwelling. Sometimes four or five women or girls sit with her on the same camel, one on either side of her, and two or three others behind, the seat being made very wide, and usually covered with carpets or other drapery. She is  followed by a group of women singing. In the evening of the wedding, and often during several previous evenings, in a village, the male and female friends of the two parties meet at the bridegroom's house, and pass several hours of the night in the open air, amusing themselves with songs and a rude kind of dance, accompanied by the sounds of a tambourine, or some kind of drum: both sexes sing, but only the women dance.

II. Ancient Pagan, i.e.

1. Greek. — The ancient Greek legislators considered the relation of marriage as a matter not merely of private, but also of public or general interest. This was particularly the case at Sparta, where proceedings might be taken against those who married too late or unsuitably, as well as against those who did not marry at all. But, independent of public considerations, there were also private or personal reasons, peculiar to the ancients, which made marriage an obligation. One of these was the duty incumbent upon every individual to provide for a continuance of representatives to succeed himself as ministers of the divinity: and another was the desire felt by almost every one, not merely to perpetuate his own name, but to leave some one who might make the customary offerings at his grave. We are told that with this view childless persons sometimes adopted children. The choice of a wife among the ancients was but rarely grounded upon affection, and scarcely ever could have been the result of previous acquaintance or familiarity. In many cases a father chose for his son a bride whom the latter had never seen, or compelled him to marry for the sake of checking his extravagances.

By the Athenian laws a citizen was not allowed to marry a foreign woman, nor conversely, under very severe penalties; but proximity by blood (ἀγχιστεία) or consanguinity (συγγένεια) was not, with some few exceptions, a bar to marriage in any part of Greece: direct lineal descent was. At Athens the most important preliminary to marriage was the betrothal (ἐγγύησις), which was in fact indispensable to the complete validity of a marriage-contract. It was made by the natural or legal guardian (ὁ κύριος) of the bride elect, and attended by the relatives of both parties as witnesses. The wife's dowry was settled at the betrothal. On the day before the gamos, or marriage, or sometimes on the day itself, certain sacrifices or offerings (προτέλεια γάμων or προγάμεια) were made to the gods who presided over marriage. Another ceremony of almost general observance on the wedding-day was the bathing of both the  bride and bridegroom in water fetched from some particular fountain, whence, as some think, the custom of placing the figure of a λουτροφόρος, or “water carrier,” over the tombs of those who died unmarried. After these preliminaries, the bride was generally conducted from her father's to the house of the bridegroom at nightfall, in a chariot (ἐφ᾿ ἁμάξης) drawn by a pair of mules or oxen, and furnished with a kind of couch (κλινίς) as a seat. On either side of her sat the bridegroom and one of his most intimate friends or relations, who from his office was called the pcaranymph (παράνυμφος or νυμφευτής); but, as he rode in the carriage (ὁχημα) with the bride and bridegroom, he was sometimes called the πάροχος.

The nuptial procession was probably accompanied, according to circumstances, by a number of persons, some of whom carried the nuptial torches. Both bride and bridegroom (the former veiled) were decked out in their best attire, with chaplets on their heads, and the doors of their houses were hung with festoons of ivy and bay. As the bridal procession moved along, the hymenaean song was sung to the accompaniment of Lydian flutes, even in olden times, as beautifully described by Homer, and the married pair received the greetings and congratulations of those who met them. After entering the bridegroom's house, into which the bride was probably conducted by his mother, bearing a lighted torch, it was customary to shower sweetmeats upon them (καταχύσματα), as emblems of plenty and prosperity. After this came the nuptial feast, to which the name gamos was particularly applied; it was generally given in the house of the bridegroom or his parents, and, besides being a festive meeting, served other and more important purposes. There was no public rite, whether civil or religious, connected with the celebration of marriage among the ancient Greeks, and therefore no public record of its solemnization. This deficiency then was supplied by the marriage-feast, for the guests were of course competent to prove the fact of a marriage having taken place. To this feast, contrary to the usual practice among the Greeks, women were invited as well as men; but they seem to have sat at a separate table, with the bride, still veiled, among them. At the conclusion of this feast she was conducted by her husband into the bridal chamber; and a law of Solon required that, on entering it, they should eat a quince together. as if to indicate that their conversation ought to be sweet and agreeable. The song called the Epithalamium was then sung before the doors of the bridal chamber. The day after the marriage, the first of the bride's residence in her new abode, was called the epaulia (ἐπαύλια), on which their friends sent the customary presents to  the newly-married couple. On another day, the spatulia (ἀπαύλια), perhaps the second after marriage, the bridegroom left his house to lodge apart from his wife at his father's-in-law.

Some of the presents made to the bride bv her husband and friends were called anacalypteria. (ἀνακαλυπτήρια), as being given on the occasion of the bride first appearing unveiled; they were probably given on the epaulia, or day after the marriage. Another ceremony observed after marriage was the sacrifice which the husband offered up on the occasion of his bride being registered among his own phratores.

The above account refers to Athenian customs. At Sparta the betrothal of the bride by her father or guardian (κύριος) was requisite as a preliminary of marriage, as well as at Athens. Another custom peculiar to the Spartans, and a relic of ancient times, was the seizure of the bride by her intended husband, but of course with the sanction of her parents or guardians. She was not, however, immediately domiciled in her husband's house, but cohabited with him for some time clandestinely, till he brought her, and frequently her mother also, to his home.

The Greeks, generally speaking, entertained little regard for the female character. They considered women in fact, as decidedly inferior to men, qualified to discharge only the subordinate functions in life, and rather necessary as helpmates than agreeable as companions. To these notions female education for the most part corresponded, and, in fact, it confirmed them; it did not supply the elegant accomplishment and refinement of manners which permanently engage the affections when other attractions have passed away. Aristotle states that the relation of man to woman is that of the governor to the subject; and Plato, that a woman's virtue may be summed up in a few words, for she has only to manage the house well, keeping what there is in it, and obeying her husband. Among the Dorians, however, and especially at Sparta, women enjoyed much more estimation than in the rest of Greece.

2. Roman. — A legal Roman marriage was called justiae nuptiae, justum matrimonium, as being conformable to jus (civile) or to law. A legal marriage was either cum conventione uxoris in manum viri, or it was without this conventio. But both forms of marriage agreed in this: there must be connubium between the parties, and consent. The legal consequences as to the power of the father over his children were the same in both.  Connubium is merely a term which comprehends all the conditions of a legal marriage. Generally it may be stated that there was only connubium between Roman citizens; the cases in which it at any time existed between parties not both Roman citizens, were exceptions to the general rule. Originally, or at least at one period of the republic, there was no connubium between the patricians and the plebeians; but this was altered by the Lex Canuleia (B.C. 445), which allowed connubium between persons of those two classes. There were various degrees of consanguinity and affinity within which there was no connubium. An illegal union of a male and female, though affecting to be, was not a marriage: the man had no legal wife, and the children had no legal father; consequently they were not in the power of their reputed father. The marriage cum conventione differed from that sine conventione in the relationship which it effected between the husband and the wife; the marriage cum conventione was a necessary condition to make a woman a nmotetjiamilias. By the marriage cum conventione the wife passed into the familia of her husband, and was to him in the relation of a daughter, or, as it was expressed, in manum covenit. In the marriage sine conventione the wife's relation to her own familia remained as before, and she was merely uxor. “Uxor,” says Cicero, “is a genus of which there are two species: one is materfamilias, quae in manum convei it; the other is uxor only.” Accordingly a materfamilias is a wife who is in manu, and in the familia of her husband. A wife not in manu was not a member of her husband's familia, and therefore the term could not apply to her. Matrona was properly a wife not in manu, and equivalent to uxor; and she was called matrona before she had any children. But these words are not always used in these their original and proper meanings.

It does not appear that any forms were requisite in the marriage sine conventione; and apparently the evidence of such marriage was cohabitation matrimonii causa. The matrimoni causa might be proved by various kinds of evidence. In the case of a marriage cum conventione, there were three forms:

(1) Usus,

(2) Farreunm, and

(3) Coemptio.

(1.) Marriage was effected by usus if a woman lived with a man for a whole year as his wife; and this was by analogy to usucaption of movables generally, in which usus for one year gave ownership. The law of the  Twelve Tables provided that if a woman did not wish to come into the manus of her husband in this manner, she should absent herself from him annually for three nights (trinoctium), and so break the usus of the year.

(2.) Farreum was a form of marriage in which certain words were used in the presence of ten witnesses, and were accompanied by a certain religious ceremony, in which panis farreus was employed; and hence this form of marriage was also called confarreatio. It appears that certain priestly offices, such as that of Flamen Dialis, could only be held by those who were born of parents who had been married by this ceremony (confuarreati parentes).

(3.) Coemptio was effected by mancipatio, and consequently the wife was in mancipio. A woman who was cohabiting with a man as uxor, might come into his manus by this ceremony, in which case the coemptio was said to be matrimonii causa, and she who was formerly uxor became apud maritum filiae loco.

Sponsalia were not an unusual preliminary of marriage, but they were not necessary. The sponsalia were an agreement to marry, made in such form as to give each party a right of action in case of non-performance, and the offending party was condemned in such damages as to the judex seemed just. The woman who was promised in marriage was accordingly called sponsca, which is equivalent to promisa; the man who was engaged to marry was called sponsus. The sponsalia were of course not binding if the parties consented to waive the contract. Sometimes a present was made by the future husband to the future wife by way of earnest (arrha, arrha sponsalia), or, as it was called, propter nuptias donatio.

The consequences of marriage were:

1. The power of the father over the children of the marriage, which was a completely new relation — an effect indeed of marriage, but one which had no influence over the relation of the husband and wife.

2. The liabilities of either of the parties to the punishments affixed to the violation of the marriage union. 3. The relation of husband and wife with respect to property. When marriage was dissolved, the parties to it might marry again; but opinion considered it more decent for a woman not to marry again. A  woman was required by usage (mos) to wait a year before she contracted a second marriage, on the pain of infamia.

It remains to describe the customs and rites which were observed by the Romans at marriages. After the parties had agreed to marry, and the persons in whose potestas they were had consented, a meeting of friends was sometimes held at the house of the maiden for the purpose of settling the marriage-contract, which was written on tablets, and signed by both parties. The woman, after she had promised to become the wife of a man, was called sponsa, pacta, dicta, or sperata. It appears that — at least during the imperial period — the man put a ring on the finger of his betrothed as a pledge of his fidelity. This ring was probably, like all rings at this time, worn on the left hand, and on the finger nearest to the smallest. The last point to be fixed was the day on which the marriage was to take place.

The Romans believed that certain days were unfortunate for the performance of the marriage rites, either on account of the religious character of those days themselves, or on account of the days by which they were followed, as the woman had to perform certain religious rites on the day after her wedding, which could not take place on a dies ater. Days not suitable for entering upon matrimony were the calends, nones, andoides of every month, all dies atri, the whole months of May and February, and a great number of festivals. On the wedding-day, which in the early times was never fixed upon without consulting the auspices, the bride was dressed in a long white robe with a purple fringe, or adorned with ribbons. This dress was called tunica recta, and was bound round the waist with a girdle (corona, cingulum, or zona), which the husband had to untie in the evening. The bride's veil, called flammeum, was of a bright yellow color, and her shoes likewise. Her hair was divided on this occasion with the point of a spear. The bride was conducted to the house of her husband in the evening.

She was taken with apparent violence from the arms of her mother, or of the person who had to give her away. On her way she was accompanied by three boys dressed in the pretexta, and whose fathers and mothers were still alive (patimni iet matrinsi). One of them carried before her a torch of white thorn (spina), or, according to others, of pine wood; the two others walked by her side, supporting her by the arm. The bride herself carried a distaff and a spindle, with wool. A boy called camillus carried in a covered vase (cumera, cumerum, or casmillum) the so-called utensils of the bride and playthings for children (crepundia). Besides these persons who officiated on the occasion, the procession was  attended by a numerous train of friends, both of the bride and the bridegroom. When the procession arrived at the house of the bridegroom, the door of which was adorned with garlands and flowers, the bride was carried across the threshold by pronubi. i.e. men who had been married to only one woman, that she might not knock against it with her foot, which would have been an evil omen. Before she entered the house, she wound wool around the door-posts of her new residence, and anointed them with lard (adeps suillus) or wolf's fat (adeps lupinus).

The husband received her with fire and water, which the woman had to touch. This was either a symbolic purification, or a symbolic expression of welcome, as the interdicere aqua et igni was the formula for banishment. The bride saluted her husband with the words, Ubi tu Caius, ego Caia. After she had entered the house with distaff and spindle, she was placed upon a sheep-skin, and here the keys of the house were delivered into her hands. A repast (coena nuptialis), given by the husband to the whole train of relatives and friends who accompanied the bride, generally concluded the solemnity of the day. Many ancient writers mention a very popular song, Talasius or Talassio, which was sung at weddings; but whether it was sung during the repast or during the procession is not quite clear, though we may infer from the story respecting the origin of the song that it was sung while the procession was advancing towards the house of the husband. It may be easily imagined that a solemnity like that of marriage did not take place among the merry and humorous Italians without a variety of jests and railleries; and Ovid mentions obscene songs which were sung before the door of the bridal apartment by girls, after the company had left. These songs were probably the old Fescennina, and are frequently called Epithalamia. At the end of the repast, the bride was conducted by matrons who had not had more than one husband (pronubae) to the lectus genialis in the atrium, which was on this occasion magnificently adorned and strewed with flowers. On the following day the husband sometimes gave another entertainment to his friends, which was called repotia, and the woman, who on this day undertook the management of the house of her husband, had to perform certain religious rites; on which account, as was observed above, it was necessary to select a day for the marriage which was not followed by a dies ater. These rites probably consisted of sacrifices to the Dii Penates.

The position of a Roman woman after marriage was very different from that of a Greek woman. The Roman presided over the whole household; she educated her children, watched over and preserved the honor of the  house, and, as the materfamilias, she shared the honors and respect shown to her husband. Far from being confined, like the Greek women, to a distinct apartment, the Roman matron (at least during the better centuries of the republic) occupied the most important part of the house, the atrium. — Smith, Dict. of Class. Ant. s.v.

III. Among the Hindus. — There are writers, perhaps we had better call them “fact gatherers” (comp. Miller. Chips, 2:262), who, not contenting themselves with the accomplishment of the task for which they are fitted, frequently go out of their way to cast a slur upon the Christian's belief' and to ridicule him for entertaining the thought that the Bible is the educator of the human race. Yet the deeper the researches into the “primitive” condition of man, and the more intimate our relation with those nations who can claim a civilization outside of the pale of Christian teachings, the more stubborn appears the fact that Christianity alone assigns to woman a position of equality with man. The N.T. teaches “there is neither Jew nor Greek; there is neither bond nor free; there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus.” The Hindu's sacred writings, however, not only fail to make woman the equal of man, but they even put a stigma upon her from her very birth. A woman, it is affirmed by the Institutes of Manu (q.v.), whose inspiration is as unquestioned as his legislative supremacy is universal among the Hindus, “is never fit for independence, or to be trusted with liberty; for she may be compared to a heifer on the plain, which still longeth for grass.” “‘They exhaust,” says Massie (Continental India, 2:153), “the catalogue of vice to affix its epithets to woman's nature — infidelity, violence, deceit, envy, extreme avariciousness, an entire want of good qualities, with impurity, they affirm, are the innate faults of womankind.” “Why,” says Butler (Land of the Veda, p. 470), “if my native friend had six children, three boys and as many girls, and I happened to inquire, ‘Lalla, how many children have you?' the probability is he would reply, ‘Sir, I have three children;' for he would not think it worth while to count in the daughters.” Indeed, the Brahmin is taught that perfection is to be attained only, freed from the contamination of woman, in a purely ascetic state (Wuttke, Christian Ethics, 1:51).

But let us not be misunderstood as conveying the impression that the lay Hindfi favors asceticism. Far from it. Among the laity celibacy is a reproach in either sex. As among the Chinese (see below), “girls are not desired, not welcome;” and, when they come, they are either quickly done away with, where the English law does not interfere [see INFANTICIDE], or, if they must live, are  ignored, if not despised. Arrived at the age of only seven, the age at which the Shasters pronounce the girl marriageable, the unhappy parents begin to look about for an early opportunity to free themselves from the burden that is upon then by betrothal of the child. As all through the East, so also here the whole matter is held by the parents in their own hands. The poor girl has no choice or voice in her own destiny — all is arranged without consulting her views or affections in any way whatever. “Courtship, in our Christian sense,” says Butler, “the maiden in India can never know. She is not allowed to see or converse with him to whose control she will ere long be handed over. She cannot write to him, for she can neither read nor write; all she is able to do is to follow the instructions to ‘worship the gods for a good husband.' She is taught to commence as soon as she is four years old. Her prayers are addressed chiefly to Kama-deva (q.v.), the Hindû Cupid ... the maiden prays, and father and mother manage the business of selection. Each caste, SEE INDIAN CASTE, has its professional match-makers, whose aid is indispensable. When the negotiations have reached a certain definiteness, the Pundits are consulted to avoid mistakes of consanguinity, and then the astrologers, who pronounce upon the carefully-preserved horoscopes of the boy and girl, whether they can be united with safety. These preliminaries all found satisfactory, the aid of the Brahmin is sought to ascertain if the family god favors the union. The stars, the gods, and men being a unit, negotiations are opened between the parents and relations as to the amount of gift and dowry, and, when conclusions are reached here to their mutual satisfaction, the astrologer is again called in to ascertain and name a lucky day when the agreement may be registered, and a bond for the dowry executed. This is done with due solemnity, and then the astrologer has again to ascertain and name a lucky day for the ceremony, which is accepted by the parents under their bond to see to the consummation of the engagement. This is the usual method, slightly varied in different localities” (p. 479, 480). No female child is expected to have gone beyond the age of twelve without the consummation of an engagement. Woe be unto that family wherein a girl is past the age of twelve and yet unbetrothed (Butler, p. 497). And yet what is the fate of the poor girl after she has actually found her mate? Marriage to the Hindû female means slavery in its most abject form. “The Hindû,” says Massie (2:154), “does not marry to secure a companion who will aid him in enduring the ills of life, or in obtaining the means of rational employment, he seeks only a slave who shall nourish (he thinks not of training) children, and abide in abject subjection to his rule.”

Betrothal with the Hindûs being as binding as marriage (indeed, the word “marriage” is used to include both betrothal and our conception of the matrimonial alliance), the female child enters into a new state of existence immediately after the ceremony of betrothal. “Henceforth she is no more free to roam the fields and enjoy the lovely face of nature. Reserved for her husband, she can no longer be seen with propriety by any man save her father and brothers. She is from that day ‘a plurdah-sashlzi' — one who sits behind the curtains within the enclosure which surrounds her mother's home;” and now commences her education, which, lasting for five or six years, may be epitomized in its entire curriculum under these four heads: cooking, domestic service, religion, and their peculiar female literature, to enter at last a state of dependence more strict, contemptuous, and humiliating, ordained for the weaker sex among the Hindus, than which there cannot easily be conceived another. Look into the house which the bride has entered, and see her as she begins the duties for which she has been trained. She rises to prepare her husband's food, and, when all is ready and laid out upon the mat — for they ignore such aids as chairs and tables, knives or forks, and take their meals with the hand, sitting on the floor — she now announces to her lord that his meal is ready. He enters and sits down, and finds all duly prepared by her care. Why does she still stand? Why not sit down too, and share with her husband the good things which she has made ready. She dares not. He would not allow it — the law of her religion forbids it. She must stand and wait upon him, for do not the Shasters render it her duty? “When in the presence of her husband,” they teach her, “a woman must keep her eyes upon her master, and be ready to receive his commands. When he speaks she must be quiet, and listen to nothing else, and attend upon him alone. A woman has no other god on earth but her husband.”

Therefore she waits upon her husband so patiently. But not only is she prohibited from enjoying the blessings of the family table, even when her lord has fully satisfied himself, but she is obliged to remove what remains to another apartment — “for her religion not only forbids her eating with him, but also prohibits her from eating even what he leaves ‘in the same room where he dines' — and not till then can she and her children eat their food” (Butler, p. 492). If the state we have portrayed be sad and low enough, what shall be said of the helpless condition in which the poor woman of India is placed if her husband be cruel, aye, brutal? “Woman,” says Butler (p. 492), “is absolutely without redress, in the power of her husband, and no one can interfere when it stops short of actual murder.” Such is woman's history in a married life, as guided and  controlled by the sacred writings of a people who enjoy a non-Biblical civilization. “If ever woman had an opportunity of showing what she might become under the teachings and influence of a civilization where Christianity or the Bible did not interfere with her state, the women of India have had that opportunity, and now, after forty centuries of such experiment, what is woman there to-day?” (Butler, p. 469). Surely here is a question worthy the attention of those “fact gatherers” who so eagerly thrust aside the benighted influences of a Christian civilization.

Polygamy exists among the Hindûs, as it is allowable. It is a luxury, however, that few poor men can afford, and hence the practice of “successional polygamy:” Hindûs often forsake their wives, and then take others. Where polygamy has invaded the household, the woman who has had the good fortune to be the first wife takes precedence in rank; she remaining the mistress of the zenana — the Hindû harem.

Polyandry, strangely enough, has also established itself here. “This singular and amazing relation existed in India twenty-five centuries ago, and lingers today in some localities to such an extent as to call for the legislative action of the English government.” SEE POLYANDRY.

The marriage-rites are numerous, tedious, and in many parts far from delicate. All, however, being expressed in Sanscrit, and recited by the officiating Brahmin with the utmost rapidity, no one understands what is said. The principal rites among the Brahmins are walking three times round a fire, and tying the garments of the parties together. The bride has also to make seven steps, at the last of which the marriage is complete.

The marriage is usually solemnized in the house of the bride's father. Thither the bridegroom proceeds, attended by his friends, and from thence conducts the bride to his home in a grand procession, usually by night, with torches and great rejoicings. One both occasions considerable expenditure is incurred in feasting the friends and relatives, and in providing ornaments, music, processions, and illuminations. The wealthy spend freely on these objects, and the poorer classes often incur debts which burden them for many years. The costs incurred by the fathers, on both sides, in celebrating a marriage, form a heavy item of Hindû expenditure, and one of the motives to female infanticide is doubtless laid in the desire to avoid this charge (Trevor, Its Natives and Missions, p. 214).  The marriage procession is thus described by Butler (p. 485). “Often when traveling at night in my palanquin, I have been roused from my sleep by my bearers catching sight of an approaching marriage procession, with its torches, music, and shouting; falling in with the enthusiasm of each event, they would cry out that ‘the bridegroom cometh.' First the bridegroom would make his appearance, mounted on a fine horse splendidly caparisoned — his own or borrowed for the occasion — and wearing a grand coat, decked out in tinsel and gold thread, with the matrimonial crown on his head, and his richly-embroidered slippers, all very fine, his friends shouting and dancing alongside of him, and, of course, as he passes, we make our salaam and wish him joy. Right behind the bridegroom's horse comes the palanquin of the bride, but she is veiled, and the venetians are closely shut, and on the little lady is borne to a home which she never saw before, to surrender herself into the hands of one who has neither wooed nor won her; a bride without a choice, with no voice in her own destiny; married without preference; handed over, by those assumed to do all the thinking for her, to a fate where the feelings of her heart were never consulted in the most important transaction of her existence; beginning her married life under circumstances which preclude the possibility of her being sustained by the affection which is founded upon esteem. When the procession has come within hailing distance of his home, the watching friends go forth to meet the bridegroom, the bride enters her apartments, the door is shut, and the guests are entertained in other parts of the establishment.”

IV. Among the Chinese and Japanese. — The Chinese are divided into a number of clans, each distinguished by a clan name. Of these clans there are from a hundred to a thousand, according to different authors. The laws is that no man shall marry a woman of his own clan name. Thus relationship by the male line, however distant, prevents marriage. This rule is very ancient, its origin being referred by the Chinese to the mythic times of their empire. The legendary emperor Fu-Hi, who reigned before the Hea dynasty, which, according to the Chinese annals, began in B.C. 2207, is said to have divided the people into clans, and established this rule regarding marriage (Tyler, Researches, p. 278). We give the Chinese marriage customs at considerable length, as they are highly illustrative of Oriental usages in general.

As in all Eastern countries, the girl to be given in wedlock is not consulted in the choice of her future husband, the parents deciding in her stead. The  Chinese are firm believers in the sentiment to which the Western mind has given expression in the proverb that “Matches are made in heaven.” To secure an alliance, a person is employed as a go-between or match-maker. The negotiation is generally opened by the family of the male person. Not unfrequently the girl has to be paid for — a relic of the patriarchal custom. Occasionally, when a female child is born to persons in humble circumstances, it is given away to a family having a male child only; is reared by the latter, and, when the girl and boy have reached a marriageable age, they are joined in matrimony. Not unfrequently it occurs among wealthy families having a daughter that the custom of purchase is reversed, and a husband secured for a pecuniary consideration. The wealthy look with special favor upon the literary class, and not unfrequently great sacrifices are made to secure a scholarly husband. “It not unfrequently occurs,” says Doolittle (China, 1:99), “that a rich family, having only one daughter and no boys, desires to obtain a son-in-law who shall be willing to marry the girl and live in the family as a son. Sometimes a notice is seen posted up, stating the desire of a certain man to find a son- in-law and heir who will come and live with him, perhaps stating the age and qualifications of an acceptable person. In such a case, the parents of those who have a son whose qualifications might warrant such an application, and whom they would be willing to allow to marry on such terms, are expected to make application by a go-between, when the matter would be considered by the rich man. Sometimes the rich man makes application by a go-between to the parents of a young man whose reputation he is pleased with, and who perhaps may be a recent graduate, his name standing near the head of the list of successful competitors of the first or second literary degree.”

Betrothal. — This among the Chinese is considered as binding as marriage, if the rites and observances have been carefully looked after. The final act in betrothment is the exchange of cards (for description, see Doolittle, 1:67). The time intervening between betrothal and marriage varies from a month or two to eighteen or twenty years, depending much on the age of the parties. “From one to three months before the marriage a fortunate day is selected for its celebration. Generally a member of the family of the bridegroom, or a trusty friend, takes the eight horary characters which denote the birth-time for each of the affianced parties, and for each of their parents, if living, to a fortune-teller, who selects lucky days and times for the marriage, for the cutting of the wedding garments, for the placing of  the bridal bed in position, for the finishing of the curtains of the bridal bed, for the embroidering of the bridal pillows, and for the entering of the sedan, on the part of the bride, on the day of her marriage. These items are written out on a sheet of red paper, which is sent to the family of the girl by the hands of the go-between. If accepted, the periods specified become the fixed times for the performance of the particulars indicated, and both parties proceed to make the necessary arrangements for the approaching wedding. Presenting the wedding-cakes and material for the bridal dress to the family of the bride by the other party is next in order. The relative time usually adopted for the performance of this custom is about one month before the day fixed for the marriage. The number of these ‘cakes of ceremony,' or wedding-cakes, varies from several score to several hundreds. They are round, a and about an inch thick, weighing generally about one pound and ten or twelve ounces each, and measure nearly a foot in diameter. They are made out of wheat flour, and contain in the middle some sugar, lard, and small pieces of fat pork, mixed together in a kind of batter, and then cooked: they are, in fact, a sort of mince-pies. There is also sent a sum of money, of greater or less amount, according to previous agreement; a quantity of red cloth or silk, usually not less than five kinds, for the use of the bride; five kinds of dried fruits, several kinds of small cakes, a cock and a hen, and a gander and a goose. The family of the girl, on receiving these wedding-cakes, proceeds to distribute them among their relatives and intimate friends. The small cakes are also distributed in a similar manner. The money sent is generally spent in outfitting the bride.

“A few days before the day fixed for the wedding, the family of the bridegroom again makes a present of various articles of food and other things to the family of the bride, as a cock and a hen, a leg and foot of a pig and of a goat, eight small cakes of bread, eight torches, three pairs of large red candles, a quantity of vermicelli, and several bunches of fire-crackers. There are also sent a girdle, a head-dress, a silken covering for the head and face, and several articles of ready-made clothing, which are usually borrowed or rented for the occasion. These are to be worn by the bride on her entering the bridal sedan to be carried to the home of her husband on the morning of her marriage. The food, or a part of it, including the cock, is to be eaten by her on that morning. The fire-crackers are for explosion on the road, and the torches are for burning during the time occupied en route to her new home. On each of the eight bread-cakes is made a large red character in an ancient form of writing, of an auspicious meaning, as  ‘longevity,' ‘happiness,' official emolument,' and ‘joy;' or certain four of them have four characters, meaning ‘the phoenixes are singing in concert,' or ‘the ducks are seeking their mates.' Four of these bread-loaves are accepted; the remaining four and the hen, according to strict custom, are returned to the party which proffers them. The bread-cakes and the vermicelli are omens significant of good, owing to a play on the local sound of the characters which denote them, or in consequence of the shape of the article. The vermicelli is significant of longevity,' because of its length; and the four bread-cakes reserved by the family of the bride are kept for a singular use on the morning of the girl's entering her bridal chair. Placing the bridal bedstead in the position where it is to stand is an important ceremony. When the day selected arrives, which is generally only a few days before the wedding, the bedstead is arranged in some convenient place in the bride's chamber, and then for a considerable time it must not be moved, for fear of ill luck. This placing of the bedstead in position is attended with various superstitious acts.”

Worship of Ancestors by the Bridal Party. — “Usually the day before the wedding, the bride has her hair done up in the style of married women of her class in society, and tries on the clothes she is to wear in the sedan, and for a time after she arrives at her future home on the morrow. This is an occasion of great interest to her family. Her parents invite their female relatives and friends to a feast at their house. The professed object of trying on the clothing is to see how the articles provided will fit, and to ascertain that everything is ready, so that there may be no delay or confusion on the arrival of the hour when she is to take her seat in her sedan. While thus dressed (the thick veil designed to conceal her features on arrival at her husband's residence not now being worn), she proceeds to light incense before the ancestral tablets belonging to her father's family, and to worship them for the last time before her marriage. She also kneels down before her parents, her grandparents (if living), her uncles and aunts (if present), and worships them in much the same manner as she and her husband will on the morrow worship his parents and grandparents, and the ancestral tablets belonging to his family. On the occasion of the girl's trying on these clothes and worshipping the tablet and her parents, it is considered unpropitious that those of her female relatives and friends who are in mourning should be present.

“The bridal chair is selected by the family of the bridegroom, and sent to the residence of the bride generally on the afternoon preceding the  wedding-day, attended by a band of music, some men carrying lighted torches, two carrying a pair of large red lanterns, containing candles also lighted, and one having a large red umbrella, and one or two friends or other attendants. The bridal chair is always red, and is generally covered with broadcloth, or some rich, expensive material. It is borne by four men, who wear caps having red tassels. The musicians and all the persons employed in the procession have similar caps.

Very early on the morning of her marriage the bride or the ‘new woman' arises, bathes, and dresses. While she is bathing the musicians are required to play. Her breakfast consists theoretically of the fowl, the vermicelli, etc., sent by the family of her affianced husband. In fact, however, she eats and drinks very little of anything on the morning or during the day of her wedding. When the precise time approaches for taking her seat in her sedan, usually between five and eight o'clock in the morning, previously fixed by the fortune-teller, her toilet is completed by one of her parents taking a thick veil and placing it over her head, completely covering her features from view. She is now led out of her room by one of her female assistants, and takes her seat in thee sedan, which has been brought into the reception-room of the house. The floor from her room to the sedan is. covered for the occasion with a kind of red carpeting, so; that her feet may not touch the ground. She takes herplace in the sedan amid the sound of fire-crackers and, music by the band. The bride, her mother, and the various members of the family, are required by custom to, indulge during this morning in hearty and protracted. crying — oftentimes, no doubt, sincere and unaffected. While seated in the sedan, but before she starts for her future home, her parents, or some members of her family, take a bed-quilt by its four corners, and, while holding it thus before the bridal chair, one of the bride's assistants tosses into the air, one by one, four bread-cakes, ins such a manner that they will fall into the bed-quilt.

These bread-cakes were received from the family of her husband at the same time as the cock and vermicelli were received. The woman during this ceremony is constantly repeating felicitous sentences, which are assented to by some others of the company. The quilt containing these cakes is gathered up and carried immediately to an adjoining room. The object of this ceremony is explained to be to profit the family of the: bride's parents, being an omen of good, which is in some, manner indicated to the Chinese apprehension by the. quilt and the cakes being retained in the house — the local sound of the common word for ‘bread,' and a certain word meaning ‘to warrant,' ‘to secure,' being identical.”  Bridal Procession. — After these performances “the, bridal procession starts en route for the residence of the other party, amid explosions of fire- crackers and the music of the band. In the front of the procession go, two men carrying two large lighted lanterns, having the ancestral or family name of the groom cut in a large form out of red paper pasted upon them. Then, come two men carrying similar lanterns, having the, family name of the bride in a similar manner pasted on them. These belong to her family, and accompany her only a part of the way. Then comes a large red umbrella, followed by men carrying lighted torches, and by the band of music. Near the bridal chair are several brothers of the bride or friends of her family, and several friends or brothers of the groom. These latter are dispatched from the house of the groom early in the morning, for the purpose of meeting the bridal procession and escorting the bride to her home. This deputation sometimes arrives at the house of the bride before she sets out on her journey, and, if so, it accompanies the procession all the way. About midway between the homes of the bride and the groom the procession stops in the street, while the important ceremony of receiving the bride is formally transacted. The friends of the bride stand near each other, and at a little distance stand the friends of the groom. The former produce a large red card, having the ancestral name of the bride's family written on it; the latter produce a similar card bearing the ancestral name of the groom. These they exchange, and each, seizing his own hands a la Chinois, bows towards the members of the other party.

The two men in the front of the procession who carry the lanterns having the ancestral name of the groom now turn about, and, going between the sedan chair and the two men who carry the lanterns having the ancestral name of the bride, come back to their former position in the procession, having gone around the party which has the lanterns with the bride's ancestral name attached. This latter party, while the other is thus encircling it, turns round in an opposite direction, and starts for the residence of the family of the bride, accompanied by that part of the escort which consisted of her brothers or the friends of her family. The rest of the procession now proceeds on its way to the residence of the bridegroom, the band playing a lively air. At intervals along the street fire-crackers are exploded. It is said that, from the precise time when the two parties carrying lanterns having the ancestral names of the two families attached separate from each other in the street, the name of the bride is changed into the name of her betrothed; the lanterns having his name attached remaining in the procession, while those which have her (former) name are taken back to the residence of her  father's family. From this time during the day she generally is in the midst of entire personal strangers, excepting her female assistants, who accompany the procession and keep with her wherever she goes. On arriving at the door of the bridegroom's house fire-crackers are let off in large quantities, and the band plays very vigorously. The torch-bearers, lantern-bearers, and the musicians stop near the door. The sedan is carried into the reception-room. The floor, from the place where the sedan stops to the door of the bride's room, is covered with red carpeting, lest her feet should touch the floor.

A woman who has borne both male and female children, or at least male children, and who lives in harmonious subjection to her husband, approaches the door of the sedan and utters various felicitous sentences. If she is in good pecuniary circumstances, and if her parents are living and of a learned family, so much the more fortunate. A boy six or eight years old, holding in his hands a brass mirror, with the reflecting surface turned from him and towards the chair, also comes near and invites the bride to alight. At the same time the married woman who has uttered propitious words advances as if to open the door of the sedan, when one of the female assistants of the bride, who accompanied the procession, steps forward and opens it. The married woman referred to and the boy are employed by the family of the groom, and receive a small present for their services, which are considered quite important and ominous of good. The mirror held by the lad is expected to ward off all deadly or pernicious influences which may emanate from the sedan. The bride is now aided by her female assistants to alight. While being led towards the door of her room, the sieve which had been placed over the door of the bridal chair on its arrival is sometimes held over her head, and sometimes it is placed directly in front of the door of the sedan, so that, on stepping out, she will step into it.

“The groom, on the approach of the bridal procession, disappears from the crowd of friends and relatives who have assembled at his residence on the happy occasion, and takes his position standing by the side of the bedstead, having his face turned towards the bed. When the bride enters the room, guided by her assistants, he turns around, and remains standing with his face turned from the bed. As soon as she has reached his side, both bridegroom and bride simultaneously seat themselves side by side on the edge of the bedstead. Oftentimes the groom manages to have a portion' of the skirt of her dress come under him as he sits down by her, such a thing being considered as a kind of omen that she will be submissive. Sometimes  the bride is very careful, by a proper adjustment of her clothing at the moment of sitting down, not only to prevent the accomplishment of such an intention on his part, but also to sit down, if possible, in such a manner that some of his dress will come under her, thus manifesting her determination to preserve a proper independence, if not to bring him actually to yield obedience to her will. After sitting thus in profound silence together for a few moments, the groom arises and leaves the room. He waits in the reception-room for the reappearance of his bride, to perform the ceremony called ‘worshipping the temple' (q.v.). Until this time the bride has worn the heavy embroidered outside garment, head-dress, etc., which she had on when she entered her sedan. These are now removed. She has her hair carefully combed in the style of her class in society, and she is arrayed in her own wedding garments. Sometimes her hair is gorgeously decked out with pearls and gems, true or false, according to the ability of the family to purchase, rent, or borrow. When her toilet has been completed, and everything has been made ready, the bride and bridegroom sit down in her room to their wedding dinner. He now, oftentimes for the first time in his life, and always for the first time on his marriage day, beholds the features of his wife. He may eat to his fill of the good things provided on the occasion, but she, according to established custom, may not take a particle. She must sit in silence, dignified and composed.

“The wedding festivities generally last at least two days. ‘The first day the male friends and relatives of the groom are invited to ‘shed their light' on the occasion. On the second day the female friends and relatives of the family of the groom are invited to the wedding feast; this is often called the ‘women's day.' Not long after the family and guests have breakfasted on the morning of the second day, the newly-married couple, amid the noise of fire-crackers, come out of their room together for the purpose of worshipping the ancestral tablets belonging to the household, the grandparents, and parents of the groom. This custom is known by the name of ‘coming out of the room.' In the case of those families who devote only one day to the marriage festivities and ceremonies, this custom is observed on the afternoon of the first day. Not long subsequent to the ceremony of ‘coming out of the room,' the couple proceed to the kitchen for the purpose of worshipping the god and goddess of the kitchen. This is performed with great decorum, and is regarded as an important and essential part of marriage solemnities. Incense and candles are lighted, and arranged on a table placed before the picture or the writing which  represents these divinities, plastered upon the wall of the kitchen. Before this table the bridegroom and his bride kneel down side by side, and bow in worship of the god and goddess of the kitchen. It is believed that they will thus propitiate their good-will, and especially that the bride, in attempting culinary operations. will succeed better in consequence of paying early and respectful attentions to these divinities. On the third day the parents of the bride send an invitation to their son-in-law and his wife to visit them. With this invitation they send sedans for them. The card is usually brought by her brothers, if she has any of the proper age, or by relatives having her own ancestral name. Until this morning, since she left her former home two days previous, the bride has seen none of her own family, and generally none of her own relatives or acquaintances. She and her husband now receive the congratulations and compliments of her brothers or other relatives, and prepare to visit her parents. The bride enters her sedan first, and proceeds a short distance in front of her husband. They do not start together, nor is it proper that they should arrive at the house of her parents at the same time.

The chair provided for the bride on this occasion is a common black sedan in all respects, except that its screen in front has a certain charm painted upon the outside. This charm is the picture of a grim-looking man, sitting on a tiger, with one of his hands raised up, holding a sword, as if in the act of striking, representing a certain ruler of elves, hobgoblins, etc. The object Of its use on the occasion of a bride's returning to her parents' house, on the third day after her marriage, is to keep off evil and unpropitious influences from her. On arrival at her paternal home the bride's sedan is carried into the reception-room, and she alights amid the noise of fire- crackers. The sedan which contains the i son-in-law stops a few rods from his father-in-law's residence, where lie is met by one of his brothers-in-law, or some relative or friend deputed to meet and conduct him into the house. The two parties, standing in the street, respectfully shake their own hands towards each other oil meeting, according to the approved fashion. The newly-arrived is now invited to enter the house. He is seated in the reception-room, where he is treated successively to three cups of tea and three pipes of tobacco. .Afterwards he is invited to go and see his mother- in-law in her room, where he finds his wife. There lie sits awhile, and visits after a stereotyped manner, being careful to use only good or propitious words, avoiding every subject and phrase which, according to the notions of this people, are unlucky. He is soon invited into the reception-room, where he is joined by his wife. Everything being arranged, the husband and wife proceed to worship the ancestral tablets of her family. At the  conclusion of this ceremony the bride retires to her mother's apartments. or to some back room, where she and the female relatives present are feasted. Her husband invited to partake of some refreshments in the reception-room, in doing which he is joined by his bride's brothers, or some others of her family relatives. According to the rules of etiquette, he must eat but very little, however hungry he may be. The usual phrase employed in speaking of it is that he eats part of ‘three bowls of vegetables,' after which he declines to receive anything more, under the plea that he has eaten enough. He soon takes his departure in his sedan, leaving his bride to follow by herself by-and-by, accompanied usually only by a servant or female friend. Husbands are never seen with their wives in public.”

The marriage customns of the Japanese are so very like those of the Chinese that we have grouped them together. The custom of purchasing the wife is still more general among the Japanese than other Asiatic nations. Polygamy is strictly forbidden. Though the harem is tolerated, only one larwful wife is recognised. “It appears, however,” says MacFarlane (Japan, p. 268), “to be very easy for a man to put away his wife and take another — at least so far as any law exists to the contrary.” The condition of woman is far better than in any other Asiatic country.

V. Among Savages. — Perhaps in no other way can the great advantages of Christian civilization be more conclusively shown than by the improvement which it has effected in the relations between the two sexes. The best students of the primitive condition of man have come to the conclusion that where divine revelation does not extend the institution of marriages if it exists at all, it is by no means the outgrowth of affection and a desire for companionship, but is entered into by the male savages “as a mere animal and convenient connection” as the “means of getting their dinner cooked.” There is “no idea of tenderness nor of chivalrous devotion” (Hill, Tracts of Chittagong, p. 116; comp. Pallas, Voyages, 4:94). Indeed, according to Lubbock (Origin of Civilizaltion, and Primitive Condition of Man), the lowest races have no such institution as the marriage rite, because “true love is almost unknown among them” (p. 50). Kolben (Hist. Cape of Good Hope, 1:1.62) tells us that “the Hottentots are so cold and indifferent to one another that you would think there was no such thing as love between them.n There are even some savages, as the North American Indian tribe, the Tinnes, who have no word for “dear” or “beloved;” and it is said of the Algonquins that when  the Bible was translated into their language a word had to be coined to give expression to our verb “to love.” There are other uncivilized races of men that lack greatly in words to express social relations, as, e.g., the Sandwich Islanders, who, according to Lubbock (p. 61-63), possess no words answering to “son,” “daughter,” “wife,” or “husband,” due not to poverty of language, but to the fact that “the idea of marriage does not enter into the Hawaian system of relationship.”

Among savages, the peculiar ideas attached to the bond of matrimony make the marriage-ceremony rather an institution peculiar to them. As we have seen above, there are many rude people who do not recognize the symbol of marriage, and, naturally enough, no ceremony is known to them; and then there are many cases in which the marriage bond is recognized, but no ceremony of marriage is observed. “Yet,” says Lubbock (p. 58), “we must not assume that marriage is necessarily and always lightly regarded where it is unaccompanied by ceremonial.” In Tahiti, says Cook (Voyage around the World), “marriage, as appeared to us, is nothing more than an agreement between the man and the woman, with which the priest has no concern. Where it is contracted it appears to be pretty well kept, though sometimes the parties separate by mutual consent” (comp. Klemm, Cultur der Menschen, 4:299).

1. Ceremonies. — There cannot be said to exist any marriage ceremonies among the Badagas (Hindostan); the Kurumbas, a tribe of the Neilgherry Hills (Transact. Ethnol. Soc. 7:276); the Indians of California (Smithsoniani Rep. 1863, p. 368); the Kutchin Indians, further north (Smith. Rep. 1866, p. 326); the Arawaks of South America (Brett, Guiana, p. 101), and the Brazilian tribes generally (Martins, Rechtszustand unter den Ureinwohnern Brasiliens, p. 51); and the same is the case with tie Australian tribes (Eyre's Discoveries, 2:319). Speke (Journ. p. 361) says “there are no such things as marriages in Uganda;” and of the Mandingoes (West Africa), Caille (Trav. to Timbuctoo, 1:350) says that husband and wife are not united by any ceremony; and Hutton (in Klemm, Cultur, 3:280) makes the same statement as regards the Ashantees. In Congo and Angola (Astley, Coll. of Voyages, 3:221, 227) “they use no peculiar ceremonies in marriage, nor scarce trouble themselves for consent of friends.” Neither do we find that the Hottentots know anything about marriage ceremonies, if we may follow La Vaillant (Voy. 2:58); nor do the Bushmen, according to Mr. Wood (Nat. Hist. Man, 1:269), have in their language any means of distinguishing an unmarried from a married girl.  According to Dalton (Trans. Ethl. Soc. 6:25), the Keriahs of Central India have no word for marriage in their own language, and the only ceremony used appears to be little more than a sort of public recognition of the fact. “The marital rite among our tribes” (i.e. the Redskins of the United States), says Schoolcraft (Ind. Tribes, p. 132, 248), “is nothing more than the personal consent of the parties, without requiring any concurrent act of a priesthood, magistracy, or witnesses; the act is assumed by the parties without the necessity of any extraneous sanction.” “There is,” says Bruce (Travels, 4:487), “no such thing as marriage in Abyssinia, unless that which is contracted by mutual consent, without other form, subsisting only till dissolved by dissent of one or the other, and to be renewed or repeated as often as it is agreeable to both parties, who, when they please, live together again as man and wife, after having been divorced, had children by others, or whether they have been married or had children with others or not.” Among the Bedouin Arabs there is a marriage ceremony in the case of a girl, but the remarriage of a widow is not thought sufficiently important to deserve one.

2. Communal Marriage. — Bachofen and M'Lennan, two of the most devoted students of marriage among the savages, will have it that the primitive condition of man was one of pure Hetairism, or, as it might perhaps be conveniently Englished, “communal marriage,” where every man and woman in a small community were regarded as equally married to one another. Of course none of our readers will be misled by the use of the word “primitive.” It is not our province here to enter into a discussion on primeval man [see PRE-ADAMITES]; we use the word with reference to the lowest condition of unchristianized man, satisfied, as we stated at the beginning of our subject, that the marriage relation, as it exists among civilized men, is due solely to the influence of divine revelation-man's noblest educator. The most extravagant form of communism we find related of the Techurs of Oude. “They live together almost indiscriminately in large communities, and even when the people are regarded as married the tie is but nominal” (Watson and Kaye, People of India, 1:85). In the Andaman Islands, we are told by Sir Edward Belcher (Trans. Ethn. Soc. 5. 45), it is the custom for man and woman to remain together until the child is weaned, when they separate as a matter of course, and each seeks a new partner. Among the Southals, one of the aboriginal tribes of India, marriages take place once a year, mostly in January. “For six days all the candidates for matrimony live together in promiscuous concubinage, the  introductory rite to the marital relation; for only after this are the separate couples regarded as having established their right to marry” (Watson and Kaye, 1:2). Among the Todas, of the Hawaian race, when a man marries a girl, she becomes the wife of all his brothers as they successively reach manhood; and they also become the husbands of all her sisters, as they become old enough to marry. (Comp. here Ethn. Journ. 1867, p. 286, on a practice among the Sioux and other North American Indians.) Among the Greenland Esquimaux it is related that “those are reputed the best and noblest tempered who, without any pain or reluctancy, will lend their friends their wives” (Egede, Hist. Greenland, p. 142). This custom of wife- lending is, however, by no means confined to the inhabitants of Greenland, but prevails among North and South American Indians, Polynesians, Eastern and Western negroes, Arabs, Abyssinians, Kaffirs, Mongols, Tutski, etc. (see Lubbock, p. 89), and is practiced especially as an act of hospitality. Plutarch will have it that the custom of lending wives existed also among the Romans. Nor must it be forgotten that it was held one of the essentials of the model Platonic republic that “among the guardians, at least, the sexual arrangements should be under public regulation, and the monopoly of one woman by one man forbidden” (Bain, Mental sand Moral Science; comp. Kames, Hist. of Man, 2:50). SEE PROSTITUTE.

A very peculiar custom is found among the Nassaniyeh Arabs. They practice what might be appropriately termed three-quarter marriage; i.e. the woman is legally married for three days out of four, remaining perfectly free for the fourth (Lubbock, p. 54). In Ceylon, according to Davy (Ceylon, p. 286), marriages are provisional for the first fortnight, at the expiration of which they are either annulled or confirmed. Among the Reddies of Southern India a still more singular custom prevails. “A young woman of sixteen or twenty years of age may be married to a boy of five or six years. She, however, lives with some other adult male — perhaps a maternal uncle or cousin-but is not allowed to form a connection with the father's relatives; occasionally it may be the boy — husband's father himself-that is, the woman's father-in-law. Should there be children from these liaisons, they are fathered on the boy-husband. When the boy grows up the wife is either old or past child-bearing, when he, in his turn, takes up with some other boy's wife in a manner precisely similar to his own, and procreates children for the boy-husband” (Shortt, Trans. Ethnol. Soc., New Series, 7:194).

3. Marriage by Purchase. — Those who believe, like Tyler, M'Lennan, Bachofen, and Lubbock, that the communal system of the marital relation  existed in the primeval state, hold that out of it arose the system of individual marriage. We who depend upon the guidance of a written revelation are rather of the opinion that it is the influence of Christian civilization upon savage life that has led some of them to prefer individual to communal marriage. It is true that the marriage by capture has done much to bring about individual marriage, but it is by no means clear to us that even then the practice was not borrowed from Christianized people directly or indirectly. We certainly do not believe, with Lessing, that nations develop without external influences, that civilization is the possession of every people, and that it is constantly progressive. The condition of the American savage, and the remnants of an early and high civilization, bear witness to the contrary. Yet we believe, with Brinton (Myths of the New World, p. 5), that “religious rites are living commentaries on religious beliefs;” and that, while the idea of God does not and cannot proceed from the external world, it nevertheless finds its historical origin, also, in the desperate struggle for life, in the satisfaction of the animal wants and passions, in those vulgar aims and motives which possessed the mind of the primitive man to the exclusion of everything else. It is pretty clear that with all pre-Christian nations the modes of getting a wife were the same with those of acquiring any other species of property — capture, gift, sale. The contract of sale may be said to be at the foundation of the marriage relation in every system of ancient law. When daughters belonged to parents as goods, they were parted with only on the principles of fair exchange. Usually the contract was between the heads of families, the intending bride and bridegroom not being consulted. As to the marriage ceremonies, they then were those and no other which were necessary to complete and evidence a sale-delivery, on the price being paid, and “the taking home.” It was never thought of that the children should be consulted, and allowed to act on their likings. Just so the savage has been in a measure addicted to the purchase of his wife, with only this difference, however, that the property is secured by the buyer for himself. In Sumatra, e.g., there were formerly three perfectly distinct kinds of marriage: the “Jugur,” in which the man purchased the woman; the “Ambel-anak,” in which the woman purchased the man (see below, Polyandry); and the “Semando,” in which they joined on terms of equality (comp. Marsden, Hist. of Sumatra, p. 262 sq.). “Among low races,” says Lubbock (p. 68), ‘the wife is indeed literally the property of the husband, as Petruchio says of Catharine:

‘I will be master of what is mine own.

She is my goods, my chattels; she is my house,

My household stuff, my field, my barn,

My horse, my ox, my ass, my anything.' “

Still more peculiar and odd are the ceremonies of courtship and marriage in the mountainous districts of Eastern Hungary. In the fall of the year a fair is held there of marriageable young men and women. From all quarters long trains of chariots wind their way to the plain of Kalinosa. They are laden with household furniture, and followed by the cattle of the family. In the midst of these goods may be seen the young lady whom her family has brought to seek a husband at the fair. She is dressed in her best, with brilliant silk scarf and scarlet petticoat. These caravans take up their position one after the other on one side of the plain, while on the other side a cavalcade of young men approaches and deploys along the whole line. The men — young Wallachians, for the most part — are dressed in their best goat-skins, and make what show of horsemanship they can. After both parties have taken up their respective quarters opposite each other, the fathers step forward and begin to negotiate marriages for their children. The questions asked on these occasions are, we fear, of a somewhat sordid character. “How many bullocks?” “How much money?” “Your daughter's furniture looks rather old; that chest of drawers does not shut properly. I must find something better than that for my son.” Such would doubtless be a correct report of the conversations held in this primitive, if not poetical Arcadia, previous to clinching the matrimonial bargain. The business is, however, carried out with a promptitude equal to its frankness. As soon as the parents are agreed, a priest, who is always ready at hand, is summoned. He chants a hymn and gives his benediction, the bride then kisses her parents, mounts the chariot, and starts for some unknown village with a husband whom she has never seen before, the furniture and cattle which her parents have allowed her as a marriage-portion following in the rear.

5. Marriage by Capture. — Marriage by purchase, however, is by no means the most usual way of the savage to secure a help-meet for himself. Perhaps the general mode by which rude nations enter into the marital relation is that of capture. In the opinion of Lubbock, the first state of individual marriage was brought about by capture, and, if he chose to treat of this practice as confined to rude nations, we can see no reason to disagree with him that man came to claim for his sole personal benefit the female he secured from the conquered. Indeed, such a practice finds a  counterpart not only among the pagan nations, but is related of even in the O.-T. Scriptures (Deu 20:10-14). Our readers must not, however, be led to believe that among savage races marriage by capture means the procuring of a wife by hostility. Many savages, indeed, never secure their female companions except by capture, though they be of the same tribe to which they themselves belong. Indeed, while there are many rude nations that do not tolerate anything else but endogamy, i.e. inter- tribal marriage, many others, perhaps the majority, permit only exogamy, i.e. marriage without the tribe. (See this head below.) Nor does it at all follow that all exogamous marriages do away with communism. It is simply a step in the right direction, and in many instances has perhaps been instrumental in bringing about individual marriage relations. There is certainly no symbol more widespread, nor more varied in its forms, than that of capture in marriage ceremonies. In many cases feigned theft is necessary to the validity of the marriage. For the Hindu such a marriage form is prescribed in the Sudras (Lassen, Indische Studien, p. 325), and in the Institutes of Manu marriage by capture is enumerated among “the eight forms of the nuptial ceremony used by the four classes” (chap. 3:33, Jones v. Houghton). “In the description of this marriage, called Racshasa, we have the exact prototype of the Roman and Spartan forms, in a code of laws a thousand years older than our aera” (Nat. Qu. Rev. June, 1872, p. 89).

The practice of capture is found in great perfection among the American Indians, existing everywhere throughout the savage races of South America, but more particularly in the regions of the Orinoco and the Amazon. The Fuegians have the practice as well as the fiction of capture. The Horse Indians of Patagonia are commonly at war with each other, or with the Canoe Indians, victory on either side resulting in the capture of women and slaughter of men. The Oens, or Coin men, are more systematic, for every year, at the time of red leaf, they are said to make excursions from the mountains in the north to plunder from the Fuegians their women, dogs, and arms (M'Lennan, Prim. Marriage, p. 61). The tribes of the Amazon and the Orinoco are in a state of constant warfare, and alternately rich and poor in women. Mr. Bates found the Manaos on the Rio Negro to resemble the Oens in habits. The Caribbees were found by Humboldt to form family groups, often numbering only forty or fifty, which were at constant enmity with each other. Capture prevailed among them to such an extent that the women of any tribe belonged so much to distinct tribes that  in no group were the men and women found to speak the same language (Personal Narrative of Travels, v. 210). Among the wild Indians of the North the same account is applicable in varying degrees. Hearne tells us that among the Hudson's Bay Indians “it has ever been the custom for the men to wrestle for any woman to whom they are attached, and, of course, the strongest party always carries off the prize; a weak man, unless he be a good hunter and well-beloved, is seldom permitted to keep a wife that a stronger man thinks worth his notice ... This custom prevails throughout all their tribes, and causes a great spirit of emulation among their youth, who are, upon all occasions, from their childhood, trying their strength and skill in wrestling” (Voyage to the Northern Ocean, p. 104). Franklin also savs that the Copper Indians hold women in the same lowv estimation as the Chippewayans do, “looking upon them as a kind of property, which the stronger may take from the weaker” (Journey to the Shores of the Polar Sea, 8:43), and Richardson (Boat Journeey, 2:24) “more than once saw a stronger man assert his right to take the wife of a weaker countryman. Any one may challenge another to wrestle, and, if he overcomes, may carry off the wife as the prize.” Yet the women never dream of protesting against this, which, indeed, seems to them perfectly natural.

The capture of women for wives prevails also among the aborigines of the Deccan, and in Afghanistan (Latham, Descript. Ethinol. 2:215). It formerly prevailed, according to Olaus Malgnus, in Muscovy, Lithuania, and Livonia (Historiat de gentibus Septentrionalibus, bk. 14, ch. 9, p. 48). There is ample reason to believe that the practice was general among the nations in the north of Europe and Asia. Olaus Magnus, indeed, represents the tribes of the north as having been continually at war with one another, either on account of stolen women, or with the object of stealing women, “propter raptas virgines aut arripiendas” (ut sup. p. 328). In numerous cases the plunderers were of the royal houses of Denmark and Sweden. Among the Scandinavians, before they became Christians, wives were almost invariably fought for and wedded at the sword-point. Among the Kalmucks, Kirghis, Nogais, and Circassians, where the price cannot be agreed upon, nothing is more common than to carry off the lady by force. This capture constitutes a marriage, even before the parties come to terms (M'Lennan, p. 73). The Australians, while having a general system of betrothals, yet employ the practice of capturing wives to a great extent. According to Turnbull, when a man sees a woman whom he likes, he tells her to follow him. If she refuses, he forces her to accompany him by blows,  ending by knocking her down and carrying her off (Voyage round the World, 1:81 sq.). Sir George Grey says that many plots are laid to carry off the women, and in the encounters which result they receive usually very harsh treatment.

Many other less barbarous nations keep up the show of force only. The following are among the most marked examples. Among the Khonds the marriage-ceremony begins with a feast at the dwelling of the bride. This is followed by dancing and song. When the night is far spent in these amusements, the principals are lifted by an uncle of each on his shoulders and carried through the dance. Suddenly they exchange burdens, and the uncle of the youth disappears with the bride. The friends of the bride now seek to arrest his flight, those of the groom to cover it, the mock contest that ensues being often carried to great lengths (M'Pherson, Report upon Khonds, p. 55). Among the noble class of the Kalmucks a similar form appears. The price to be paid being fixed, the bridegroom and his noble friends go on horseback to her house to carry her off. Her friends make a sham resistance, but she is always carried off, on a richly-caparisoned horse, with loud shouts and feux de joie (Xavier de Hell, Travels in Steppes of Caspian Sea., p. 259). Dr. Clarke (Travels, etc., 1:433) describes a different ceremony, probably appertaining to a different clan of the Kalmucks. In this the girl is first mounted on horseback and rides off at full speed pursued by her lover. If he overtakes her, she becomes his wife; but it sometimes happens that the fugitive does not favorably incline towards her pursuer, in which case she will not stiffer him to overtake her. The author was assured that no instance was known of a Kalmuck girl being thus caught unless she had a partiality for her pursuer. In many cases this form of capture has become a mere pretense, as in lifting the bride by force on horseback; or, as in North Friesland, where a young fellow, called the bride-lifter, lifts the bride and the two bridesmaids on a wagon in which the married couple are to travel home (Weinhold, p. 50). Among the Bedouins the groom must force the bride to enter his tent. A similar custom existed in some provinces in France in the 17th century (Marriage Ceremonies, etc. [Gaya, Lond. 1698], p. 30). Among the Circassians the form is like that in ancient Rome. In the midst of noisy feasting and revelry, the groom must rush in, and, with the help of a few daring young men, carry off the lady by force. By this proceeding she becomes his lawful wife (Louis Moser, The Caucasuzs and its People, p. 31). Lord Kames gives a vivid picture of the custom existing in his day, or shortly previous, among  the Welsh. On the morning of the wedding day the groom appeared, with his friends, on horseback, and demanded the bride.

Her friends, also mounted, refused. There ensued a mock contest, the bride being carried off mounted behind her nearest kinsman, and pursued with loud shouts. “It is not uncommon to see two or three hundred sturdy Cambro-Britons riding at full speed, crossing and jostling, to the no small amusement of the spectators.” When they all were tired, the groom was allowed to overtake the bride and lead her off in triumph (Sketches of the History of Man [1807], bk. 1, sec. 6, p. 449). In Africa the same custom exists, as observed by Speke and others. Also throughout America. It is observed in its perfection among the people of Terra del Fuego. As soon as a youthful Fuegian has shown his ability to support a wife by exploits in fishing and bird-catching, he obtains her parents' consent, builds or steals a canoe, and watches his chance to carry her off. If she is opposed, she hides in the woods till he is tired of looking for her; but this seldom happens (Fitzroy and King, Voyage of the Beagle, 2:182). Sir Henry Piers, in 1682, describes a custom of like nature among the ancient Irish. The ceremony commenced with the drinking of a bottle of good usquebaugh, called the agreement bottle. Next the payment of the portion was agreed upon, generally a fixed number of cows. On the day of bringing home, the two parties rode out to meet each other. “Being come near to each other, the custom was of old to cast short darts at the company that attended the bride, but at such distance that seldom any hurt ensued” (Collectanea de Rebus Hibernicis, 1:122). The Turcoman youth elopes with his lady-love to some neighboring village, where they live five or six weeks. In the mean time his friends obtain the consent of the parents. Afterwards the bride returns to her own home, where she is retained for six months or a year, sometimes two years, and is not allowed to see her husband except by stealth (Fraser, Journey, 2:372). This custom of spending the honey-moon away from home is observed by various other tribes, and has its counterpart in the civilized custom of a wedding journey.

Among the Bedouins of Sinai, the maiden, when coming home in the evening with the cattle, is attacked by the groom and two of his friends. She often defends herself fiercely with stones. The more she struggles, bites, and cries, the more her own companions applaud her. She is taken to her father's tent, where follows the ceremony of throwing over her the abba, or man's cloak, and the name of the groom is formally announced. In the Mezeyvne tribe, the girl, after being captured as above, is permitted to  escape from her tent and fly to the neighboring mountains. The groom goes in search of her, and is often many days in finding her. Her female companions know her hiding-place, and keep her supplied with provisions. The length of time she remains hidden from the groom depends greatly upon the impression he has made upon her heart. After being found she returns home, but runs away again in the evening. These flights are several times repeated before she finally returns to her tent. It is sometimes a year before she goes to live in her husband's tent (Burckhardt, Notes, 1:269).

6. Exogamy and Endogamy. — Marriage by capture, it is held by Lubbock and others of his class, led to the practice of exogamous marriages. We are, however, of the opinion that the great prevalence of infanticide (q.v.) among savages, especially the destruction of female infants, caused a paucity of women, and made it necessary to secure wives from hostile tribes. On this ground we can easily explain the predominance of exogamy over endogamy. Among the Khonds, intermarriage between members of the same tribe, we are told by M'Pherson (Account of the Religion of the Khonds, p. 57), is considered incestuous, and punishable with death. Many savage races have even established something of a caste distinction for this purpose. Thus, e.g., the Kalmucks are divided into four great nations or tribes, subdivided again into many smaller clans. The common people do not marry within three or four degrees of relationship. But no member of the noble class can marry within his own tribe; his wife must be a noble, and of a different stock (Bergmann, Streifereien, 3:155). The Circassians are forbidden to marry within their own fraternities, though these sometimes comprise several thousand members. Formerly such a marriage was considered as incest, and punished by drowning; now a fine of two hundred oxen, and the restitution of the wife to her parents, are exacted (Bell, Journal of a Residence in Circassia, 1:347). The Yurak Samoyedes of Siberia consider all the members of the tribe as relations, however large the tribe, and forbid marriage within the tribe limits (Latham, Descriptive Ethnology, 2:455).

The system among the North American Indians is very similar. The tribal affiliation of each person is distinguished by his tolem, generally some animal sacred to the tribe. Marriage is forbidden between persons of the same tolem.” Lalitau considers each nation as divided into clans, whose members are spread indiscriminately through the nation, and says that no clansman could marry a member of his own clan. Every child was considered as belonging to the clan of its mother (1:558). The Indians of Guiana have similar customs. The Brazilian Indians vary, some being  exogamous, others endogamous in their customs. Among the Tinne Indians of the North the same rule holds. A man who marries a woman of his own tribe is laughed to scorn, and considered as marrying his own sister, even if she belong to a separate division of the tribe (Notes on Tinneh, Smithsonian Report, 1866). In India the custom prevails to a considerable extent, and is of very ancient origin, the Institutes of Manu prescribing that a “twice-born” man shall not marry a woman related to him within the sixth degree, or one bearing his family name (ch. 3, § 5). The Battas of Sumatra enforce this custom of exogamy by a mode of punishment which we should imagine would effectually secure its observance. They punish those who impiously marry within the tribe by cutting them up alive, and eating them, grilled or raw, with salt and red pepper. They claim that marriage between a man and woman who had common ancestors is highly criminal (Taylor, Nat. Hist. of Society, 1:122). The principle of exogamy is strictly enforced among the Australian tribes. These savages are divided into small tribes, named after the districts which they inhabit. The tribe inhabiting a particular district considers itself the owner thereof, and vigorously resents any intrusion. Yet there are many tribes often found inhabiting the same area quite differently disposed. Thus on the subHimalayan ranges are certain tribes which forbid intermarriage of clansmen, and others which forbid marriage outside of the tribe limits. In some districts, as in the hills on the north-eastern frontier of India, in the Caucasus, and the hill-ranges of Syria. are found a variety of tribes undoubtedly of the same original stock, yet in this particular utterly differing — some forbidding marriage within the tribe, and some proscribing marriage without it (M'Lennan, p. 147)

7. Polyandry and Polygyny. — The paucity of women not only reveals to us the reason why exogamy became so generally established among rude nations, but also easily explains the practice of polyandry, which we are told by best authorities exists to a moderate extent among savage races. Lubbock, however, will have it that “polyandry, or the marriage of one woman to several men at once, is more common than is generally supposed, though much less so than polygamy” (p. 55; compare p. 100). It prevails in its most striking form throughout Thibet and in the Himalayan regions. It is also met with in Ceylon, among tribes of the north of Asia, and in parts of Africa and America. In former times it seems to have prevailed still more widely. Tacitus found traces of it among the Germans; and Strabo tells us that in certain cantons of Media a woman was looked  upon with contempt who had less than five husbands (lib. 2, p. 794). Caesar tells us that in his time polyandry prevailed among the Britons (De Bello Gallico, lib. 5, ch. 14); and other traces of its former existence remain. It occurs in two distinct forms: the ruder, that in which the husbands are not brothers; the less rude, that in which they are brothers. The latter form only prevails in Thibet. In several other places, as in Ceylon, the two forms coexist. In Thibet the choice of the wife is the privilege of the elder brother. The number of husbands does not appear to be defined or restricted within fixed limits. The same system prevails throughout the Himalayan regions, and generally in Ceylon. Humboldt found this form among the South American savages, and Caesar among the ancient Britons. In connection with the polyandry of Ceylon are two distinct forms of marriage the Diga and the Bina. The first occurs when the wife goes to live in the house or village of her husband; the second, when the husband or husbands come to Live with her. Among the Kandyans, the right of inheritance of a woman and her children depends on whether she is a dîga or a bîna wife (Forbes, Ceylon, 1:333). Among the Kochs, though their marriage is now monogamous, a like system prevails, seeming to point to former polyandry (compare, on the prevalence of polyandry, M'Lennan, p. 180 sq.; Lubbock, p. 100 sq.).

8. Family Relations among Savages. — That the marriage system in such imperfect stages of development as we find it to be among savage races cannot furnish any of the advantages guaranteed by the Biblical marriage system, will appear to all a matter hardly necessary to be dwelt upon. Yet there are some faint ideas of the family relation, as we conceive it, prevailing among rude nations also. That polyandry, polygamy, and communism cannot establish the relationship of father and mother, is clearly apparent. Exogamy, however, will do this measurably, especially where it approaches the monogamous system. In communal marriage no man can identify his father; the child is raised by the mother as a sort of tribal property, and naturally enough assumes her name, and only considers parentage as existing in the female line. This gave rise to the wide-spread system of kinship through the mother only, continuing to exist in many cases, though the cause which provoked it has disappeared. There is good reason to believe that this system formerly existed among the Celts, and Max Muller (Chips from a German Workshop) has traced it to the ancient Brahmins. It also appears to have been in existence in the Shemitic races, and is traceable in the Grecian systems. Its effect is visible in the habits of  many modern tribes, and shows itself evidently in the wide-spread habit, of which we have already given several instances, of naming the chill after the clan of its mother, and considering it as belonging especially to her family. Another cause of this lack of knowledge of the paternal relation might be habits similar to those attributed by Lafitau to the North American Indians, who, he says, visited their wives, as it were, by stealth: “Ils n'osent aller dans les cabanes particuliers ou habitent leurs spouses, que durent l'obscturit de la nuit... ce serait un action extraordinaire de s'y presenter le jour” (1:576).

Herodotus says that the Lycians named the children from the mother. On the Etruscan tombs descent is traced in the female line. Many modern instances exist besides those we have already mentioned. We may instance the Nairs, and other peoples of India; the Saporogian Cossacks, certain Chinese communities, the Berberts of Sahara, and various other African tribes. Among the Buntar — the highest rank of Sudras in Tulava — a man's children are not his heirs. During his lifetime he may give them money, but all of which he dies possessed goes to his sisters and to their children. When a rich man died in Guinea, his property descended to his sister's son. Battel says the town of Loango was governed by four chiefs, the sons of the king's sister; for king's sons never became kings. Quatremere relates that, “Chez les Nubiens, dit Abon Selah, lorsqu'un roi vient h mourir et qu'il laisse un fils et un neveu du cote de sa scour, celui-ci monte sur le trone de prefirence h l'heritier naturel” (Geograph. sur l'Egypte, etc.). I'Lennan (Primit. Marriage, p. 247) thus traces the development of the family relation to our present status; and though we have said from the outset that we cannot sanction the position taken by him and others of his class, we will not refuse them an introduction to our readers: “The polyandry, in which all the husbands were brothers, would establish the certainty of the children being of their own blood. In time the eldest brother became considered, by a species of fiction, the father of all the children; the mother was deposed from the headship of the family, and kinship became established in the paternal line. The elder brother became a sort of paterfamilias; the right of succession being in the younger brothers in their order, and, after them, in the eldest son. Thus the idea of fatherhood grew up through the Thibetan system of polyandry. In most races, though, as the sexes became more evenly balanced, through progress towards civilization, the system of monogamy or of polygamy would arise. Paternity thus becoming certain, the practice of sons succeeding as heirs direct to their father's estates would ensue, and, as this idea of paternal kinship arose, that of maternal relationship would die  away.” “Our family system, in which the child is equally related to both its parents,” says Lubbock (p. 110), “appears at first sight the only natural one, but it is merely so in connection with our marriage system, there being sufficient reason to concludes as we have seen, that the child is first related to the family group only; then to the mother, and not to the father; afterwards to the father, and not to the mother; and, only as a final result of civilization, becomes related to both.” Maine (Ancient Law) and other writers of his class, however, hold to a theory that considers man's history, in the light of divine revelation, to open with perfect recognition of such kinship. In their view the family, under the father's government, was considered the primary unit, containing the germs of the state and of royalty. The family gathers other families about it, becoming the center of a group; and these groups, tracing back their descent to a common origin, aggregate into tribes and nations. Tribes are numerous which make this claim to common descent. But, upon inquiry, the ancestor of the race is always a legendary hero or god — a being invented to explain the origin of the tribe. In some cases the time of the invention is known, as with the Greek tribes which traced their descent to the sons of Helen.

There are several other peculiar customs widely in vogue relating to marriage, some of which are so curious that it will be well to give a brief description of them also. The strangest of these is the general avoidance of intercourse between children and parents-in-law, in which the one is often forbidden to look at; or mention the name of the other. The reason or the origin of these customs, or of the many strange forms which these assume, is not clear to us, and we can only give some instances of their general character. Under the peculiar Fijian system known as the tabu, the husband and wife are forbidden to eat from the same dish. (Compare the above custom among the Hindus.) In other places the father is not permitted to speak to the son after the latter is fifteen years old (Williamns, Fiji, 1:136). Among nmany races the woman is absolutely forbidden to speak to her son-in-law. This system prevails generally among the American Indians (Origin of Civilizations, p. 7). Among the Omahaws neither the father nor mother in-law will hold direct communication with their son-in-law (James, Exp. to Rocky Mountains, 1:232). Under the social system of the Mongols and Kalmucks a similar restriction appears, the wife being forbidden to speak to her father-in-law, or to sit in his presence. With the Ostiaks of Siberia a similar rule holds (“Un fille mariee dvite autant qu'il lui est possible la prisence du pere de son mari, tant qu'elle n'a pas d'enfant; et le  mari, pendant ce temps, n'ose pas paraitre devant la mere de sa femme. S'ils se rencontrent par hasard, le mari lui tourne le dos, et la femme se couvre le visage” [Pallas, 4:71]). In China customs of a like nature exist, and also in some of the Pacific islands. In some cases this peculiar system assumes the strangest and most decided form. In Central Africa the lover carefully avoids seeing either the father or mother of his future bride, taking great precautions to avoid an encounter. If he is of a different camp, this prohibition extends to all the members of the lady's camp, except a few special friends with whom he is permitted to have intercourse. He avoids passing through the camp, and, if obliged to do so, carefully covers his face (Caille, Travels to Timbuctoo, 1:94). This appears to be a relic of the old system of capture, in which the captor would approach with the greatest stealth, and carefully avoid being observed by the inmates of the opposite camp, as in the case of the Australians above described.

Another custom widely prevalent, and of a yet stranger character, is that known in Bearl as La Couvade. It consists in putting the husband to bed on the birth of a child, and nursing him with the greatest care, while the mother goes to her usual duties. In some cases the poor fellow is put on such a strict regimen that he really becomes sick. There are, in fact, cases in which his peculiar sufferings are continued for several months, and he is so hardly dealt with that a real sickness would be far more endurable. Cases of this description occur in various parts of America, and inl many regions of Europe and Asia, taking often the strangest forms. The idea thus symbolized is that the child is affected by anything happening to its nearest parent, and that any intemperance in eating, drinking, or otherwise, seriously affects the health of the child. Under the idea of male kinship, the father was considered the nearest parent; hence, was obliged to perform this peculiar penance. Max Müller says that the poor husband was first tyrannized over by his female relatives, and afterwars frightened into superstitiously making a martyr of himself, until he became really ill, or took to his bed in self-defense (Chips from a German Workshop, 2:281). Lafitau regards it as arising from a dim recollection of original sin, rejecting the Carib explanation that if the father engaged in rough labor, or was careless in his diet, “cela feroit mal h l'enfant, et que cet enfant participeroit b tous les defauts naturels des animaux dont le pere auroit mange” (1:259). For additional illustrations, SEE WEDLOCK. (J. H. W.)

## Marron, Paul Henri[[@Headword:Marron, Paul Henri]]

             a Calvinistic divine, was born at Leyden April 12,1754. After studying at the Academy of Leyden, Marron entered the ecclesiastical office, and in 1776 became pastor of the Walloon Church of Dort. In 1782 he was appointed chaplain of the Dutch embassy at Paris. Six years later, Rabaut- Saint-Etienne secured his election as pastor by the Protestants of Paris, on whom Louis XVI had just conferred civil rights, and who flattered themselves that they would obtain more complete justice. Beilg disappointed in this hope, they decided, in order to retain their pastor, who had just been called to Sedan, to celebrate public worship in a place rented for that purpose. In June, 1790, Bailly, mayor of Paris, and general La Fayette, obtained permission for the Protestants to rent the Church of Saint-Louis-du-Louvre, which had been suppressed. Marron consecrated it on the 22d of the same month. In November, 1793, he had to present to the parish, as a patriotic gift, the four silver cups used in the celebration of the Lord's Supper. This proceeding did not save him from persecution. He had been twice arrested on suspicion, when, on the 7th of June, 1794, he was again imprisoned, and did not recover his liberty until after the fall of Robespierre.

At this period, not being able to exercise his ministry publicly, he privately fulfilled its duties, and lived on the remuneration received as translator. In March, 1795, he obtained permission to resume his pastoral functions. At the time of the reorganization of divine worship, he shared largely in the benefits of the law of April 7, 1801, and was confirmed in his position of pastor. Marron was a member of the Institute of the Low Countries, and of the Society of Sciences at Harlem; he had some talent for preaching, and possessed, above all, the showy gift of oratory. He died at Paris, July 30, 1832. He composed some Latin verses on the events of his time, which are not without merit, and left some small works, of which the principal are, Lettre d'un Protestant à l'abbe Cerutti (Paris, 1789, 8vo) (anonymous): — Paul-Henri Marron à la citoyenlne Helene-Marie Williams (Paris, an. 3:8vo); this letter has been inserted in the second volume of his Letters containing a sketch of the politics of France from the 31st of May, 1793, to the 28th of July, 1794 (Lond. 1795, 3 vols. 12mo): — Constitution du peuple Batave, traduite du Hollandais (Paris, 1789, 8vo): — P. H. Marron, ministre du saint-Egvangile à Monsieur Lecoz, archeveque de Besanyon; this letter, dated Nov. 11, 1804, is printed at the end of a Letter to il Lecoz, archbishop of Besangon, on his project of uniting all the Protestants and Romran Catholics in the French empire,  etc. (Paris, 1807, 8Tvo). Marron also wrote for the Journal de Paris, the Journal, and the Magasin Encyclopedique; and contributed numerous articles to the ninth edition of the Nouveau Dictionnaire Historique, to the Biographie Universeile of Michaud, and to the Revue Encyclopedlique. He is credited with the notes added to Mirabeau's work, entitled Au Bataves, sur le stathouderat (1788,8vo). See Necrologe de 1832 (Par. 1833, 8vo); Barbier, Dict. des ouvrages anoznymes et pseudonymes; Haag, La France Protestante; Hoefer, Nouvelle Biographie Generale, vol. 33, s.v.

## Marrow[[@Headword:Marrow]]

             (מֹחִ, mo'ach, fatness, Job 21:24; kindred is the verb מָחָה, machah', Isa 25:6, “fatness unmarrowed,” i.e. drawn out from the marrow- bones, and therefore the most delicate; μυελός, Heb 4:12), the soft, oleaginous substance contained in the hollow of the bones of animals (Job 21:23); used figuratively for the delicate and most satisfying provisions of the Gospel (Isa 25:6), and likewise in the New Testament for the most secret thoughts of the heart (Heb 4:12). Other terms so rendered are חֵלֶב (che'leb, Psa 63:5, fat or fatness, as elsewhere rendered) and שַׁקּוּי(shikku'y, Pro 3:8, a moistening, i.e. refreshing of the bones; or “drink,” as in Hos 2:5).

## Marrow Controversy[[@Headword:Marrow Controversy]]

             The Marrow of Modern Divinity was a work published in 1646 by Edward Fisher (q.v.), of the University of Oxford. It was in the form of a dialogue, to explain the freeness of the law — to expose, on the one hand, Antinomian error, and also, on the other, to refute Neonomian heresy, or the idea that Christ has, by his atonement, so lowered the requirements of the law that mere endeavor is accepted in room of perfect obedience. A copy of the book, which had been brought into Scotland by an English Puritan soldier, was accidentally found by Boston, then minister of Simprin, and was republished in 1718, under the editorial care of Mr. Hogg, minister of Carnock. It had been recommended long before by several divines of the Westminster Assembly. The treatise, consisting of quaint and stirring dialogues, throws into bold relief the peculiar doctrines of grace, occasionally puts them into the form of a startling proposition, and is gemmed with quotations from eminent Protestant divines. The publication of the Marrow threw the clergy into commotion, and by many  of them it was violently censured. But not a few of the evangelical pastors gave it a cordial welcome, and among multitudes of the people it became a favorite book, next in veneration to the Bible and the Shorter Catechism. In 1719 its editor, Mr. Hogg, wrote an explanation of some of its passages, but in the same year principal Haddow, of St. Andrew's, opened the Synod of Fife with a sermon directed against it. The synod requested the publication of the discourse, and this step was the signal for a warfare of four years' duration.

The Assembly of that year, acting in the same spirit with the Synod of Fife, instructed its commission to look after books and pamphlets promoting such opinions as are found in the Marrow, though they do not name the book, and to summon before them the authors and recommenders of such publications. The commission, so instructed and armed, appointed a committee, of which principal Haddow was the soul; and before this committee, named the “Committee for Purity of Doctrine,” four ministers were immediately summoned. The same committee gave in a report at the next Assembly of 1720, in the shape of an overture, classifying the doctrines of the Marrow, and solemnly condemning them. It selected several passages which were paradoxically expressed, while it severed others from the context, and held them up as contrary to Scripture and to the Confession of Faith. The passages marked for reprobation were arranged under distinct heads such as the nature of faith, the atonement, holiness, obedience and its motive, and the position of a believer in reference to the law. The committee named them as errors, thus-universal atonement and pardon, assurance of the very essence of faith, holiness not necessary to salvation, and the believer not under the law as a rule of life. Had the Marrow inculcated such tenets it would have been objectionable indeed.

The report was discussed, and the result was a stern condemnation of the Marrow; and “the General Assembly do hereby strictly prohibit and discharge all the ministers of this Church, either by preaching, writing, or printing, to recommend the said book, or in discourse to say anything in favor of it; but, on the contrary, they are hereby enjoined and required to warn and exhort those people in whose hands the said book is or may come not to read or use the same.” That book, which had been so highly lauded by many of the southern divines — such as Caryl and Burroughes — by the men who had framed the very creed of the Scottish Church, and who were universally acknowledged to be as able as most men to know truth and detect error, was thus put into a Presbyterian Index expurgatorius. Nobody can justify the extreme statements of the Marrow, but their bearing and connection plainly free them from an Antinomian  tendency. In fact, some of the so-called Antinomian statements condemned by the Assembly are in the very words of inspiration. But the rigid decision of the Assembly only added fuel to the controversy which it was intended to allay, and the forbidden book became more and more an object of intense anxiety and prevalent study. The popular party in the Church at once concerted measures to have that act repealed. Consultations were repeatedly held by a section of the evangelical clergy, and at length it was agreed to hand in a representation to the court, complaining of the obnoxious decision, and of the injury which had been done by it to precious truth. This representation was signed by twelve ministers, and it briefly called the Assembly's attention to the fact that it had( condemned propositions which are in accordance at once with the Bible and the symbolical books. The names of the twelve were Messrs. James Hogg, Carnock; Thomas Boston, Etterick; John Bonar, Torlphichen; JohnWilliamson, Inveresk; James Kidd, Queensferry; Gabriel Wilson. Maxton; Ebenezer Erskine, Portmoak; Ralph Erskine and James Wardlaw, Dunfermline; Henry Davidson, Galashiels; James Bathgate, Orwell; and William Hunter, Lilliesleaf. These are the famous “Marrow Men”also known as the “Tweelve Brethren” and the “Representers.” They were long held in great veneration by the lovers of evangelical religion. Says Buck (Theol. Dict. s.v.), “The Representers were not only accurate and able divines, and several of them learned men, but ministers of the most enlightened and tender consciences, enemies in doctrine and practice to all licentiousness, and shining examples of true holiness in all manner of conversation. They were at the same time zealous adherents to the Confession of Faith and the Catechisms.” Other discussions followed; the Representers were summoned, in 1722, to the bar of the Assembly and admonished, against which they solemnly protested. As the Assembly was not supported in the position it had assumed by the religious sentiment of the nation, no further steps were taken in the matter, and thus the victory virtually lay with the evangelical recusants. It was, however, substantially this same doctrinal controversy — though it did not go by the same name — which, eleven years later, resulted in the deposition of Ebenezer Erskine and the origination of the secession of 1734. See Eadie, Eccles. Cyclopaedia, s.v.; Brit. and For Ev. Rev. 1868 (April), p. 261; Hetherington, Eccles. Hist. Ch. of Scotland (see Index in vol. 2). SEE ERSKINE, EBENEZER.

## Marryat, Zephaniah, D.D[[@Headword:Marryat, Zephaniah, D.D]]

             an English Independent minister, was born about 1684. He was first an assistant preacher at Union Street, Southwark, with Mr. Samuel Palmer, who had a controversy with the Reverend John Wesley's father, and succeeded as sole pastor in 1710. He became a master of Greek literature. In 1720 he acquired reputation by a published work, The Exalted Savior, intended to correct prevailing errors on the Trinity. He superintended a large charity-school in Gravel Lane, and preached a Sunday-evening lecture at Lime Street. In 1743 he was chosen divinity tutor at an academy held in Plasterers' Hall, and was very successful. He was also one of the  Merchant Lecturers. He died suddenly, September 15, 1754. See Wilson, Dissenting Churches, 4:199.

## Mars[[@Headword:Mars]]

             a contraction of Mavers or Mavors, in the Oscan or Sabine language Mamers, Greek Avers, is the name of the Roman and Greek god of war, or, better, of battles.

(1) With the Romans this divinity is surnamed Gradivus (=grandis divus, the great god), also Silvalus, and appears to have been originally an agricultural deity — propitiatory offerings were presented to him as the guardian of fields and flocks; but as the fierce shepherds who founded the city of Rome were even more addicted to martial than to pastoral pursuits, one can easily understand how Mars Silvanus should have, in the course of time, become the “God of War.” Mars, who was a perfect representation of the stern, relentless, and even cruel valor of the old Romans, was held in the highest honor. He ranked next to Jupiter; like him he bore the venerable epithet of Father (Marspiter); he was one of the three tutelary divinities of the city, to each of whom Numa appointed a flamen; nay, he was said to be the father of Romulus himself (by Rhea Silvia, the priestess of Vesta), and was thus believed to be the real progenitor of the Roman people. He had a sanctuary on the Quirinal; and the hill received its name from his surname, Quirinus, the most probable meaning of which is the spear-armed. It was under this designation that he was invoked as the protector of the Quirites (citizens) — in other words, of the state, The principal animals sacred to him were the wolf and the horse. He had many temples at Rome, the most celebrated of which was that outside the Porta Capena, on the Appian Road. The Campus Martius, where the Romans practiced athletic and military exercises, was named after him; so was the month of March (Martins). the first month of the Roman year. The Ludi Martiales (games held in his honor) were celebrated every year in the circus on the 1st of August.

(2) ARES, the Greek god of war, was the son of Zeus and Hera, and the favorite of Aphrodite, who bore him several children. He is represented in Greek poetry as a most sanguinary divinity, delighting in war for its own sake, and in the destruction of men. Before him into battle goes his sister Eris (Strife); along with him are his sons and companions, Deimos (Horror), and Phobos (Fear). He does not always adhere to the same side, like the great Athena, but inspires now the one, now the other. He is not  always victorious. Diomede wounded him, and in his fall, says Homer, “he roared like nine or ten thousand warriors together.” Such a representation would have been deemed blasphemous by the ancient Roman mind, imbued as it was with a solemn, Hebrew-like reverence for its gods. The worship of Ares was never very prevalent in Greece; it is believed to have been imported from Thrace. There and in Scythia were its great seats, and there Ares was believed to have his chief home. He had, however, temples or shrines at Athens, Sparta, Olympia, and other places. On statues and reliefs he is represented as a person of great muscular power, and either naked or clothed with the chlamys. — Chambers, Cyclop. s.v.; Smith, Dict. Gr. and Romans Biog. and Mythol. vol. 2, s.v.; Vollmer, Mythol. Wörterbuch, s.v.

## Mars Hill[[@Headword:Mars Hill]]

             (῎Αρειος πάγος, collis Kartius, Act 17:22, the Areopagus, as in Act 17:19; so called, according to Pausan. 1:28, 5, from the fact that Mars was first judged there), a limestone hill in Athens, northwest of the Acropolis (Herod. 8:52), and considerably lower (Pococke, East, iii, tab. 65), where (even down to the time of the Roman emperors, Gell. 12:7) the most ancient and boasted Athenian supreme tribunal (Tacitus, Annal. 2:55) and court of morals (AEschyl. Eumen. 701; Senec. Tranq. 3; Val. Max. 2:6,4), composed of the mest honorable and upright citizens (Athen. vi, p. 251), and held in the highest regard not only throughout Greece, but even among foreigners (comp. Wetstein, 2:565), had its sessions, to discuss cases of civil and criminal offenses, originally according to the sole law of its own discretion (comp. Aristot. Polit. 2:10; v. 12; Macrob. Saturn. 7:1, p. 204; Quintil. Institut. v. 9; EAlian, V. I. v. 15). After having continued for many centuries in full authority, it fell under some restrictions in the times of the New Test.; but the date of its extinction is unknown. (See Pauly, Real- Encyklop. 1:700 sq.; Doderlein, in the Hall. Encyklop. v. 193 sq.; also Meursii Areopagus, Ludg. Bat. 1624; Bockh, De Areopago, Berol. 1826.) From some part of that hill, but not before the judges (for there is no trace of a regular judicial procedure in the entire narrative), Paul delivered his famous address (Act 17:19 sq.) to his hearers upon the steps and in the valley (comp. Robinson, Researches, 1:10 sq.). SEE AREOPAGUS.

## Mars, St[[@Headword:Mars, St]]

             a French hermit, was born at Bais, near La Guerche, about 510. He was priest at Vitre, and acquired a great reputation for piety. When old, he constructed a hermitage for himself in some waste land in the neighborhood of the village of Mars, and there ended his days. His tomb became celebrated for the numerous miracles which it was claimed were performed there. The faithful came thither on pilgrimages from all parts of Brittany. In 1427 the inhabitants of Bais, fearing an incursion of the English, carried the body of their saint to Saint-Madelaine de Vitre. The danger passed, the Baisiens demanded the body of their saint, but the canons of Vitre refused to restore it. From law-suits they proceeded to blows, and many times during the processions the Baisiens attempted to recover their precious relic; but the inhabitants of Vitre always proved the stronger, and retained the body of Saint Mars until 1750, when a decree of the Parliament of Rennes reconciled the parties by dividing the body of the saint. Vitre kept the head, the right thigh, and two sides; Bais had the remainder. The festival of Saint Mars occurs on the 14th of January and 21st of June. At these periods the shrine is carried solemnly through the surrounding country. — Dom Lobineau, Histoire de Bretagne; Godescard, — Vie des plus celebres Saints, vol. 1; A. Hugo, La France pittoresque; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, vol. 33, s.v.

## Marsay, Charles Hector De St. Georges[[@Headword:Marsay, Charles Hector De St. Georges]]

             Marquis de, a French mystic, was born in 1688 at Paris, whither his parents, pious members of the Reformed Church, had fled to avoid the persecution raging against the Protestants in the provinces. While yet a  youth the whole family removed to Germany- and there Charles I took part in the Spanish War of Succession in the Netherlands. He now became a convert to the views of Bourignon (q.v.), and with his friend Cordier retired, in 1711, to Schwarzenau, in the province of Wittgenstein. Cordier, however, leaving him, he married, in 1712, Clara Elizabeth of Callerberg, whose views were similar to his own. During the years 1713-16 he made several journeys to Switzerland, where he became acquainted with the works of Madame Guyon (q.v.). He then returned to Schwarzenau, learned the watch-making trade, became president of the Philadelphian Society, and resided there until 1724. In 1746 he became a Pietist, and died in the neighborhood of Ambleben in 1753, a truly evangelical Christian, a disciple of Christ, clinging faithfully to the truth as it is in Jesus. Marsay had great influence in propagating throughout Germany the mystic views of Bourignon and Guyon. He wrote Freimüthige u. christliche Discurse (1734): — Zeugniss eines Kindes v. d. Richtigkeit d. Wege d. Geistes (1735, 2 parts): —Selbstbiographie, in the 2d vol. of Valenti, System d. hoheren Heilkunde (Elberf. 1826). — Gobel, Gesch. der wahren Inspirations-gemeinden (in Niedner's Zeitschr. f. hist. Theol. 1855, 3, § 21, 4); the same, Gesch. d. christl. Lebens, etc. (Cobl. 1852), 2, bk. 9; also the excellent article in Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 9:116 sq.

## Marsden, J.B[[@Headword:Marsden, J.B]]

             an English divine, was born about 1803. He graduated from St. John's College, Cambridge, in 1827, and was ordained to the curacy of Burslem, Staffordshire, from whence he removed to the curacy of Harrow, Middlesex. From 1833 to 1844 he held the rectory of.Tooting, Surrey, during the minority of his successor. From 1844 to 1852 he was vicar of Great Missenden, Bucks, and from 1852 to his death, in 1870, incumbent of St. Peter's, Birmingham. Mr. Marsden published, The History of the Early Puritans, from the Reformation to the Opening of the Civil War: — The History of the Later Puritans, from the Opening of the Civil War to 1662: — The Churchmanship of the New Testament: — Discourses for the Festivals of the Church of England: — The Law of Fasting, as set forth in Holy Scripture, a pamphlet: — Sermons: — The Coming of Christ: — Sermons from the Old Testament: — Christian Churches and Sects: — Life of the Reverend Samuel Marsden, of New South Wales: — Life of the Reverend Hugh Stowell, of Manchester: — Two Sermons on the Life, Ministry, and Death of the Reverend Richard Marks, author of The Retrospect. He was also editor of the Christian' Observer from 1859 to 1869. Although not gifted as a preacher, he was a ripe scholar, and his writings demonstrate his ability as an author. See (Lond.) Christian Observer, August, 1870, page 633; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Marsden, Samuel[[@Headword:Marsden, Samuel]]

             one of the noblest missionary workers the Church of England ever sent out to battle for Christ, the noted Australian chaplain and friend of the Maori, was born of humble parentage in 1764, and was educated at the free grammar-school at Hull, by the celebrated English divine Dr. Joseph Milner. Samuel began life as a tradesman at Leeds. He had been converted under Wesleyan preaching, had joined the Methodists, and belonged to their society for some time, but, having higher aspirations than the mercantile profession, he entered the English Church to secure a collegiate training. He was placed at St. Joseph's College, Cambridge, and there educated by the Elland Society, whose object it was to aid poor young men having the ministry in view. Before Marsden had even taken his degree, he was offered the chaplaincy to New South Wales. At first he was very adverse to accepting it, but, finding that there was no one who could so well fill this difficult post, he consented, and in the spring of 1793 was ordained. Soon after he married Elizabeth Triston, a very worthy lady, who did much to aid him in his missionary labors. In 1794 he arrived at Paramatta, his new home.

Early in the 17th century England had adopted  penal transportation. The newly-acquired territories in America were then used for this purpose, and, as we know, oftentimes aided in the propagation of white slavery. The Revolution, and the subsequent establishment of independence in the colonies, obliged England to discontinue this practice of disposing of criminals. But the great fear entertained in England that the country would be overrun with crime, led the government of George Ill to establish a penal colony in Australia. About seven years previous to Marsden's arrival there the first convict ship had been sent out with its living freight, and yet up to this time religious training was unknown. It little mattered to England what became of the convict, so long as he was well out of her way. A powerful military force was required to keep this mass of corrupt humanity in subjection, and, instead of being benefited, they were rather hardened in their sins. For teaching the Gospel the Church furnished only two ministers — for soldiers, convicts, settlers, and all. Marsden was one of these, and, the senior preacher failing in health, he was soon left to struggle on alone. Although severely tried by domestic affliction, he was not found wanting. At that time the custom prevailed there and in England for the parish priest to administer justice as well as give spiritual advice. The son of a Yorkshire farmer could not be expected to be very conversant with law, but good sense and a clear perception of justice came to the rescue. His farming education, however, served him well, for, receiving a grant of land, and thirteen convicts to till it, as part payment for his services, he made it the model farm in New South Wales, and from the profits was enabled to establish schools and missions. A rebellious spirit manifesting itself among the convicts, Marsden sailed for England, after an absence of fourteen years, to appeal to the home government. His main object was to secure a grant permitting the convicts' friends to go out with them to the penal colony. This was denied him, but his representation that the convicts ought to be instructed in trades was well received.

During his visit to England Mr. Marsden also laid the foundation of the missions to New Zealand, and prepared to become the apostle of the Maori race. Before leaving Australia he had had some intercourse with these tribes, which he found to be of a much higher type of humanity than the Australian native. Indeed, they possessed such a spirit of enterprise and curiosity that they would often visit the island of Australia, and Marsden is said to have entertained thirty at one time. He vainly endeavored to obtain help from the Church Missionary Society. No clergyman could be found to  undertake the mission to New Zealand, but two laymen, William Hall and John King, consented to act as pioneers.

These two good men accompanied Marsden to Australia in August, 1809. They were soon followed by Thomas Kendall. To transfer these lay missionaries to their intended field of labor, Marsden conceived the plan of fitting out a missionary ship, but, failing to interest outside parties, he finally purchased a small one at his own expense. This was the Active, the first of the mission ships that now carry the Gospel to every part of the globe. Marsden accompanied this expedition, and was kindly welcomed by the natives. His method in founding missions to propagate Christianity was unlike that of Eliot, to begin with faith, and then to look for civilization. He rather thought that civilization prepared the way for the acceptance of faith, and, as his teachers were laymen, he employed them only in laying the foundations of a Christian civilization. Marsden frequently repeated his visits, and in many ways aided the enterprise. On his fourth visit he took out with him the Rev. Henry Williams, who afterwards became bishop of a Maori district. It was now nine years since he had first landed here, and, in spite of so many disappointments and so much opposition, he found the condition of the natives greatly improved. A Wesleyan mission had been established at Wingaroa, under Mr. Leigh. During his two months' stay he endeavored to persuade the natives to adopt a fixed form of government, and advised the missionaries to collect a vocabulary, and arrange a grammar that might aid in future translations. In 1838 he made his seventh and last visit. He was now seventy-two years of age. Wherever he went he was greeted as the friend of the Maori. He had always hoped that this intelligent people might be Christianized, and it gladdened his heart to see the improvements they had made. Sunday was generally observed among the natives, and polygamy and cannibalism were fast diminishing, and there was every token that the apostle of New Zealand had conquered a country and people for the Church of God. Marsden was possessed of a will and force of character that enabled him to accomplish whatever he undertook. He died May 12, 1838. See Miss Charlotte M. Yonge, Pioneers and Founders, p. 216-240. SEE NEW ZEALAND; SEE SELWYN.

## Marselus, Nicholas J., D.D[[@Headword:Marselus, Nicholas J., D.D]]

             a minister of the Reformed (Dutch) Church, was born in Mohawk Valley in 1792. He graduated from Union College in 1810, and from New Brunswick Seminary in 1815; was licensed by the Classis of New Brunswick, became pastor at Greenbush and Blooming Grove from 1815 to 1822, New York city from 1822 to 1858, and thereafter was without a charge until his death, May 5, 1876. His publications are, Translation of Elijah (1825): — The Good Old Way (1830): — Gospel Ministry (1842): — Ministerial Appeal (1850): — A Sermon (eod.). See Corwin, Manual of the Reformed Church in America, 3d ed. page 367.

## Marsena[[@Headword:Marsena]]

             (Heb. Marsena', מִרְסְנָא, according to Benfey, the Sanscrit smarsha, noble, with the Zend ending na, man; Sept. Μαρσενά, but most copies omit; Vulg. Marsana), one of the seven Medo-Persian satraps or viziers of  Xerxes (Est 1:14). B.C. 483. Josephus understands that they had the office of interpreters of the laws (Ant. 11:6, 1).

## Marsh[[@Headword:Marsh]]

             (גֶּבֶא, ge'be, a collection of waters, Eze 47:11; elsewhere a cistern or reservoir, rendered “pit,” Isa 30:14; Jer 14:3), a swamp or wet piece of land. The passage in Ezekiel speaks of the future blessings of the Jews after their restoration under the figure of drainage of land useless by its dampness: “But the miry places thereof, and the marishes thereof, shall not be healed: they shall be given to salt” (47:11); that is, the part in question shall be reserved for the production of salt by the evaporation of the waters (see Henderson, Comment. ad loc.). It is supposed that the “valley of salt” in the neighborhood of the Dead Sea is here referred to, for there the Kedron, the course of which the prophet describes the holy waters as following, empties. This plain or valley has  been traversed and described by captains Irby and Mangles in terms appropriate to the prophecy. Lieut. Lynch, in coasting around the southern extremity of the Dead Sea, found not only the Ghof to be an immense marshy flat, but the bottom of the lake itself a muddy shoal, scarcely allowing the boat to be rowed through it. The salt hills around presented a scene of unmitigated desolation (Expedition, p. 310).

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

             a noted Irish prelate, flourished in the second half of the 17th century. He was made bishop of Limerick in 1667; was transferred to Kilmore and Ardagh in 1673; in 1682 became archbishop of Dublin, and died in 1693. But little is accessible to gather a detailed account of his life and work. Lawrence B.. Phillips (Dict. Biog. Ref.) refers to Cotton, Fasti Ecclesiae Hibernicae (Dubl. 1849, 5 vols. 8vo), and to D'Alton, Lives of the Archbishops of Dublin (Dublin, 1838,8vo).

## Marsh, Herbert[[@Headword:Marsh, Herbert]]

             an English theologian and prelate, “one of the acutest and most truly learned divines of his day,” was born in London in 1757, and was educated at St. John's College, Cambridge; graduated with great distinction; was made fellow, and became M.A. in 1782. He then went to the Continent, and studied at the University of Gottingen, and later at Leipsic. He returned to England in 1800, and in 1807 became professor of divinity at Cambridge. In 1816 he was appointed bishop of Llandaff, and bishop of Peterborough in 1819. He died May 1, 1839. He published several religious and controversial treatises, and furnished an excellent English translation of Michaelis's Introduction to the New Testament, with notes. “A dissertation on the genuineness of 1Jn 5:7, included in Michaelis's work, drew from Mr. Travis, archdeacon of Chester, ‘Letters to Edward Gibbon, Esq.,' in defense of the genuineness of the passage, which bishop Marsh answered, in vindication of Michaelis and himself, in his celebrated ‘Letters to Archdeacon Travis' — an able and critical production, but which did not, as some eminent scholars have supposed, settle the question. He has also published several parts of a Course of Divinity Lectures, with a historical view of the progress of theological learning, and notices of authors. This work, entitled Lectures on Divinity, with an Account of the principal Authors who have excelled in Theological Learning (7 parts, Cambr. 1809-23; Lond. 1838), includes  ‘Lectures on Sacred Criticism and Interpretation,' which have been published separately, and are, as is well known to Biblical scholars, of the highest value” (Horne, in Bibl. Bib. 1839, p. 160 sq.). His other works are Essay on the Usefulless and Necessity of Theological Learning to those designed for Holy Orders (1792): — Comparative View of the Churches of England and Ronme (Lond. 1841, 8vo). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth. 2:1225; Blackwood's Magazine, 29:69 sq.

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

             D.D., a Congregational minister, was born July 19, 1794, at Hartford, Vt. He graduated at Dartmouth College in 1817; spent some years in Andover Theological Seminary; was ordained Oct. 12,1824, and during the same month entered upon the duties of a professorship in Hampden Sydney College, Va. In 1826 he was elected president of the University of Vermont, which position he resigned in 1833, but continued as professor of moral and intellectual philosophy until 1840. He died at Colchester, Vt., July 3, 1842. Dr. Marsh assisted in translating the work of Bellermann on the Geography of the Scriptures (1822). He published a Preliminary Essay to Coleridge's “Aids to Reflection” (1828): — Selections fiom the Old English Writers on Practical Theology: — his Inaugural Address at Burlington (1826): — a Treatise on Eloquence: — Translation of Herder's Work on Hebrew Poetry: — and Translation of Hegewisch's Chronology. A memoir of his life, with selections from his writings, was published by professor Torrey (1843, 8vo; 2d ed. 1845). See North Amn. Rev. 24:470; Duyckinck, Cyclop. Am. Lit. 2:130; Sprague, Annals, 2:692; Drake, Dict. Am. Biog. s.v.

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

             (1), D.D., a Congregational minister, was born Nov. 2, 1742 (O. S.), at Haverhill, Mass. He graduated at Harvard College in 1761; entered the ministry in 1765; was appointed tutor at Harvard in 1771; remained there two years, and was ordained January, 1774, pastor of the First Church, Wethersfield, Conn.. where he died, Sept. 13, 1821. He published a few occasional Sermons. — Sprague, Annals, 1:619.

## Marsh, John (2)[[@Headword:Marsh, John (2)]]

             (2), D.D., son of the preceding, an eminent American divine, who enjoyed a national reputation from his connection, almost from its origin, with the  great temperance reform of the last half century, was born in Wethersfield, Conn., April 2, 1788; graduated at Yale College, and in 1818 was settled as a Congregational pastor in Haddam, Conn. He at once identified himself with the cause he so ably served for half a generation, and attracted public attention by the address which he delivered, — before the Windham County Temperance Society in Pomfret, Conn., in 1829. That year a state society had been formed, of which Jeremiah Day, of Yale College, was the president, and Mr. Marsh the secretary and general agent, and, to do efficient service for the society, the latter offered his services to the county associations as far as he could in connection with his pastoral labor. His address in Pomfret, styled “Putnam and his Wolf,” ran a parallel between general Putnam's well-known pursuit of the wolf in his den in that town and the temperance crusade against a more terrible monster. The address was afterwards printed, and in a short period 150,000 copies were disposed of. The American Tract Society finally placed it upon its list. SEE TEMPERANCE REFORM.

In 1833 Dr. Marsh was invited to leave his charge and become an agent of the society in Philadelphia; and by the advice of his friends he yielded himself to what was at that time a most laborious and self-denying mission. Three years later he removed to New York as secretary of the American Temperance Union, and editor of its organ and of its publications, and remained until 1865, when the society was reorganized, and a change was made in its officers. Although full of years, he allowed himself no rest from his labors, preaching constantly, lecturing upon his life theme, and offering himself to every good word and work. His last efforts were put forth in behalf of an endowment of the Yale Theological Seminary. He had already raised $10,000, and was full of encouragement in reference to the results of his endeavors. His labors ended only with his life. He died Aug. 4, 1868. “Few men have been more respected or more widely known throughout the country than Dr. Marsh. Enthusiastic in his mission, catholic in spirit, welcoming every new laborer in the great field, and readily seizing upon each new phase of the temperance reformation, his name will remain inseparably connected with the history of the cause in all future time. He was a good man, shedding a benign influence by his devoted life wherever he moved” (N. Y. Christian Advocate, August, 1868). Besides editing The Temperance Journal, Dr. Marsh was the author of several popular works; among others, of a well- known Epitome of Ecclesiastical History (N. Y., A. S. Barnes and Co.); of a valuable handbook entitled Temperance Recollections — Labors, Defeats, Triumphs, an autobiography (N. Y. 1866, 12mo), “a rich text-  book for every man who would plead the cause of temperance;” etc. See the (N. Y.) Christian Advocate, August, 1868; the Eclectic Magazine, 1866 (June), p. 773. (J. H. W.)

## Marsh, Narcissus[[@Headword:Marsh, Narcissus]]

             D.D., a learned Irish prelate, was born at Hannington, near Highworth, in Wiltshire, in 1638; was educated at Magdalen College, Oxford, and in 1658 became fellow of Exeter College. The degree of D.D. he received in 1671; some time previous he was made chaplain to the bishop of Exeter, and later to chancellor Hyde, earl of Clarendon. In 1673 he was appointed principal of St. Alban's Hall, Oxford, and in 1678 provost of Dublin College. In 1683 he became bishop of Leighlin and Ferns; archbishop of Cashel in 1690, of Dublin in 1694, and of Armagh in 1703. He died Nov. 2, 1713. Dr. Marsh was a pious and noble soul. He founded an almshouse at Drogheda for poor widows of clergymen, and provided for their support. He likewise repaired, at his own expense, many decayed churches within his diocese, and bought in several impropriations, which he restored to the Church.

He also gave to the Bodleian Library a great number of MSS. in the Oriental languages, chiefly purchased out of Golius's collection. He was a very learned and accomplished man. Besides sacred and profane literature, he had applied himself to mathematics and natural philosophy; he was deep in the knowledge of languages, especially the Oriental; he was also skilled in music, the practice as well as the theory. He published Manuductio ad logicam, written by Philip de Trieu; to which he added the Greek text of Aristotle, and some tables and schemes, and Gassendus's small tract De demonstratione, which he illustrated with notes (Oxon. 1678): — Institutiones logicae, in usumjuventutis academicae (Dublin, 1681): — An Introductory Essay to the Doctrine of Sounds (published in the “Philosophical Transactions” of the Royal Society of London): — A Charge to his Clergy of the Diocese of Dublin (169:4, 4to). See Hook, Eccles. Biog. vol. vii, s.v.; Biog. Brit. s.v.; Wood, Athen. Oxon. vol. ii (see Index); Ware's Ireland, s.v.; Allibone, Dict. Brit. and Amer. Auth. s.v. (J. H. W.)

## Marsh, Sidney Harper, D.D[[@Headword:Marsh, Sidney Harper, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, son of Reverend Dr. James Marsh, was born at Hampden Sidney, Virginia, August 29, 1825. He graduated from Vermont University in 1846; from 1846 to 1851 was employed in teaching; and the following year attended Union Theological Seminary. After his ordination as an evangelist, May 1, 1853, he went to Oregon in the service of the Society for Promoting Collegiate Education; became principal of Tualatin Academy, at Forest Grove; was chosen president of Pacific University, when it was incorporated, in 1854, and held that office until his death, February 5, 1879. See Cong. Yearbook, 1880, page 23.

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

             (1), D.D., an English divine, was incumbent of St. Mary's, Leamington; later rector of Beddington, and died in 1866. He published Catechism on the Collects (3d ed. 1824, 24mo): — Plain Thoughts on Prophecy (3d ed.  1843, 8vo): — Occasional Sermons, etc. (1821, etc.). See Memoirs of the late Rev. Wm. Mars, D.D., by his daughter (post 8vo).

## Marsh, William (2)[[@Headword:Marsh, William (2)]]

             (2), a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Orono, Me., May 4, 1789; was converted when about fifteen years old; began preaching before he was twenty-one years of age, at one time assisting the preacher in charge of a circuit which included the present Dresden charge. In 1811 Marsh joined the New England Conference; was ordained deacon in 1813, and elder in 1815. His appointments were as follows: 1811, Durham, Me.; 1812, East Greenwich, R. I.; 1813, New London; 1814, Bristol; 1815, Tolland, Conn.; 1816, Nantucket, Mass.; 1817, Lynn; in 1818 he appears to have been sent to Bath, but for some reason now unknown he spent most of that year in Orrington. In 1820 he was superannuated, and from 1821 to 1828 he was located and resided in Orrington, where he labored as he was able. In 1829, at the earnest request of the Church at Hampden, he again entered the itinerancy, and was stationed with them. A powerful revival was the result, the people coming miles to the meeting, and, being converted, returning to their homes to scatter the hallowed influence in regions beyond. In 1830-31 he presided on. Penobscot District; in 1832 was stationed at Houlton. From 1833-37 he was forced by continued ill health to take a superannuated relation, and retire from active duty. In 1838 lie was made effective, and stationed at Lincoln; 1839, at Monroe; 1840, at Frankfort; 1841, superannuated; 1842, was effective, and stationed at Cherryfield; 1843, at Eddingtln; 1844, again superannuated. In 1845 we find him again effective, and presiding elder of Bangor District; 1846-47, on Portland District; 1848, Bangor District; 1849, superannuated; 1850, effective, and stationed at Oldtown; 1851-53, superannuated; 1854-55, effective, and stationed at Orrington Centre; 1856-57, at South Orrington, after which he never sustained an effective relation. He died Aug. 26, 1865. “Father Marsh possessed great natural abilities. As he had clear perception, good judgment, was apt in illustration, graphic in description, and ready with appropriate language, he could not fail to be an able and effective speaker. It is true that his early educational advantages were not great, nor could we speak of him as a critical scholar; yet, in the best sense of the term, he was learned ... He has been justly styled a model in the social relations. His religious experience was deep, his affections centered on God. As a preacher, in his prime, he had few equals. He seemed at times to entirely command the thought and feelings of his  hearers, yet was this almost unbounded influence entirely consecrated to Christ, and used to promote his glory and the salvation of men. It is needless to add that under such a ministry many were converted.” See Conference Minutes, 1866, p. 110.

## Marshall Or Mareschal, Thomas[[@Headword:Marshall Or Mareschal, Thomas]]

             an English divine of note, was born at Barkby, in Leicestershire, about 1621; was entered at Lincoln College, Oxford, in 1640, and whlile there became a constant hearer of archbishop Usher's sermons in All-hallows  Church. The influence of that prelate's style is apparent in all the writings of Mr. Marshall. Upon the breaking out of the civil war he took up arms for the king at his own charge, and therefore, in 1645, when he was a candidate for the degree of bachelor of arts, was admitted without paying fees. Upon the approach of the Parliamentary visitation, he left the university, went beyond sea, and became preacher to the company of English merchants at Rotterdam and Dort. In 1661 he was made bachelor of divinity; and, in 1668, became fellow of his college; and, in 1669, doctor of divinity. In 1672 he was appointed rector of Lincoln College, Oxford; later he became chaplain-in-ordinary to the king, — and, in 1681, finally dean of Gloucestershire. He died in 1685. He was distinguished for his knowledge of the Oriental tongues and of the Anglo-Saxon. He published Observationes in Evangeliorum versiones per antiquas duacs, Gothicas scilicet, etc., Anglo-Saxonicas, etc. (Dort, 1665); also a Life of Archbishop Usher (Lond. 1686); The Catechism set forth in the Book of Common Prayer briefly explained by short Notes (Oxf. 1679). See Wood, Athenoe Oxonienses, vol. ii (see Index); Genesis Biog. Dict. . v.; Wood, Eccles. Biog. vol. vii, s.v.

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

             a pioneer Baptist minister, was born at Windsor, Connecticut, April 23, 1748. He was converted in South Carolina at the age of twenty-two; soon began to preach in Georgia; was licensed in 1771, and ordained in 1775. In 1784 he became pastor at Kiokee, Georgia, and labored there and in all the  adjoining region as a flaming evangelist until his death, August 15, 1819. See Cathcart, Baptist Encyclop. s.v.

## Marshall, Alexander Washington, D.D[[@Headword:Marshall, Alexander Washington, D.D]]

             an Episcopal minister, was born at Charleston, S.C., August 10, 1798. He graduated from the General Theological Seminary in 1828, and in October of that year was ordained deacon, and took charge of St. David's Church, Cheraw, S.C. Having been ordained to the priesthood, March 14, 1830, he continued there until 1841, when he was called to the organization and care of a city mission, worshipping in St. John's Chapel, Charleston. He died ill that city, November 7, 1876. See Obituary Record of Yale College, 1877.

## Marshall, Andrew[[@Headword:Marshall, Andrew]]

             a colored Baptist minister, was, according to his own account, born a slave in 1755, but by his diligence and economy succeeded in purchasing his own freedom and that of his whole family. He joined the Baptist Church when nearly fifty years old; was in 1806 ordained pastor of the Second (colored) Baptist Church in Savannah; and after this had, under his ministrations, become large enough to be divided, he became pastor of the part which took the name of “First African Baptist Church.” This position he tilled until his death, Dec. 8, 1856, occasionally preaching also in Augusta, Macon, Milledgeville, Charleston, and New Orleans. He was also in business on a large scale. He possessed elements in his nature which would have made him a leading character anywhere. The high mental efforts which he at times displayed proved him to be equal to any subject which he would find occasion to meet, if allowed opportunity for preparation. His sight and hearing remained to the last as good as in middle life. and his lower limbs only began seriously to fail him in his one hundredth year. During the long period of his ministry he baptized about thirty-eight hundred persons, and he supposed that about four thousand had professed conversion under his preaching. — Sprague, Annals, 6:251.

## Marshall, George[[@Headword:Marshall, George]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Beltegh Parish, Derry County, Ireland. in 1830. He attended the schools of his native land, and, after his arrival in America, continued his studies, and graduated at Union College, Schenectady, N. Y., in 1852, and at the theological seminary at Princeton, N. J., in 1855. He was immediately licensed, and in 1856 ordained and installed pastor of Rock Church, Cecil Co., Md., where he continued to labor until his death, Feb. 27, 1861. Mr. Marshall was a man of devoted piety, excellent natural talents, and solid attainments; his sermons were sound and instructive, his delivery earnest and impressive. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1862, p. 101.

## Marshall, George, D.D[[@Headword:Marshall, George, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Pennsylvania in 1806. He graduated from Jefferson College, and entered upon his ministry at Bethel in 1832, in which relation he continued until his death, April 30,1872. Dr. Marshall was well known in western Pennsylvania as one of the leaders of the Presbyterian Church. In the councils of the Church he was always heard with respectful attention, and his words were direct and weighty. See Presbyterian, May 18, 1872.

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

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Washington Co., Pa., Jan. 13, 1813. He received his early education in St. Clairsville, Ohio; graduated at Franklin College, Ohio, in 1839; studied theology in the seminary of the Associate Presbyterian Church in Canonsburg, Pa.; was licensed in 1843, and installed pastor of the Associate Presbyterian churches of Londonderry and West Chester, Ohio. Owing to the discussion going on in anticipation of the union between the Associate and Associate Reformed Presbyterian churches, his mind was directed to the investigation of their views concerning psalmody and intercommunion, and this led, in 1854, to his joining the presbytery of St. Clairsville. In 1855 he became the stated supply for Woodsfield Church, Ohio, and in 1857 he accepted a call to the churches of Doddsville and Huntsville, Ill. He died Aug. 24, 1858. Mr. Marshall was practical and zealous as a preacher, social and affable as a Christian gentleman. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1860, p. 75.

## Marshall, Joseph D[[@Headword:Marshall, Joseph D]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born at Stanford, Conn., in Nov., 1804, of Congregational parentage. His early years were spent in mercantile life; he was converted when about twenty years old; felt a call for the ministry, and in 1827 entered the New York Conference, and was for two years stationed at Kingston Circuit. In 1829 he was appointed to New Pfalz Circuit; in 1830 to Flushing; in 1832 was transferred to Troy Conference, and appointed to St. Albans Circuit; next and successively to Pern, Charlotte, Shelburne, and Wesley Chapel, Albany; in 1837 was retransferred to the New York Conference, and appointed to Windham Circuit; in 1838 to Sag Harbor; in 1839 was superannuated, because of failing health; and, though he returned to effective work for a time, he only recovered his health in 1843, when he re-entered active work, and successively preached at Goshel, Conn., Birmingham, Reading, and New Canaan. Thereafter he was a superannuate. He died at Brooklyn, Jan. 9, 1860. “He magnified his office as a pastor in all the churches committed to his care ... He was characterized for his equanimity of disposition, and the pure tone of his devotional and experimental piety.” See Smith, Sacred Memories, p. 232 sq.

## Marshall, Matthew Morton, D.D[[@Headword:Marshall, Matthew Morton, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Fredericksburg, Virginia, February 19, 1804. He began to preach at the age of twenty, and continued, chiefly at Trenton, Tennessee, until his death, at Chattanooga, August 23, 1874. See Nevin, Presbyterian Encyclop. s.v.

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

             D.D., an English divine, flourished in the beginning of the 18th century. But little is known of his personal history. In 1712 he preached before the sons of the clergy; in January, 1715, he was lecturer at Aldermanbury and curate at Kentish Town; later he became canon of Windsor. He appears also to have had the lectureship of St. Martin's, Ironmomger-lane, and died Feb. 6, 1730-31. He published A Translation of the Genuine Works of St. Cyprian (1717, fol.): — Sermons (1717, 1731-1750, 4 vols. 8vo); besides a number of occasional Sermons, etc. — Darling, Cyclop. Bibl. 1:1796; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth. s.v.; Hook, Eccles. Biog. s.v.

## Marshall, Samuel Vance[[@Headword:Marshall, Samuel Vance]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Fayette Co., Ky., Feb. 6, 1798. He was educated at Transylvania University, Lexington, Ky. (class of 1821); studied theology in the seminary at Princeton, N. J.; was licensed in 1825, and ordained by West Lexington Presbytery in 1826. During 1827 lie labored as a missionary in South Carolina; then went to North Middleton and Matthew Sterling churches, in Kentucky; and subsequently to Woodfird, Ky. In 1735 he was elected professor of languages in Transylvania University, and in 1837 to the same chair in Oakland College, Miss. Here he spent the remainder of his life in teaching, and in voluntary service as an evangelist, especially among colored people. He died Nov. 30, 1860. Mr. Marshall was a man of strong character, and of large attainments, adapted to academic and popular purstuits; a good preacher, kind and social in his position. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1862, p. 102. Marshall, Stephen, a noted commonwealth Presbyterian divine, lecturer at St. Margaret's Church, Westminster, who flourisledl in the first half of the 17th century, and died in 16155, was the author of some controversial theological treatises, etc. (1640-81). He also published a number of occasional Sermons. “ The most memorable of Marshall's works is his sermon preached at the funiral of Pyvm” (1644, 4to). See Life of Stephen Marshall (1680, 4to); Darling, Cyclop. Bibl. 1:1 759; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth. s.v.

## Marshall, Walter[[@Headword:Marshall, Walter]]

             an English divine of the second half of the 17th century, was educated at, and later became fellow of New College, Oxford, and Winchester College; vicar of Hursley, Hampshire; was ejected at the Restoration; subsequently became pastor of a dissenting congregation at Gosport, and died in 1690. He published The Gospel Mystery of Sanctification Opened in sundry Practical Directions, together with a Sermon on Justification (Lond. 1692, 8vo; often reprinted; last ed. 1.838, 32mo). — Allibone, Dict. Brit. and Amer. Auth. s.v.; Bogue and Bennett, Hist. Dissenters, 1:454.

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

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Perthshire, Scotland, in 1789; was educated and studied divinity at Glasgow; was licensed by the Presbytery of Dysart, Scotland; preached a number of years at Calinshow, Fifeshire, and in 1832 came to America, and was installed pastor of the Church at Peekskill, N. Y. In 1843, when the marriage question engaged the attention and called forth not a little of the talent and Biblical lore of the Church, he made the argument in that relation before the Synod of New York, which was afterwards published under the title, An Inquiry  concerning the Lawfulness of Marriage between Parties previously related by Affinity; also a short Iistory of Opinions in different Ages and Countries, and of the Action of the Ecclesiastical Bodies on that Subject. He died in 1864. Mr. Marshall possessed ntne analytical powers, comprehensive and penetrating; his sermons were remarkably exact, his masnner rather studied. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1865, p. 99; Sprague, Ann. Amer, Pulplit, 9:7. (J. L. S.)

## Marsham, Sir John[[@Headword:Marsham, Sir John]]

             an English scholar, celebrated for his acquirements in history, languages, and chronology, was born in London in 1602, and was educated at St. John's College, Oxford. He embraced the cause of the Royalists in the civil war. He died in 1685. He was the author of a work entitled Chronologicus Canon l'Egyjptiacus, Elbruaicsus, etc. (Lond. 1672, fol.), in which he attempts to reconcile Egyptian chronology with the Hebrew Scriptures, by supposing four collateral dynasties of Egyptian kings reigning at the same time. This theory has been adopted by several eminent scholars, He also wrote the preface to the first volume of Dugdale's Monasticon Anglicanum, and left behind him at his death, unfinished, Canonis chronici liber quintus: sive, Imperium Persicum: — De provinciis et legionibus Romanis: — De re aumetaria; etc. We are likewise in some measure obliged to him for the History of Philosophy by his very learned nephew, Thomas Stanley, Esq., since it was chiefly at his instigation that that excellent work was undertaken. See Wood, Athenae Oxonienses; Shuckford, Sacred and Profane History; Gen. Biog. Dict. s.v.

## Marshman, Joshua, D.D[[@Headword:Marshman, Joshua, D.D]]

             a noted English Baptist missionary to India, one of the “Serampore Brethren,” as the band of missionaries among whom he and Dr. Carey were the most prominent often styled themselves, the person who, above all others, gave to the English Protestant mission in India the strength, consistency, and prudence which it wanted, was born April 20, 1767, at Westbury Leigh, in Wiltshire. While yet a lad, Joshua Marshman attracted attention by his passion for reading, and his quiet, heartfelt religion. His parents were poor, and he had to struggle hard to secure an education. In 1794 he became master of a school at Bristol, at the same time entering himself a student at “Bristol Academy,” where he stludied thoroughly Latin, Greek, Hebrew, and Syriac. His mind became imbued at this time  with the missionary spirit which the noted English cobbler, Carey, was spreading in England, and in 1799 Marshman offered to become one of the party sent out to India by the “Baptist Missionary Society,” to further the cause which Carey was advocating. Oct. 13, 1799, the company found themselves sixteen miles above Calcutta, at Serampore, on the Hooghly, “a town pleasantly situated, beautiful to look at, and full of a mixed population of Danes, Dutch, English, and natives of all hues.” The intention was to proceed to British ground, Serampore being at that time Danish territory; but the Anglo-Indians objected to Christian missionary enterprises in their midst, and the mission was finally established at Serampore, to spread thence, in God's own appointed time, the truths of his Gospel among the benighted of all India. The fate of the missionary enterprise has been spoken of in the article INDIA SEE INDIA (q.v.); the activity of each member in the biographical sketches of these faithful servants of Christ, SEE CAREY; SEE WARD, THOMAS; we can here deal only with the part Joshua Marshman himself played in this, one of the most important of missionary enterprises.

Marshman had married the daughter of a Baptist minister before he became teacher at Bristol; his wife now accompanied him to India, and proved a helpmeet indeed from the very outset. Shortly after landing at Serampore, finding the support granted by the home society inadequate to the wants of the colony, Marshman, with the assistance of his wife, opened two boarding-schools for European children, and, succeeding even beyond their most sanguine expectations in securing not only a support for themselves, but a maintenance of the mission, shortly after opened a school for the natives also, which was quickly filled; and the pecuniary return of this enterprise, together with the additional income which Carey received for his services as an instructor in the government college at Fort William, enabled these good people in a short time to render their mission nearly independent of home support. The Baptists of England, however, failed to appreciate these heroic and self-sacrificing labors of Carey, and Marshman, and Ward, and much fault was found by the committee of the general society. “There were among them many men of good intentions, but without breadth of views, and used to small economies. They listened to false reports, censured without sufficient information, pinched their missions, and dictated the management, so that to deal with them was but a vexation of spirit ... Moreover, the American subscribers [American Baptists joined their English brethren until Judson went out from the  American society] sent a most vexatious and absurd remonstrance against any part of their contributions for training young men to the ministry being employed in teaching science. ‘As if,' said Dr. Marshman, ‘youths in America could be educated for ministers without learning science.'

Had the government of the mission been in the hands of a body acquainted, by personal experience, with the needs of the Serampore Brethren, any misunderstanding springing up could easily have been allayed; but, managed by the class of men we have just spoken of, the disagreement between the Baptist Missionary Society and the Serampore missionaries (originating in 1817) lasted for some time, and even seriously threatened the success of the enterprise. In 1822 Dr. Marshman had dispatched his son John to England to restore pleasant relations. The disagreement continuing, Dr. Marshman decided to go before the society in person, and in 1826 returned home. But even he failed in his mission; and in 1827, after much argument, the matter ended in the separation of the Serampore mission from the general society. To a man like Dr. Marshman, now hoary with age, this matter became a serious annoyance, and his strength of body and of mind were greatly impaired. Additional trouble came when the ownership of the buildings at the Serampore mission was to be disposed of, the home society naturally enough claiming the property, although it had been secured mainly by the hard labors of Carey and Marshman. In 1823, Dr. Marshman's trials had become very heavy. At that time Mr. Ward was taken away by cholera. “For twenty-three years had the threefold cord between Carey, Marshman, and Ward been unbroken. They had lived together like brothers, alike in aim and purposes, each supplying what the other lacked; and the distress of the parting was terrible, especially to Dr. Marshman, who, at the time of his friend's illness, was suffering from an attack of deafness, temporary indeed, but for some days total, so that he could only watch the final struggle without hearing a single word.” His mental strength was even then sorely tried, for “he wrote as if he longed to be with those whose toils and sorrows were at an end.” Greater was the shock that the treatment of the home society brought upon him. “Morbid attacks of depression came on, during which he wandered about unable to apply himself so much as even to write a letter.” June 9, 1834, Dr. Carey died, and he was left alone to defend his cause. In 1836 a daughter of his, who had married the afterwards so celebrated Christian soldier of the British army, Henry Havelock, barely escaped with her life from her bungalow, which had caught fire, losing one of her three children, a baby,  in the flames. The nervous excitement which this affair caused Dr. Marshman prostrated him completely, and he died Dec. 5, 1837. A few days previous to this event arrangements had been concluded in London for the reunion of the Serampore Mission with the parent society, and for retaining Dr. Marshman in the superintendence.

By severe and diligent labor Dr. Marshman had acquired a complete knowledge of the Bengalee, Sanscrit, and Chinese languages. Into the Chinese he translated the four Gospels, the Epistles of Paul to the Romans and the Corinthians, and the book of Genesis. He also wrote A Dissertation on the Characters and Sounds of the Chinese language (1809, 4to): — The Works of Confucius' containing the original Text, with a Translation (1811, 4to, reviewed in London Quarterly Review, 11:332):Clavis Sinica: — Elements of Chinese Grammar, with a Preliminary Dissertation on the Characters and Colloquial AIedium of the Chinese (Serampore, 1814). In Sanscrit and Bengalee he assisted Dr. Carey in the preparation of a Sanscrit grammar in 1815, and a Bengalee and English dictionary in 1825. In 1827 he published an abridgment of the dictionary. He also engaged in a controversy with Ramimolhun Kloy (q.v.), who distinguished himself greatly among his countrymen in India by his spirited attacks upon idolatry, and by the publication of a work entitled The Precepts of Jesus, the Guide to Peace, in which, while exalting the precepts, he asperses the miracles of Christ. Dr. Marshman answered this work by a series of articles in the Friend of Idia (a periodical issued by the Serampore missionaries), subsequently republished in book form (Lond. 1822), entitled A Defence of the Deity and Atonement of Jesus Christ, in reply to Rammnohun Roy, of Calcutta. In 1824 appeared a second London edition of Rammohun Roy's work, illustrated with a portrait of the author, and containing a reply to Dr. Marshman. In a sketch of Dr. Marshman's character at the end of the first volume of Dr. Cox's History of the Baptist Missionary Society he is spoken of as “possessed of great mental power and diligence, of firmness bordering upon obstinacy, and of much wariness.” See Lond. Gent. Mag. 1838, pt. ii, p. 216; English Cyclopaedia of Biography (1.857), 4:120; Kaye, Christianity in India, ch. vii; Yonge, Pioneers and Founders (Lond. 1872,12mo), ch. v; Trevor, India, its Natives and Missions, p. 316; Marshman (J.), Life and Times of Carey, Marshman, and Ward (Lond. 1859, 2 vols. 8vo; popular ed., N.Y. 1867, 12mo).

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

             (Concilium Marsiacense), was held Dec. 8,1326, by William de Flavacour, archbishop of Auch, and his suffragans. The proceedings are of little interest. This council established the feast of S. Martha, the sister of S. Mary Magdalene, celebrated on the fourth of the calends of August. See Landon, Manual of Councils, p. 390.

## Marsile[[@Headword:Marsile]]

             a Dutch philosopher and theologian, was born at Inghen, in the diocese of Utrecht. He was canon and treasurer of the Church of Saint-Andrew, at Cologne, and when Rupert, the duke of Bavaria, founded the academy of Heidelberg in 1386, he called Marsile to a professorship of philosophy. He died there Aug. 20, 1394. Tritenhemius attributes to him a Dialectic, and some comments on Aristotle and on Peter Lombard. Fabricilus adds that his commentaries on the four books of the Sentences were published in Strasburg in 1501, folio. A volume published at La Haye (1497, fol.) contains the first two books of the Sentences, with the criticism of D'Inghen. — Fabricius, — Bibl. seed. et ifj: Latin.; Dict. des Sciences philos.; B. Haureau, De la Philos. scolast. 2:483; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, vol. 33, s.v.

## Marsilius Of Padua[[@Headword:Marsilius Of Padua]]

             an eminent opponent of the papacy, was born towards the close of the 13th century, and was probably a native of Italy. He first attracted notice at the University of Orleans, in France, and later at that of Paris, where he studied jurisprudence, and also paid some attention to philosophy, medicine, and theology, and in 1312 became rector. It was not, however, until 1324 that he became particularly noted. In that year he composed his principal work, Defensor pacis s. de re imperatoria et pontificia. In this work, written in the interest of the emperor Louis IV, the Bavarian, and against the papacy, he describes the papacy of his time as the most dangerous foe to peace and prosperity, supporting his assertion by a reference to events then current, e.g. the quarrel of Boniface VIII with Philip the Fair of France, the arrogance of Clement V towards the emperor Henry VII, and the treatment  accorded by pope John XXII, then reigning, to Louis the Bavarian. In order to prevent such scandals for the future, he declares that the axe must be laid at the root of the evil; and he then proceeds to consider,

1, the nature, origin, and end of the state, with constant reference to peace and quietness as the highest good of social life;

2, the relation between Church and State, opposing to the exaggerated pretensions of the Curia a doctrine of the Church which he grounds on reason, tradition, Scripture, history, and ecclesiastical law. The leading thoughts are these:

(1) The official duties and authority of every priest are confined to the ministration of the Word and sacraments. His power is spiritual and moral; the civil power alone may employ force, and the priest, even if he be bishop or pope, is subject to the civil power.

(2) All priests, whatever their name, are equal in spiritual rank and authority; there was no distinction in the apostolic Church between bishops and presbyters; and the N.T. shows that there was no primacy of Peter, but that the apostles were all equal. In externals and non-essentials there may be distinctions between priests, and gradations of office, so far as circumstances require, but as a merely human arrangement.

(3) There is only one divinely-appointed Head of the Church — Christ himself.

(4) The highest authority on earth in ecclesiastical matters does not inhere in a single priest or bishop, not even in the bishop of Rome, but in a general council, composed as well of intelligent laymen, who are versed in the Scriptures, as of priests. Christ has promised to be with his Church unto the end of the world, and a general council is the proper exponent and organ of the Church. The pope has not even authority to convene a council, since the case is possible that he should be guilty of conduct which itself would require the attention of a general council. This authority, therefore, belongs to the sovereign, as supreme lawgiver.

(5) The Scriptures, including what must be necessarily inferred from their teaching, alone deserve an unconditional assent. The principles thus submitted by Marsilius found a practical application in 1338, when the heiress of the Tyrol sought a divorce from her husband, John of Bohemia, in order to marry a son of the emperor; a step which was sanctioned by  Louis IV (in 1342), regardless of the fact that the parties were within the degrees of consanguinity in which marriage was prohibited by the Church, public opinion everywhere censuring the emperor's action. Both Marsilius and the learned Franciscan, William Occam, came forward in the emperor's defense, in a work bearing the title in each case, Tractatus de jurisdictione Imeperattoris in causis matrimonialibus. They are complementary to each other, Marsilius treating especially of the dissolution of the former marriage, and Occam of the dispensation on account of consanguinity. Marsilius here also advanced the principle, that the ministers and teachers of the Word are to decide on the sufficiency of any reason for divorce under the divine law, but that the sovereign legislator must decide, on grounds of human law, whether such sufficient reason exists in any given case. Because of his work Defensorpacis, Marsilius was placed under the ban in 1327. His death is generally assigned to 1328, but Louis IV speaks of him as living, in a letter addressed to pope Benedict, in 1336, and there is no reason to doubt the genuineness of his work on marriage, which appeared in 1342. He must therefore have lived until after that date. In his life he appears as one of the most determined opposers of the unlimited pretensions of the papacy; and in his views of the headship of the Church as centering in Christ, and of the Scriptures as furnishing the sole rule of faith and practice for the Church, we recognize him as a forerunner of the Reformation. His works were published in Goldast's Monarchia s. Romans imp. (Frankf. 1668). See Schrsckh, Kirchengesch. 31:79 sq.; Neander, Christian Dogm. 2:599 sq.; Milman, Hist.of Latin Christianity, 7:89 sq.; Herzog, Real-Encyclop. 20:109 sq.; Wetzer und Welte, Kirchen-Lex. 6:896 sq.; Friedberg, Zeitsch. f. Kirchenrecht (Tiibilmg. 1869), 8:69 sq.

## Marsilius, Ficinus[[@Headword:Marsilius, Ficinus]]

             SEE FICINUS.

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

             a French ecclesiastical writer, was born at Paris in 1647, and died at Uzbs in 1724. He is the author of, Histoire de l'Origine des Dixmes, des Ben- efices et des Autres Biens Temporels de l'Eglise (Lyonas, 1689): — Histoire de l'Inquisition et de son Origine (Cologne, 1693; based upon Limborch's Historia Inquisitionis): — Hlistoire du Ministere du Cardinal de Ximenez (Toulouse, 1693; Paris, 1739): — Histoire de Henri VII, Roi  d'Angleterre (1697): — La Vie de St. Frangois de Sales (1700): — Apologie ou Justification d'Erasme (1713): — Entretiens sur les Devoirs de la Vie Civile, et sur Plusieurs Points de la Vie Morale Chretienne (1714). See Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:696, 716, 870. (B.P.)

## Mart[[@Headword:Mart]]

             (סָחָר, sachar', Isa 23:3; also spoken of what is gained from traffic, profit, wealth, “merchandise,” Pro 3:14; Isa 45:14), a trading-place or emporium. The root signifies to travel about as traders, buying and selling; thus pointing out at once the general character of the commerce of the East from the earliest age to the present. SEE COMMERCE; SEE MARKET; SEE MERCHANT.

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

             a French martyr to the Protestant cause, was born at Bergerac in 1684, and was condemned in 1702 to the galleys at Dunkirk, where he spent seven  years. He died in 1777. See The Huguenot Galley-Slave (New York, 1867); Quarterly Review (July), 1866.

## Martel, Andre[[@Headword:Martel, Andre]]

             a Swiss Protestant theologian, was born at Montauban in 1618; studied theology at Saumur, and was appointed pastor of Saint-Affrique. In 1647 he was called to Montauban to fill the same office. In 1653 he became professor of theology in the Reformed academy of that town; he was rector there in 1660, when he was transferred to Puylaurens. Although very reserved in all that could wound the pretensions of the Catholic clergy, he was nevertheless involved in a suit instituted against the pastors of Puylaurens, who were accused of having received into the Church those who, once converted to Romanism, had relapsed into Protestantism, contrary to the royal prescriptions of April, 1663, of June, 1665, and of April, 1666. He was conducted with them to the prisons of Toulouse. The attention of the government was particularly directed to him; it was hoped that if they succeeded in extracting from him an abjuration, his example would draw a great number of his fellow-reformers, and would serve as an excuse to those who only asked a pretext for passing over to Romanism. His moderation, moreover, induced them to believe in the possibility of success. Consequently they endeavored to move him sometimes by menaces, sometimes by promises. All was useless, and they finally liberated him. After the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, the ministers of Montauban and of the neighboring churches retired to Holland. Martel preferred Switzerland, and withdrew to the canton of Berne, where he very soon obtained the direction of one of the principal churches. He died at Berne towards the close of the 17th century, about seventy years of age. Of Martel's productions, we have Response a la methode de M. le cardinal de Richeleu (Rouen, 1674, 4to). This reply, said Cathala-Couture, indicates in the author a profound klnowledge, and, above all, a tone of moderation and propriety far removed from the bitterness and fanaticism which prevail ordinarily in the greater part of controversial works: — De Natura Fidei et de Gratia efficaci (Montauban, 1653, 4to): — inaugural thesis — a number of theses which he delivered, during his presidency, to the scholars of the academy of Montauban, from 1656 to 1674: — a collection of sermons that Cathala-Couture attributes to him, without, however, giving their titles in detail. See Cathala-Couture, hist. du Querci, vol. iii; Haag, La France Protest.; Bayle, Nouvelles Lettres (La Haye, 1739), p. 314, 315; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, vol. 33, s.v.

## Martene, Edmund[[@Headword:Martene, Edmund]]

             a learned French Benedictine, was born at St. Jean de Losne, in the diocese of Dijon, Dec. 22, 1654. After completing his studies, he took the vows in the Benedictine convent of St. Remi, at Rheims, Sept. 8, 1672. He soon distinguished himself by his thorough acquaintance with the ancient ascetic writers, and was sent by the superiors of the Congregation of St. Maur, upon whom his convent depended, to the headquarters of the order, St. Germain des Pres, at Paris. Here he was placed under the guidance, and enjoyed the friendship of the great lights D'Achery and Mabillon. He soon afterwards published his Commentarius in regulam S. P. Benedicti (Paris, 16190, 4to), which met with great success. He was well versed in monastic archaeology, and, encouraged by Mabillon, published next De Antiquis monachorum ritibus libri quinque (Lugd. 1690, 2 vols. 4to). He was then sent to the convent of Marmoutier, where he remained several years, continuing his studies, and imbibing the strong ascetic views of Claudius Martin, whose biography he wrote upon the death of Martin. His exaggerated praise of this mystic ascetist seemed to his superiors more likely to provoke ridicule than admiration in the age of Louis XIV, and its publication was forbidden. The Vie du vieneable P. Dom Claude Aiartin, etc., was nevertheless published either with or without the author's consent (Tours, 1697, 8vo). He was exiled to Evreux for his insubordination. He was, however, soon transferred to the convent of St. Ouen, at Rouen, and there assisted Dom de Sainte Marthe in his edition of the work of Gregory the Great. Here he republished the life of Martin, and added Maximies sjpirituelles du vienraeble P. D. Claude Mairtin (Rouen, 1698, 12mo). His next work, to which the above De antiquis moonachorum, etc., was but a preface, is De antiquis ecclesiae ritibus (Rotomagi. 1700 sq., 3 vols. 4to), and as appendix the Tractatus de antiquae ecclesiae disciplina in celebrandis offciis (Ludg. 1706, 4to).

In 1700 he published also, as a complement to D'Achery's Spicilegium, his Vetersm scriptorunm et monuslentorusm... collectio nova, after which he devoted himself especially to antiquarian researches, and writing commentaries on the works of ancient writers. In 1708 the general chapter of his order sent him on a journey through France, to visit all the libraries, and to collect documents for a new Gallia Christiana. Dom Ursinus Durand (q.v.) was given him as colleague in 1709, and after six years thus employed the result of their researches was published under the title Thesaurus norus Anecdotorume (Paris, 1717, 5 vols. fol.), and Voyage litteraire de deux  religieux Benedictins, etc. (Paris, 1717, 4to). In the same year he was allowed by chancellor D'Aguesseau to compile a new collection of the works of French historical writers, more complete than that of Andrew Duchesne, but was prevented from carrying out his plan by political events. He was now sent again, with his former colleague, on a literary journey, from which they returned in 1724. The result of it was the Veterums scriptorums et monumentorum... amplissima collectio (Paris, 1724-33, 9 vols. fol.). In 1734 he fell into disgrace in consequence of his opposition to the bull Unigenitus, thereafter devoted himself exclusively to his studies, and in 1738 published a much enlarged edition of his archaeological works. He also continued Mabillon's Annales ordisis S. Benedicti, tom. vi, ab anno Christi 1117 ad 1157 (Paris, 1739), and prepared a continuation of the Actea Sanctorumiis ordinis S. Benedicti, and an edition of the life and works of Thomas of Canterbury. He also asked permission to publish a Histoire de la Congregatione S. Meturl, but was refused on account of its too enthusiastic praise of the monastic life. He died June 20, 1739. See Tassin, Hist. Litt. de la Congr. de S. Maur; Moreri, Dict. Histor.; Mercure de France, August, 1739; Le Pour et le Contre, vol. xii, n. 249; Christian Obserer, vol. 18; Dowling, Introd. to Ch. Hist.; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 9:119; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 33:1003; Pierer, Universal-Lexikon, 10:926. (J. N. P.)

## Martens, Karl Andreas August[[@Headword:Martens, Karl Andreas August]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born April 18, 1774, and died March 17, 1832, at Halberstadt, doctor of theology and first preacher. He wrote, Ueber die symbolischen Bucher der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche, etc. (Halberstadt, 1830): — Ueber Pietismus, sein Wesen und seine Gefahren (ibid. 1826): — Theophanes oder uber die gottliche Offenbarung (ibid. 1819): — Eleutheros, oder Untersuchung jiber die Freiheit des menschlichen Willens (Magdeburg, 1823): — Jesus auf dem Gipfel seines irdischen Lebens (Halberstadt, 1811). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:335, 365, 369, 482, 550; 2:159; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2:855. (B.P.)

## Martensen, Hans Larsen[[@Headword:Martensen, Hans Larsen]]

             one of the most prominent Danish Lutheran theologians, was born August 9, 1808, at Flensburg. He studied at Copenhagen, and in 1832 passed the ecclesiastical examination and received a gold medal. The same .year he received from the government a travelling scholarship, and visited Berlin, Munich, Vienna, and Paris, giving particular attention to the study of the philosophy of the Middle Ages. On his return to Denmark, in 1836, he became a licentiate in theology, submitting a thesis on the Autonomy of the Human Conscience, which was afterwards translated from the Latin into Danish (1841), and into German (1845). The next year he began to lecture to the younger students in the University of Copenhagen on moral philosophy.

The material of these lectures was published in his Outline of a System of Moral Philosophy, in 1841. His lectures on Speculative Dogmatik, from 1840, when he became professor ordinarius, awakened extraordinary interest. "It was a new and unheard-of gospel, in charming language, that flowed from his inspired, enrapturing lips. Not merely did the students contend with one another for places in his lecture-room, but men advanced in years, of various callings, were found regular hearers." His popularity became greater still when, in 1845, he became courtpreacher, and his Hegelianism began to give a coloring to the  conscience of his generation. The public was thoroughly prepared to receive his doctrines gladly when, in 1849, he published the most successful and famous of his contributions to theological literature, his Christian Dogmatics, which has been translated into most European languages, even into modern Greek, and has exercised as wide an influence on Protestant thought as any volume of our century.

In Germany it has enjoyed a popularity even wider than in Scandinavia, and has been honored by a formal refutation from the propaganda at Rome. It was not, however, unchallenged at home, a severe attack upon it having been made by professor Rasmus Nielsen, supported secretly by Kirkegaard (q.v.). In 1854, when bishop Mynster died, Martensen, who had refused the bishopric of Sleswig, accepted the primacy of Denmark, and began his administrative labors in the Church with acts of great vigor and determination. He became in consequence cordially detested, and violently attacked by all those sections, of the Danish Lutheran body which wavered to this side or to that from a hierarchical orthodoxy.A great part of Martensen's time and energy henceforth was taken up with polemics against Grundtvig, Nielsen, the Catholics, and the Irvingites. Many of his later writings are of this purely controversial character, his Exposure of the Socalled Grundtvigianism, which he styled "a leaven, but not a principle," his Catholicism and Protestantism, against the claims of the Vatican Council, his Socialism and Christendom. The time at his command, after faithful administration of his duties, was, during his earlier years, devoted to the preparation of his System of Christian Ethics (1871-78; German, 1878-79; English, 1873-82), and his final scientific work in the line of his early studies of the mystics, on Jacob Boihme (1879; German, 1882; English, by T. Rhys Evans, 1885). As a fitting conclusion of his literary activity, he published his Autobiography (1883). Dr. Martensen died, February 3, 1884, and was buried with great solemnity in his own cathedral of Our Lady. The king and the Conservative party knew what they owed" to the rigid Tory prelate, whose face was set like a flint against the modern spirit in politics, in literature, in philosophy. He was a great man, a man who did honor to Denmark. It is not the critics of his own country only, it is the more impartial Germans, who have declared Hans Larsen Martensens to be the greatest Protestant theologian of the present century." See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2:856; Quarterly Review (Lond. April 1884); Lutheran Church Review (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, July 1884; Expositor (Lond. and N.Y., January 1885). (B.P.)

## Martha[[@Headword:Martha]]

             (Μαρθά, of unknown signification, but a Syriac prop. name [מִרְתָּא] according to Plutarch, Vit. Mar. 17), a Jewess, the sister of Lazarus and Mary, who resided in the same house with them at Bethany (Luk 10:38; Luk 10:40-41; Joh 11:1-39; Joh 12:2). SEE LAZARUS. From the house at Bethany being called “her house,” in Luk 10:38, and from the leading part which Martha is always seen to take in domestic matters, it has seemed to some that she was a widow, to whom the house at Bethany belonged, and with whom her brother and sister lodged; but this is uncertain, and the common opinion that the sisters managed the household of their brother is more probable. Jesus was intimate with this family, and their house was often his home when at Jerusalem, being accustomed to retire thither in the evening, after having spent the day in the city. The point which the evangelists bring out most distinctly with respect to Martha lies in the contrariety of disposition between her and her sister Mary. The first notice of Christ's visiting this family occurs in Luk 10:38-42. He was received with great attention by the sisters, and Martha soon hastened to provide suitable entertainment for the Lord and his followers, while Mary remained in his presence, sitting at his feet, and drinking in the sacred words that fell from his lips. The active, bustling solicitude of Martha, anxious that the best things in the house should be made subservient to the Master's use and solace, and the quiet earnestness of Mary, more desirous to profit by the golden opportunity of hearing his instructions than to minister to his personal wants, strongly mark the points of contrast in the characters of the two sisters. (See bishop Hall's observations on this subject in his Contemplaitions, 3:4, Nos. 17, 23, 24.) She needs the reproof, “One thing is needful;” but her love, though imperfect in its form, is yet recognized as true, and she too, no less than Lazarus and Mary, has the distinction of being one whom Jesus loved (Joh 11:3). The part taken by the sisters in the transactions connected with the death and resurrection of Lazarus (Joh 11:20-40) is entirely and beautifully in accordance with their previous history (see Tholuck, Comment. ad loc.). The facts recorded of her indicate a character devout after the customary Jewish type of devotion, sharing in Messianic hopes and accepting Jesus as the Christ; sharing also in the popular belief in a resurrection, but not rising, as her sister did, to the belief that Christ was making the eternal life to belong, not to the future only, but to the present. Nothing more is recorded of Martha save that some time after, at a supper given to Christ and his disciples at Bethany, she, as usual, busied herself in the external service. Lazarus, so marvelously restored from the grave, sat with her guests at table. “Martha served,” and Mary occupied her favorite station at the feet of Jesus, which she bathed with her tears, and anointed with costly ointment (Joh 12:1-2). SEE MARY.

Notwithstanding the seeming drawbacks upon Martha's character, so vividly painted in the Gospels, there can be no doubt of her genuine piety and love for the Savior. A.D. 29. See Niemeyer, Charakt. 1:66; and Schulthess, Neueste theol. Nachricht, 1828, 2:413. According to tradition, she went with her brother and other disciples to Marseilles, gathered round her a society of devout women, and, true to her former character, led them to a life of active ministration. The wilder Provengal legends make her victorious over a dragon that laid waste the country. The town of Tarascon boasted of possessing her remains, and claimed her as its patron saint (Acta Sanctorum, and Brev. Roen. in Jul. 29; Fabricii Lux Evangel. p. 388).

## Martha, Order of[[@Headword:Martha, Order of]]

             is the name sometimes given to the organization of the Hospital Sisters of St. Martha of Pontarlier, etc. The aim of this female order is the care of the sick and the poor, and the gratuitous instruction of poor children. SEE HOSPITAL SISTERS.

## Marthe, Anne Briget[[@Headword:Marthe, Anne Briget]]

             a French nun, called Sister Martha, born at Besanson in 1749, deserves a place here for her devotion during the French Revolution and the wars that followed to the relief of the sick and wounded, and of prisoners of all nations. She died in 1824. The Martha Order (q.v.) is named after her.

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

             a learned Benedictine of St. Maur, was born at St. Sever Calp in the diocese of Aire, Dec. 30, 1647. In 1667 he entered the convent of La Daurade, at Toulouse. He now applied himself with great zeal to the study of Oriental languages and Biblical literature, both of which he afterwards taught in colleges of his order. During his residence at Bordeaux he wrote a work against the chronological system of Pezron, which attracted the notice of his superiors. He was called to the head-quarters of his order, the abbey of St. Germain des Pres, and intrusted with the preparation of a new edition of the works of St. Jerome. In 1690 he published his prodromus of this work, in which he demonstrated the incorrectness of preceding editions. His edition was violently attacked by Simon and Leclerc, but Martianay as vigorously defended it. This controversy lasted a long time, yet did not prevent him from publishing a large number of works, more remarkable for their learning and ingenuity than for largeness of thought or critical acumen. He died June 16, 1717. Among his works we notice the above-mentioned edition of the works of St. Jerome (Paris, 1693-1706, 5 vols. fol.): — Defense du texte Hebreu et de la chronologie de la Vulgate (Par. 1689): — Continuation de la Defense du texte, etc. (Par. 1693). In both these works he endeavors to prove that the Hebrew text is to be preferred to the Septuagint, and that less than 4000 years elapsed from the creation of the world to the advent of Christ: Traites de la comnnmissance et de la vr-it de I'Ecrifure Sainte (Paris, 1694-95, 4 vols.): — Trait methodique, ou maniere d'expliquer I'Ecriture par le secourds es trois syntaxes, la propr, re, la figurie, et l'harmonique (1704): — Vie de St. Jerome (1706): — artmonzie analy tique de plusieurs sens caches et  rapports inconnus de l'A ncien et du Nouveau Testament (1708): — Essais de Traduction ou Remarques sur les traducltions Frangaises du Nouveau Testament (1709): — Le Nouveau Testament traduit en Frangais sur la VulgLate (1712): — Methode sacree, pour a pprendre a expliquer I'Ecriture sainte par l'Ecritlure meme (1716); etc. See Journal des Savants, Aug. 9 1717; Hist. Litt. de la Congreg. de St. Maur, p. 382-397; Herzog, Real-Encyklopädie, 9:120; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 34:2. (J. N. P.)

## Martien, William Stockton[[@Headword:Martien, William Stockton]]

             a ruling elder of the Presbyterian Church, was born June 20,1798. He was of Huguenot descent, and received an early Christian education. In 1828 he commenced business, and in 1830, in connection with others, engaged in the establishment of The Presbyterian, of which he continued to be the chief proprietor and publisher until 1861. In 1833 he commenced the publication of religious books, and, as a member of the Board of Publication of the Presbyterian Church, he issued many works of standard religious character. In 1846 he was elected and ordained ruling elder, in which office he continued to labor in the Sabbath and mission schools belonging to the congregation until his death, April 16, 1861. Mr. Martien was a man of great enterprise and efficiency in the Church — faithful and conscientious in the discharge of every trust, wise in counsels, and eminently gifted in management. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1862, p. 142.

## Martigny, Alexandre[[@Headword:Martigny, Alexandre]]

             a French archaeologist, was born April 22, 1808, at Sauverny, France. He received holy orders in 1832, and died August 19, 1880, at Belley. He is the author of the famous Dictionnaire des Antiquites Chretiennes (Paris, 1864; 2d ed. 1877). In 1865 he published a French translation of De' Rossi's Bulletino di Archeologia Cristiana. (B.P.)

## Martin[[@Headword:Martin]]

             (better known as abbot Chaffrey), a Roman Catholic French writer, was born at Abries in 1813. In 1839 he received holy orders, and was appointed professor at the seminary in Embrun. He was honorary canon of different chapters, and died at Paris in 1872. He published, Le Panorama des Predications (1851-55, 3 volumes: 8th ed. 1864): — La Bibliotheque des Predicateurs (1867-68, 4 volumes): — Theologie Morale en Tableaux (1857): — Repertoire de la Doctrine Chretienne (1857; 2d ed. 1859-63, 3 volumes): — Portraits Litteraires des Plus Celebres Predicateurs Contemporains (1858): — Mois de Alarie des Predicateurs (eod. 2 volumes): — Sermons Nouveaux sur les Mysteres de Notre Seigneur Jesus-Christ (1860, 2 volumes): — Vies des Saints a l'Usage des Predicateurs (1861-68, 4 volumes). See Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Martin (Paschoud), Joseph[[@Headword:Martin (Paschoud), Joseph]]

             a Protestant theologian, was born at Nimes, October 14, 1802. He studied at Geneva, was for some time pastor at Luneray, and in 1828 at Lyons, where he labored with his former classmate, Adolphe Monod. In 1837 he was called to Paris, but after two years of work was obliged to retire from the active ministry for a time on account of an incurable disease. In 1839 he commenced publishing a monthly journal, entitled Le Disciple de Jesus Christ. In 1853 he founded L'Alliance Chretienne Universelle, on the following basis: "Love of God, the Creator and Father of all men; love of all men, the immortal creatures and children of God; love of Jesus Christ, the son of God and Savior of mankind." Adolphe Monod was the first who wrote against the principles of this journal. In 1851 the consistory of Paris appointed the younger Athanase Coquerel as his assistant, and made him retire, under the pretext of heresy, in 1864. In spite of the protests of his medical advisers, Martin resumed his ministerial functions. In 1868 he succeeded Athanase Coquerel, the father, as president of the presbytery, and died May 24, 1873, at Loges, near Versailles. See Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Martin (St.) Of Braga[[@Headword:Martin (St.) Of Braga]]

             a prelate of the Roman Catholic Church, was born in Pannonia about the beginning of the 6th century. In his youth he visited the holy places of Palestine. He afterwards went to Galicia, in Spain, where he did much to preserve orthodoxy among the population, which inclined strongly to Arianism. He established several convents there, and was himself abbot of Dumia until about 560. At that time he was made archbishop of Bracara, now Braga, in Portugal. As such he took part in the second Council of Bracara, in 563, against the Priscillianists and Arians, and in 572 presided over the third council at the same place on Church discipline. He died about 583. He was a very voluminous writer. Among his works we notice Formula honestae vitae s. de denrentiis quaotuor virtutum (in the Bibl. P. Par. Lund. 10:382 sq., and Gallandi Bibl. Patr. 12:273 sq.). This work was  very well received. The Sententice Egyptiorum patrunm were not translated from Greek into Latin by Martin, as some have supposed, but by Paschasius, deacon of the convent of Dumia, at Martin's instigation (Rosweyd, Vit. Patr. [Antv. 1615], p. 1002 sq.; see also Grasse, Handbuch dc allg. Literaturg .esch. 2:1.27). Some Latin poems of Martin are to be found in Sismondi, Opp. [ed.Ven.], 2:653, and in Gallandi Bibl. Patr.). But more important than all these is his Collectio Orientalium Canonum, s. Capitula lxxxiv collecta ex Graecis synodis et versa, etc. (in Aguirre, Conc. Hisp. 2:327 sq., and Mansi, 9:846 sq.; see Florez, Esp. Saggr. 4:151 sq.). It is a sort of translated compilation of, with commentaries on, the acts of the Greek councils, adapted for the use of the Western Church. It is divided into two parts, the first containing the canons concerning the clergy, the second those applying to the laity. See D. Czvittingeri Specimen lunigarire literatae (Francf. and Lip. 1711); Schrockh, Kirchesngesch. 17:392 sq.; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 9:122. (J. N. P.)

## Martin (St.) Of Tours[[@Headword:Martin (St.) Of Tours]]

             a prelate of the Roman Catholic Church, was born in Pannonia about the year 316. He was educated at Pavia, and, at the desire of his father, who was a military man, entered the army under Constantine I, who was then emperor. When eighteen years old he became a convert to Christianity, was baptized, and a few years afterwards went to Gaul, and there became a pupil and follower of St. Hilarius (q.v.) Pictaviensis. He quitted the army, and zealously devoted himself to the interests of orthodox Christianity. On a visit to Lombardy, wishing to see his parents again, who were Arians, Martin reproved the inhabitants for their views. They took his liberty unkindly; he was imprisoned and flogged by order of the magistrates of Milan. He then retired to a neighboring village with a few adherents, but being again persecuted by Auxentius, the Arian bishop of Milan, he attempted to return to Gaul. That country, however, was also a prey to religious dissensions; Hilarius himself had been banished to Poitiers, and Martin therefore retired to the island of Gallinaria, in the Tyrean Sea. When St. Hilarius was restored to his Church in 360, Martin hastened back to him, and with his assent retired to the wilds in the neighborhood of Poitiers, at the place now called Liguge. Here he was soon joined by others. and thus arose the convent of Liguge, probably the oldest monastic establishment of France. About 370, Lidoire, bishop or archbishop of Tours, died, and the clergy of that diocese insisted upon Martin's acceptance of the vacant see. He was finally persuaded to accept the office,  but he governed the diocese like a convent, and always lived himself in the simple way to which he was accustomed at Liguge. He erected a convent which became the celebrated monastery of Marmoutiers, near Tours.

Under his active and vigilant care the diocese attained great prosperity, while he himself became renowned for his talents and his virtues, not only in the neighboring parts, but even throughout Gaul When Maximus, after the murder of Gratian, caused all the bishops of Gaul who had supported his rival to be deposed or imprisoned, Martin was sent by them to the court at Treves to protest against this violence, and succeeded so well that the emperor released all the prisoners. On another occasion, when the Spanish bishops Idacius and Ithacius besought Maximus to surrender Priscillian and his followers to the civil authorities, to be executed as heretics, Martin protested against such sanguinary orthodoxy, and when, notwithstanding his protests, Priscillian was executed by order of the emperor, Martin refused to hold any intercourse with those who had advocated that measure. This conduct displeased the emperor, and when Martin, some time after, had occasion to ask the pardoning of Narces and Leocadius, accused of rebellion, he granted it only on the condition that Martin would become reconciled with Ithacius. Martin submitted, but left Treves at once, and it is said expressed himself sorry for having purchased the pardon of Narces and Leocadius at that price. He died at Candes about 396. His life by his contemporary, Sulpicius Severus, is a very curious specimen of the Christian literature of the age, and, in the profusion of miraculous legends with which it abounds, might take its place among the lives of the mediueval or modern Roman Church. The only extant literary relic of Martin is a short Confession of Faith on the Holy Trinity, which is published by Galland, Bibl. Patr. 7:559. He is the first who, without sufflering death for the truth, has been honored in the Latin Church as a confessor of the faith. The festival of his birth is celebrated on the 11th of November. In Scotland this day still marks the winter-term, which is called Martinmas (q.v.). In Germany, also, his memory continues to our day among the populace in the celebration of the Martinalia. See Gregorius Turon, Hist. Francor. lib. 10; Gervaise, Vie de Saint Martin (1699); Dupuy, Histoire de Saint Martin (1852); Jean Maan, Metropol. Turonensis; Hist. Litto de la France, 1:417; Galliac Christ. vol. xiv, col. 6; Schaff, Ch. Hist. 2:203 sq.; Gieseler, Eccles. Hist. 1:278; Montalembert, Monks of the West, vol. 1, bk. 3; Mrs. Jameson, Sacred and Legendarly Art, p. 720; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 34:14; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 9:126 sq. (J. H. W.)

## Martin Brethren[[@Headword:Martin Brethren]]

             or Knights of the Order of St. Martin of Mayence, were organized in 1294 by archbishop Gerhard, and renewed by archbishop Berthold in 1497, and flourished until the days of the French Revolution. Their object was the attainment of a godly life, brotherly love among the knights, and protection of the holy faith. Their sign was a golden shield, with a picture of St. Martin. — Regensburg Allgem. Encyklop. s.v. Martinsbrüder.

## Martin I[[@Headword:Martin I]]

             Pope, son of Fabricius, a distinguished citizen of the Papal States, was called to the papal chair July 5, 640, as successor to Theodore I. The emperor Constans II made every exertion to induce Martin to approve a decree he had promulgated in 659, forbidding discussions between the orthodox Romanists and the Monothelites. Martin, on the contrary,  assembled a council at Rome (the first Lateran), without the emperor's consent, in Oct., 649, in which all heresies, and particularly that of the Monothelites, were condemned, and the decrees of Heraclius and of Constans II denounced. (See for details the article SEE LATERAN COUNCILS [1].) The emperor, enraged at this opposition, caused Martin to be taken prisoner, June 19, 653, and exiled him to the island of Naxos. On Sept. 17, 654, the pope was taken to Constantinople, and kept in prison there for six months. But he bore all his trials with great firmness, refusing to be reconciled to the heretics, and was finally transported to the Thracian Chersonesus. There, in the midst of unfeeling barbarians, he had to suffer the greatest deprivations. Yet he bore it all with Christian patience, and died Sept. 16, 655. His body was afterwards removed to Rome. He is commemorated by the Church of Rome Nov. 12. Eighteen encyclical letters attributed to Martin are published in the Bibliotheca Patrum, and in Labbe's Concilia. See F. Pagi, Breviarium, etc., complectans illustriora Pontificum Romanorum gesta conciliorumn, etc.; Platina, Vitae Potif. Roman.; Artaud de Montor, Hist. des souverains Pontifes Romains, vol. i; Bower, Hist. Popes, 3:44 sq.; Riddle, Hist. Papacy, 1:297; Baur, Dreieinigkeitslehre, vol. 1 and 2; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 34:18; Neander, Hist. of the Christian Religion and Church, 3:186, 187, 188, 191; Herzog, Real-Encyklopädie, 9:122. (J. H.W.)

## Martin II[[@Headword:Martin II]]

             (MARINUS I), Pope, was born at Montefiascone, in the Papal States. He was thrice sent to Constantinople (866, 868, 881) as papal legate to oppose the nomination of Photius as patriarch, but when he was elected pope, Dec. 23, 882, did not continue in the policy of his predecessor, John VIII, but reversed the condemnation of Photius, of bishop Formosus of Porto and others. His reign lasted only fourteen months. He died Feb. 14, 884. See Fleury, Hist. Eccl. 3:542; F. Pagi, Breviarium Pontificumn Romanorum, etc.; Muratori, Ann. Ital.; Artaud de Montor, Hist. des souverains Pontifes Rosatinss, 2:141; Bower, Hist. Popes, v. 101 sq.; Riddle, Hist. Papacy, 2:32; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 34:18; Herzog, Real-Encyklopädie, 9:124.

## Martin III[[@Headword:Martin III]]

             (called by some MARINUS II), Pope, a Roman by birth, succeeded Stephen VIII in 942. He died only four years after, and was succeeded by Agapetus II. Martin III was a patron of learning, and a noble Christian exemplar.

## Martin IV[[@Headword:Martin IV]]

             (Simon de la Brie), Pope, was probably a native of Touraine, France, and of humble origin. He was educated at Tours, and there entered the Franciscan order. St. Louis, king of France, favored him, and gave him a position at the church of St. Martin. In 1262 he was created cardinal by pope Urban IV, and by pope Gregory X was appointed apostolical legate to the French court. He continued in this office under the popes Hadrian V, John XXI, and Nicholas III; but upon the decease of the last named (Aug. 22, 1280) he was elected successor in the papal chair in 1281, through the influence of Charles of Anjou, king of Sicily and Naples. The “Sicilian Vespers” (q.v.), in 1282, having ejected Charles of Sicily, Martin came to the support of his royal friend with all his influence, and even by the spiritual censures he had at his command sought to maintain French domination in Sicily. He excommunicated Peter of Aragon, whom the Sicilians had elected king; but his excommunication was of no more avail than the arms of the Angevins, for the Sicilians stood firm against both. Martin also excommunicated the Byzantine emperor Michael, and by this measure widened the breach between the Greek and Latin churches. He died in 1285, and was succeeded by Honorius IV. It is to the use of the censures of the Church in the unpopular cause of Charles of Anjou that many Church historians ascribe the decline and ultimate extinction of the authority in temporals which the papacy had hitherto exercised. Not only did he lower the popular esteem of the papal authority, but he made himself a laughing-stock by his rashness and inability to make good his threats. Letters of this pope are found in D'Achery, Spicileg. 3:684. His biography (Vita) was written by Bernard, Grindon, and by Muratori. See Muratori, Annali d'ltaclia, 7:435-442; Artaud de Montor, Hist. des soueraains Pontifes Romains, 3:55-63; Bower, Hist. Popes, 6:324; Hefele, Conciliengesch. 6:188 sq.; Leo, Gesch. v. Italien, vol. 4. (J. H. W.)

## Martin Mar-Prelate, Controversy Of[[@Headword:Martin Mar-Prelate, Controversy Of]]

             About 1580, the year of the Armada, there appeared in Egland a number of tracts — “a series of scurrilous libels in which the queen, the bishops, and the rest of the conforming clergy, were assailed with every kind of contumely” (Hardwick, Ch. Hist. p. 256) — written probably by some radicals of the Puritan camp when the controversy between the Church and the Puritans was waxing hot. Marsden says “there is some reason to believe that the whole was a contrivance of the Jesuits.” The charge against the latter is based, however, only upon supposition, and deserves no encouragement. The public printing-presses being at the time shut against the Puritans, all their printing had to be done secretly, and it is therefore difficult to determine the origin of the “Martin Mar-Prelate” tracts. The Puritan divines Udal and Penry, on their trials, were charged with the authorship, or with a willful knowledge of the authors; but they refused to make any revelations, and the real authorship of these once dreaded and proscribed, but now ludicrous lampoons, remains a mystery. Their titles and contents are given somewhat in detail by Neale, Hist. of the Puritans (Harpers' edit. 1:190 sq.). They were reprinted as Puritant Disc. Tracts (Lond. 1843). See also Maskell, Hist. of the Martin Mar-Prelate Controversy (Lond. 1845); Marsden, Early Puritans, p. 198 sq.; id. Hist. of Christian Churches and Sects, 1:131; Hunt, Religious Thought of England, 1:72. (J. H. W.)

## Martin Of Dunin[[@Headword:Martin Of Dunin]]

             a noted Polish Roman Catholic prelate, was born in the village of Wal, near Rawa, Prussian Poland, Nov. 11,1774. Until his twelfth year he was kept at the Jesuit school of Rawa; was then entered a student at the Gymnasium of Bromberg; but, having determined to devote his life to the Church and her cause, he was sent to Rome, and became a student in the Collegium Germanicum in 1793. Upon the completion of his studies, three years after, he was ordained subdeacon; later, by papal dispensation, successively deacon and priest, when he returned to his native country, which had in the meantime lost its independence, and fallen a prey to the Russians, Austrians, and Prussians. Martin himself was now a Prussian subject, but he took a position in the diocese of Cracowa, and was thus in the employ of that portion of the Roman Catholic Church of Poland under control of the Austrian government.

In 1808 the archbishop of Gnesen, count Raczynski, called him to Gnesen, and conferred upon Martin first a canonicate in the metropolitan church, and shortly after made him auditor. Thereafter honors came fast and freely. in 1815 lie was made chancellor of the metropolitan chapter; in 1824 master of the Cathedral of Posen, and shortly after was entrusted by the Prussian government with the supervision of the Roman Catholic schools in the diocese. In 1829 he was promoted to the position of capitular vicar and general-administrator, and in 1831 was honored with the archiepiscopal chair of Gnesen and Posen. This position came to him in an hour when great discretion and strong  nerve were required of Romish prelates on Prussian territory. The discontent of the Poles in 1830, and the rebellion in which it resulted, caused the government of Frederick William III to look with suspicion upon the priesthood of the papal Church. It was a notorious fact that the latter was leagued with the revolutionists. Poland had ever been a devoted daughter of Rome; Prussia decidedly Protestant, the most daring opponent of papal interests. Could it be expected that the Roman Catholics would hesitate to work for the restoration of Polish independence? Has not even in our day the Prussian government all it can do to control the priesthood in that section of her territory? See POSEN. To prevent the further spread of revolutionary tendencies among the priesthood, the Prussian government inaugurated a new policy, the execution of which resulted in a spirited contest between the representative of Rome, our Martin of Dunin, and the secular authority of the province of Posen.

The difficulties commenced at the seat of the metropolitan. A school for the education of Romish priests was sustained at this place by the government. Hitherto the instructors had been chosen by the Church for whose service it was intended, but now the government insisted upon its right to choose the incumbents of the professorships. The archbishop protested, but the government proceeded without any regard to his opposition. Fresh fuel was added to the flame in 1837. By the bull Magnae nobis admirationis, issued by pope Benedict XIV (June 27, 1748), mixed marriages were made possible only by special dispensation from the pope, and, when permission was granted, the children of such unions were demanded for the Church of Rome. Poland had conceded this point to the Roman pontiff, but the Prussian government in 1837 declared that in its territory no such dispensation was needed, nor any understanding in regard to the religious education of any children from such a union. This action on the part of the government the archbishop held to be illegal, and he stoutly asserted his right to dissent from the decision of all secular authority. Had he rested here, and awaited the settlement of this difficulty between the pope of Rome and the king of Prussia, all would have been well. Martin, however, proceeded at once to inaugurate measures which clearly revealed him as a plotter against the government he had sworn to uphold. He secretly entered into communication with the clergy of his dioceses, and threatened with excommunication any and all priests who should obey the mandates of the government without his consent. Promptly the government, after hearing of this procedure, arrested the archbishop, and brought him to trial, and he was condemned to six months' confinement in a fortress,  incapacitated for office, and burdened with the expense of his trial. Previous to his arrest the government had addressed the Roman Catholics of the province of Posen, and had assured them of the preservation of their rights and privileges as heretofore, but, notwithstanding all these precautions, the priesthood remained firmly bound to the interests of their religious shepherd, and no sooner had Martin of Dunin been condensed and imprisoned at the fortress of Colberg (Oct. 4, 1839), than the Romanists of the two archiepiscopal sees went into mourning. Fortunately this difficulty occurred near the closing days of the reign of Frederick William III. The wife (now queen widow) of Frederick William IV (who came to the throne in 1840), herself a Roman Catholic, was no doubt instrumental in securing an understanding between the archbishop and her royal spouse. Martin returned to Posen Aug. 5,1840, and died Dec. 26. 1842. See Pohl, Martin von Dunin (Marienburg, 1843, 8vo); Aschbach, Kirchen-Lexikon, s.v. SEE PRUSSIA. (J. H. W.)

## Martin Of Treves[[@Headword:Martin Of Treves]]

             a Capuchin monk, was born about 1630, in the archbishopric of Treves. He took the cowl at an early age, and a little later became a lector of theology; but in consequence of a pestilence, whose ravages broke up his school in 1666, he devoted himself to literature. A catechism issued by him was received with great favor by the public, and this success led to the publication of a great number of works for instruction and edification; but. zealous for the glory of God and the honor of his Church, he did not confine his efforts to this field. He was indefatigable in preaching, in catechizing, and in missionary work, and during the course of his labors traversed nearly the whole of the archbishoprics of Mayence and Treves. His benevolent spirit found expression in the readiness with which he ministered to the diversified wants of the people, among whom the instruction of the unlearned and of children claimed his especial notice. He is even credited with removing thorns and stones from the highways, and with placing stepping-stones in streams for the convenience of travelers. Withal, he was a thorough ascetic, eating neither flesh nor fish, and traveling without either hat or sandals in the most inclement weather; and he attended mass as often as possible each day for more than twenty years. As a teacher, he was wont to lay especial stress on the adoration of the mass and the worship of the Virgin, which doctrines he was often compelled to defend against opponents. He organized a number of brotherhoods in the provinces of the Rhine, and rebuilt many churches that had been destroyed in the Thirty-years' War. He died, after a brief illness, Sept. 10, 1712. His works, after being disregarded for a time, are again offered to the public; they mostly consist of contributions to practical religion. The most important are Christian Doctrine (Cologne, 1666): — History of the Church (1693): — Exposition of the Mass (1698): — Legends of Saints (1705): — An Essay on the Divine Perfections (Mayence, 1707): Life of Christ (Mayence and Augsburg, 1708). — Wetzer u. Welte (R. C.), Kirchen-Lexikonz, 12:771 sq.

## Martin V[[@Headword:Martin V]]

             (Otto de Colonna), pope from 1417 to 1431, was the son of Agapetus de Colonna, and a descendant of one of the most ancient and illustrious  families of Italy. Martin studied canon law at Perugia, and on his return to his native city, Rome, was created by Urban VI prothonotary and referendary; by Boniface IX nuncio to the States of Italy; under Innocent VII he received the appointment of cardinal deacon of St. George ad Aulicum Autreum; and by John XXIII he was appointed apostolic legate for the patrimony of St. Peter, and vicar-general of the apostolic see in Umbria. When Gregory XII, because of a breach of his oath of office, became so unpopular as to be deserted by his cardinals, Martin alone adhered to him steadfastly until he was deposed by the Council of Pisa. He was likewise a faithful supporter of his immediate predecessor, pope John, and even followed him in his flight from Constance, thus clearly foretokening the uncompromising stand which he afterwards took against all opposition to what he conceived to be the papal prerogative.

The general discontent with the abusive reign of pope John XXIII, which Gerson, the noted chancellor of the University of Paris, had severely attacked, not even hesitating to say that the pontiff was “no longer servant of servants, but John, the lord of lords,” as well as other auspicious events, had resulted in the general Council of Constance (q.v.), whose moving spirits seemed determined on reform. Their two great objects were the restoration of the Church's unity, and the reformation of the abuses which had crept in. One of their first steps, largely influenced by the emperor Sigismund, was to depose pope John. There still remained, however, two rival pontiffs, Benedict XIII and Gregory XII, each claiming the title of supreme head of the Church. The latter of these was induced to abdicate, and the former, being without any temporal support, was ignored by the council. The election of a pope was forthwith considered. The choice fell upon cardinal Otto de Colonna by an overwhelming majority of the electors from the five nations represented in the council, and the unanimous vote of the cardinals. Neander (Ch. Hist. v. 126) thus narrates the proceedings for the election: “The Germans set the example of sacrificing their own wishes and interests to the good of the Church, declaring themselves ready to give their votes for an Italian; they also prevailed on the English to yield. The French and Spaniards were refractory at first; but finally, after the invocation of the Holy Ghost, on St. Martin's day, in November, they were prevailed upon to give place for the Holy Spirit as a spirit of concord; and on the same day cardinal Otto of Colonna was chosen pope, after the election had lasted three days.” The election having taken place on St. Martin's day, the new pope, in honor of  that saint, assumed the title of Martin V. The whole assembly was in an ecstacy of joy at the result, especially because it exhibited the unanimity of hitherto conflicting parties. Martin was immediately invested with the papal robes and placed on the altar, where the emperor hastened to do him homage by kissing his feet.

But scarcely was Martin securely seated on the pontifical throne when the whole face of affairs at Constance changed, and it soon became evident that all intentions of reform, for which mainly the council had been called and John XXIII deposed. had been put away from the mind of Martin. Mild, but sagacious and resolute, “seeming to yield everything to the emperor and council, he conceded nothing.” As early as April following his election (Nov. 11, 1417), he dissolved the council, which had struggled through three years and a half for reform, without being any nearer the accomplishment of their hopes than when they began, and the spirit of advance which had inspired the uprising of Bohemia and the organization of the Lollards (q.v.) was crushed for a time, to rise only two centuries thence in a force that defied all opposition, and resulted in a schism nearly destroying the mother Church. So far from aiding a reform, Martin V's first act was one of tyranny. “The papal chancery had been the object of the longest, loudest, and most just clamor. The day after the election the pope published a brief confirming all the regulations established by his predecessors, even by John XXIII ... The form was not less dictatorial than the substance of the decree. It was an act of the pope, not of the council. It was an absolute resumption of the whole power of reformation, so far at least as the papal court, into his own hands” (Milman, Latin Christianity, 7:517). The Council of Constance, instead of shaking the papal supremacy, had, by the choice of Otto de Colonna, raised it higher than ever before by producing a pope who, as Romanists will have it, “recovered the waning reverence of Christendom.” Martin V was the product of no schism or party, but of the Church universal, and he was justified in seeking such supremacy; nor do we wonder that, in the last consistory of the cardinals at Constance, Martin V put forth a constitution by which, in direct contradiction to the principles so distinctly laid down at Constance, he directed that no one should be allowed to dispute any decision of the pope in matters of faith, and to appeal from him to a general council (Neander, v. 127). SEE INFALLIBILITY.

From Constance the pope proceeded to Florence, where he was received with the greatest official respect, and where he remained for three years, during which interval all opposition, in  the form of anti-popery, virtually died out. He then proceeded to Rome, where he was also received with demonstrations of great joy, and honored with the title of the Father of his Country. He set himself with great energy to the task of restoring the fallen glory of the Eternal City, and so well did he succeed that he received the additional title of Romulus the Second. By his address and superior sagacity, Martin V succeeded in bringing a protracted quarrel with Alphonso of Aragon to a termination, which at once secured his own ends and pacified a stubborn adversary. At the Council of Constance the next general council was appointed to meet, five years later, at Pavia. Accordingly such a council was actually opened there in the year 1423, but, on account of the spread of the pestilence called the Black Death, it was dissolved and transferred to Sienna. But at Sienna also only a few sessions were held; and, on the pretense that the small number of prelates assembled did not authorize the continuance of the council, in conformity with the determination of the Council of Constance, the next meeting was appointed to be held seven years later, in the year 1431, at Basle (comp. Fisher [G. P.], The Reformation [N.Y. 1873, 8vo], p. 43). SEE JULIAN, Cardinal. This council was intended to close the difficulty with the Hussites (q.v.), whose leaders Martin V had so summarily disposed of at Constance (q.v.), and to effect the reunion of the Greek Church. At this important crisis he died, in Rome, of an apopletic fit, in February, 1431. As a man, Martin V was of that class who form their determinations deliberately and adhere to them steadily, and, if necessary, doggedly. He was possessed of great administrative ability. He has been accused of avarice, though perhaps unjustly. He certainly favored learning, and the palaces of his cardinals were the schools of advancement for the youth of Italy. He has also been charged, and with greater justice, with nepotism, an instance of which is the appointment of his nephew at the age of fourteen as archdeacon of Canterbury. The main features of his reign are the pacification of Italy, the restoration of peace between France and England, the rebuilding of Rome, and the wars against Bohemia. He was succeeded by pope Eugenius IV. See Bower, Hist. Popes, 7:260 sq.; Neander, Ch. Hist. v. 126 sq.; Milman, Lat. Christianity, 7:513 sq.; Muratori, Script. iii, p. ii; Leo, Gesch. v. Itelien, 4:520 sq.; Trollope, Hist. Florence, vol. ii (see Index in vol. iv); Reichel, Roman See in Middle Ages, p. 492 sq.; Life of Cardinal Julian, p. 18, 57 sq., 96 sq., 103, 126 sq., 243 sq., 338; Gillett, Huss and Hussites, 2:335 sq.; Foulkes, Divisions of Christendom, vol. ii, ch. vi, p. 83, 134; Butler (C. M.), Eccles. Hist. 2:109-  113; Waddington, Ch. Hist. p. 105, 110, 137, 142, 196; Jahrb. deutsch. Theol. 1871, 3:564.

## Martin, Andre[[@Headword:Martin, Andre]]

             a French ecclesiastic and philosopher, was born in Poitou in 1621; was admitted to the oratory in 1641, and instructed in philosophy. In 1679 he became a professor of theology at Saumur, but was suspended some time after, because accused of Jansenism. He died at Poitiers, Sept. 26, 1695. He was one of the earliest advocates of the Cartesian philosophy, and wrote Philosophia Moralis Christiana (Angers, 1653). See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 34:32.

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

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Washington Co., Ind., Oct. 19, 1814. He was educated at Marietta College, Marietta, Ohio; studied theology privately; was licensed by Salem Presbytery, and in 1843 ordained pastor of Mount Vernon Church, Ind. In 1848 he became pastor of Hartford Church, Ind.; in 1852, of Bloomfield, Iowa; in 1854, of West Grove, Iowa; in 1861, of Olivet, in Mahaska Co., Iowa, where he died, Nov. 9, 1865. Mr. Martin was a man of retiring manners, a faithful pastor, an excellent presbyter, and an earnest and sound preacher. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1867, p. 312.

## Martin, Benjamin N., D.D[[@Headword:Martin, Benjamin N., D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister and educator, was born at Mr. Holly, N.J., October 20, 1816. He graduated from Yale College in 1837, and from Yale Divinity School in 1840. After serving the Congregational Church in Hadley for five years, he was installed pastor of the Fourth Presbyterian Church in Albany, N.Y. In 1852 he was appointed professor of logic, intellectual and moral philosophy, in the University of New York city, which position he held until his death, December 26, 1883. Among the clergy and literary circles professor Martin enjoyed a large acquaintance. He was very popular among the students, and gave up his whole time to the university. He contributed largely to many religious journals, and was the author of several books. One of his many lectures was delivered before the Yale Theological School, entitled The Theology of the Doctrine of the Forces. See N.Y. Observer, January 3, 1884; Cong. Year-book, 1884, page 30. (W.P.S.)

## Martin, Bon-Louis Henri[[@Headword:Martin, Bon-Louis Henri]]

             a celebrated French historian, was born at St. Quentin, February 20, 1810. He studied at Paris, and like all the other young men of his epoch, fell under the influence of the romantic school, and commenced his literary career with writing verses for periodicals. But he soon betook himself to his lifelong study of the history of France. Paul Lacroix suggested that Martiu should help him in preparing an immense historical work in forty- eight volumes. It was not to be a history of France, but a collection of extracts from chronicles and histories, extending from the earliest period to 1830. The first volume appeared in 1833, when Martin's colleague deserted him , and he concluded the book in 1836. He then wrote the first volume of a history of Soissons; and believing his studies had fitted him for the task, he commenced the prodigious labor of writing a complete history of France. His interest in the history of the Gauls makes his first volumes the most attractive of all, As successive editions were called for, he spent his time in painstaking revisions of his history, incorporating every new discovery, and keeping his book, up to the fourth edition, in 1878, entirely abreast of the knowledge of the time. In 1878 and 1879 he published a history of France from 1789 to 1830, in four volumes, as a sequel to his great work. In 1878 he was elected a member of the Academie Frangaise, in place of Thiers. Martin died December 14, 1883. With him expired the last of the great historians bred in the school of Thierry. See Hanotaux, Henri Martin (Paris, 1885), (B.P.)

## Martin, C. F[[@Headword:Martin, C. F]]

             a Congregational minister, was born in Illinois about 1821. He was educated at Knox College, Galesburg, Illinois; taught in an academy at Lisbon, Illinois, four years, and then entered the Union Theological Seminary, New York City, to prepare for the ministry. Upon the completion of his studies, he was sent by the American Missionary Society to act as missionary among the Copts in Egypt. His health failing him, he was obliged to return after a three years' stay in the East. Later he became pastor of the Congregational Church in Peru. Illinois, and remained there until 1863, when he was appointed associate secretary of the western branch of the American Tract Society. He labored among the soldiers at Chattanooga until he fell in the work, March 7, 1864.

## Martin, Claude[[@Headword:Martin, Claude]]

             a French theologian, was born at Tours in 1619. He had scarcely attained twelve years of age when he was abandoned by his mother, who entered the convent of the Ursulines. After having studied for some time in the city of Orleans, he entered the Order of the Benedictines. In 1654 he was appointed prior of Blancs-Manteaux. He afterwards filled the same charge at Saint-Corneille de Compiegne, at Saint-Serge d'Angers, at Bonne- Nouvelle de Rouen, and at Marmoutiers. He died Aug. 9, 1696. Martin was distinguished both for great learning and deep piety. His works are Meditations Chretiennes pour les Dimanches, les fetus, et les principales fites de l'annee (Paris, 1669, 2 vols. 4to): — Conduite pour la retraite du amois (Paris, 1670, 12mo): — Pratique de la regle de Saint-Benoit (Paris, 1674, 12mo): — Tie de la venerable mere Marie de l'Incarnation, superieure des Ursulines en Canada (Paris, 1677, 4to): — irditation pour  la fete et pour l'octave de sainte Ursule (Paris, 1678, 16mo). — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, vol. 33, s.v.

## Martin, Conrad[[@Headword:Martin, Conrad]]

             a Roman Catholic prelate of Germany, was born May 18, 1812, at Geismar, Prussia, and studied under Allioli and Dollinger, as well as under Gesenius, Tholuck, and Tuch. For some time religious instructor at Cologne, Martin was, in 1844, appointed professor and inspector of the clerical seminary in Bonn. In 1856 he was elected bishop of Paderborn, and from that time was the obedient servant of the papal see. As a member of the Vatican Council, he belonged to those bishops who advocated the infallibility of the pope. He was the first who openly protested against the Prussian May-laws of 1873, and thus he came in conflict with the government. He was fined, and finally imprisoned at Wesel. He escaped into Belgium, and died in exile, July 19, 1879, at St. (Guibert. He was buried at Paderborn. He wrote, Lehrbuch der katholischen Religion fur hohere Lehranstalten (5th ed. Mayence, 1873): — Lehrbuch der  katholischezn Moral (5th ed. ibid. 1865): — Die Wissenschaft von den gottlichen Dingen (3d ed. ibid. 1869): — Die Arbeiten des vatikasnischen Konzils (Paderborn, 1870): — Vaticani Concilii Documentorum Collectio (ibid. 1871): — Drei Jahre aus meinzen Leben (Mayence, 1877), describing his imprisonment and escape: — Blicke zis Jenseits (ibid. 1877): — Zeitbilder (ibid. 1879, posthumous). (B.P.)

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

             a French Protestant theologian, was born at Revel, Languedoc, in 1639. He studied philosophy at Nismes, and theology at Puy-Laurens. After acting as pastor at several places, he was obliged to leave France in consequence of the revocation of the Edict of Nantes: so great was the consideration he enjoyed that Roman Catholics themselves assisted him to flee. He next became pastor at Utrecht, and, although invited to Deventer as professor of theology in 1686, and to Haag in 1695, he remained attached to his congregation. He died at Utrecht in 1721. He wrote three volumes of sermons, some polemical and apologetic works, and some critical essays, all of which give evidence of his learning and talent. The most important of his works are Le Nouveau Testament, explique plar des notes courtes et clairses (Utrecht, 1696, 4to): the notes are partly dogmatic, partly literary, and were subsequently used by the editor of the French Roman Catholic translation of the N.T. published at Brussels (1700, 4 vols. 12mo): — Histoire du Vieux et du Nouveau Testament (Amnst. 1700, 2 vols. fol.). It contained some magnificent copper-plate engravings, and was often reprinted. But Martin's chief claim on posterity lies in his revision of the Geneva version of the Bible, which he undertook at the request of the Walloon communities. It appeared in 1707 (Amst. 2 vols. fol.), and was often reprinted in 8vo. The first edition contained theological and critical notes, with a general introduction, and special ones appended to each  book; these, however, were omitted in the subsequent popular editions. It was approved by the Synod of Leuwarden in 1710. Martin's translation, subsequently revised by Osterwald, is still the one most in use in the Protestant churches of France. Among his other works we notice Sermons sur divers textes de l'Ecriture Sainte (Amst. 1708. 8vo): — L'Excellence de la foi et de ses effets, expliquee en xx sermons (Amst. 1710, 2 vols. 8vo): — Trait de la Religion naturelle (Amst. 1713, 8-vo; translated into Dutch in 1720, English in 1720, and German in 1735): — Le vrai sens du Psaume cx (Amst. 1715, 8vo). His dissertation on natural religion caused quite a long and spirited controversv with the Arian Emlyn (q.v.). See Niceron, Memoires, vol. xxi; Chaufepie, Dict. hist.; Prosper Marchand, Dict.; Nayral, Biog. Castraise, vol. ii; Haag, La France Protestante, vol. vii; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 34:34; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 9:130.

## Martin, Enoch R[[@Headword:Martin, Enoch R]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Washington Co., Ind., about the year 1811. He received a good common-school education; studied theology privately; was licensed by Cincinnati Presbytery, and ordained by Salem Presbytery in 1836. He preached for several years to the Matthew Vernon and Utica churches, in Clark Co., Ind.; thence removed to Jefferson Co.. Lnd., and preached to the Mizpeh, Sharon, and Matthew Vernon churches, and afterwards became pastor of Sharon Church, Ill. In 1862 he accepted a call to the Pisgah and Sharon churches, Ind. He died Nov. 26, 1863. Mr. Martin was a very useful minister, and a sincere Christian; he did. much for the cause of education and the suppression of intemperance. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1865, p. 167.

## Martin, Gregory[[@Headword:Martin, Gregory]]

             an English Roman Catholic theologian of the 16th century, was a native of Sussex, and was admitted a scholar of St. John's College, Oxford, in 1557. He became professor of Hebrew at Douay, and subsequently at Rheims. He died in 1582. He is supposed to have been the author, or one of the authors, of the Rheims translation of the New Testament, and of the Old Testament in the Douay version. He wrote several theologico-controversial pamphlets, among them A Discovery of the manifold Corruptios of the Holy Scriptures by the Heretics of our Days, specially the L'English Sectaries (printed in Fulke's Defence of the Translations, Parker Society,  1843). — Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth. s.v.; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. s.v.

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

             a Protestant theologian of Geneva, was born in 1794. While yet a student, he was obliged to take part in the campaigns against Germany, which the first Napoleon inaugurated. He fought in the battles at Leipsic and Waterloo, and in 1815 went to Geneva. For two years he followed commercial pursuits, and then betook himself to theological study. In 1818 he was enrolled as a student, and in 1822 graduated, presenting for his thesis, L'Unite de la Foi. Martin soon distinguished himself, both as an instructor and pulpit orator, and his writings were not only often reprinted, but some of them, as L'Oraison Dominicale, were even translated into other languages. He died in 1874. See Bouvier, Jacques Martin, Predicateur Patriofe, in the Etrennes Religieuses (1877), and the same in Lichtenberger's Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Martin, Jacques de[[@Headword:Martin, Jacques de]]

             a French ecclesiastic, noted as a writer on philosophical subjects, was born in the diocese of Mirepoix, May 11, 1684; was educated at ‘Toulouse; entered the order of the Congregation of St. Maur in 1709; taught the humanities at Sorize; went to Paris in 1727, and died there Sept. 5, 1751. He was a multifarious writer, and possessed an unusual acquaintance with the most diversified subjects of learning. But he was censured for the immodesty of his illustrations. His most important work is La Religion des Gaulois (Paris, 1727, 2 vols. 4to), in which he attempts to prove that the religion of the Gauls was derived from that of the patriarchs; and that, consequently, an illustration of their religious ceremonies must tend to throw light on many dark passages in the Scriptures. He wrote also Explicastions de plusieults textes dtficiles de l'Ecriture Sainte: — Ie l'origine de l'amine, selon le sentimenzt de Saint Augusstin (1736, 12mo). See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 34:37.

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

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Union District, S. C., May 14,1801. He graduated at the North Carolina University, at Chapel Hill, N. C., in 1825; studied divinity under the care of Dr. Cunningham, of Concord Church, Green Co., Ala.; was licensed in 1827, and soon after ordained as a domestic missionary in West Florida and South Alabama. In 1830 he took charge of the churches at Linden and Prairie Bluffs, Ala.; in 1837 moved to Louisville, Miss., where he organized a Church; in 1841 became pastor of a Church at Multona Springs, Miss.; in 1848 removed to Memphis, Tenn., where he taught school till 1850, when he went to Arkansas, and organized several churches. He died Sept. 14,1863. Mr. Martin possessed an excellent mind; his education was sound and classical, his piety devout and habitual. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1867, p. 445.

## Martin, James, D.D[[@Headword:Martin, James, D.D]]

             an Associate minister, was born at Albany, N.Y., May 12, 1796. He graduated from Union College, Schenectady, in 1819, and after a course in theology in the theological seminary of Philadelphia, was licensed Sept. 2, 1822, and soon after took charge of an Associate Reformed congregation at Albany. He edited the Religious Monitor in 1833. In 1842 he was elected professor of didactic theology and Hebrew in the theological seminary at Cannonsburg, Pennsylvania. He died June 15, 1846. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, IX, 3:112.

## Martin, Johann[[@Headword:Martin, Johann]]

             a Reformed theologian,who died at Groningen in 1665, is the author of, Analysis Popularis in Mfalachiam Prophetam: — Analysis Popularis in Epistolas ad Philippenses et Thessalonicenses. See Benthem, Holldndischer Kirchen-Staat; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

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

             (1), an English Baptist minister of the 18th century, was in early life a mechanic; but, brought under the influence of Gospel teaching, he studied, and became the minister of a Baptist congregation at London. He published  a number of occasional Sermons and theological treatises (1763-1807). Of these, the most important was The Conquest of Canaan (Lond. 1797, 12mo). Of his occasional sermons, the one on Act 14:7, deserves special mention, entitled The Gospel of our Salvation (Lond. 1796, 8vo). Besides, there were published three volumes of his sermons, one treating of The Character of Christ (1793, 8vo); the other two were edited by Thomas Palmer (1817, 2 vols. 8vo). John Martin is described by Ivimy (Baptists) as “a man of strong mental powers,” and as a truly “evangelical preacher.” See his Autobiography (1797, 12mo). See also Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. s.v.; Allibone, Dict. Brit. and Amer. Auth. s.v.

## Martin, John (2)[[@Headword:Martin, John (2)]]

             (2), an English painter of Biblical subjects, was born near Hexham, Northumberland, July 19, 1789; went to London in 1806, and, after some years spent in obscure struggles, made his first appearance as an exhibitor at the Royal Academy in 1812. His picture was entitled Sadak in Search of the Waters of Oblivion, and attracted much notice. It was followed within two years by the Expulsion from Paradise, Clytee, and Joshua commanding the Sun to stand still. The last of these works was a great success in point of popularity, but it was also the cause of a quarrel between Martin and the English Academy, in consequence of which he never obtained any distinction from the society. From this period till nearly the close of his life he incessantly painted pictures in a style which was considered “sublime” by the same sort of people who thought Montgomery's Satan and Pollok's Course of Time equal to Paradise Lost. The principal of these productions are Belshazzar's Feast (1821); Creation (1824); The Deluge (1826); The Fall of Nineveh (1828); Pandemonium (1841); Morning and Evening (1844); The Last Man (1850). He died at Douglas, Isle of Man, Feb. 9, 1854. — Chambers, Cyclop. s.v. See Autobiography of John Martin in the Athenoeum (1854).

## Martin, John Nicholas[[@Headword:Martin, John Nicholas]]

             a distinguished minister of the Lutheran Church, was born in the duchy of Deux Ponts, or Zweibrücken, in Rhenish Bavaria, and came to this country about the middle of the 18th century, in company with a Lutheran colony, as their spiritual teacher. They landed in Philadelphia with the intention of settling permanently on the rich soil of Pennsylvania, but, as the land they desired could. not be procured, they passed on to the valley of the  Shenandoah, whither many of the German emigrants had already been attracted; but the congregation to which Mr. Martin ministered finally determined to locate in South Carolina, in a district between the Broad and Saluda rivers, a favorite spot with the Germans of that day in the South. The German population in this region increased fast, and Lutheran churches were established on both sides of the rivers. Here Martin remained for many years, all the time officiating in his vernacular German. In 1776 he took charge of the Lutheran Church in Charleston. This was his last field of labor. Many reminiscences of his life and services during this eventful period of our country's history are still preserved. The American Revolution interrupted the peaceful course of his ministry, and exposed him to various annoyances and trials. His naturally ardent temperament, as well as his love of liberty, led him to espouse the cause of the American colonies with great zeal. and patriotic devotion. He was closely watched by the enemy; and when it was ascertained that he would not pray for the king, and that his ministrations were not favorable to the royal cause, his pulpit labors were interdicted, he was put under arrest, and a guard placed over him. Subsequently his property was confiscated, and he driven from the city. He remained in the interior of the state until the conclusion of the war. On his return in 1783, although aged and his physical vigor gone, his congregation still clung to him. Thesy urged him to resume his pastoral relations; but he ministered to them only until a regular pastor could be procured for them from Germany. In 1787 he was released from further service, with a vote of thanks for the fidelity with which he had ministered to the spiritual interests of his people. He now retired to his little farm near the city. His physical as well as mental powers gradually failed him, and he closed his honored and useful life July 27, 1795, illustrating in his death the principles which through a long life he had advocated. Mr. Martin was faithfully devoted to his work, and exceedingly useful as a minister of the Gospel. He possessed an integrity that no considerations of personal interest or expediency could seduce from the straight line of duty. He was a man of great courage and decision, firm and persistent in the maintenance of his principles, with an energy of will and a zeal which no discouragements could repress and no failure abate. In the vindication of what he believed was the truth, he vas prepared for any emergency. The people appreciated his sagacity, and relied on his clear, practical judgment. He steadfastly devoted himself to their interests. It was the constant burden of his heart and the earnest purpose of his life to honor Christ in the  salvation of souls. He was regarded by the community in which he lived as a great blessing. His death was considered a public calamity. (M. L. S.)

## Martin, John Satchell, D.D[[@Headword:Martin, John Satchell, D.D]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal-Church, South, was born at Alexandria, Virginia, September 7 1815. He joined the Baltimore Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1835, and in 1866 entered the ministry of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. He was secretary of his conference from 1853 until his death, July 8, 1888. In 1856 and again in 1860 he was a member of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, and subsequently a member of every General Conference of the same Church, and secretary of that body in 1882 and 1886. He was secretary of the great Methodist Centenary also. See Minutes of Annual Conferences of the M.E. Church, South, 1888, page 157.

## Martin, John Wynne, D.D[[@Headword:Martin, John Wynne, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Ireland, and entered the ministry there. In 1837 he became principal of the Deaf and Dumb Asylum at Belfast, in 1840 of that at Dublin, and in 1846 returned to that at Belfast. In 1853 he sailed for America; in 1857 became rector at Doe Run, Pennsylvania; in 1880 professor in Lincoln University, and afterwards labored in the City Mission, N.Y., and as principal of the Beaver Academy, Pennsylvania. He died at Norristown, June 11, 1883. See Nevin, Presbyterian Encyclop. s.v.

## Martin, Margaret Maxwell[[@Headword:Martin, Margaret Maxwell]]

             a lady Methodist noted as a writer, was born at Dumfries, Scotland, in 1807, emigrated to America, and was married in 1836 to the Rev. William Martin, a Methodist divine. She has published Methodism, or Christianity in Earnest, and other religious works.

## Martin, Saint-Marquis Louis Claude De[[@Headword:Martin, Saint-Marquis Louis Claude De]]

             called “the Unknown Philosopher,” a noted French mystic, was born at Amboise (Touraine) Jan. 18,1743; was educated for the bar; preferred a military life, and, through the influence of M. de Choiseul, obtained a commission. The regiment to which he was assigned contained several officers who had been initiated into a sort of mystical freemasonry by the  Portuguese mystic Martinez Pasqualis; he soon became enamored with mystical doctrines, and read largely in that line. Mysticism, however, was at that time confined to rather narrow limits in France; the mind of nearly the whole country was absorbed in the rising school of materialism, and to combat the latter became the task of our obscure officer of the regiment of Foix. Saint-Martin soon threw up his commission, and gave himself wholly to writing and meditation, bent to crush, by every means in his power, the cold, heartless form of speculation which was then everywhere the order of the day. First he translated the works of Jacob Boehne; but finally he originated a religious mysticism, which, according to Morell (Hist. of Philos. in the 19th Cent. p. 208), consisted of the principles of the Cambridge Platonist Henry More, “reared up under the guidance of a versatile and enthusiastic spirit, as a barrier against the philosophical sensationalism of Condillac and the religious skepticism of Voltaire.” But as all mystical schools have sooner or later found their natural issue in fanaticism, so Saint-Martin also struck against this self-same rock, and, despite the guarded manner in which he handled theological questions, the heresies contained in his writings are neither few nor small. Yet, notwithstanding many feats and vagaries of an ultra eccentric description, Saint-Martin has left us one of the best refutations of sensualist errors on record, and his influence against the materialism of the 18th century has to our very day failed to receive the recognition deserved. With his eyes fixed upon the invisible world, he passed unscathed through all the horrors of the French Revolution; he saw the Reign of Terror, the Directory, the Consulate, and quietly and happily closed a life of great literary activity at Aulnav, near Paris, Oct. 13,1803.

Among Saint-Martin's achievements, his victory over the sensationalist Garat deserves especial notice. “The legislators of the first French Revolution, in their attempt to remodel society after the Reign of Terror, had taken as their code of laws, and as their universal panacea, a debasing theory, which they, however, imagined would regenerate the world, and according to which they most naturally therefore wished to train the new generation. Such was the origin of the Ecole Normale, subsequently remodeled and organized by Napoleon, and still rendering the greatest services as a seminary of teachers. Saint-Martin had been sent by the district he inhabited to attend the lectures delivered in that school, and, of course, was expected to receive as sound gospel the teaching of the celebrated philosopher Garat, whose prelections on ‘ideology' were  scarcely anything else but a rechauffe of Condillac, dressed up with much taste, but still more assurance. A disciple of Jacob Bcehme, the young mystic, felt that what society required was not the deification of matter, nor the Encyclopadie made easy; he boldly rose up to refute the professor, and, by a reference to the third volume of the Debats des Ecoles Normales, the reader can follow all the circumstances of a discussion which ended in Garat's discomfiture. M. Caro (Saint-Martin's biographer) has supplied a valuable resume of the whole affair — an extremely important epoch in the life of Saint-Martin.” M. Caro, in his Essai sur lea vie et la Doctrine de Saint-Martin (Paris, 1856), has given a complete list of Saint-Martin's works. They are rather numerous. The best are the following: Des Erreurs et de la Versits, ou les hornmes rappeles au Principe universel de la Science (1775); L'Homme de Desir; and De l'Esprit des Choses, ou coup d'oeil Philosophiques sur la nature des etres, et sur l'objet de leur existence (1800, 2 vols. 8vo). These supply a clue to the main features of the author's character, and by a careful study of them we are enabled to ascertain the exact position he occupies in the gallery of modern metaphysicians.

M. Damiron, in reviewing the life and works of Saint-Martin (Archives Litteraires, 1804), affords us the following resume of Saint-Martin's views: “The system of Saint-Martin aims at explaining everything by means of man. Man is to him the key to every phenomenon, and the image of all truth. Taking, therefore, literally the famous oracle of Delphi, ‘Nosce te ipsum,' he maintains that, if we would fall into no mistakes respecting existence, and the harmony of all beings in the universe, we have only to understand ourselves, inasmuch as the body of man has a necessary relation to everything visible, and his spirit is the type of everything that is invisible. What we should study, then, are the physical faculties, whose exercise is often influenced by the senses and exterior objects, and the moral faculties or the conscience, which supposes free-will. It is in this study that we must seek for truth, and we shall find in ourselves all the necessary means of arriving at it:” this it is which our author calls natural revelation. For example: “The smallest attention,” he says, “suffices to assure us that we can neither communicate nor form any idea without its being preceded by a picture or image of it, engendered by our own understanding; in this way it is that we originate the plan of a building or any other work. Our creative faculty is vast, active, inexhaustible; but, in examining it closely, we see that it is only secondary, temporary, dependent, i.e. that it owes its origin  to a creative faculty, which is superior, independent, and universal, of which ours is but a feeble copy. Man, therefore, is a type, which must have a prototype, and that prototype is God.” This extract affords a fair insight, we think, into the philosophical mysticism by which Saint-Martin attempted to supplant the shallow materialism and growing infidelity of his age, and to induce his countrymen to take a deeper insight into the constitution of the human mind, and its close connection with the divine. See, besides M. Caro's work above alluded to, Damiron, Memnoirespour servir a l'histoire dephilosophie au 18e siecle, vol. i; Malter, Saint-Martin, Le Philosophe inconnu (1862); Morell, History of Modern Philosophy, p. 208, 209; London Quarterly Review, 1856 (Jan.); 1857 (April), p. 177; Methodist Quarterly Review, 1863 (April), p. 339. (J. H. W.)

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

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Chestnut Level, Lancaster County, Pennsylvania, January 9, 1767. He was converted in his twenty-second year, graduated from the University of Pennsylvania in 1790, was licensed by the Baltimore Presbytery in May 1793, and soon after was installed pastor of the congregation at Slateridge, York County, laboring there faithfully for five years, and then accepted a call from the congregation of Chaneford, where he remained until 1812. He died June 28, 1845. Dr. Martin published several sermons: two in which the doctrine of election is proved and illustrated (1806); one on Regeneration, printed in the Spruce Street Lectures; and one entitled Children are an Heritage of the Lord. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 4:118.

## Martin, Sarah[[@Headword:Martin, Sarah]]

             an English philanthropist, was born near Yarmouth in 1791, and died in 1843. She was distinguished for her labors in the cause of prison reform. See Brief Biographies, by Samuel Smiles; Rev. Erskine Neale, Christianity and Infidelity Contrasted; Edinburgh Review (April), 1847.

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

             an English jurist noted for the part he took in the Marian persecution, was born at Cerne, in Dorsetshire, in the first half of the 16th century, and was educated at Winchester School and at New College, Oxford. In 1555 he was made chancellor of the diocese of Winchester. Martin wrote in Latin, Life of William of Wykeham, the founder of New College. He vehemently opposed the marriage of priests, and thus also created considerable excitement. He also took part with Story in the trial of archbishop Cranmer at Oxford. He died in 1584. See Hook, Eccles. Biog. s.v.; Strype, Annals; Wood, Athenae Oxon.

## Martin, William Wisner[[@Headword:Martin, William Wisner]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Rahway. N. J., Dec. 18, 1837. He received a most careful parental training; pursued his preparatory studies in the Academy at Brooklyn, N. Y.; graduated at Yale College, as salutatorian of his class, in 1860; studied divinity at the Union Theological Seminary, New York City, where he graduated in 1863; and was immediately licensed and ordained as a home missionary to the Pacific coast. On his arrival there, he began his labors in Sonora, and joined Sierra  Nevada Presbytery; thence he supplied the Howard Street Church, San Francisco, for a few months, and subsequently accepted a call from the Church at San José, but, before his installation took place, was taken ill and died, Oct. 16, 1865. Mr. Martin was characterized by an exceedingly frank and genial disposition, clear and discriminating habits of thought, and thorough, decided Christian principles. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1867, p. 311.

## Martina[[@Headword:Martina]]

             a Christian martyr in the reign of the tyrant Maximin, was a noble and beautiful virgin of Rome, who for the sake of Christ suffered manifold tortures, which were finished at length by the sword of the executioner, A.D. 235. Multitudes of Christians, in the course of this three years' persecution, were slain without trial, and buried indiscriminately in heaps, fifty or sixty being sometimes cast into a pit together. — Fox, Martyrs, p. 25, 26.

## Martinalia[[@Headword:Martinalia]]

             SEE MARTINMAS.

## Martindale, Stephen[[@Headword:Martindale, Stephen]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Maryland in 1788, and entered the itinerant ministry in 1808. He continued in active service for fifty-three years, filling the most important appointments in the Philadelphia and New York conferences. For twenty years he held the office of presiding elder on the Rhinebeck, Long Island, Prattsville, New York, and Poughkeepsie districts. In all these posts his fidelity, prudence, and capacity were amply shown; and through his long term of ministerial service he maintained an unblemished and even exalted reputation. He was elected to nearly every General Conference between 1820 and 1856. He  died at Tarrytown, N. Y., May 23, 1860. See Smith, Memorials N. Y. and N. Y. East Conf. p. 127.

## Martindale, Theodore Dwight[[@Headword:Martindale, Theodore Dwight]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born, of Congregational parents, at Greenfield, Mass., Nov. 28, 1820; was educated at the Western Reserve Seminary; taught for a time after his conversion; served in the local ministry for several years; was admitted into the Ohio Conference in the fall of 1852, and appointed to Blendon Circuit. His subsequent appointments were Maysville, Marietta, Logan, Pickerington, and Newark, when, in 1862, his connection with the Conference was dissolved, and thenceforth he sustained the relation of local preacher. In the fall of 1871 the presiding elder of the Zanesville District, at the request of the Circuit, appointed him as a supply with the venerable David Smith on the Hebron Charge, in the bounds of which he resided. He entered upon the work with commendable zeal and with general acceptability, but died on April 7, 1872. He was gifted and fluent in language, and his pulpit efforts generally ranged above mediocrity. See S. C. Riker, in West. Christ. Advocate, July 10, 1872.

## Martinet, August[[@Headword:Martinet, August]]

             a Roman Catholic divine, who died October 11, 1877, at Bamberg, doctor and professor, is the author of, Hebraische Sprache-Schule fur Universitaten (Bamberg, 1835): — Chrestomathie aus modernen neuhebraischen Schriften entnommen (ibid. 1837). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:117; Ftirst, Bibl. Jud. 2:232. (B.P.)

## Martinet, Louis-Franois[[@Headword:Martinet, Louis-Franois]]

             a Roman Catholic divine, was born at Epernay, diocese of Rheims, April 19, 1753. At the age of sixteen he entered the regular canons of the Congregation of France, and during his course of studies at the abbey of St. Genevieve, of Paris, he was particularly favored by his superiors, who early made him teacher of philosophy and theology. Ordained priest at the age of twenty-five, he was made prior of Daon, in the diocese of Angers. It was in this capacity that he was elected delegate to the provincial assembly of the clergy of Anjou, and later to the states-general of 1789. Faithful to the principles of the minority of the Constituent Assembly, he was constantly opposed to the legislative measures which, under the semblance of a useful reform, had a destructive and ruinous object. He succeeded in escaping persecution, and emigrated to England. There he did not share in the illusions of his companions in exile of a speedy return to France; and, with a view to exercising his ministry usefully, he applied himself to the study of English. Gifted with indefatigable industry, and severely ascetic in his habits, he was enabled to regulate his time judiciously, and thus attain great success. In 1804 he returned to France, and at the period of the  concordat was elected priest of Courbevoie. He passed from there to the parish of Saint-Leu-Saint-Giles, at Paris. It is to Martinet that we owe the preservation of the church of Saint-Leu; and, notwithstanding the opposition of M. Frochot, the prefect of the Seine, he succeeded in interesting powerful protectors, and the church was not abandoned. They even donated to him considerable funds for the reparation and embellishment of the edifice. In 1820 he was made priest of the parish church of Saint Laurent, and, although advanced in age, his zeal and activity did not diminish in his administration. He died May 30, 1836. Martinet was one of the most worthy priests of the clergy of Paris. A knowledge of a great variety of subjects, an unbiased, clear, and methodical mind, a pleasing and easy elocution, were increased by that urbanity of manner, that delicacy of tact, and that exquisite politeness which he observed in his habitual relations with persons of distinguished rank. — Biographie Universelle, Supplem., vol. 73, s.v.

## Martini, Antonio[[@Headword:Martini, Antonio]]

             an Italian prelate, was born at Prato in 1720. Having chosen an ecclesiastical career, and possessing a good knowledge of the ancient languages, he occupied his time in translating the sacred writings into Italian. Pius VI, informed of his merits, appointed him bishop of Bobio (1778); afterwards the grand duke of Tuscany called him to the archiepiscopacy of Florence (1781). Martini was greatly opposed to all new ideas, and decidedly manifested his opinion in haughtily condemning the doctrines of Ricci in the synod.

## Martini, Christian David Anton[[@Headword:Martini, Christian David Anton]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born January 22, 1761. He studied at Gottingen, and for some time acted as teacher at his native place. In 1789 he was made professor of theology at Rostock, in 1791 doctor of theology. In 1804 he was called to Wurzburg, in 1807 to Altdorf, and in 1809 to Munich. Martin died September 1, 1815. He wrote, Commentatio Philologico-Critica in Locum Esaiae 52:13, 53:12 (Rostock, 1791): — Eusebii Caesareensis de Divinitate Christi Sententia, etc. (ibid. 1795): — Persecutionis Christianorum sub Imperatoribus Romanis Causae et Effectus (ibid. 1802-1803): — Ueber die Einfuhrung der christl. Religion als Staatsreligion, etc. (Munich, 1814). See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:219, 557, 574, 590, 597, 598. (B.P.)

## Martini, Corneille[[@Headword:Martini, Corneille]]

             a learned Belgian Lutheran, was born at Antwerp in 1567, and was educated in Germany, where he took the degree of doctor of arts and theology. In 1591 he taught logic in his native city, and for thirty years filled that chair successfully. He died at Helmstidt, Dec. 17, 1621, at the age of fifty-four. His works are De Subjecto etsini Logicae (Lemgo, 1597, 12mo): — Metaphysica Commentatio, compendiose. succincte, et perspicue comprehendens universam metaphysices doctrinam (Strasburg, 1605, 12mo, et al.): — De Analysi logica (Helmst. 1619, et al.): — Commentarius in Alpuleii librum περὶ ἑρμηνείας (Frankfort, 1621, 12mo): — Commentariorum logicortuim adversus Ramistas Libri quinque  (Helmst. 1623, 12mo): — Ethica: — Compendium Theologiae. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, vol. 34, s.v.

## Martini, Giambattista[[@Headword:Martini, Giambattista]]

             best known under the title of “Padre Martini,” was born at Bologna in 1706. Early in youth he entered the Order of St. Francis, and, prompted by a spirit of inquiry and love of antiquity, soon set out on travels which he extended to Asia. On his return to Europe, he devoted himself to the study of music under the celebrated Ant. Perti. In 1723 he became maestro di capella of the convent of his order, which office he retained till his death in 1784. “He was,” says Dr. Burney, who knew him well, “regarded during the last fifty years of his life as the most profound harmonist, and the best acquainted with the art and science of music, in Italy. All the great masters of his time were ambitious of becoming his disciples and proud of his approbation.” Martini was also a composer, and produced much music for the Church, which was formerly held in esteem. His sixty canons in the unison, for two, three, and four voices, are still known, and admired for their smoothness and grace. His reputation depends, however, mainly on his Essay on Counterpoint (Bologna, 1774, 2 vols. folio), and on his History of Music (1781, 3 vols. 4to). See English Cyclo s.v.

## Martini, Jacob[[@Headword:Martini, Jacob]]

             a Lutheran theologian, was born at Langenstein, near Dresden, Saxony, October 16, 1570, and died at Wittenberg, May 30, 1649, doctor and professor of theology. He wrote, Disputationum de Messia Decas: — De Causa Peccati: — Libri iii de Elohim:Vindiciae Ecclesiae Lutheranae contra Valerianum Magnum: — Systema Theologicum: — Collegium Anti-Calvinianum: — Collegium Anti-Photinianum: — Questiones Biblicae in Genesin: — Partitiones et Questiones Metaphysicae: — De Theologiae Constitutione et Verbo Dei Scripto: — Quomodo Sola Fides Justificet. See Witte, Memoriae Theologorum; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Martini, Martino[[@Headword:Martini, Martino]]

             a Jesuit missionary, was born at Trent in 1614, visited China, and published, after his return, De Bello Tartarico in Sinis, which was translated into the principal European languages; also an excellent map of China (“Atlas Sinensis”), and a History of China previous to the Christisan Aera. He died in 1661.

## Martini, Raymond[[@Headword:Martini, Raymond]]

             a Spanish Dominican friar, noted for his great attainments as an Orientalist, was born at Sobirats, Catalonia, near the middle of the 13th century. At a general chapter held at Toledo in 1250, Martini was selected as among the most promising and talented of his order to be educated as a defender of the faith. Spain was at this time the great center of Jewish and Mohammedan scholarship, and the Dominican general Raymond de Penafort was bent upon a polemical war with the “heretics.” To defray the expenses of educating such of the priests and friars as might act as polemics, Raymond had secured a pension from the kings of Castile and  Aragon. Both Hebrew and Arabic were assiduously studied by Martini, who, after having sufficiently qualified himself by the mastery of these Shemitic tongues, promptly commenced his attack on the Jews in a work entitled Pugiofidei, which he finished in 1278. He is also reputed to have written Capistrum Judaeorum, and also A Confutation of the Alcoran. The time of his decease is not generally known. The great knowledge which Martini displayed in his comments on the books and opinions of the Jews, has made some unjustly imagine that he was of that religion. The “Pugio fidei” is said to have been greatly enlarged after Martini's death. We are told that Bosquet, who died bishop of Montpelier, fell upon the manuscript, while he was with great ardor rummaging all the corners of the library of the College de Foix at Toulouse, about 1.629, read it, and, after copying some things out of it, gave it to James Spiegel, a learned German, and his preceptor in the Hebrew tongue. Spiegel advised Maussac to publish it; but the latter, though very able to do it himself, had for an assistant Mr. de Voisin, son of a counselor in the Parliament at Bourdeaux, who took upon him the greatest part of the task. Thomas Turc, general of the Dominicans, was very earnest in spurring on the promoters of this edition; and, not satisfied with soliciting them by letters equally importunate and obliging, he gave orders that they should be provided with all the manuscripts of the “Pugio fidei” that could be recovered. In short, the Dominican Order interested themselves so much in it that they bore the charges of the impression, which was made at Paris in 1651.

## Martinique, Or Martinico[[@Headword:Martinique, Or Martinico]]

             called by the natives Madiana, one of the Lesser Antilles, lying between latitude 14° 23' 43' and 14° 52' 47” north, and longitude 60° 50' and 61° 19' west, is forty miles long, about twelve miles broad, and has an area of about 380 square miles, and 160,831 inhabitants, of whom upwards of 87,000 are black. The island was discovered by the Spaniards in 1493, colonized by the French in 1635, and now belongs to them. It is of an oval form, with much indented coasts, and is everywhere mountainous; the highest peak, Mount Pelee, being considerably more than 4000 feet above the sea-level. There are six extinct volcanoes on the island, one of them with an enormous crater. The cultivated portion (about one third of the whole of Martinique) lies chiefly along the coast. The climate is moist, but, except during the rainy season, is not unhealthy, and the soil is very productive. Of the land in cultivation, about three fifths are occupied with sugarcane.  The government of the island consists of a governor, a privy council of seven, a and a colonial council of thirty members. Slavery was abolished in 1848. The island is liable to dreadful hurricanes. The capital is Fort Royal, but St. Pierre (q.v.) is the largest town and the seat of commerce. The average annual fall of rain is eighty-four inches. The year is divided into two seasons; one commences about Oct. 15, and lasts some nine months, and the other, or rainy season, lasts the remainder of the year. During the short season the yellow-fever prevails largely. The inhabitants of the Martinique Islands are usually adherents of the Church of Rome.

## Martinists[[@Headword:Martinists]]

             a Russian sect of mystics, which originated near the opening of our aera, as a result of the labors of St. Martin, the French philosopher whose life and labors we have spoken of above. The Martinists allied themselves with freemasonry, and spread from Moscow over all Russia. Aiming to supplant infidelity by mysticism, they read largely the writings of German mystics and pietists; Arndt and Spener were special favorites, and were widely scattered in translations. Catharine II opposed the sect, but it continued to flourish notwithstanding all persecution, until the despotic reign of Nicholas I, when, with many other sects, the Martinists were crushed. Under Alexander I, the Martinists, favored by the patronage of prince Galitzin, enjoyed their “golden age.”

## Martinius, Matthias[[@Headword:Martinius, Matthias]]

             a German Reformed theologian, was born in 1572, and became eminent as a scholar, preacher, and instructor. He was made courtpreacher in 1595, professor at Herborn in the following year, and placed in charge of the grammar-school connected with the academy at that place in 1597. He continued in that relation during ten years; and in 1610, after an interval spent in preaching at Emden, accepted a call from the Council of Bremen to become the rector of the famous gymnasium of their city, and to fill the chair of theology in its faculty. Under his direction this institution rose to great prosperity, and students, even from many foreign lands, thronged its halls. In 1618 he was delegated to the Synod of Dort, where he was noted for the moderation of his views. The course of that body never received his approval, although his name appears among its signers, and in later years he was often heard to exclaim, “O Dort, would to God I had never seen thee!” He died in 1630 of apoplexy, and was buried at Bremen. His chief  work, the Lexicon philologico-etymologicum, is still used. His other writings, of which sixty-eight have been enumerated, are unimportant. The Lexicon was published at Bremen in folio in 1623, in a second edition at Frankfort in 1665, and at Utrecht in 1697. — Herzog, Real-Encyklopädie, 20:113 sq. (G. M.)

## Martinmas[[@Headword:Martinmas]]

             or the Mass of St. Martin, a feast kept on the 11th of November in honor of St. Martin of Tours. The feast was often a merry one. In England and Scotland the winter's provisions were, in olden days, cured and stored up at that time of the year, and were hence called a mart. Luther derived his first name from being born on the eve of this festival; in Germany called also Martinalia. See Eadlie, Eccles. Cyclop. s.v.; Regensburg Real- Encyklop. 9:312, Colossians 1, (3).

## Martins Day, St[[@Headword:Martins Day, St]]

             SEE MARTINMAS.

## Martinus, Polonus[[@Headword:Martinus, Polonus]]

             or BOHEMUS, a Polish chronicler and ecclesiastic of the 13th century, was born at Troppau, in Silesia; entered the Dominican Order; became chaplain and confessor to pope Clement IV, and to several of his successors; and in 1278 was appointed archbishop of Gnesen. He died shortly after at Bologna (1278). He wrote valuable works in the department of ecclesiastical history, including biographies of several popes. His most important production is the Chronicon de Summis Pontificibus. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 34:27.

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

             known as “the scholar missionary,” one of the most distinguished missionaries of modern times, was born of humble parentage at Truro, in Cornwall, England, Feb. 18, 1781. He was educated in the grammar-school of his native place; sought for a scholarship in Corpus Christi College, Oxford, but, failing in this, he went to Cambridge, and entered St. John's College in October, 1797. He was at that time outwardly moral, but still unconverted. But, while at college, the death of his father directed his mind to religious subjects, and, by his association with the celebrated evangelical preacher Charles Simeon, he soon became one of the most thoroughly  Christian students in the college, where, in 1801, he came out “senior wrangler,” the highest academical honor adjudged. He was chosen fellow of his college in March, 1802, and obtained the first prize for the best Latin prose composition in the university. Believing it to be his duty to preach the Gospel, he now devoted himself to the work of the ministry. England was at this time wide-awake in the cause of missions, and Martyn finally determined that he also must go forth to propagate Christianity among the nations who sat in darkness. He sought to be employed by the “Society for Missions to Africa and the East,” now the “Church Missionary Society;” but, as he was too young to take holy orders, his appointment was postponed. He was ordained deacon Oct. 22,1803; was made bachelor of divinity in March, 1805, and was at the same time ordained priest, and, obtaining an appointment as missionary to India, embarked Sept. 10, 1805.

Henry Martyn reached Madras April 21, 1806. He stopped for a while at Calcutta, where he continued the study of Hindostance, which he had commenced in England, and applied himself also to Sanscrit, as the key to most of the Eastern languages, and to Persian. He then removed to the station of Dinapore, where he was appointed to labor, primarily among the English troops there posted, and the families of the civilians. But to the natives also he constantly addressed himself, and, amid all these labors, yet found time to complete a translation of the English liturgy into Hindostanee (Feb. 24, 1807), a translation of the N.T. in that language, and, this finished, commenced a version of the N.T. in Persian, in which he had the assistance of an Arab translator, Sabat (q.v.).

Near the close of 1809, Mr. Martyn commenced his first public ministrations among the heathen at Cawnpore, whither he had removed in April of this year. His auditory sometimes counted as many as eight hundred. They were young, old, male, female, bloated, wizened, clothed with abominable rags, nearly naked, some plastered with mud or cow- dung, others with matted, uncombed locks, streaming to the heels, others bald or scabby-headed. The authorities seem to have had a wide-open eye on his proceedings, and anything which appeared to graze roughly against the superstitions of his auditory would at once have wrecked his scheme. Finally, exhausted with these and other labors, his health began to give way, and he was recommended either to try the effects of a sea-voyage, or to return to England for a time. Having embraced the latter proposal, he determined to travel by way of Persia and Arabia, with a view of submitting his Persian and Arabic translations of the N.T. to the revision  and critical judgment of learned Persians. He left Cawnpore in the last of September, 1810, and in the early summer of 1811 landed at Bushire, and thence proceeded to Shiraz, where he resided for more than ten months. Here he created great interest by the religious discussions which, as the sole advocate of the Christian faith, he carried on in the crowded conclaves of Mollahs and Sofis. He completed his Persian version of the N.T. Feb. 24, 1812, and a Persian translation of the Psalms six weeks later. From Shiraz he went to Tabriz, resolved on visiting the king in his summer camp, and presenting his work in person. His interview with the vizier, who was surrounded by a number of ignorant and intemperate Mollahs, called forth all the energies of Martyn's faith and patience, and at length it was found that, owing to an informality — the want of an introduction from the British ambassador — he could not be admitted to the royal presence. He now proceeded to Tabriz, where he was laid up for two months, and compelled to abandon all hopes of presenting his N.T. in person to the king, but Sir G. Ousely, the British ambassador, relieved his anxiety by kindly promising to present the volume himself.

Ten days after his recovery from the fever which had laid him up, he proceeded on his journey homeward. His plan was to return to England via Constantinople, but, in consequence of too hurried traveling, he was laid Lup at Tocat with severe illness, and died Oct. 16, 1812. ‘No more is known of Henry Martvp save that he died at Tocat, without a European near ... He died a pilgrim's solitary death, and lies in an unknown grave in a heathen land.” The regrets in England which this event created were great. Mulch was expected from him, and much would probably have been done by him in the cause to which he had devoted himself. As it was, he brought not a few, both Hindus and Mohammedans, to make profession of the Christian faith, and he caused the Scriptures to be extensively dispersed among a people who had not previously known them. “The ardent zeal of the Celtic character; the religious atmosphere that John Wesley had spread over Cornwall, even among those who did not enroll themselves among his followers; the ability and sensitiveness hereditary in the Martyn family together with the strong influence of a university tutor — all combined to make such a bright and brief trail of light to the career of Henry Martyn” (Miss C . . Yonge, Pioneers and Founders, p. 71). An interesting account of his life, compiled from various journals left by him, was published by the Rev. John Sargent in 1819. Of his productions there were published Sermons preached in Calcutta and elsewhere (4th edit. Lond. 1822, 8vo): — Controversial Tracts on Christianity and Mohammedanism (edited by Prof. Samuel Lee,  D.D., Camb. 1824, 8vo): — Journals and Letters (edited by the Rev. J. B. Wilberforce, later bishop of Oxford, Lond. 1837, 2 vols. 8vo; abridged 1839, post 8vo, and often). See. besides the biography already referred to, that by John Hall (N. Y. 18mo, published by the American Tract Society). See also Eclectic Review, 4th series, 3:321; Bost. Spirit of the Pilgrims, 4:428; Albert Barnes, Essays and Reviews (1855), 2:278; Edinb. Rev. 1844: (July), 80. 278; Cyclopaedia of Modern Religious Biography, p. 321; Timpson, Bible Triumps, p. 423; Encyclopaedia of Religious Knowledge; Lond. Quart. Rev. 1857 (July), art. 2, p. 329; Princeton Rev. 1853, p. 409; 1855, p. 327. (J. H. W.)

## Martyr[[@Headword:Martyr]]

             (μάρτυς and μάρτυρ, so rendered only in Act 22:20; Rev 2:13; Rev 18:6) is properly a witness, and is applied in the New Testament

(a) to judicial witnesses (Mat 18:16; Mat 26:65; Mar 14:63; Act 6:13; Act 7:58; 2Co 13:1; 1Ti 5:19; Heb 10:28. The Septuagint also uses it for the Hebrew עֵד, ed, in Deu 17:16; Pro 24:28);

(b) To one who has testified, or can testify to the truth of what he has seen, heard, or known. This is a frequent sense in the New Testament, as in Luk 24:48; Act 1:8; Act 1:22; Rom 1:9; 2Co 1:23; 1Th 2:5; 1Th 2:10; 1Ti 6:12; 2Ti 2:2; 1Pe 5:1; Rev 1:5; Rev 3:14; Rev 11:3, and elsewhere.

(c) The meaning of the word which has now become the most usual. is that in which it occurs most rarely in the Scriptures, i.e. one who by his death bears witness to the truth. In this sense we only find it in Act 22:20; Rev 2:13; Rev 17:6. This now exclusive sense of the word was brought into general use by the early ecclesiastical writers, who applied it to every one who suffered death in the Christian cause (see Suicer, Thesaurus Eccles. sub. roc.). SEE MARTYRS.

Stephen was in this sense the first martyr, SEE STEPHEN, and the spiritual honors of his death tended in no small degree to raise to the most extravagant estimation, in the early Church, the value of the testimony of blood. Eventually a martyr's death was supposed, on the alleged authority of the under-named texts, to cancel all the sins of the past life (Luk 12:50; Mar 10:39); to supply the place of baptism (Mat 10:39), and at once to secure admittance to the presence of the Lord in Paradise (Mat 5:10-12).  In imitation of the family custom of annually commemorating at the grave the death of deceased members, the churches celebrated the deaths of their martyrs by prayers at their graves, and by love-feasts. From this high estimation of the martyrs, Christians were sometimes led to deliver themselves up voluntarily to the public authorities — thus justifying the charge of fanaticism brought against them by the heahen. the. For the most part, however, this practice was discountenanced, the words of Christ himself being brought against it (Mat 10:23; see Gieseler, Eccles. Hist. 1:109, 110). For monographs, see Volbeding, Index Programmatum, p. 75, 116. SEE CONFESSOR.

## Martyr, Peter[[@Headword:Martyr, Peter]]

             one of the early Reformers, was born at Florence, Italy, in 1500. His family name was Vermigli, but his parents gave him that of Martyr, from one Peter, a martyr, whose church stood near their house. In 1516 he became a canon regular of the Order of St. Augustine, in the convent of Fiesole, near Florence. In 1519 he was sent to the University of Padua, where he soon distinguished himself as a good scholar. He acquired great reputation as a preacher, was made abbot of Spoleto, and afterwards principal of the College of St. Peter ad Aram, at Naples. Here he made the intimate acquaintance of Juan Valdez (q.v.): a Spaniard, who had become a convert to the doctrines of the Reformation, and from whom Vermigli adopted some of those tenets. He concealed them for a time; but his Biblical studies convincing him more and more of the errors of the Church of Rome, and a perusal of the works of Luther, Zwingle, and Bucer making sure his conversion, he publicly avowed his new doctrine shortly after his appointment to Lucca as prior of San Frediano, and was compelled to leave the place secretly. After a short stay at Florence, he went by way of (Germany to Switzerland. He found an asylum finally in Strasburg, and there, in 1542. Twas called to a theological chair, and acted for five years as the colleague of Bucer in the ministerial office. In 1546 he married a converted nun.

In 1547 he received from Cranmer, and accepted, an invitation to England. The request was sent in the name of king Edward VI, acting under the advice of Seymour, the protector.

In 1549 he was appointed professor of divinity at Oxford. The fame of his learning secured him a large auditory, many Romanists among the number; and though they had much envying and heart-burning about him, as may easily be imagined, yet they bore him pretty patiently till he came to handle the doctrine of the Lord's Slipper. Then they began to break forth into outrages, to disturb  him in his lectures, to fix up malicious and scandalous schedules against him, and to challenge him to disputes; which challenges he did not disdain to accept, but disputed first privately in the vice-chancellor's lodge, and afterwards in public, before his majesty's commissioners deputed for that purpose. At length, however, they stirred up the seditious multitude against him so successfully that he was obliged to retire to London till the tumult was suppressed;” and on returning again, in the year following, he was, for his better security, made by the king canon of Christ-church. It is said that some alterations in the Prayer-book were made at Peter Martyr's suggestions. On the accession of Mary he was obliged to leave England, and, returning to Strasburg, there resumed his former professorship. However, as he inclined to Calvin's views on the doctrine of the Eucharist, he accepted a pressing invitation extended to him by the Senate of Zurich, in 1556, to fill the chair of theology in that university.

In 1561 he received letters from the queen of France, the king of Navarre, the prince of Conde, as well as from Beza and others of the leading French Protestants, requesting him to attend at the famous Colloquy of Poissy, in France. Here he distinguished himself as well for his skill as for his prudence and moderation. He died at Zurich Nov. 12, 1562. “Peter Martyr is described as a man of an able, healthy, big-boned, and well-limbed body, and of a countenance which expressed an inwardly grave and settled turn of mind. His parts and learning were very uncommon; as was also his skill in disputation, which made him as much admired by the Protestants as hated by the Papists. He was very sincere and indefatigable in promoting a reformation in the Church, yet his zeal was never known to get the better of his judgment. He was always moderate and prudent in his outward behavior, nor even in the conflict of a dispute did he suffer himself to be transported into intemperate warmth or allow unguarded expressions ever to escape him. But his pains and industry were not confined to preaching and disputing against the Papists; he wrote a great many books against them, none of which raised his reputation higher than his Defence of the Orthodox Doctrine of the Lord's Supper [Defensio Doctrinae veteris et apostolicae de S. Eucharistiae sacramento; accessit Tractatio, et Disputatio habita Univ. Oxon. de eodem, 1562, fol.] against bishop Gardiner. He wrote also several tracts of divinity, and commentaries on several books of Scripture, for all of which he was as much applauded by one party as he was condemned by the other.” Tirabaschi, a zealous Roman Catholic, acknowledges that Martyr was free from the arrogance and virulence with which the Romanists are wont to charge the Reformers;  that he was deeply acquainted with the Scriptures and the fathers, and was one of the most learned writers of the Reformed Church. He was the author of Expositio Symboli Apostolici; De Coena Doinini Quaestiones, a system of theology, which was first published in England by Massonius, then more fully under the title Loci communes, ex vatsiis ipsius authoris scriptis (Zurich, 1580, folio; translated into English, 1583, folio, etc.). His other works are, In primumr librum Miosis qui vulgo Genesis dicitur commentarii. Addita est initio operis vita ejusdem i Josia Simlero (Tiguri. 1569, folio): — In Librum Judicun commentarii, cume tractationeperutili rerum et locorumi. Editio tertia, prioribus longe emendatior (Tigulri. 1571, folio): — In duos libros Samuelis prophetce commnentarii doctissimi, cue rerum et locorum plurimorum tractatione perutili (Tiguri. 1575, folio): — In Epistolam S. Pauli ad Ronmazos coummentarii doctissimi, cum tractatione perutili rers7u et locorum, qui ad earn epistolampertinent. Cum indicibus (Basle, tertia editio, 1570, folio): — In i. Epistolamn ad Corinthios conmmentarii doctissimi (Tiguri, editio secunda, 1567, folio): — Commentarii in duos libros Regum (1599): — Commentarii in Threnos (1629). See Simler, Oratio de vita et obitu D. Petri Martyris (Zurich, 1562, 4to); Schlosser, Leben des Theodor Beza u. d. P. M. Vermigli (Heidelb. 1807); Leben der Vater u. Begriinder d. reformirten Kirche, vol. 7 (Elberfeld, 1858); Schmidt, Vie de Pierre Martyr Vermigli (Strasb. 1835, 8vo); McCrie, Hist. Reformation in Italy; Wordsworth, Biog. vol. 3.; Fisher, Hist. Ref. p. 336, etc.; Biblioth. Sacra (1859), p. 445: Genesis Biog. Dict. s.v.; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. 2:1991; Hook, Ecclesiast. Biog. 7:245; Mosheim, Eccles. Hist. 3:67, 192; Herzog, Real-Encykl. 17:82 sq.

## Martyrdom[[@Headword:Martyrdom]]

             is a term employed by Christian ecclesiastical writers to record the suffering of death on account of one's adherence to the faith of the Gospel. See MARTYR. Iln times of persecution, martyrdom came to be thought so meritorious that it acquired the name of second baptism, or baptism in blood, because of the power and efficacy it was supposed to have in saving men by the invisible baptism of the Spirit, in the absence of the external element of water. In any case in which a catechumen was apprehended and slain for the name of Christ before he could be admitted among the faithful by baptism, his martyrdom was deemed sufficient to answer all the purposes of the sacrament. In the writings of Prosper there is an epigram to this effect:

“Franudati non sunt sacro baptismate Christi,

Fons qnibus ilpsa sui salnguinis unda fnit;

Et quicquid sacii fert mystica forma lavacri,

Id totum implevit gloria martyrii.”

“They are not deprived of the sacred baptism of Christ who, instead of a font, are washed in their own blood; for whatever benefit accrues to any by the mystical rite of the sacred laver, is all fulfilled by the glory of martyrdom.” The martyrs were supposed to enjoy very singular privileges; in some ages the doctrine was taught that immediately on death they passed to the enjoyment of the beatific vision, for which other Christians were required to wait till the day of judgment; and that God would grant to their prayers the hastening of his kingdom and the shortening the times of persecution.

## Martyriarius[[@Headword:Martyriarius]]

             is the name, in the Roman Catholic Church, of the keeper of sacred relics. The relics of martyrs are most generally kept under the principal altar of the church.

## Martyrion[[@Headword:Martyrion]]

             SEE MARTYRIUM.

## Martyrium[[@Headword:Martyrium]]

             The name of a church built over the grave of a martyr, or called by his name to preserve the memory of him, had usually the distinguishing title of martyriunm, or memoria martyrum. Instances of this kind of designation occur with great frequency in the writings of Eusebius, Augustine, etc. Eusebius calls the church which was built by Constantine on Calvary, in memory of Christ's passion and resurrection, Martyrium Salvatoris.

## Martyrology[[@Headword:Martyrology]]

             (Acta Martyrum) is

(1) with the Protestant a catalogue or list of those who have suffered martyrdom for their religion, including the history of their lives and sufferings; but  (2) with those who believe in the adoration and intercession of saints and martyrs, a calendar of martyrs and other saints arranged in the order of months and days, and intended partly to be read in the public services of the Church, partly for the guidance of the devotion of the faithful towards the saints and martyrs. The use of the martyrology is common both to the Latin and Greek Churches. In the latter it is called Menologion (q.v.).

Eusebius of Caesarea was the first who wrote an extensive history of the Christian martyrs; it was translated into Latin by St. Jerome, but has been long irrecoverably lost. St. Jerome's own work on the same subject — the oldest one now extant — is regarded as the great martyrology of the Latin Church [it is published in the eleventh volume of the collected edition of his works by Vallars]; but it is little used in comparison with later compilations of idle legends and pretended miracles. The latest Greek martyrology or menology extant dates from the 9th century. It was prepared by order of emperor Basilius Macedo (867-886), and was published in 1727 by cardinal Urbini. In the mediaeval period, martyrologies were issued in England by Venerable Bede; in France by Florus, Ado, and Usuard; and in Germany by St. Gall, Nolter, and Rabanus Maurus. The so-called “Roman Martyrology” (Martyrologium Romanum) is designed for the entire Church, both East and West, and was published by authority of Gregory XIII, with a critical commentary by the celebrated cardinal Baronius, in 1586. A still more critical edition was issued by the learned Jesuit Herebert Rosweid. The Protestant Church possesses many accounts of martyrs; but as a true martyrology in English, from a Protestant stand-point, we may mention Fox's Book of Martyrs. SEE MARTYRS; SEE MARTYRDOM.

Martyrology is (3) also applied to the painted or written catalogues in the Roman churches, containing the foundations, obits, prayers, and masses to be said each day. SEE ACTA MARTYRUM.

## Martyrs[[@Headword:Martyrs]]

             those who lay down their life or suffer death for the sake of their religion. In accordance with the primitive Greek sense of the word, i.e. a witness, SEE MARTYR, it is applied by Christian writers to such as suffer in testimony of the truth of the Gospel or its doctrines. The Christian Church has abounded with martyrs, and history is filled with surprising accounts of their singular constancy and fortitude under the most cruel torments that human nature is capable of suffering. The primitive Christians were accused by their enemies of paying a sort of divine worship to martyrs. Of  this we have an instance in the answer of the Church of Smyrna to the suggestion of the Jews, who, at the martyrdomn of Polycarp, desired the heathen judge not to suffer the Christians to carry off his body, lest they should leave their crucified Master, and worship him in his stead. ‘To this they answered,' We can neither forsake Christ nor worship any other, for we worship him as the Son of God; but love the martyrs as the disciples and followers of the Lord, for the great affection they have shown to their King and Master.” A like answer was given at the martyrdom of Fructuosus in Spain; for when the judge asked Eulogius, his deacon, whether he would not worship Fructuosus, as thinking that, though he refused to worship the heathen idols, he might yet be inclined to worship a Christian martyr, Eullogius replied, “I do not worship Fructuosus, but him whom Fructuosus worships.” The courage and constancy of the sufferers naturally enough won the highest admiration from their brethren in the faith; and so it came to be held a special privilege to receive the martyr's benediction, to kiss his chains, to visit him in prison, or to converse with him; and as it was held by the primitive Christians that the martyrs enjoyed very singular privileges with God, SEE MARTYRDOM, it came to be held also that their great and superabundant merit might, in the eyes of the Church, compensate for the laxity and weakness of less perfect brethren, and thus gradually a practice of intercession arose, which finally degenerated into the granting of indulgences, etc., as now common in the Roman Catholic Church. SEE INDULGENCES; SEE INVOCATION.

Perhaps the admiration and veneration which Christian martyrdom secures has had a great tendency to excite many to court martyrdom. We must not lose sight of the fact, however, that martyrdom in itself is no proof of the goodness of our cause, but only that we ourselves are persuaded that it is so. “It is not the blood, but the cause that makes the martyr” (Mead). Yet we may consider the number and fortitude of those who have suffered for Christianity as a collateral proof at least of its excellency; for the thing for which they suffered was not a point of speculation, but a plain matter of fact, in which (had it been false) they could not have been mistaken. The martyrdom, therefore, of so many wise and good men, taken with a view of the whole system of Christianity, will certainly afford something considerable in its favor.

In the early days of Christianity it was no unusual occurrence to build a church over the grave of a martyr, calling the church after his name, in order to preserve the memory of his sufferings. SEE MARTYRIUM. But  soon every Church wished to possess a saint's tomb for an altar. Mere cenotaphs did not suffice. Thus, according to Augustine, Ambrose was delayed in the consecration of a new church at Milan till a seasonable dream helped him to the bones of two martyrs, Gervasius and Protasius. And the second Council of Nice (A.D. 787) went even so far as to threaten bishops with deprivation if they should undertake to consecrate churches without relics. The consequence was that a supply was produced by such a demand, and frauds of every kind were perpetrated and overlooked. Each Church also had its own Fasti, or calendar of martyrs. SEE CALENDAR; SEE CHURCH.

The festivals of the martyrs are also of very ancient date. On the first establishment of their religion, it was natural that Christians should look back from a condition of unexpected security on the sufferings of their immediate predecessors with the most vivid sentiments of sympathy and admiration. They had witnessed those sufferings, they had beheld the constancy with which they were endured; the same terror had been suspended over themselves, and their own preservation they attributed, under the especial protection of divine Providence, to the perseverance of those who had perished. The gratitude and veneration thus fervently excited were loudly and passionately expressed; and the honors which were due to the virtues of the departed were profusely bestowed on their names and their memory. Enthusiasm easily passed into superstition, and those who had sealed a Christian's faith by a martyr's death were exalted above the condition of men, and enthroned among superior beings. The day of martyrdom, moreover, as being held to be the day of the martyr's entering into eternal life, was called the “natal” or “birth” day, and as such was celebrated with peculiar honor, and with special religious services. Their bodies, clothes, books, and the other objects which they had possessed, were honored as Relics (q.v.), and their tombs were visited for the purpose of asking their intercession. SEE MARTYRS, FESTIVALS OF THE.

Of the sayings, sufferings, and deaths of the martyrs, though preserved with great care for the purposes above alluded to, and to serve as models to future ages, we have but very little left, the greatest part of them having been destroyed during the Diocletian persecution; for a most diligent search was then made after all their books and papers, and all of them that were found were committed to the flames. Some of those records since compiled have either never reached us at all, or, if they have, their authority is extremely suspected. SEE MARTYROLOGY.

The appropriate homage to be rendered to the martyrs by the Protestant world, as a reason why our respect of these sainted dead should not degenerate into martyr-worship, by the exhibition of an enthusiasm which with the early Christians was quite natural, but with us would be artificial, has been well commented upon by Gieseler (Church History, 1:1.08, 282), who says: “The respect paid to martyrs still maintains the same character as in the 2d century, differing only in degree, not in kind, from the honor shown to other esteemed dead. As the churches held the yearly festivals of their martyrs at the graves of the latter, so they willingly assembled frequently in the burial-places of their deceased friends, for which they used in many places even caves (cryptae catacumbae). At the celebration of the Lord's Supper, both the living who brought oblations, as well as the dead, and the martyrs for whom offerings were presented, especially on the anniversary of their death, were included by name in the prayer of the Church. Inasmuch as the readmission of a sinner into the Church was thought to stand in close connection with the forgiveness of sin, an opinion was associated with the older custom of restoring to Church communion the lapsed who had been again received by the martyrs, that the martyrs could also be serviceable In obtaining the forgiveness of sins. In doing so they set out in part with the idea, which is very natural, that the dead prayed for the living, as the living prayed for the deads, but that the intercession of martyrs abiding in the captivity of the Lord would be of peculiar efficacy on behalf of their brethren; while they also thought that the martyrs, as assessors in the last decisive judgment, were particularly active (1Co 6:2-3). Origen attributed very great value to that intercession, expecting from it great help towards sanctification; but he went beyond the ideas hitherto entertained, in attributing to martyrdom an importance and efficacy similar to the death of Christ. Hence he feared the cessation of persecution as a misfortune. The more the opinion that value belonged to the intercession of martyrs was established, the oftener it may have happened that persons commended themselves to the martyrs yet living for intercession.”

The number of martyrs who suffered death during the first ages of Christianity has been a subject of great controversy. The early ecclesiastical writers, with the natural pride of partisanship, have, it can hardly be doubted, leaned to the side of exaggeration. Some of their statements are palpably excessive; and Gibbon, in his well-known sixteenth chapter, throws great doubt even on the most moderate of the computations of the  Church historians. But it is clearly though briefly shown by Guizot, in his notes on this celebrated chapter (see Milman's Gibbon's Decline and Fall, 1:598), that Gibbon's criticisms are founded on unfair and partial data, and that even the very authorities upon which he relies demonstrate the fallaciousness of his conclusions. Those who are interested in the subject will find it discussed with much learning and considerable moderation in Ruinart's Acta Primitiva et Sincera Martyrum. No little difference of opinion has also existed as to what, in the exploration of the ancient Christian tombs in the Roman Catacombs, are to be considered as signs of martyrdom. The chief signs, in the opinion of older critics, were (1) the letters 13. I., (2) the figure of a palm-tree, and (3) a phial with the remains of a red liquor believed to be blood. Each of these has in turn been the subject of dispute, but the last is commonly regarded as the conclusive sign of martyrdom. The first recorded martyr of Christianity, called the “protomartyr,” was the deacon Stephen, whose death is recorded in Acts 6, 7.

See Siegel, Christliche Alterthümer, 3:272 sq.; Bingham, Orig. Eccles. p. 102, etc.; Riddle, Christian Antiquit. p. 101 sq.; Donaldson, Lit. 2:284 sq.; Neander, Plant cand Train. Christ. Churches (see Index); Lardner, Works, 3:91, 219 sq.; Jortin, Remarks, 1:345; Taylor, Anc. Christianity, p. 380; Milman, Christianity (see Index); Lat. Christianity (see Index); Waddington, Ch. Hist. pt. iv, p. 114; Schaff, Ch. Hist. 1:177 sq., 182 sq.: Coleman, Anc. Christianity, p. 404; Am. Theol. Rev. 1860 (Aug.), p. 530; Zeitschr. histor. theol. 1850, p. 315; Eadie, Eccles. Cyclop. s.v.; Chambers, Cyclop. s.v.

## Martyrs, Canonization of the[[@Headword:Martyrs, Canonization of the]]

             The ceremony for canonizing saints in the Roman Catholic Church varied greatly until, in the middle of the last century, pope Benedict XIV definitely prescribed it. It is now as follows: After the candidate's reputation for sanctity has been duly proved, he is styled venerable, after which an inquiry is entered into to establish the proof of his virtues, in a high or, as it is termed, heroic degree. For that purpose the whole life and all the actions of the candidate are scrutinized. That task devolves on the Sacred Congregation of the Rites, assisted by theologians and canonists, three auditors of the rota, and monks belonging to five different orders. Natural philosophers and physicians are also called on to give their opinions on the temperament of the candidate and on the miracles which  are attributed to him. The most important and the most original character in this court of inquiry is that of the promoter of the faith, also called the Advocate of the Devil. His Satanic majesty is a power which must be taken into account, and is allowed to have his cause pleaded even before the ecclesiastical tribunal. This advocate may be supposed to bring forward arguments to prove that the man who is a candidate for canonization is guilty of every sin; that he has violated the ten commandments of God and those of the Church; has eaten on fast days; has entered into a compact with the daemons of avarice, pride, envy, hatred, and malice; and that the miracles attributed to him were performed by the devil himself. The advocate would probably conclude his argument by saying, “Render therefore unto Satan that which is Satan's, and do not deprive Beelzebub of the fruit of his works.” The advocate for the candidate then rises, and endeavors to overturn all the arguments of his learned brother by bringing forward and enlarging upon all the virtues of his client, and concludes by begging the judges to throw open to him the doors of beatitude, and adorn his forehead with the rays of glory. The tribunal then examines all the arguments pro and con, and at length pronounces in favor of the candidate. Next comes the question of the miracles, and the natural philosophers are requested to bring forward all the objections they may have to make. They in their turn declare that science is vanquished, and the miracles are declared to be bona fide. A favorable report is then made to the pope, who delivers the sentence of beatification, and on the day appointed pronounces the canonization from his throne at the Vatican. The honors conferred by canonization are seven in number:

1. The names are inscribed in the ecclesiastical almanacs, in the list of martyrs, and in the litanies.

2. They are publicly invoked in the prayers and service of the Church.

3. Chapters, churches, and altars are dedicated to them.

4. Sacrifice is offered in their honor at the mass.

5. Their fete day is celebrated.

6. Their images are exhibited in the churches, and they may be there represented with a crown of light round the head.

7. Their relics are offered to the veneration of the faithful, and carried with pomp in solemn processions. SEE CANONIZATION.

## Martyrs, Festivals of the[[@Headword:Martyrs, Festivals of the]]

             These commemorations of Christian sufferers for the cause of their blaster are of very ancient date, and may be carried as high as the time of Polycarp, who suffered death about A.D. 168. In the days of Chrysostom and Theodoret these festivals had become so frequent that, so they tell us, oftentimes one or two were celebrated in one and the same week (see Chrysostom, Hom. 40 in Juventinum, 1:546; Theodoret, Serin. 8 de Maertribus, 4:605; Chrysostom, Hom. 65 de Martyr. 4:971). On these occasions, as has been intimated in the article MARTYRS SEE MARTYRS , the assemblies were not held in the churches or in the usual places of worship, but at the graves of the martyrs. The night preceding the festival was passed in holy vigil, praying and singing psalms and hymns. As they were esteemed high festivals, the same service that was performed on the Sabbath was always performed on such occasions. But, besides the usual solemnities of other festivals, the history of the sufferings of the martyrs was also commonly read, and orations were delivered commending their virtues, and the audience invited to profit by these self-denying examples. This practice was encouraged by a canon of the third Council of Carthage (“Liceat etiam legi passiones martyrusm, cum anniversarii dies eorum celebrantur,” Con. Carth. 3. can. 47). Mabillon gives several instances to show that they were read also in the French churches. In the Roman Church they were forbidden by pope Gelasius, as many were said to be anonymous, and others by heathen or heretical authors; but this rule, it seems, did not then prescribe as to other churches. The Lord's Supper was always administered at these festivals, and at the close the rich usually made a feast for the poor, especially to the widows and orphans. — Farrar, Eccles. Dict. s.v.; Bingham, Antiquities of the Christian Church, 1:659; Cyclop. Of Religious Knowledge, s.v.; Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lex. 12:777. SEE FEASTS.

## Maruf El-Karkhi, Eben-Mahfond[[@Headword:Maruf El-Karkhi, Eben-Mahfond]]

             an Arabic mystic, was born at Carkh, between Hamadan and Ispahan, about the year 750. The son of a Christian, he became a Mussulman, under the name of Ali. While attached to the house of the imam Ali Riza, at Bagdad, where he discharged the duties of a door-keeper, he formed a firm friendship with one of the most ancient mystic chiefs, Daud el-Thayi, and became himself one of the most celebrated mystics of Arabia. He died in 816, at Bagdad. The mystical system of Marûf is neither the ascetic system  of the ancient Indian and Christian Coenobites, which he rejected, nor that of the more recent Persian mystics, who are entirely absorbed in contemplations of divine love. He lays stress on the practical virtues; and if he preaches humility in saying that we should never appear before God except with the exterior of a poor mendicant, he still is not led astray in his reflections upon divine love, which, according to him, is a gift of God's grace, and not learned by the lessons of masters. Maruf, it is true, elsewhere carries out his thoughts, by saying that we must turn to God if we expect God's favor upon us. These ideas have caused him to be regarded as one of the orthodox mystics of Islam. His maxims are found dispersed throughout the ascetic works of Abûlfaray Mansûr ibn al-Yanzi, especially in the Manakhib-Marûf; or Panegyrics of Maruf, and in the Kenzel Modzakkirin, or Treasure of the Deistical Panegyrists. In the Monutekhab fi'l Nowle is found the most complete selection of Marûf's utterances. — Hadj'l Chalfa, Lexikon Bibliographicum et Encyclopoedicam; Djami, Biographie des Soufis; Hammer, Gesch. der Arsabischen Literatzur; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, vol. 33, s. V.

## Marut or Marut[[@Headword:Marut or Marut]]

             (Sanscrit-wind) denotes in the Hindu mythology the genus or divinities presiding over the winds. In the Vedas the Maruts are often addressed as the attendants and allies of Indra, and are called the sons of Prisni (or Pricni), or the Earth; they are also called Rhudras, or the sons of Rhudra. See the Introductions to the several volumes of professor Wilson's translation of the Rig Veda; see also Moor, Hindu Pantheon, s.v.; Thomas, Dict. of Biog. and Mythol. s.v.

## Maruta (Saint), Liturgy Of[[@Headword:Maruta (Saint), Liturgy Of]]

             one of the twelve liturgies contained in the missal of the Maronites, published at Rome in 1592.

## Maruthas[[@Headword:Maruthas]]

             one of the most important men in the Syrian Church of the 4th and 5th centuries, was bishop of Tagrit, in Mesopotamia, called also by the Syrians Maipherkin, Maipherkat, and Medinat Sohde, i.e. city of the martyrs. He took an active part in the management of Church affairs, and is also known as a writer. So great, indeed, was the consideration he enjoyed at the hands of his contemporaries that he was popularly credited with power to work miracles. In 403 he made a journey to Constantinople, as agent in the negotiations between the emperors Arcadius and Theodosius II and the Persian emperor Yezdegerd II, who was persecuting the Christians, and in these negotiations he gained the esteem and confidence of the Persian  emperor. He was enabled by his sagacity to defeat the intrigues of the Magians to effect his downfall, and his reputation only rose higher, so that he obtained permission for the Christians to rebuild their churches, and to hold their meetings for divine worship. The next year he went again to Constantinople to plead the cause of Chrysostom, who was exiled. He was subsequently sent again by Theodosius II to Yezdegerd. He is said on this occasion to have taken part in a synod assembled by patriarch Isaac of Seleucia Ctesiphon, but Hefele (Conciliengesch. 2:90) has proved that the documents we possess concerning this council are spurious, and the very existence of such a council is now considered doubtful. Maruthas, however, took part in the Council of Antioch against the Messalians (q.v.). in 383 or 390. He wrote a nulmber of works in Syriac, described by Assemani (ut infr.). Among them the following deserve special notice: A liturgic work, found in Syriac in the missal of the Maronites (1594, p. 172), and in Latin in Renaudot (Liturgiarumn Orient. collectio, 2:261); an exposition of the Gospels, from which it appears that he inclined towards the doctrine of transubstantiation; a history of the Persian martyrs under king Shapur (Sapores) — this history forms the first part of Assemani's Acta Alartyrum Orientalium. qui in Perside passi sunt, et Occidentalium, translated under the title Elliche Acten heiliger Martyrer d. Moragenlandes (Innsbruck, 1836). See Assemani, Biblicih. Orient. Clenseniino-Vaticcna, 1:174-179; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 9:131; Neander, Hist. of the Christican Religion and Church, 2:110, 700. (J.N. P.)

## Marx, Jacob[[@Headword:Marx, Jacob]]

             a Roman Catholic theologian of Germany, was born September 8, 1803. In 1829 he received holy orders, was in 1836 professor of Church history and canon law at Treves, in 1861 doctor of theology, in 1869 member of the chapter, and died February 15, 1876. He is the author of, Ursachen der schnellen Verbreitung der Reformation zunachst in Deutschland (Mayence, 1834): — Der Bilderstreit der byzantinischen Kaiser (Treves,  1839): — Das Wallfahrten in der katholischen Kirche (Mayence, 1842): — Geschichte des heiligen Rockes in der Domkirche zu Trier (1844): — Die Ausstellung des heiligen Rockes (1845): — Caspar Olevian oder der Calvinismus in Trier im Jahre 1559 (1846): — Geschichte des Erzstiftes Trier bis zum Jahre 1816 (1856-64, 5 volumes). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2:858. (B.P.)

## Mary[[@Headword:Mary]]

             (Μαρία or Μαριάμ, from the Heb. מַרְיָם Miriam), the name of several females mentioned in the New Test.

1. The wife of Joseph, and a lineal descendant of David (Matthew i); “the Mother of Jesus” (Act 1:14), and “Mary, his Mother” (Mat 2:11); in later times generally called the “VIRGIN MARY,” but never so designated in Scripture. Little is known of this highly-favored individual, in whom was fulfilled the first prophecy made to man, that the “seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head” (Gen 3:15). As her history was of no consequence to Christianity, it is not given at large. Her genealogy is recorded by Luke (ch. 3), in order to prove the truth of the predictions which had foretold the descent of the Messiah from Adam through Abraham and David, with the design evidently of showing that  Christ was of that royal house and lineage (comp. Davidson's Sacred hermeneutics, p. 589 sq.). Eusebius, the early ecclesiastical historian, although unusually lengthy upon “the name Jesus,” and the genealogies in Matthew's and Luke's Gospels, throws no new light upon Mary's birth and parentage. The very simplicity of the evangelical record has no doubt been one cause of the abundance of the legendary matter of which she forms the central figure. Imagination had to be called in to supply a craving which authentic narrative did not satisfy. We shall give the account from both these sources somewhat in detail, with a full discussion of many interesting questions incidentally involved in their consideration. SEE MARIOLATRY.

I. Scriptural Statements. —

1. We are wholly ignorant of the circumstances and occupation of Mary's parents. If, as is most probable, the genealogy given by Luke is that of Mary (Greswell, etc.), her father's name was Heli, which is another form of the name given to her legendary father, Jehoiakim or Joachim. But if Jacob and Heli were the two sons of Matthan or Matthat, and if Joseph, being the son of the younger brother, married his cousin, the daughter of the elder brother (Hervey, Genealogies of our Lord Jesus Christ), her father was Jacob. SEE GENEALOGY OF OUR LORD ). She was, like Joseph, of the tribe of Judah, and of the lineage of David (Psa 132:11; Luk 1:32; Rom 1:3). What was her relationship to the so-called “sister” named Mary (Joh 19:25) is uncertain (see No. 3 below), but she was connected by marriage (συγγενής, Luk 1:36) with Elisabeth, who wsas of the tribe of Levi and of the lineage of Aaron.

2. In the autumn of the year which is known as B.C. 7, Mary was living at Nazareth, probably at her parents' house, not having yet been taken by Joseph to his home. She was at this time betrothed to Joseph, and was therefore regarded by the Jewish law and custom as his wife, though he had not yet a husband's rights over her. SEE MARRIAGE. At this time the angel Gabriel came to her with a message from God,. and announced to her that she was to be the mother of the long-expected Messiah. He probably bore the form of an ordinary man, like the angels who manifested themselves to Gideon and to Manoah (Jdg 6:13). This would appear both from the expression εἰσελθών, “he came in,” and also from the fact of her being troubled, not at his presence, but at the meaning of his words. Yet one cannot but believe that there was a glory in his features which at once convinced Mary of the true nature of her visitor, entering as he did  unannounced, apparently into her secret chamber — most probably at the time of her devotions. The scene as well as the salutation is very similar to that recounted in the book of Daniel, “Then there came again and touched me one like the appearance of a man, and he strengthened me, and said, O man greatly beloved, fear not: peace be unto thee, be strong, yea, be strong!” (Dan 10:18-19). The exact meaning of κεχαριτωμένη is “thou that hast had bestowed upon thee a free gift of grace.” The A.V. rendering of “highly favored” is therefore very exact, and much nearer to the original than the “gratia plena” of the Vulgate, on which a huge and wholly unsubstantial edifice has been built by Romanist devotional writers. The next part of the salutation, “The Lord is with thee,” would probably have been better translated, “The Lord be with thee.” It is the same salutation as that with which the angel accosted Gideoi (Jdg 6:12). “Blessed art thou among women,” is nearly the same expression as that used by Ozias to Judith (Jdg 13:18). Gabriel proceeds to instruct Mary that by the operation of the Holy Ghost the everlasting Son of the Father should be born of her; that in him the prophecies relative to David's throne and kingdom should be accomplished; and that his name was to be called Jesus. He further informs her, perhaps as a sign by which she might convince herself that his prediction with regard to herself would come true, that her relative Elisabeth was within three months of being delivered of a child.

The angel left Mary, and she set off to visit Elisabeth either at Hebron or Juttah (whichever way we understand the εἰς τὴν ὀρεινὴν εἰς πόλιν Ι᾿ούδα, Luk 1:39), where the latter lived with her husband Zacharias, about twenty miles to the south of Jerusalem, and therefore at a very considerable distance from Nazareth. Immediately on her entrance into the house she was saluted by Elisabeth as the mother of her Lord, and had evidence of the truth of the angel's saying with regard to her cousin. She embodied her feelings of exultation and thankfulness in the hymn known ulnler the name of the Magnificat. Whether this was uttered by immediate inspiration, in reply to Elisabeth's salutation, or composed during her journey from Nazareth, or was written at a later period of her three months' visit at Hebron, does not appear with certainty. The hymn is founded on Hannah's song of thankfulness (1Sa 2:1-10), and exhibits an intimate knowledge of the Psalms, prophetical writings, and books of Moses, from which sources almost every expression in it is drawn. The most remarkable clause, “From henceforth all generations shall  call me blessed,” is borrowed from Leah's exclamation on the birth of Asher (Gen 30:13). The same sentiment and expression are also found in Pro 31:28; Mal 3:12; Jam 5:11. In the latter place the word μακαρίζω is rendered with great exactness “count happy.” The notion that there is conveyed in the word any anticipation of her bearing the title of “Blessed” arises solely from ignorance.

Various opinions have been held as to the purpose of divine Wisdom in causing the Savior to be born of a betrothed rather than a disengaged virgin. It seems eminently seemly and decorous that the mother of the Messiah should have some one to vouch for her virginity, and to act as her protector and the foster-father of her child, and that he should be one who, as heir of the throne of David, would give to his adopted Son the legal rights to the same dignity, while of all persons he was the most interested in resisting the claims of a pretendar. Origen, following Ignatius, thinks it was in order to baffle the cunning of the devil, and keep him in ignorance of the fact of the Lord's advent.

Mary returned to Nazareth shortly before the birth of John the Baptist, and continued living at her own home. In the course of a few months Joseph became aware that she was with child, and determined on giving her a bill of divorcement, instead of yielding her up to the law to suffer the penalty which he supposed that she had incurred. Being, however, warned and satisfied by an angel who appeared to him in a dream, he took her to his own house. It was soon after this, as it would seem, that Augustus's decree was promulgated, and Joseph and Mary traveled to Bethlehem to have their names enrolled in the registers (B.C. 6) by way of preparation for the taxing, which, however, was not completed till several years afterwards (A.D. 6), in the governorship of Quirinus. They reached Bethlehem, and there Mary brought forth the Savior of the world, and humbly laid him in a manger.

Bethlehem stands on the narrow ridge of a long gray hill running east and west, and its position suggests the difficulty that a crowd of travelers would have in finding shelter within it. As early as the second century, a neighboring cave was fixed upon as the stable where Joseph abode, and where accordingly Christ was born and laid in the manger. The hill-sides are covered with vineyards, and a range of convents occupies the height, and encloses within it the cave of the nativity; but there are grassy slopes adjoining, where the shepherds may have kept watch over their flocks, seen  the vision of the angelic hosts, and heard the divine song of “Glory to God in the highest, on earth peace and good will towards men.” Full of wonder and hope, they sought the lowly sojourn of the Virgin, and there saw with their own eyes what the Lord had made known to them. But while they published abroad and spread the wondrous tale, Mary kept all these things and pondered them in her heart.

3. The circumcision, the adoration of the wise men, and the presentation in the Temple, are rather scenes in the life of Christ than in that of his mother. The presentation in the temple might not take place till forty days after the birth of the child. During this period the mother, according to the law of Moses, was unclean (Leviticus 12). In the present case there could be no necessity for offering the sacrifice and making atonement beyond that of obedience to the Mosaic precept; but already he, and his mother for him, were acting upon the principle of fulfilling all righteousness. The poverty of Mary and Joseph, it may be noted, is shown by their making the offering of the poor. But though tokens of poverty attended her on this occasion, she was met by notes of welcome and hymns of grateful joy by the worthiest and most venerable of Jerusalem. Simeon, we know, was a just and devout man-one who waited for the consolation of Israel, and had revelations from the Holy Ghost; but tradition also says that he was the great rabbi Simeon, the son of Hillel, and father of Gamaliel, in whose days, according to the rabbins, the birth of Jesus of Nazareth took place (Rosenmüller, quoted by Wordsworth). Anna, too, who had spent her long life in daily attendance at the worship of the Temple, was evidently the center of a devout circle, whose minds had been led by the study of Scripture to an expectation of redemption.

Mary wondered when Simeon took her child into his arms, and received him as the promised salvation of the Lord, the light of the Gentiles, and the glory of Israel; but it was the wonder of joy at the unexpected confirmation of the promise already given to her by the angel. The song of Simeon and the thanksgiving of Anna, like the wonder of the shepherds and the adoration of the magi, only incidentally refer to Mary. One passage alone in Simeon's address is specially directed to her: “Yea, a sword shall pierce through thy own soul also.” The exact purport of these words is doubtful. A common patristic explanation refers them to the pang of unbelief which shot through her bosom on seeing her Son expire on the cross (Tertullian, Origen, Basil, Cyril, etc.). By modern interpreters it is more commonly referred to the pangs of grief' which she experienced on witnessing the sufferings of her Son.  In the flight into Egypt, Mary and the babe had the support and protection of Joseph, as well as in their return from thence in the following year, on the death of Herod the Great (B.C. 4). It appears to have been the intention of Joseph to settle at Bethlehem at this time, as his home at Nazareth had been broken up for more than a year; but on finding how Herod's dominions had been disposed of, he changed his mind and returned to his old place of abode, thinking that the child's life would be safer in the tetrarchy of Antipas than in that of Archelaus. It is possible that Joseph might have been himself a native of Bethlehem, and that before this time he had only been a visitor at Nazareth, drawn thither by his betrothal and marriage. In that case, his fear of Archelaus would make him exchange his own native town for that of Mary.

4. Henceforward, until the beginning of our Lord's ministry — i.e. from B.C. 4 to A.D. 25-we may picture Mary to ourselves as living in Nazareth, in a humble sphere of life, the wife of Joseph the carpenter, pondering over the sayings of the angels, of the shepherds, of Simeon, and of those of her Son, as the latter “increased in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and man” (Luk 2:52). Two circumstances alone, so far as we know, broke in on the otherwise even flow of the still waters of her life. One of these was the temporary loss of her Son when he remained behind in Jerusalem (A.D. 8); the other was the death of Joseph. The exact date of this last event we cannot determine, but it w-as probably not long after the other. SEE JOSEPH.

5. From the time at which our Lord's ministry commenced, Mary is withdrawn almost wholly from sight. Four times only, as detailed below, is the veil removed which, surely not without reason, is thrown over her. If to these we add two references to her, the first by her Nazarene fellow- citizens (Mat 13:54-55; Mar 6:13), the second by a woman in the multitude (Luk 11:27). we have specified every event known to us in her life. It is noticeable that, on every occasion of our Lord's addressing her, or speaking of her, there is a sound of reproof in his words, with the exception of the last words spoken to her from the cross.

(1.) The marriage at Cana in Galilee (John 2) took place in the few months which intervened between the baptism of Christ and the Passover of the year 26. When Jesus was found by his mother and Joseph in the Temple in the year 8, we find him repudiating the name of “father” as applied to Joseph. “Thy father and I have sought thee sorrowing.” “How is it that ve  sought me? Wist ye not that I must be at [not Joseph's and yours, but] my Father's house?” (Luk 2:48-49). Now, in like manner, at his first miracle, which inaugurates his ministry, he solemnly withdraws himself from the authority of his earthly mother. This is Augustine's explanation of the “What have I to do with thee? my hour is not yet come.” It was his humanity, not his divinity, which came from Mary. While, therefore, he was acting in his divine character, he could not acknowledge her, nor does he acknowledge her again until he was hanging on the cross, when, in that nature which he took from her, he was about to submit to death (St. Aug. Conmn. in Joan. Evang. tract 8, vol. 3, p. 1455 [Paris, 1845, edit. Migne]). That the words Τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί;= מה לי יל  imply reproof, is certain (comp. Mat 8:29; Mar 1:24; and Sept., Jdg 11:12; 1Ki 17:18; 2Ki 3:13), and such is the patristic explanation of them (see Iren. Adv. Haer. 3:18; Apuld Bibl. Pair. Alax. tom. ii, part ii, p. 293; St. Chrysost. Hom. in Joan. 21). But the reproof is of a gentle kind (Trench. On the Miracles, p. 102 [London, 1856]; Alford, Comm. ad loc.; Wordsworth, Comm. ad loc.). Mary seems to have understood it, and accordingly to have drawn back, desiring the servants to pay attention to her divine Son (Olshausen, Comm. ad loc.). The modern Romanist translation, “What is that to me and to thee?” is not a mistake, because it is a wilful misrepresentation (Douay version; Orsini, Life of Mary, etc.; see The Catholic Layman, p. 117 [Dublin, 1852]). Lightfoot supposes the marriage to have taken place in the house of Alphaeus, Mary's brother-in-law, as his son Simon is called the Canaanite, or man of Cana. But this term rather describes him as a former Zealot. SEE ZELOTES.

It is clear that Mary felt herself to be invested with some authority in the house. Jesus was naturally there as her Son, and the disciples as those whom he had called and adopted as his especial friends. As yet, the Lord had done no miracle; and it has been questioned whether Mary, in drawing his attention to the failure of the wine, meant to invoke his miraculous powers, or merely to submit the fact to his judgment, that he might do what was best under the circumstances — either withdrawing from the feast with his disciples, or engaging the attention of the guests by his discourse. The better opinion, however, seems to be that she knew he was about now to enter on his public ministry, and that miracles would be wrought by him in proof of his divine mission; and the early fathers do not scruple to say that a desire to gain eclat by the powers of her Son was one motive for her wish that he should supply the deficiency of the wine, and that by his reply he meant to condemn this feeling.

(2.) Capernaum (Joh 2:12) and Nazareth (Mat 4:13; Mat 13:54; Mar 6:1) appear to have been the residence of Mary for a considerable period. The next time that she is brought before us we find her at Capernaum (Mat 12:46; Mar 3:21; Mar 3:31; Luk 8:19). It is the autumn of the year 27-a year and a half after the miracle wrought at the marriage-feast in Cana. The Lord had in the mean time attended two feasts of the Passover, and had twice made a circuit throughout Galilee, teaching and working miracles. His fame had spread, and crowds came pressing round him, so that he had not even time “to eat bread.” Mary was still living with her other sons, and with James, Joses Simon, Jude, and their sisters (Mat 13:55); and she and they heard of the toils which he was undergoing, and they understood that he was denying himself every relaxation from his labors. Their human affection conquered their faith. They thought that he was killing himself, and, with an indignation arising from love, they exclaimed that he was beside himself, and set off to bring him home either by entreaty or compulsion. He was surrounded by eager crowds, and they could not reach him. They therefore sent a message, begging him to allow them to speak to him.

This message was handed on from one person in the crowd to another, till at length it was reported aloud to him. Again he reproves; again he refuses to admit any authority on the part of his relatives, or any privilege on account of their relationship. “Who is my mother, and who are my brethren? And he stretched forth his hand towards his disciples, and said, Behold my mother and my brethren! For whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother” (Mat 12:48-49). Compare Theoph. in Marc. 3:32; St. Chrys. lonz. 44 in Matt.; St. Aug. in Joan. tract x, who all of them point out that the blessedness of Mary consists, not so much in having borne Christ, as in believing on him and in obeying his words (see also Quaest. et Resp. ad Orthodox. 136; ap. St. Just. Mart. in the Bibl. a. Pax tr. tom. ii, pt. ii, p. 138). This, indeed, is the lesson taught directly by our Lord himself in the next passage in which reference is made to Mary. In the midst or at the completion of one of his addresses on the same occasion, a woman of the multitude, whose soul had been stirred by his words, cried out, ‘Blessed is the womb that bare thee, and the paps which thou hast sucked!” Immediately the Lord replied, “Yea, rather, blessed are they that hear the word of God, and keep it” (Luk 11:27). He does not either affirm or deny anything with regard to the direct bearing of the woman's exclamation, but passes that by as a thing indifferent, in order to point out in what alone the true blessedness of his mother and of  all consists. This is the full force of the μενοῦνγε with which he commences his reply.

(3.) The next scene in Mary's life brings us to the foot of the cross. She was standing there with her sister Mary and Mary Magdalene, and Salome, and other women, having no doubt followed her Son as she was able throughout the terrible morning of Good Friday. It was about 3 o'clock in the afternoon, and he was about to give up his spirit. His divine mission was now, as it were, accomplished. While his ministry was in progress he had withdrawn himself from her that he might do his Father's work. But now the hour had come when his human relationship might again be recognized, “Tune enim agnovit,” says Augustine, “quando illud quod peperit moriebatur” (St. Aug. In Joan. 9). Standing near the company of the women was the apostle John, and, with almost his last words, Christ commended his mother to the care of him who had borne the name of “the Disciple whom Jesus loved:” “Woman, behold thy Son.” “Commendat homo homini hominem,” says Augustine. From that hour John assures us that he took her to his own abode. If by “that hour” the evangelist means immediately after the words were spoken, Mary was not present at the last scene of all. The sword had sufficiently pierced her soul, and she was spared the hearing of the last loud cry, and the sight of the bowed head. Ambrose considers the chief purpose of our Lord's words to have been a desire to make manifest the truth that the redemption was his work alone, while he gave human affection to his mother. “Non egebat adjutore ad omniurn redemptionem. Suscepit qnidem matris affectum, sed non quaesivit hominis auxilium” (St. Amb. Expos. Evang. Luc. 10:132). But it is more probable that she continued at the spot till all was over. See CRUCIFIXION.

(4.) A veil is drawn over her sorrow, and over her joy which succeeded that sorrow. Medieval imagination has supposed, but Scripture does not state, that her Son appeared to Mary after his resurrection from the dead. (See, for example, Ludolph of Saxony, Vita Christi [Lyons, 1642], p. 666; and Rupert., De Divinis Officis [Venice, 1751], 7:25, tom. 4, p. 92). Ambrose is considered to be the first writer who suggested the idea, and reference is made to his treatise De Virginitate, 1:3; but it is quite certain that the text has been corrupted, and that it is of Mary Magdalene that he is there speaking. (Comp. his Exposition of St. Luke, 10:156. See note of the Benedictine edition [Paris, 1790], 2:217.) Another reference is usually given to Anselm. The treatise quoted is not Anselm's, but Eadmer's. (See  Eadmer, De Excellentia Mariae, chap. v, appended to Anselm's Works [Paris, 1721 ], p. 138.) Ten appearances are related by the evangelists as having occurred in the forty slays intervening between Easter and Ascension Day, but none to Mary. She was doubtless living at Jerusalem with John, cherished with the tenderness which her tender soul would have specially needed, and which undoubtedly she found pre-eminently in John. We have no record of her presence at the Ascension. Arator, a writer f the 6th century, describes her as being at the time not on the spot, but in Jerusalem (Arat. De Act. post. 1. 50, apud Migne, 68. 95 [Paris, 1848], quoted by Wordsworth, Gk. Test. Com. on the Acts, 1:14). We have no account of her being present at the descent of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost. What we do read of her is, that she remained steadfast in prayer in the upper room at Jerusalem with Mary Magdalene and Salome, and those known as the Lord's brothers and the apostles (Act 1:14). This is the last view that we have of her. Holy Scripture leaves her engaged in prayer (see Wordsworth, as cited above).

6. From this point forwards we know nothing of her. It is probable that the rest of her life was spent in Jerusalem with John (see Epiph. Haer. 78). According to one tradition, the beloved disciple would not leave Palestine until she had expired in his arms (see Tholuck, Light from the Cross, vol. 2, Serm. x, p. 234 [Edinb. 1857]); and it is added that she lived and died in the Coenaculum, in what is now the Mosque of the Tomb of David, the traditional chamber of the Last Supper (Stanley, S. and P. ch. 14, p.456). Other traditions make her journey with John to Ephesus, and there die in extreme old age. It was believed by some in the 5th century that she was buried at Ephesus (see Conc. Ephes., Conc. Labb. 3:574 a); by others, in the same century, that she was buried at Gethsenane, and this appears to have been the information given to Marcian and Pulcheria by Juvenal of Jerusalem. As soon as we lose the guidance of Scripture, we have nothing from which we can derive any sure knowledge about her. The darkness in which we are left is in itself most instructive.

7. The character of the Virgin Mary is not drawn by any of the evangelists, but some of its lineaments are incidentally manifested in the fragmentary record which is given of her. They are to be found for the most part in Luke's Gospel, whence an attempt has been made, by a curious mixture of the imaginative and rationalistic methods of interpretation, to explain the old legend which tells us that Luke painted the Virgin's portrait (Calmet, Kitto, Migne, Mrs. Jameson). We might have expected greater details from  John than from the other evangelists, but in his Gospel we learn nothing of her except what may be gathered from the scene at Cana and at the cross. It is clear from Luke's account, though without any such intimation we might rest assured of the fact, that her youth had been spent in the study of the holy Scriptures, and that she had set before her the example of the holy women of the Old Testament as her model. This would appear from the Magnificat (Luk 1:46). The same hymn, so far as it emanated from herself, would show no little power of mind as well as warmth of spirit. Her faith and humility exhibit themselves in her immediate surrender of herself to the divine will, though ignorant how that will should be accomplished (Luk 1:38); her energy and earnestness, her journey from Nazareth to Hebron (Luk 1:39); her happy thankfulness, in her song of joy (Luk 1:48); her silent, musing thoughtfulness, in her pondering over the shepherds' visit (Luk 2:19), and in her keeping her Son's words in her heart (Luk 2:51), though she could not fully understand their import. Again, her humility is seen in her drawing back, yet without anger, after receiving reproof at Cana, in Galilee (Joh 2:5), and in the remarkable manner in which she shuns putting herself forward throughout the whole of her Son's ministry, or after his removal from earth. Once only does she attempt to interfere with her divine Son's freedom of action (Mat 12:46; Mar 3:31; Luk 8:19); and even here we can hardly blame, for she seems to have been roused, not by arrogance and by a desire to show her authority and relationship, as Chrysostom supposes (Hom. 44 in Matt.), but by a woman's and a mother's feelings of affection and fear for him whom she loved. It was part of that exquisite tenderness which appears throughout to have belonged to her. In a word, so far as Mary is portrayed to us in Scripture, she is, as we should have expected, the most tender, the most faithful, humble, patient, and loving of women, but a woman still. See Niemeyer, Charakt. 1:58.

II. Christian Legends. — These, as might naturally be expected, played an important part in the traditional history of Mary. They began to appear probably in the early part of the 3d century, and were usually published under false names. Of these the apocryphal writings called the Protevangeliumn and the Gospel of the Birth of Mary are among the earlier specimens. We give at considerable length their conntents on this head.

1. The early Life of Mary. — According to these apocryphal accounts, Joachim and Anna were both of the house of David. The abode of the  former was Nazareth, the latter passed her early years at Bethlehem. They lived piously in the sight of God, and faultlessly before man, dividing their substance into three portions, one of which they devoted to the service of the Temple, another to the poor, and the third to their own wants. So twenty years of their lives passed silently away. But at the end of this period Joachim went to Jerusalem with some others of his tribe, to make his usual offering at the Feast of the Dedication. It chanced that Issachar was high-priest (Gospel of Birth of Mary); that Reuben was high-priest (Protevangelion). The high-priest scorned Joachim, and drove him roughly away, asking how he dared to present himself in company with those who had children, while he had none; and he refused to accept his offerings until he should have begotten a child, for the Scripture said, “Cursed is every one who does not beget a man-child in Israel.” Joachim was ashamed before his friends and neighbors, and he retired into the wilderness and fixed his tent there, and fasted forty days and forty nights. At the end of this period an angel appeared to him, and told him that his wife should conceive, and should bring forth a daughter, and he should call her name Mary. Anna meantime was much distressed at her husbands's absence, and being reproached by her maid Judith with her barrenness, she was overcome with grief of spirit. In her sadness she went into her garden to walk, dressed in her wedding-dress. She there sat down under a laurel-tree, and looked up and spied among the branches a sparrow's nest, and she bemoaned herself as more miserable than the very birds, for they were fruitful and she was barren; and she prayed that she might have a child, even as Sarai was blessed with Isaac. At this moment two angels appeared to her, and promised her that she should have a child who should be spoken of in all the world. Joachim returned joyfully to his home, and when the time was accomplished Anna brought forth a daughter, and they called her name Mary. Now the child Mary increased in strength day by day, and at nine months of age she walked nine steps. When she was three years old her parents brought her to the Temple, to dedicate her to the Lord. There were fifteen stairs up to the Temple, and, while Joseph and Mary were changing their dress, she walked up them without help; and the high-priest placed her upon the third step of the altar, and she danced with her feet, and all the house of Israel loved her. Then Mary remained at the Temple until she was twelve (Prot.), fourteen (G. B. M.), years old, ministered to by the angels, an aadvancing in perfection as in vears. At this time the high- priest commanded all the virgins that were in the Temple to return to their homes and to be married. But Mary refused, for she said that she had  vowed virginity to the Lord.

Thus the high-priest was brought into a perplexity, and he had recourse. to God to inquire what he should do. Then a voice from the ark answered him (G. B. M.), an angel spake unto him (Prot.); and they gathered together all the widowers in Israel (Prot.), all the marriageable men of the house of David (G. B. M.), and desired them to bring each man his rod. Among them came Joseph and brought his rod, but he shunned to present it, because he was an old man and had children. Therefore the other rods were presented and no sign occurred. Then it was found that Joseph had not presented his rod; and behold, as soon as he had presented it, a dove came forth from the rod and flew upon the head of Joseph (Prot.); a dove came from heaven and pitched on the rod (G. B. M.). So Joseph, in spite of his reluctance, was compelled to betroth himself to Mary, and he returned to Bethlehem to make preparations for his marriage (G. B. M.); he betook himself to his occupation of building houses (Prot.); while Mary went back to her parents' house in Galilee. Then it chanced that the priests needed a new veil for the Temple, and seven virgins cast lots to make different parts of it; and the lot to spin the true purple fell to Mary. As she went out with a pitcher to draw water, she heard a voice saying to her, “Hail, thou that art highly favored, the Lord is with thee. Blessed art thou among women!” and she looked round with trembling to see whence the voice came; and she laid down the pitcher and went into the house, and took the purple and sat down to work at it. But behold the angel Gabriel stood by her and filled the chamber with prodigious light, and said, “Fear not,” etc.

When Mary had finished the purple, she took it to the high-priest; and, having received his blessing, went to visit her cousin Elisabeth, and returned back again. Then Joseph returned to his home from building houses (Prot.); came into Galilee, to marry the Virgin to whom he was betrothed (G. B. M.), and finding her with child, he resolved to put her away privately; but being warned in a dream, he relinquished his purpose and took her to his house. Then came Annas the scribe to visit Joseph, and he went back and told the priest that Joseph had committed a great crime, for he had privately married the Virgin whom he had received out of the Temple, an d had not made it known to the children of Israel. So the priest sent his servants, and they found that she was with child; and he called them to him, and Joseph denied that the child was his, and the priest made Joseph drink the bitter water of trial (Num 5:18), and sent him to a mountainous place to see what would follow. But Joseph returned in perfect health, so the priest sent them away to their home. Then after three months Joseph put Mary on  an ass to go to Bethlehem to be taxed; and as they were going, Mary besought him to take her down, and Joseph took her down and carried her into a cave, and, leaving her there with his sons, he went to seek a midwife. As he went he looked up, and he saw the clouds astonished and all creatures amazed. The fowls stopped in their flight; the working people sat at their food, but did not eat; the sheep stood still; the shepherds' lifted hands became fixed; the kids were touching the water with their mouths, but did not drink. A midwife came down from the mountains, and Joseph took her with him to the cave, and a bright cloud overshadowed the cave, and the cloud became a great light, and when the bright light faded there appeared an infant at the breast of Mary. Then the midwife went out and told Salome that a Virgin had brought forth, and Salome would not believe; and they came back again into the cave, and Salome received satisfaction, but her hand withered away, nor was it restored until, by the command of an angel, she touched the child, whereupon she was straightway cured. See Giles, Codex Apocryphus Novi Testamenti, p. 33- 47 and 66-81 (Lond. 1852); Jones, On the New Testament, vol. 2, ch. 13 and 15 (Oxf. 1827); Thilo, Codex Apocryphus; also Vitae glorississimae Matris Anno peir F. Petrum Doriando, appended to Ludolph of Saxony's Vita Christi (Lyons, 1642); and a most audacious Historia Christi, written in Persian by the Jesuit P. Jerome Xavier, and exposed by Louis de Dieu (Lugd. Bat. 1639).

Three spots lay claim to be the scene of the Annunciation. Two of these are, as was to be expected, in Nazareth, and one, as every one knows, is in Italy. The Greeks and Latins each claim to be the guardians of the true spot in Palestine; the third claimant is the holy house of Loretto. The Greeks point out the spring of water mentioned in the Protevangelion as confirmatory of their claim. The Latins have engraved on a marble slab in the grotto of their convent in Nazareth the words Verbum hic caro factum est, and point out the pillar which marks the spot where the angel stood; while the head of their Church is irretrievably committed to the wild legend of Loretto. See Stanley, S. and P. ch. 14.

In the Gospel of the Infancy, which seems to date from the 2d century, innumerable miracles are made to attend on Mary and her Son during their sojourn in Egypt, e.g. Mary looked with pity on a woman who was possessed, and immediately Satan came out of her in the form of a young man, saying, “Woe is me because of thee, Mary, and thy Son!” On another occasion they fell in with two thieves, named Titus and Dumachus; and  Titus was gentle and Dumachus was harsh: the Lady Mary therefore promised Titus that God should receive him on his right hand. Accordingly, thirty-three years afterwards, Titus was the penitent thief who was crucified on the right hand, and Dumachus was crucified on the left. These are sufficient as samples. Throughout the book we find Mary associated with her Son, in the strange freaks of power attributed to them, in a way which shows us whence the cultus of Mary took its origin. See Jones, On the New Test. vol. 2 (Oxf. 1827); Giles, Codex Apocryphus; Thilo, Codex Apocryphus.

2. Mary's later Life. — The foregoing legends of Mary's childhood may be traced back as far as the third or even the second century. Those of her death are probably of a later date. The chief legend was for a length of time considered to be a veritable history, written by Melito, bishop of Sardis, in the 2d century. It is to be found in the Bibliotheca Maxima (tom. 2, pt. 2, p. 212), entitled Sancti Melitonis Episcopi Sardensis de Transitu Virginis Marice Liber; and there certainly existed a book with this title at the end of the 5th century, which was condemned by Pope Gelasius as apocryphal (Op. Gelas. apud Migne, 59:152). Another form of the same legend has been published at Elberfeld, in 1854, by Maximilian Enger in Arabic. He supposes that it is an Arabic translation from a Syriac original. It was found in the library at Bonn, and is entitled Joannis Apostoli de Transitu Beattae Marice Virginis Liber. It is perhaps the same as that referred to in Assemani (Biblioth. Orient. [Rome, 1725], 3:287), under the name of listoria Dormsitionis et Assumptionis B. Mariae Virginis Joanni Evangeliste falso inscripta. We give the substance of the legend with its main variations.

When the apostles separated in order to evangelize the world, Mary continued to live with John's parents in their house near the Mount of Olives, and every day she went out to pray at the tomb of Christ, and at Golgotha. But the Jews had placed a watch to prevent prayers being offered at these spots, and the watch went into the city and told the chief priests that Mary came daily to pray. Then the priests commanded the watch to stone her. At this time, however, king Abgarus wrote to Tiberius to desire him to take vengeance on the Jews for slaying Christ. They feared, therefore, to add to his wrath by slaying Mary also, and yet they could not allow her to continue her prayers at Golgotha, because an excitement and tumult was thereby made. Accordingly, they went and spoke softly to her, and she consented to. go and dwell in Bethlehem; and  thither she took with her three holy virgins who should attend upon her. In the twenty-second year after the ascension of the Lord, Mary felt her heart burn with an inexpressible longing to be with her Son; and behold an angel appeared to her, and announced to her that her soul should be taken up from her body on the third day, and he placed a palm-branch from paradise in her hands, and desired that it should be carried before her bier. Mary besought that the apostles might be gathered round her before she died, and the angel replied that they should come.

Then the Holy Spirit caught up John as he was preaching at Ephesus, and Peter as he was offering sacrifice at Rome, and Paul as he was disputing with the Jews near Rome, and Thomas in the extremity of India, and Matthew and James: these were all of the apostles who were still living; then the Holy Spirit awakened the dead, Philip and Andrew, and Luke and Simon, and Mark and Bartholomew; and all of them were snatched away in a bright cloud and found themselves at Bethlehem. Angels and powers without number descended from heaven and stood round about the house; Gabriel stood at blessed Mary's head, and Michael at her feet, and they fanned her with their wings; and Peter and John wiped away her tears; and there was a great cry, and they all said “Hail, blessed one! blessed is the fruit of thy womb!” The people of Bethlehem brought their sick to the house, and they were all healed. Then news of these things was carried to Jerusalem, and the king sent and commanded that they should bring Mary and the disciples to Jerusalem. Accordingly, horsemen came to Bethlehem to seize Mary, but they did not find her, for the Holy Spirit had taken her and the disciples in a cloud over the heads of the horsemen to Jerusalem. Then the men of Jerusalem saw angels ascending and descending at the spot where Mary's house was. But the high-priests went to the governor, and craved permission to burn her and the house with fire, and the governor gave them permission, and they brought wood and fire; but as soon as they came near to the house, behold there burst forth a fire upon them which consumed them utterly. Now the governor saw these things afar off, and in the evening he brought his son, who was sick, to Mary, and she healed him.

Then, on the sixth day of the week, the Holy Spirit commanded the apostles to take up Mary, and to carry her from Jerusalem to Gethsemane, and as they went the Jews saw them. Then drew near Juphia, one of the high-priests, and attempted to overthrow the litter on which she was carried, for the other priests had conspired with him, and they hoped to cast her down into the valley, and to throw wood upon her, and to burn her  body with fire. But as soon as Juphia had touched the litter the angel smote off his arms with a fiery sword, and the arms remained fastened to the litter. Then he cried to the disciples and Peter for help, and they said, “Ask it of the Lady Mary;” and he cried, “Lady, O Mother of Salvations, have mercy on me!” Then she said to Peter, “Give him back his arms;” and they were restored whole. But the disciples proceeded onwards, and they laid down the litter in a cave, as they were commanded, and gave themselves to prayer.

Now the angel Gabriel announced that on the first day of the week Mary's soul should be removed from this world. So on the morning of that day there came Eve, and Anne, and Elisabeth, and they kissed Mary, and told her who they were: there came Adam. Seth, Shem, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, David, and the rest of the old fathers: there came Enoch, and Elias, and Moses: there came twelve chariots of angels innumerable: and then appeared the Lord Christ in his humanity, and Mary bowed before him and said, “O my Lord and my God, place thy hand upon me;” and he stretched out his hand and blessed her; and she took his hand and kissed it, and placed it to her forehead, and said, “I bow before this right hand, which has made heaven and earth, and all that in them is, and I thank thee and praise thee that thou hast thought me worthy of this hour.” Then she said, “O Lord, take me to thyself!” But he said to her, “Now shall thy body be in paradise to the day of the resurrection, and angels shall serve thee; but thy pure spirit shall shine in the kingdom, in the dwelling-place of my Father's fullness.” Then the disciples drew near, and besought her to pria for the world which she was about to leave. So Mary prayed. After her prayer was finished her face shone with marvelous brightness, and she stretched out her hands and blessed them all; and her Son put forth his hands and received her pure soul, and bore it into his Father's treasure-house. Then there was a light and a sweet smell, sweeter than anything on earth; and a voice from heaven saving, “Hail, blessed one! blessed and celebrated art thou among women” (The legend ascribed to Melito makes her soul to be carried to paradise by Gabriel while her Son returns to heaven.)

Now the apostles carried her body to the valley of Jehoshaphat, to a place which the Lord had told them of, and John went before and carried the palm-branch. There they placed her in a new tomb, and sat at the mouth of the sepulcher, as the Lord commanded them; and suddenly there appeared the Lord Christ surrounded by a multitude of angels, and said to the apostles, “What will ye that I should do with her whom my Father's  command selected out of all the tribes of Israel that I should dwell in her?” So Peter and the apostles besought him that he would raise the body of Mary and take it with him in glory to heaven. Then the Savior said, ‘Be it according to your word.” So he commanded Michael the archangel to bring down the soul of Mary. Then Gabriel rolled away the stone, and the Lord said, “Rise up, my beloved, thy body shall not suffer corruption ill the tomb.” Immediately Mary arose, and bowed herself at his feet and worshipped; and the Lord kissed her, and gave her to the angels to carry her to paradise.

But Thomas was not present with the rest, for at the moment that he was summoned to come he was baptizing Polodius, who was the son of the sister of the king. And he arrived just after all these things were accomplished, and he demanded to see the sepulcher in which they had laid his Lady: “For ye know,” said he, “that I am Thomas, and unless I see I will not believe.” Then Peter arose in haste and wrath, and the other disciples with him, and they opened the sepulcher and went in; but they found nothing therein save that in which her body had been wrapped. Then Thomas confessed that he too, as he was borne in the cloud from India, had seen her holy body carried by the angels with great triumph into heaven; and that on his crying to her for her blessing, she had bestowed upon him her precious Girdle. which when the apostles saw they were glad. Then the apostles were carried back each to his own place. For the story of this Sacratissimo Cintolo, still preserved at Prato, see Mrs. Jameson's Legends of the Madonna, p. 344 (Lond. 1852).

On this part of the legend, see generally Joannis Apostoli de Tran situ Benate Mariae Virginis Liber (Elberfeldae, 18.54); St. Aelitonis Episc. Sard. de Transitu V. M. Liber, apud Bibl. Malx. Pasr. tom. ii, pt.ii, p. 212 (Lugd. 1677); Jacobi a Voragine. Legenda. Aureas, ed. Graesse, ch. 119, p. 504 (Dresd. 1846); John Damasc. Serma. de Dorsit. Deiparce, in Opp. ii, p. 857 sq. (Venice, 1743); Andresw of Crete, In Dornmit. Deiparce Sersr. iii, p. 115 (Par. 1644); Mrs. Jameson, Legends of the Madonna (London, 1852); Butler, Lives of the Saints in Aug. 15; Dressel, Edita et inedita Epipahanii Monachi et Presbyteri, p. 105 (Paris, 1843).

3. Her Assumption. — The above story gradually gained credit. At the end of the 5th century we find that there existed a book, De Transitu Virginis Mariae, which was condemned by pope Gelasius as apocryphal. This book is without doubt the oldest form of the legend, of which the books ascribed  to Melito and John are variations. Down to the end of the 5th century, the the story of the Assumption was external to the Church, and distinctly looked upon by the Church as belonging to the heretics and not to her. But then cam he the change of sentiment on this subject consequent on the Nestorian controversy. The desire to protest against the early fables which had been spread abroad by the heretics had now passed away, and had been succeeded by the desire to magnify her who had brought forth him who was God. Accordingly a writer, whose date Baronius fixes at about this time (Ann. Eccl. 1:347, Lucca, 1738), suggested the possibility of the Assumption, but declared his inability to decide the question. The letter in which this possibility or probability is thrown out came to be attributed to Jerome, and may still be found among his works, entitled Ad Paulam et Eustochium de Assumptione B. Virginis (v. 82, Paris, 1706). About the same time, probably, or rather later, an assertion (now recognized on all hands to be a forgery) was made in Eusebius's Chronicle, to the effect that “in the year A.D. 48 Mary the Virgin was taken up into heaven, as some wrote that they had had it revealed to them.” Another tract was written to prove that the Assumption was not a thing in itself unlikely; and this came to be attributed to St. Augustine, and may be found in the appendix to his works; and a sermon, with a similar purport, was ascribed to St. Athanasius.

Thus tie names of Eusebius, Jerome, Augustine, Athanasius, and others, came to be quoted as maintaining the truth of the Assumption. The first writers within the Church in whose extant writings we find the Assumption asserted, are Gregory of Tours in the 6th century, who has merely copied Melito's book, De Transitu (De Glor. Mart. lib. 1, c. 4; Migne, 71, p. 708); Andrew of Crete, who probably lived in the 7th century; and John of Damascus, who lived at the beginning of the 8th century. The last of these authors refers to the Euthymiac history as stating that Marcian and Pulcheria, being in search of the body of Mary, sent to Juvenal of Jerusalem to inquire for it. Juvenal replied, “In the holy and divinely-inspired Scriptures, indeed, nothing is recorded of the departure of the holy Mary, Mother of God. But from an ancient and most true tradition we have received, that at the time of her glorious falling asleep all the holy apostles, who were going through the world for the salvation of the nations, borne aloft in a moment of time, came together to Jerusalem; and when they were near her they had a vision of angels, and divine melody was heard; and then with divine and more than heavenly melody she delivered her holy soul into the hands of God in an unspeakable manner. But that which had borne God, being carried with angelic and apostolic  psalmody, with funeral rites, was deposited in a coffin at Gethsemane. In this place the chorus and singing of the angels continued three whole days. But after three days, on the angelic music ceasing, those of the apostles who were present opened the tomb, as one of them, Thomas, had been absent, and on his arrival wished to adore the body which had borne God. But her all-glorious body they could not find; but they found the linen clothes lying, and they were filled with an ineffable odor of sweetness which proceeded from them. Then they closed the coffin. And they were astonished at the mysterious wonder, and they came to no other conclusion than that he who had chosen to take flesh of the Virgin Mary, and to become a man, and to be born of her — God the Word, the Lord of Glory — and had preserved her virginity after birth, was also pleased, after her departure, to honor her immaculate and unpolluted body with incorruption, and to translate her before the common resurrection of all men” (St. Joan. Damas. (Op. 2:880, Venice, 1748). It is quite clear that this is the same legend as that which we have before given. Here, then, we see it brought over the borders and planted within the Church, if this “Euthymiac history” is to be accepted as veritable, by Juvenal of Jerusalem in the 5th century, or else by Gregory of Tours in the 6th century, or by Andrew of Crete in the 7th century, or, finally, by John of Damascus in the 8th century (see his three Homilies on the Sleep of the Blessed Virgin Mary, in his Opp. 2:857- 886). The same legend is given in a slightly different form as veritable history by Nicephorus Callistus in the 13th century (Niceph. 1:171, Paris, 1630); and the fact of the Assumption is stereotyped in the Breviary services for August 15 (Brev. Rom. Pars cest. p. 551, Milan, 1851). Here again, then, we see a legend originated by heretics, and remaining external to the Church till the close of the 5th century, creeping into the Church during the 6th and 7th centuries, and finally ratified by the authority both of Rome and Constantinople. See Baronius, Anmn. Eccl. (1:344, Lucca, 1738) and Martyrologium (p. 314, Paris, 1607).

4. On the dogma of Mary's sinlessness, SEE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION. On her worship, SEE MARIOLATRY. On the alleged transportation of her dwelling to Italys SEE LORETTO.

III. Jewish Traditions. — These are of a very different nature from the light-hearted fairy-tale-like stories which we have recounted above. We should expect that the miraculous birth of our Lord would be an occasion of scoffing to the unbelieving Jews, and we find this to be the case. We have already a hint during our Lord's ministry of the Jewish calumnies as  to his birth. “We (ἡμεῖς) be not born of fornication” (Joh 8:41), seems to be an insinuation on the Jews' part that he was. To the Christian believer the Jewish slander becomes in the present case only a confirmation of his faith. The most definite and outspoken of these slanders is that which is contained in the book called תולרות ישוע, or Toledoth Jesu. It was grasped at with avidity by Voltaire, and declared by him to be the most ancient Jewish writing directed against Christianity, and apparently of the first century. It was written, he says, before the Gospels, and is altogether contrary to them (Lettre sur les Juifs). It is proved by Ammon (Biblisch. Theologie, p. 263, Erlang. 1801) to be a composition of the 13th century, and by Wagenseil (Tela ignea Satanae; Confut. Libr. Toldos Jeschu, p. 12, Altorf, 1681) to be irreconcilable until the earlier Jewish tales. In the Gospel of Nicodemus, otherwise called the Acts of Pilate, we find the Jews represented as charging our Lord with illegitimate birth (c. 2). The date of this Gospel is about the end of the third century. The origin of the charge is referred with great probability by Thilo (Codex Apocsr. p. 527, Lips. 1832) to the circular letters of the Jews mentioned by Grotius (ad Mat 27:63, et ad Act. Apost. 28:22; Op. 2:278 and 666, Basil. 1732), which were sent from Palestine to all the Jewish synagogues after the death of Christ, with the view of attacking “the lawless and atheistic sect which had taken its origin from the deceiver Jesus of Galilee” (Justin, adv. Tryph.). The first time that we find it openly proclaimed is in an extract made by Origen from the work of Celsus, which he is refuting. Celsus introduces a Jew declaring that the mother of Jesus was repudiated by her husband for adultery (ὑπὸ τοῦ γήμαντος, τέκτονος τὴν τέχνην ὄντος. ἐξεῶσθαι, ἐλεγχθεῖσαν ὡς μεμοεχευμένην, Contra Celsum, c. 28, Origenis Opera, 18:59, Berlin, 1845; again, ἡ τοῦ Ιησοῦ μήτηρ κύουσα, έξωσθεῖσα ὑπὸ τοῦ μνηστευσαμένου αὐτὴν τέκτονος, ἐλεγχθεῖσα ἐπὶ μοιχείᾷ καὶ τίκτουσα ἀπό τινος στρατιώτου Πανθήρα τοὔνομα, ibid. 32).

Stories to the same effect may be found in the Talmud-not in the Mishna, which dates from the 2d century, but in the Gemara, which is of the 5th or 6th (see Tract. Sanhedrin, cap. 7, fol. 67, Colossians 1; Shabbath, cap. 12, fol. 104, Colossians 2; and the Midrash Koheleth, cap. 10:5). Rabanus Maurus, in the 9th century, refers to the same story: “Jesum filium Ethnici cujusdam Pandera adulteri, more latronum punitum esse.” Lightfoot quotes the same story from the Talmudists (Exercit. at Mat 27:56), who, he says, often vilify Mary under the name of Satdah; and he cites a story in which she is called Mary the daughter of Heli, and is represented as hanging in torment among the damned, with the great bar of hell's gate hung at her  ear (ibid. at Luk 3:23). We then come to the Toledoth Jesu, in which these caltmunies were intended to be summed up and harmonized. In the year 4671, the story runs, in the reign of king Jannaeus, there was one Joseph Pandera who lived at Bethlehem. In the same village there was a widow who had a daughter named Miriam, who was betrothed to a God- fearing man named Johanan. Now it came to pass that Joseph Pandera meeting with Miriam when it was dark, deceived her into the belief that he was Johanan her husband. So after three months Johanan consulted rabbi Sirmeon Shetachides what he should do with Miriam, and the rabbi advised him to bring her before the great council. But Johanan was ashamed to do so, and instead he left his home and went and lived at Babylon; and there Miriam brought forth a son, and gave him the name of Jehoshua. The rest of the work, which has no merit in a literary aspect or otherwise, contains an account of how this Jehoshua gained the art of working miracles by stealing the knowledge of the unmentionable name from the Temple; how he was defeated by the superior magical arts of one Juda; and how at last he was crucified, and his body hidden under a watercourse. It is offensive to make use of sacred names in connection with such tales; but in Wagensei's quaint words we may recollect, “hec nomina non attinere ad Servatorem Nostrum aut beatissimam illius matrem cceterosque quos significare videntur, sed designari iis a Diabolo supposita Spectra, Larvas, Lemures, Lamias, Stryges, aut si quid turpius istis” (Liber Toldos Jeschu, in the Tel nea ea Satanae, p. 2, Altorf, 1681). It is a curious thing that a Pandera or Panther has been introduced into the genealogy of our Lord by Epiphanius (Haeres. 78), who makes him grandfather of Joseph, and by John of Damascus (De Fide orthodoxa, 4:15), who makes him the father of Barpanther and grandfather of Mary.

IV. Mohammnedan Traditions. — These are again cast in a totally different mold from those of the Jews. The Mohammedans had no purpose to serve in spreading calumnious stories as to the birth of Jesus, and accordingly we find none of the Jewish malignity about their traditions. Mohammed and his followers appear to have gathered up the floating Oriental traditions which originated in tie legends of Mary's early years, given above, and to have drawn from them and from the Bible indifferently. It has been suggested that the Koran had an object in magnifying Mary, and that this was to insinuate that the Son was of no other nature than the mother. But this does not appear to be the case. Mohammed seems merely  to have written down what had come to his ears about her, without definite theological purpose or inquiry.

Mary was, according to the Koran, the daughter of Amram (sur. 3) and the sister of Aaron (sur. 19). Mohammed can hardly be absolved from having here confounded Miriam the sister of Moses with Mary the mother of our Lord. It is possible, indeed, that he may have meant different persons, and such is the opinion of Sale (Koran, p. 38, 251) and of D'Herbelot (Bibl. Orient. s.v. Miriam); but the opposite view is more likely (see Gaudagnoli, Apol. pro rel. Christ. c. 8, p. 277, Romans 1631). Indeed, some of the Mohammedan commentators have been driven to account for the chronological difficulty by saying that Miriam was miraculously kept alive from the days of Moses in order that she might be the mother of Jesus. Her mother Hannah dedicated her to the Lord while still in the womb, and at her birth “commended her and her future issue to the protection of God against Satan.” So Hannah brought the child to the Temple to be educated by the priests, and the priests disputed among themselves who should take charge of her. Zacharias maintained that it was his office, because he had married her aunt. But when the others would not give up their claims, it was determined that the matter should be decided by lot. So they went to the river Jordan, twenty-seven of them, each man with his rod: and they threw their rods into the river, and none of them floated save that of Zacharias, whereupon the care of the child was committed to him (Al Beidawi; Jallalo'ddin). Then Zacharias placed her in an inner chamber by herself; and though he kept seven doors ever locked upon her (other stories make the only entrance to be by a ladder and a door always kept locked), he always found her abundantly supplied with provisions which God sent her from paradise, winter fruits in summer, and summer fruits in winter. Then the angels said unto her, “O Mary, verily God hath chosen thee, and hath purified thee, and hath chosen thee above all the women of the world” (Koran, sur. 3). So she retired to a place towards the east, and Gabriel appeared unto her and said, “Verily I am the messenger of thy Lord, and am sent to give thee a holy Son” (sur. 19). Then the angels said, “O Mary, verily God sendeth thee good tidings that thou shalt bear the Word proceeding from himself: His name shall be Christ Jesus, the Son of Mary, honorable in this world and in the world to come, and one of them who approach near to the presence of God: and he shall speak unto men in his cradle and when he is grown up; and he shall be one of the righteous.” But she said, “How shall I have a son, seeing I know not a man?” The  angel said, “So God createth that which he pleaseth: when he decreeth a thing, he only saith unto it, ‘Be,' and it is. God shall teach him the Scripture and wisdom, and the Law and the Gospel, and shall appoint him his apostle to the children of Israel” (sur. 3). So God breathed of his Spirit into the womb of Mary; and she preserved her chastity (sur. 66); for the Jews have spoken against her a grievous calumny (sur. 4). ‘Thus she conceived a son, and retired with him apart to a distant place; and the pains of childbirth came upon her near the trunk of a palm-tree; and God provided a rivulet for her, and she shook the palm-tree, and it let fall ripe dates, and she ate and drank, and was calm. Then she carried the child in her arms to her people; but they said that it was a strange thing she had done. Then she made signs to the child to answer them; and he said, “Verily I am the servant of God: he hath given me the book of the Gospel, and hath appointed me a prophet; and he hath made me blessed, wheresoever I shall be; and hath commanded me to observe prayer and to give alms so long as I shall live; and he hath made me dutiful towards my mother, and hath not made me proud or unhappy: and peace be on me the day whereon I was born, and the day whereon I shall die, and the day whereon I shall be raised to life.” This was Jesus the son of Mary, the Word of Truth, concerning whom they had doubt (sur. 19).

Mohammed is reported to have said that many men have arrived at perfection, but only four women; and that these are, Asia the wife of Pharaoh, Mary the daughter of Amram, his first wife Khadijah, and his daughter Fatima.

The commentators on the Koran tell us that every person who comes into the world is touched at his birth by the devil. alnd therefore cries out; but that God placed a veil between Mary and her Son and the Evil Spirit, so that lie could not reach them. For this reason they were neither of them guilty of sin, like the rest of the children of Adam. This privilege they had in answer to Hannah's prayer for their protection from Satan (Jallaloddin; Al Beidawi; Kitada). The Immaculate Conception therefore, we may note, was a Mohammedan doctrine six centuries before any Christian theologians or schoolmen maintained it.

See Sale, Koran, p. 39. 79, 250, 458 (Lond. 1734); Warner, Comnpendium Historicumn eorum quae Muhammedani de Christo tradiderunt (Lugd. Bat. 1643); Gaudagnoli, Apologia pro Christiana Religione (Romans  1631); D'Herbelot, Bibliotheque Orientale, p. 58 (Paris 1697); Weil, Biblische Legenden der Muselmänner, p. 230 (Frkf. 1845).

V. Emblems. — There was a time in the history of the Church when all the expressions used in the book of Canticles were applied at once to Mary. Consequently all the Eastern metaphors of king Solomon have been hardened into symbols, and represented in pictures or sculpture, and attached to her in popular litanies. The same method of interpretation was applied to certain parts of the book of the Revelation. Her chief emblems are the sun, moon, and stars (Rev 12:1; Son 6:10). The name of Star of the Sea is also given her, from a fanciful interpretation of the meaning of her name. She is the Rose of Sharon (Son 2:1) and the Lily (Son 2:2), the Tower of David (Son 4:4), the Mountain of Myrrh and the Hill of Frankincense (Son 4:6). the Garden enclosed, the Spring shut up, the Fountain sealed (Son 4:12), the Tower of Ivory (Son 7:4), the Palm-tree (Son 7:7), the Closed Gtate (Eze 44:2). There is no end to these metaphorical titles. See Mrs. Jameson's Leqends of the Madonna, and the ordinary Litanies of the Blessed Virgin.

VI. Festivals, etc. — The Festival of Mary's Conception is said to have been instituted on the occasion of the preservation from shipwreck of St. Anselm, afterwards archbishop of Canterbury, and by the direction of Mary herself, who informed him that the day of her conception was the 8th of December.

The Nativity of the Virgin. — There is a good deal of controversy as to the time of its first celebration and its origin. It is celebrated on the 8th of September, and is not traceable further back than the 9th century. There is a Romish calumny that queen Elizabeth substituted her own birthday in its place.

Her Presentation in the Temple, November 21, mentioned in very early martyrologies, and in a constitution of the emperor Manuel Comnenus.

Her Espousals, January 23. The Annunciation, March 25. The Visitation, July 2, established by Urban VI., and approved by the Council of Basle.

The Purification, February 2, established in the East under the emperor Justinian, and a little later in the West.  The Assumption (κοίμησις, in the Greek Church), celebrated originally at different times, but fixed to be on the 15th of August about the time of Charlemagne.

Besides the great festivals in honor of Mary, particular churches and fraternities have had their private ones. Several religious orders have chosen her for their especial patroness, and the whole kingdom of France was, in 1638, placed under her protection by a vow of Louis XIII. Festivals have been established in honor of particular objects connected with her, as the chamber in which she was born, and which was conveyed miraculously from Nazareth to Loretto (q.v.). la Cintosla at Prato, la Saint Chemise at Chartres, the rosary which she gave to St. Dominic, and the scapular which she gave to Simon Stock; and indulgences have been granted on the occasion of these festivals, and the devotions they elicited. Books have been written to describe her miraculous pictures and images, and the boundless extent and diversity of the literature to which her worship has given rise may be inferred from a description of two of the 115 works, all on the same subject, of Hippolyte Maracci, a member of the congregation of the Clerks of the Mother of God, born 1604. Bibliotheca Mariana is a biographical and bibliographical notice in alphabetical order of all the authors who have written on any of the attributes or perfections of the holy Virgin, with a list of their works. The number of writers amounts to more than 3000, and the number of works in print or MS. to twice as many. This rare and highly-valued work is accompanied by five curious and useful indices. The other is Conceptio immaculate Deiparae Virginis Marili celebrata MCXV anagrammatibus priorsus purlis ex hoc salutationis Angelicae programmate deductis “Ave Maria gratiâ plena Dominus tecum.” This work of which Maracci was only the editor, certainly exceeds in laborious trifling the production of father J. B. Hepburne, the Scotch Minim, who dedicated to his patron, Paul V, seventy-two encomiums on the Virgin in as many different languages.

For further literature, see Volbeding, Index Programmatum, p. 9; Darling, Cyclopaedia Bibliographica, col. 1841 sq.; Danz, Worterbuch, s.v. Maria; Winer, Realw. s.v. SEE JESUS CHRIST; SEE VIRGIN.

## Mary Of Agreda[[@Headword:Mary Of Agreda]]

             SEE AGREDA, MARIA DE.

## Mary Of Egypt[[@Headword:Mary Of Egypt]]

             a saint of the Roman Catholic Church, according to her legend, ran away from her parents when twelve years of age; led a very dissolute life for seventeen years at Alexandria, and then joined a party of pilgrims on their way to Jerusalem, with the intention of living there in the same manner. Arriving in that city, she wished to visit the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, but was held back by an unseen power; she then knelt before an image of Mary, and vowed to reform her life. She was now permitted to enter the church, and, after praying to the cross, asked the Virgin to direct her what she should do to be agreeable to God. A supernatural voice told her to go to the other side of Jordan, into the wilderness. Mary obeyed, and lived there forty-seven years, enduring privations of all kinds, until the monk Zosimus discovered her one day, an old, naked, sunburnt woman, covered with white hair. She asked him for his cloak, his prayers, and his blessing; related to him her history, and asked him to come to see her again in a year, and to bring her the communion. As he came at the appointed time, she met him and communed with him. But when he went again to her, as appointed, three years afterwards, he found only a corpse, and her name written beside her on the sand. After he had long tried in vain to dig a -rave to bury her, a lion came and helped him. According to the general opinion, she died during the reign of Theodosius the Younger. Her grave became a great shrine, and a number of churches and chapels were placed under her protection. She is most honored in the Greek Church, and fis commemorated ou. Leviticus 2 d of April. See C. Baronii Martyrologium, Romanum (Moguntiae, 1631, p. 209 sq.); Herzog, Real-Encyklopädie, 9:105. (J. N. P.)

## Mary Queen Of England[[@Headword:Mary Queen Of England]]

             daughter of Henry VIII by his first wife, Catharine of Aragon, is commonly called Bloody Queen Mary, on account of her cruel persecutions of the Protestants — “a history of horrors exceeded only by the persecutions in the Netherlands by Alva, and of Louis XIV after the revocation of the  Edict of Nantes.” She was born at Greenwich, on the 18th (Burnet says 19th) of February, 1516. The only living one of several children borne by her mother, she was on this account, according to Burnet, and because her father was then “out of hopes of more children,” declared in 1518 princess of Wales, and sent to Ludlow, to hold her court there, divers matches being projected for her, none of which, however, were carried into effect. After the divorce of Catharine, and Henry's marriage of Anne Boleyn, Mary's position waned at court, and finally the title of princess of Wales was transferred to princess Elizabeth, soon after she came into the world. Mary had been brought up from her infancy in a strong attachment to the ancient religion, under the care of her mother, and Margaret, countess of Salisbury, the effect of whose instructions was not impaired by the subsequent lessons of the learned Ludovicus Vives, who, though somewhat inclined to the Reformed opinions, was appointed by Henry to be her Latin tutor. The profligate conduct of her father, and the wrongs inflicted upon her mother, naturally had the effect of making her still more attached to the Roman Catholics.

But immediately after the execution of queen Anne in 1536, a reconcilement took place between Henry and his eldest daughter, who was now prevailed upon to make a formal acknowledgment both of Henry's ecclesiastical supremacy — utterly refusing “the bishop of Rome's pretended authority, power, and jurisdiction within this realm heretofore usurped” — and of the nullity of the marriage of her father and mother, which she declared was “by God's law and man's law incestuous and unlawful.” (See the “Confession of me, the Lady Mary,” as printed by Burnet Hist. Ref. from the original, “all written with her own hand.”) This very year, however, shortly after the marriage of Jane Seymour, a new act of succession was passed, by which she was again, as well as her sister Elizabeth, declared illegitimate, and forever excluded from claiming the inheritance of the crown as the king's lawful heir by lineal descent. But as, by the powers reserved to Henry VIII of nominating his own successor after failure of the issue of queen Jane, or of any other queen whom he might afterwards marry, a possible chance was left to Mary, she continued to yield an outward conformity to all her father's capricious movements, even in the matter of religion, and she so far succeeded in regaining his favor that in the new act of succession, passed in 1544, the inheritance to the crown was expressly secured to her next after her brother Edward and his heirs, and any issue the king might have by his then wife Catharine Parr. Upon the death of Henry VIII and the accession of Edward to the throne of England (1544), Mary's hopes of reigning one day over England were  darkened by the persistent efforts of her half-brother to establish the religion of the Reformers.

Mary's compliance with the innovations in religion in her father's time, as we have noted above, had been dictated merely by fear or self-interest; no longer restrained, she manifested her fidelity to and affection for the court of Rome when, after Edward's accession, his ministers proceeded to place the whole doctrine, as well as discipline, of the national Church upon a new foundation. She openly refused to go along with them, nor could all their persuasions and threats, aided by those of her brother himself, move her from her ground. (Full details of the various attempts that were made to prevail upon her may be found in Burnet's History, p. 417-420, and in king Edward's Journal. Mention is made in the latter, under date of April, 1549, of a demand for the hand of the lady Mary by the duke of Brunswick, who was informed by the council that “there was talk for her marriage with the infant of Portugal, which being determined, he should have answer.” About the same time it is noted that “whereas the emperor's ambassador desired leave, by letters patent, that my lady Mary might have mass, it was denied him.” On the 18th of March of the following year the king writes: “The lady Mary, my sister, came to me at Westminster, where, after salutations, she was called, with my council, into a chamber; where was declared how long I had suffered her mass, in hope of her reconciliation, and how now being no hope, which I perceived by her letters, except I saw some short amendment, I could not bear it. She answered that her soul was God's, and her faith she would not change, nor dissemble her opinion with contrary doings. It was said, I constrained not her faith, but wished her not as a king to rule, but as a subject to obey; and that her example might breed too much inconvenience.”)

Had it not been for the interference of Charles V, no doubt Mary would have suffered severe punishment for her persistency in remaining faithful to the pope. The emperor, who had once even asked her hand, and only withdrew his request when Catharine was divorced, made it “the condition of his friendly relations to the English government that Mary be left in the free enjoyment of her religious faith, and the king of England, rather than be subject to war, yielded-but with tears” (Lingard, Hist. of Engl. 7:66 sq.). Yet if Mary secured liberty of conscience, she secured it at the risk of a crown. for Mary's firm adherence to the Roman faith finally induced Edward, under the interested advice of his minister Northumberland, to attempt at the close of his life to exclude her from the succession, and to make over the crown by will to lady Jane Grey, an act which was certainly without any shadow of legal force, and failed to be of  any effect. Although lady Jane was actually proclaimed queen upon the death of Edward, Mary herself claimed the crown, and with scarcely any resistance secured the throne.

Mary's reign opens a new and bloody chapter in the history of England — a period in the ecclesiastical annals when the flame of Romanism, which had been slowly dying, was fanned into new life, and, glaring up wildly, spent its full fury, and quickly died, never to burn anew. Mary, as we have seen, was ever a faithful adherent to the cause of Rome; she had quietly submitted to the innovations under Henry VIII to secure her father's favors, but as she grew older she grew more decided. Indeed, her own legitimacy to the throne was. involved in her acknowledgment of the pope. One of the pontiffs had confirmed her mother's marriage, and another had refused to annul it. Impressed by this truth, she had clung closely to the Church of her infancy, even when she seemed in danger of losing the privilege of succession, and she faltered not when lady Jane Grey became the avowed heir of her half-brother. Quite in contrast with this bearing is her conduct after the decease of Edward. Satisfied that the wav to the throne could be opened only by Protestant aid, she hesitated not to pledge to the men of Suffolk, whose help she invoked, “that she would be content with her own private exercise of religion, and that she would not force that of others” (Butler, 2:437; Neale, 1:58). She even repeated a like declaration to the council, and renewed it as late as a month after her accession to the throne. Yet all this time she was preparing the way for a speedy return of England's clergy to the Church of Rome. Even before she had made these promises she had already sent a message to the Pope announcing her accession, and giving in her allegiance to him as a dutiful daughter of the Church (Butler, 2:437).

Mary made her accession to the throne on July 19. In the course of the month of August, Bonner (q, v.), Gardiner (q.v.), and three other bishops, who had been deposed for nonconformity in the late reign, were restored to their sees, and the mass, contrary to law, began again to be celebrated in many churches. In the following month archbishop Cranmer (q.v.) and bishop Latimer (q.v.), having opposed these popish innovations, were committed to the Tower. Soon after Ridley (q.v.) was committed, and upon the meeting of Parliament, Oct. 5, only three months after the king's death, but two of the Reformed bishops — Taylor of Lincoln and Harley of Hereford — remained in their sees, while Peter Martyr (q.v.), John à Lasko, SEE LASKO, and other foreign preachers, were advised to quit the  country. After the assembling of Parliament further steps were taken. An act was forced through repealing all the acts, nine in number, relating to religion that had been passed in the late reign, and restoring the Church to the same position which it had held at the death of Henry VIII. Most high handed were the games of bishop Gardiner, a man truly unscrupulous and void of moral sense. Seeking only to promote selfish ends, he had in the reign of Henry VIII been the most subservient instrument of the king in securing the divorce from Catharine, and to procure the archbishopric he now played a like unmerciful game against all who stood in his way. The crime he had perpetrated he assured Mary had been committed by Cranmer, and persuaded all that he had ever remained a most faithful servant of the pope. See GARDINER. Some writers will even have it that Mary was at this time inclined to be just to all her subjects, and that she was only led astray by this dastardly but wily ecclesiastic. But, be this as it may, certain it is that Mary acted in the interests of Romanism only, quite unmindful of the obligations she had assumed before the Protestants. In the Convocation, the Book of Common Prayer and Poynet's Catechism were pronounced “abominable and pestiferous books.” In the lower house, six divines disputed boldly against transubstantiation for three days; but when, overpowered by numbers, they left the house, four articles were framed which became the test of heresy to all who suffered in this reign. They affirmed

(1) communion in one kind;

(2) a transubstantiation of bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ;

(3) that worship should be rendered to the host;

(4) that Christ is offered up as a sacrifice in the mass (comp. Butler, 2:440).

Rome also promptly responded, and appointed a papal legate to England — cardinal Pole — but, as Gardiner himself was desirous to secure the position (Soames. 4:77), he urged the queen to request the legate to remain at home, at least until the match proposed between herself and Philip of Spain, the pious Catholic, be further matured. There was great opposition on the part of the people to this proposed union with Spain, and it was not best to trifle with popular opinion. Indeed, as it was, these measures, and other indications given by the court of a determination to be completely reconciled with Rome, were followed by insurrection (commonly known as that of Sir Thomas Wyat, its principal leader), which broke out in the end  of January, 1554. It is true this rebellion was in a few days effectually put down, its suppression being signalized by the executions of the unfortunate lady Jane Grey and her husband, the lord Guildford Dudley, of her father, the duke of Suffolk, and, finally, of Wyat himself; but the popular indignation, instead of bringing Mary to her senses, led her further and further away from the people over whom she had forced herself as ruler. She was well aware that the people were daily growing in dissatisfaction because of her decision to lead them back to Rome, and yet, in the face of all this opposition, she contracted a union with the greatest Roman Catholic power, the government of Charles V, by her marriage to Philip II (q.v.), July 25. Though the latter pledged himself to the performance of many concessions to the English, the Spanish match remained exceedingly unpopular.

Mary's success in quelling the rebellion which she had provoked gave her, however, most complete ascendency over the reactionists, and she promptly used her courage and capacity to entrench herself by the aid of Rome. Parliament, which was assembled in November, was completely under her sway, and, inspired by her, obediently passed acts repealing the attainder of cardinal Pole, who had long waited to make his appearance in England as the papal legate, restoring the authority of the pope, repealing all laws made against the see of Rome since Henry VIII, reviving the ancient statutes against heresy, and, in short, re-establishing the whole national system of religious policy as it had existed previous to the first innovations made by her father. By one of the acts of this session of Parliament, also, Philip was authorized to take the title of King of England during the queen's life. These measures became the inaugural ceremonies of a rule of bloodshed and tyranny that closed only with the decease of the principal author and actor — “Bloody Queen Mary” herself.

Not content, however, with having restored the power of the Church of Rome over the Anglican Church, Mary introduced new and severe measures for the suppression of those who had dared to follow her father and half brother in measures of ecclesiastical reform. Many of the clergy had married. One of her first acts now was the ejection of these clergy. The number of such, according to Burnet, was 12,000 out of 16,000; but this seems exaggerated, and we prefer to follow Butler, who estimates them at a little over 3,000, certainly a large enough number of men so suddenly deprived of their living, and, with thousands dependent upon them, at a moment's warning shut out from home and hearth. To say the least, the  measure was most tyrannical; not even the option of dissolving the marriage-bond was given, though they had been married under the sanction of the law of the land. Many of the bishops-sixteen of them — shared a like fate with their subordinates.

The question, however, still remained to be settled, How shall the heretic be treated?” Cardinal Pole, from his gentler temper and larger wisdom, advised mild measures in order to win them back; but, in case they could not be won, he would, equally with Gardiner and Bonner, have had them burned. Gardiner was now for measures of repression and vigor. He contended that relaxation in the time of Henry VIII had been the cause of the rapid spread of the heresy. He was disappointed of the see of Canterbury [which Pole had secured, of course], and enraged because his books against the papal supremacy were reprinted and dispersed through the country. The queen was always on the side of the severest measures,” and the remainder of the history of the reign of Mary is occupied chiefly with the sanguinary persecutions of the adherents to the Reformed doctrines. Most Protestant writers reckon that about 280 victims perished at the stake from Feb. 4, 1555, on which day John Rogers was burned at Smithfield, to Nov. 10, 1558, when the last auto-da-fe” of the reign took place by the execution in the same manner of three men and two women at Colchester. Dr. Lingard, the Roman Catholic, admits that after expunging from the Protestant lists “the names of all who were condemned as felons or traitors, or who died peaceably in their beds, or who survived the publication of their martyrdom, or who would for their heterodoxy have been sent to the stake by the Reformed prelates themselves, had they been in possession of the power,” and making every other possible allowance, it will still be found “that in the space of four years almost 200 persons perished in the flames for religious opinion.” The harrowing narrative, in its details, may be found in part in Burnet, and in full in Fox's Martyrology. Among the most distinguished sufferers were Hooper, bishop of Gloucester, Ferrar of St. David's, Latimer of Worcester, Ridley of London, and Cranmer, archbishop of Canterbury. Nor were the sufferings confined to the stake. Intolerance also carried grief, horror, and ferocity into all England by the persecution of those who were guilty of heresy, but were not considered fit subjects for the stake.

It is said that in the last three years of Mary's reign no less than “30,000 persons were exiled, and spoiled of their goods” (Butler, 2:445), among whom were not less than 800 theologians (comp. Fisher, p. 328).  The question has been raised, Who were most responsible for these persecutions? Gardiner, bishop of Winchester and lord chancellor, was Mary's chief minister till his death in November, 1555, after which the direction of affairs fell mostly into the hands of cardinal Pole, who, after Craumer's deposition, was made archbishop of Canterbury; but the notorious Bonner, Ridley's successor in the see of London, has the credit of having been the principal instigator of these atrocities, which, it may be remarked, so far from contributing to put down the Reformed doctrines, appear to have had a greater effect in disgusting the nation with the restored Church than all other causes together. Says Soames (4:385), “These horrid proceedings filled the whole kingdom with amazement, indignation, and disgust. Unfeeling Romish bigots were disappointed because this atrocious ebullition of their party's intolerance had wholly failed to overawe the spirit of their adversaries. Timid Protestants were encouraged by the noble constancy displayed among their friends. Moderate Romanists were ashamed of their spiritual guides. The mass of men, who live in stupid forgetfulness of God, were aroused from that lethargy of sensuality, covetousness, or vanity in which they dissipate existence, to reflect upon the principles which could support the human mind tranquil, or even exulting, amid such frightful agonies.”

At the same time that the attempt was thus made to extinguish the new opinions in religion by persecution at the stake, exile, and other severe measures, the queen gave a further proof of the ardor of her own faith by restoring to the Church the tenths and first-fruits, with all the rectories, glebe-lands, and tithes that had been annexed to the crown in the times of her father and brother. She also re-established several of the old monasteries which her father had dissolved, and endowed them as liberally as her means enabled her. Gladly would she have restored them all to the Church, “but it was feared that violent commotions would ensue if that course were adopted;” and the papal legate, while he “reluctantly assented” to the arrangement as proposed by the Convocation, “that the present titles to monasteries and Church lands should not be disturbed,” “admonished those who held those lands of the guilt of sacrilege, and reminded them of the doom of Belshazzar”(!). SEE MONASTICISM.

Froude, whom the Romanists are so eager to prove guilty of unfitness as a historian, has been one of the most lenient commentators on the conduct of Mary of England towards her people. He holds that, “To the time of her accession she had lived a blameless and, in many respects, a noble life; and few men or  women have lived less capable of doing knowingly a wrong thing.” He adds that her trials and disappointments, “it can hardly be doubted, affected her sanity,” and ascribes the guilt chiefly to Gardiner, and measurably to Pole. Unless it be on the point of insanity, we are inclined to hold Mary responsible for the persecutions of her reign, believing, with Ranke, that “whatever is done in the name of a prince, with his will and by his authority, decides his reputation in history.” In her domestic life Mary was. wretched. Philip, whom she loved with a morbid passion, proved a sour, selfish, and heartless husband; at once a bigot and a brute. No children followed their union; and exasperation and loneliness, working upon a temper naturally obstinate and sullen, without doubt rendered her more compliant to the sanguinary policy of the reactionary bishops. Fortunately for England, her reign was brief. She died — after suffering much and long from dropsy and nervous debility — Nov. 17, 1558. Her successor on the throne was her sister Elizabeth, who not only undid all the work she had accomplished, but finally and successfully established Protestantism as the faith of the nation. SEE ELIZABETH.

Queen Mary's literary productions, though of but minor interest at present, deserve mention here because of the peculiar bearing they have on her early history. She is said to have been a superior Latin scholar, and was commended by Erasmus. “Scripsit bene Latinas epistolas,” says he. Towards the end of her father's reign, at the earnest solicitation of queen Catharine Parr, she undertook to translate Erasmus's Paraphrase on the Gospel of St. John, but being cast into sickness, as Udall relates, partly by overmuch study in this work, after she had made some progress therein, she left the rest to be done by Dr. Mallet., her chaplain. This translation is printed in the first volume of Erastins's Paraphrase upon the New Testament (London, 1548, folio). The “Preface” was written by Udall, the famous master of Eton School, and addressed to the queen dowager. After her accession to the throne a proclamation was issued calling in and suppressing this very book, and all others that had any tendency towards furthering the Reformation. An ingenious writer is of opinion that the sickness which came upon her while she was translating St. John was all affected; “for,” says he, “she would not so easily have been cast into sickness had she been employed on the legends of St. Teresa or St. Catharine of Sienna.” Strype (3:468) has preserved three prayers or meditations of hers: the first, Against the Assaults of Vice; the second, A Meditation touching Adversity; the third, A Prayer to be read at the Hour  of Death. In Fox's Acts and Monuments are printed eight of her letters to king Edward and the lords of the council on her nonconformity, and on the imprisonment of her chaplain, Dr. Mallet. In the Sylloge epistolsarums are several more of her letters, extremely curious: one on her delicacy in never having written but to three men, one of affection for her sister, one after the death of Anne Boleyn, and one, very remarkable, of Cromwell to her. In Haynes's State Papers are two in Spanish, to the emperor Charles V. There is also a French letter, printed by Strype (3:318) from the Cotton Library, in answer to a haughty mandate from Philip, when he had a mind to marry the lady Elizabeth to the duke of Savoy, against the queen's and princess's inclination: it is written in a most abject manner and a wretched style. Bishop Tanner ascribes to her A History of her own Life and Death, and An Account of Martyrs in her Reign, but this is manifestly an error. See Homel, Marie la Sanglante (Paris, 1862, 8vo); Burnet, Hist. Ref. p. 458 sq.; Soames, Hist. Ref. vol. iv, ch. i-iv; Perry, Ch. Hist. of Ingl. 3:26, 96; Collier, Eccles. Hist. 6:1 sq.; Fuller, Ch. Hist. 2:36t9 sq.; Short, Eccles. Hist. of Engl. p. 351-358; Froude, Hist. of Engl. v vol. v, ch. xxviii, and the whole of vol. vi; Strickland, Queens of Engl.; ‘urner, Hist. of the Reigns of Edward VI, Mary, and Elizabeth (Lond. 1829, 8vo); Butler, Eccles. Hist. (Phila. 1872, Svo), vol. ii, ch. xliii; Wordsworth, Eccles. Biog. (see Index in vol. iv); Hardwick, Reformation, p. 240; Fisher (George P.), The Reformation (N.Y. 1873, 8vo), p. 327 sq.; Brit. and For. Review, 1844, p. 388 sq.; English Cyclop. s.v.

## Mary Stuart[[@Headword:Mary Stuart]]

             the famous queen of Scotland, whose name, Froude (Hist. of Engl. 7:369) says, “will never be spoken of in history without sad and profound emotion, however opinions may vary on the special details of her life,” the hope of Rome at an hour of sorest travail. was born at Linlithgow Dec. 8, 1542. She was the third child of king James V of Scotland, by his wife Mary of Lorraine, daughter of the duke of Guise, who had previously borne her husband two sons, both of whom died in infancy. A report prevailed that Mary too was not likely to live; but being unswaddled by her nurse at the desire of her anxious mother, in presence of the English ambassador, the latter wrote to his court that she was as goodly a child as he had seen of her age. At the time of her birth her father lay sick in the palace of Falkland, and in the course of a few days after he expired, at the  early age of thirty, his death being hastened by distress of mind occasioned by the defeats which his nobles had sustained at Fala and Solway Moss. James was naturally a person of considerable energy and vigor both of mind an body, but previous to his death he fell into a state of listlessness and despondency, and after his decease it was found that he had made no provision for the care of the infant princess or for the administration of the government. After great animosities among the nobility, it was decreed that the earl of Arran, as being by proximity of blood the next heir to the crown in legitimate descent, and the first peer of Scotland. should be made governor of the kingdom, and guardian of the queen, who remainedi in the mean time with her mother in the royal palace at Linlithgow. But while the diifficulty was settling, the Roman Catholics, fearing for the decline of their power if the choi;ce of the nobility should fall upon some one likely to join hands with Henry VIII, urged cardinal Beatoun. the head of their party, to seize the regency. Ambitious for office and power, Beatoun but too willingly listened to the advice of his friends, and, producing a testament which he asserted to be that of the late king, promptly claimed the control of the affairs of Scotland.

The fraud was not long undiscovered, but as great suit had been made by king Henry, in behalf of his son Edward, for the hand of the infant queen, and as Arran and his party had been indiscreet enough to accept the offer in spite of the opposition of the people, Beatoun held his own in the country, and finally even persuaded Arran to his views, and the engagement with England was annulled. The result was a war between Scotland and England, which ended most ignominiously for the highlanders. It is not at all likely that this war would have broken out between England and Scotland had it not been for the encouragement France gave to the Highlanders. Scotland had thus far remained true to the cause of Rome: a scion of the house of Guise (duke Claude) was on the throne, and the Reformation, though progressing in the adjoining country, had not yet been suffered to make much of an impression on the Scots. But the new doctrine had found an entrance at least. Indeed, the regent Arran was himself favorable to the Reformers, and in Parliament, as early as 1542, an act had been passed declaring it lawful for all to read the Scriptures in their native language. It was clear, therefore, that though Romanism had hitherto sustained its supremacy, its power was tottering. At this critical juncture of affairs France came forward and offered assistance to the Romish party. The cause of the Church must be upheld at all hazards. The result was the establishment of two camps. “The friends of the Reformation,” says Russell (Hist. of the Ch. of Scotland [Lond. 1834,  2 vols. 18mo], 1:181), “supported those counsels which had for their object the union of the British crowns; while the Romanists very naturally clung to that alliance which, aided by the personal influence of the queen- mother, promised to strengthen the foundations of their establishment, already somewhat shaken by the popular tempest.” Had Arran been a person of indomitable will and stability of purpose the cause of the Reformers might now have been firmly established, but he was “a weak and fickle man, liable at all times to be wrought upon and biased by those of greater decision and energy of character,” and his opponent, the wily cardinal, had obtained the ascendancy, and not only neutralized Arran's opposition, but actually brought him to approve and further the great masterscheme of the cardinal to give the young queen in marriage to the dauphin of France. In consonance with a treaty for this purpose, Mary was sent to France in 1548, to be educated in that country.

Soon after her arrival at her destination Mary was placed with the French king's own daughters in one of the first convents of the kingdom, where she made rapid progress in the acquisition of the literature and accomplishment of the age. She received instructions in the art of making verses by the famous Ronsard, and Latin was taught her by the great Scottish scholar Buchanan. When only fourteen years old she had attained to such a mastery of the language that she pronounced before Henry II a Latin oration, in which she maintained that it is becoming for women to study literature and master the liberal arts. Introduced at the court of Henry II, which, as Robertson observes, “was one of the politest but most corrupt in Europe,” Mary, while yet a child, became the envy of her sex, surpassing the most accomplished in the elegance and fluency of her language, the grace and liveliness of her movements, and the charm of her whole manner and behavior. “Graceful alike in person and intellect,” says Froude, “she possessed that peculiar beauty in which the form is lost in the expression, and which every painter, therefore, has represented differently. Rarely, perhaps, has any woman combined so many noticeable qualities as Mary Stuart: with a feminine insight into men and things and human life, she had cultivated herself to that high perfection in which accomplishments were no longer adventitious ornaments, but were wrought into her organic constitution ... She had vigor, energy, tenacity of purpose, with perfect and never-failing self-possession, and, as the one indispensable foundation for the effective use of all other qualities, she had indomitable courage” (Hist. of England, vol. 7, ch. 4). The dauphin, to whom she was betrothed, was  about two years her junior, but, as they had been playmates in early childhood, a mutual affection had sprung up between them, and when, on April 24, 1558, she was to be joined to him in wedlock, she hesitated not to submit to the most absurd stipulations. Not only was she obliged to agree that her intended husband should have the title of king of the Scots, but she was even betrayed into the signature of a secret deed, by which, if she died childless, both her Scottish realm and her right of succession to the English crown, as the granddaughter of Henry VII, were conveyed to France. The foolishness of this secret compact Mary had afterwards sufficient cause to regret more than once.

Scarce were the nuptial solemnities fairly over, when queen Mary of England died (1558). In accordance with the agreement entered into, France promptly put forward her claims to the vacated throne, and, though Elizabeth was made successor, Mary Stuart's rights were insisted upon, and continued to be urged with great pertinacity by her ambitious uncles the princes of Lorraine. “On every occasion on which The dauphin and dauphiness appeared in public, they were ostentatiously greeted as the king and queen of England; the English arms were engraved upon their plate, embroidered on their banners, and painted on their furniture; and Mary's own favorite device at the time was the two crowns of France and Scotland, with the motto ‘Aliaque moratur,' meaning that of England.” July 10, 1559, Henry died, and the young dauphin ascended the throne of Charlemagne as Francis II. “Surely,” thought Mary, “I am soon to realize my highest expectations. Over three kingdoms I shall sway the scepter. The holy father himself will come from Rome and pronounce his blessing upon me as his most faithful daughter. The lately deceased queen of England received her name in honor of the blessed Virgin, I shall be pronounced more worthy of it still.” Alas for human frailty. Man proposeth, but God disposeth. Mary had reached the summit of her splendor at a moment when she believed herself only ascending the heights. Feeble and sickly, Francis It was scarcely seated on the throne when he was seized by disease, and, fast wasting away, died Dec. 5, 1560. Only a year and a half had the young pair enjoyed their royal honors. Childless, Mary was obliged to yield her place on the throne, and the reins of power were seized by the queen- mother, Catharine of Medicis, as regent for her son, Charles IX. Mary must have been prepared, under almost any circumstances, to quit a court which was now swayed by one whom, during her brief reign, she had taunted with being “a merchant's daughter.”

But there were other reasons for her  departure from France. Her presence was urgently needed in Scotland, which the death of her mother, a few months before, had left without a government, at a moment when it was convulsed by the throes of the Reformation. Her kinsmen of Lorraine had ambitious projects for her marriage; great schemes were based on her nearness of succession to the English crown; and both these. it was thought, might be more successfully followed out when she was seated on her native throne. The queen of England, however, interposed; and, as Mary would not abandon all claim to the English throne, refused to grant her a free passage. Mary, notwithstanding, resolved to go, and at length, after repeated delays, still lingering on the soil where fortune had augured so much, she reached Calais, attended thus far by the cardinals of Guise and Lorraine, while three other uncles, D'Elboeuf, D'Aumale. and the grand prior, had come to see her safely to Edinburgh. August 14 she finally set sail, “and with ‘Adieu, belle France,' sentimental verses, and a passionate châtelar sighing at her feet in melodious music, she sailed away over the summer seas,” and, safely escaping the English ships-of-war Elizabeth had despatched to intercept her, reached Leith on the 19th. Her arrival on her native shores is thus beautifully described in Harper's Magazine, Feb. 1873, p. 348: “August 19,1561. The thickest mist and most drenching rain men remembered ever to have seen. A fog so thick that the very cannon in the harbor boom with a muffled sound, and the peal of bells from the Edinburgh churches sounds ominously, as if it rang out the funeral knell of the young queen. Such is the day that greets French Mary when she lands on Scottish shores. Better far for her had not this fog hid her squadron from the watchful eyes of her royal cousin. Better that she had fallen then into the hands of queen Elizabeth than to have become her wretched prisoner seven years later, shorn of that good name which is woman's chief protection — always and everywhere her best ‘safe-conduct.”

A great change had taken place in Scotland since Mary had left her country nearly thirteen years ago. The Roman Catholic religion was then supreme; and, under the direction of cardinal Beatoun, the Romish clergy displayed a fierceness of intolerance which seemed to aim at nothing short of the utter extirpation of every seed of dissent and reform. The same causes, however, which gave strength to the ecclesiastics gave strength also, though more slowly, to the great body of the people; and at length, after the repeated losses of Flodden and Faia, and Solway Moss and Pinkie-which, by the fall of nearly the whole lay nobility and leading men of the kingdom, brought  all classes within the influence of public events-the energies, physical and mental, of the entire nation were drawn out, and under the guidance of the reformer Knox expended themselves with the fury of awakened indignation upon the whole fabric of the ancient religion. The queen-regent died June 10, 1560. In August following the estates convened, adopted and approved the Calvinistic Confession of Faith, and, abolishing the Roman Catholic religion, forbade at the same time the administering of the mass or attendance upon it — the penalty for the third offense being death. “On the morning of Aug. 25, 1560,” says Burton (4:89), “the Romish hierarchy was supreme; in the evening of the same day Calvinistic Protestantism was established in its stead.”

Hardly a year had passed since these changes had been effected. A strange atmosphere this for Mary, who had been taught in France to abhor Protestant opinions. But, fortunately for Mary, she had enjoyed a training which fitted her well for the part she was now to play. Had she not spent the most susceptible years of her life in the court of France under those worthy custodians of the conscience — Vasquez, Escobar, Mendoza? These Jesuit fathers had not hesitated to defend by their casuistry, and under color of religion, fraud, forgery, falsehood, and murder. Their teachings, before counteracted by the protests of such believers as Pascal and such heretics as Luther, had brought forth their fruit in the assassination of William of Orange and of Coligni. and in the wholesale massacre of St. Bartholomew. Surely it could not be expected that Mary would prove herself unworthy of her birth and her costly education. Indeed, as early as 1558 she had shown herself an apt pupil worthy of her Jesuitical masters. Never a blush of secret shame mantled her maiden cheek when she signed the treaty which the Scotch commissioners brought her for the purpose of guarding the independence of the nation, jealous of foreign interference; never a hint from which diplomats could guess that fifteen days before she had signedt away the kingdom to the crown of France, annulling beforehand whatever solemn promise to the contrary she might make to her own most beloved and trusting subjects. So young, so fair, and yet so false, was Mary queen of Scots. “The enthusiastic admirers and apologists of Mary maintain that she was sincerely in favor of toleration. They would make her a kind of apostle of religious liberty. It is an unreasonable stretch of charity, however, to suppose that she would not... have rejoiced in the restoration, and, had it been feasible, the forcible restoration of the old religion ... That she should ‘serve the time and still commode herself discreetly and gently with her own subjects,' and ‘in effect repose most on them of the Reformed  religion,' was the policy which had been sketched for her in France, as we learn from her faithful friend, Sir James Melville” (Fisher, Reform, p. 858, 859).

But Mary was wise enough to comprehend that the situation was such that any active opposition to the newly-established religion would be futile and disastrous to herself, and she acoommodated herself to the circumstances.. Yet even this she did only moderately. Her letters to pope Pius IV and to her uncle, the cardinal of Lorraine, in 1563, plainly reveal the secret working of her desire to restore the old religious system to supremacy as soon as practicable. With this purpose in view she refused to grant her assent to the acts of Parliament which established the new religion as the faith of the nation; while she herself failed not to seize every opportunity to prove her attachment to Romanism. The very first Sunday after her arrival Mary commanded a solemn mass to be celebrated in the chapel of the palace; and, as might have been expected, an uproar ensued, the servants of the chapel were insulted and abused, and had not some of the lay nobility of the Protestant party interposed, the riot might have become general. The next Sunday Knox preached a violent sermon against idolatry, and in his discourse he took occasion to say that a single mass was, in his estimation, more to be feared than ten thousand armed men. Upon this, Mary sent for the Reformer, desiring to have an interview with him. The interview took place, as well as one or two subsequent ones from a like cause; but the only result was to make plainer the fact that she was at variance with the newly established religious power of her country. Her youth, however, her beauty and accomplishments, and her affability, interested many in her favor; she had, moreover, from the first continued the government in the hands of the Protestants. The principal direction of affairs she had left in the hands of her half-brother, the earl of Murray (q.v.), the leader of the Protestant nobles, and she had made William Maaitland, of Lethington, another great Protestant leader, one of her most trusted advisers. The government in the hands of worthy leaders, the court sacredly promised to the unimpaired preservation of the Reformed faith and worship, no Protestant felt inclined to ask more; and there were but few to complain when Mary only demanded for herself the same privilege which she accorded to her subjects — “that of worshipping God according to her own creed.” “So the nation rested in tolerable peace, trusting in Murray rather than in Mary, and suffering her mass, though always under protest, so long as she suffered herself to be guided by his counsels. But of this kind of compromise the holy Mother Church is always impatient. Although there was no papal legate at the court of Edinburgh, Rome did  not lack for envoys-shrewd ones, too. Of' these the chief was an Italian, David Rizzio (q.v.). He entered her service as a musician soon after she went to Scotland; was promoted to the office of valet de chambre; became her private secretary; conducted all her private and secret correspondence; became eventually the power behind the throne greater than the throne itself, usurping the very government. Chief we have called him, yet he was not alone. The court of Scotland had her representatives in foreign courts, as befitted her dignity; but her true representatives were unknown to courtly fame-Chesein in France, Yaxley in the Netherlands, Ranlet in the Low Countries. So there was an outer and inner court.

My lord James, earl of Murray, was, indeed, the queen's prime minister; but this unknown adventurer from Piedmont — unknown because he succeeded best while lie hid his office, as his designs — was virtually her secretary for foreign affairs, and her most confidential adviser. The earl of Murray must be dismissed. No easy task, surely, but one that art can accomplish. Who so fitting to come between sister and brother as a husband? Queen Mary shall be married. It is time she laid off her widow's weeds. And who so fitting a spouse as my lord Darnley — the only one who, when Elizabeth dies, can compete with Mary for the throne of England? So my lord Darnley and Mary queen of Scots are brought together. They meet in Wemyss Castle, by the Firth of Forth. It is a clear case of ‘love at first sight.' Royal husbands not a few have been proposed for Mary's hand, but nothing more is heard of them. The is the handsomest and best-proportioned long man,' says Mary, ‘I have ever seen.' Everything goes as Rizzio and the papal court would have it. The Protestant interest takes fire, for Darnley is a Catholic. It is not less furious in England than in Scotland, for the nation has little hope now that queen Elizabeth will ever take a husband. and in the absence of her heirs the throne of the united kingdom will fall into the hands of this Catholic couple... Queen Elizabeth, who has been playing fast and loose, with fair promises and fickle performance, finds herself no match for the cunning Italian. Her own kingdom is threatened with faction; and rumors of Catholic rebellion, to unseat her and place her rival and cousin on the empty throne, fill the court and the nation with perplexity. She indignantly summons Darnley back again, and gets for answer that The has no mind to return.' ‘I find myself,' he says, shortly and almost contemptuously, ‘very well where I am, and so I purpose to keep me.' My lord Murray sees the end of all this from the beginning. Neither Mary's tears nor Mary's threats, and she uses both with a woman's consummate skill can wring from him an approval of the marriage.

But all his  affectionately-earnest protests are powerless to hinder it. Opposition is only fuel to the flame. Marry she will, though all the world opposes. Love, blind as it always is said to be, for the ignoble Darnley, revenge on Elizabeth, whom Mary cordially hates, and who hates her as cordially, and ambition — the ambition to make good her claim to the English throne, which since she was a girl eighteen years old she has never ceased to nourish — all push her on to this destructive marriage. And Mephistopheles is at her side to remove every obstacle and clear the way. It is Rizzio who arranges for the first meeting between Mary and Darnley. It is Rizzio who affects such liking for the young lord that he shares his bed with him. It is Rizzio who promises to secure the pope's dispensation — for Mary and Darnley are cousins. It is Rizzio who, while negotiations are still pending and the envoy is yet on his way to the court of Rome, fits up a private room in the palace, where the marriage ceremony, which the Church pronounces void, is clandestinely performed. For the papal benediction is needed, it appears, not to hallow the marriage-tie, but only to give it respectability before the public. Elizabeth might as well spare her diplomacy, since all is virtually settled. Rizzio has not exceeded his instructions. There are no delays at the court of Rome. Fast as wind and wave can carry him comes back the messenger with the promised dispensation. The marriage, already performed in secret, is repeated in public. It takes place on June 29, 1565. Queen Mary, as though some secret consciousness hung over her of the sorrows on which she is entering, wears at the marriage-altar her mourning dress of black velvet. It is a gloomy ceremony. When the herald proclaims in the streets of Edinburgh that Henry, earl of Ross and Albany, is hereafter king of Scotland, the crowd receive the proclamation in sullen silence. Even the money distributed in profusion among them awakens no enthusiasm. Only one voice cries, ‘God save his Grace.' It is the voice of Darnley's father. My lord the earl of Murray has tried dissuasion. It has failed. He has tried wile against wile, has planned to abduct lord Darnley and send him back to the queen of England. But the rough Scotchman is no match in craft for the cunning Italian. This fruitless conspiracy has only incensed the queen against him. His honest portraiture of the poor fool with whom queen Mare is so infatuated has awakened all her womanly indignation. The court is no longer safe. Rumors are rife of plans for his assassination. True or false, they are probable enough to make him avoid Rizzio and Darnley. The queen summons him to court, and offers him a safeconduct. But Protestants have learned to look with suspicion on safe-conducts proffered  by Roman Catholic princes. Murray is conveniently sick, and cannot come. Sentence of outlawry is pronounced against him.

All the hate of a hot woman's heart is aroused; ‘hatred the more malignant because it was unnatural.' Revenge is sweeter than ambition. ‘I would rather lose my crown than not be revenged upon him,' she is heard to say. He calls to arms. The interest of the Protestant religion is his battle-cry. But there are few responses. He dispatches messengers to queen Elizabeth for the help she has long since promised. She hesitates, delays, falters. Mary knows no delay. She takes the field in person. Lord Darnley rides at her side. He is clad in gilt armor, she in steel bonnet and corset, with pistols at her saddle- bow and pistols in her hand. In August the standard of rebellion was raised. In October Murray and his few retainers are flying across the border into England (Burton, 9:286). Mephistopheles no longer conceals his purpose.

Mass is no longer confined to the queen's private chapel. The retainers of Darnley's father go openly to the Catholic service. The General Assembly have passed a resolution that the sovereign is not exempt from the law of the land, and that the Reformed service take the place of the mass in the royal chapel. This is Rizzio's answer to their demand. Negotiations are opened with pope Plus V and Philip of Spain. One promises soldiers, twelve thousand men; the other sends money, twenty thousand crowns. The Catholic powers of Europe have at length settled their political controversies, and joined in a secret league for the extirpation of heresy by fire and sword; a league of which that Alva was the founder whose estimate of Protestantism was summed up in the epigrammatic saying, ‘One salmon is worth a multitude of frogs;' a league of which the outcome was the Inquisition in Holland, and the massacre of St. Bartholomew in France. That Mary was in hearty sympathy with this league is undoubted; that she was actually a party to it is both asserted and denied by men behind the scenes who had every opportunity to know. That a vigorous attempt was to be made to re-establish the Catholic faith and worship is certain. Her most Catholic majesty assures her subjects that in any event the religion of the realm shall not be interfered with. At the same time she writes to Pius V to congratulate him on the victories already gained, and to inspire him with hopes of victories yet to come: ‘With the help of God and his holiness,' she says, ‘she will yet leap over the wall'“ (Harper's Magazine, 1873, Feb., p. 352, 353). “To this fatal resolution,” says Robertson (Histoy of Scotland), “may be imputed all the subsequent calamities of Mary's life.” Many of the Protestant lords who had hitherto supported the queen now took fright lest they should suffer the fate of the  adherents of the Protestant religion under Mary of England. The bloody deeds of that foul woman were yet fresh in the minds of all. What was there to hinder Mary Stuart from uprooting heresy in her dominions, with her hands staved by all the other Romish powers of Europe? Moved by such fears, several of the Scotch nobles, whose covetousness had had more to do with their interest in the new religion than their soul's salvation (Fisher, p. 351-353), determined to strike boldly against the throne. Mary, however, was not now the ruler of Scotland. She was only called so. . Upon the throne sat the Italian singer. When Mary was married to Darnley she had promised him an equal share in the royal authority, and accordingly the public papers and the public coin were issued in the name of Henry and Mary. But Darnley had not proved the right husband for her, and ere long she manifested her disappointment by placing her name first. Gradually the place lost by the husband is occupied by the Italian adventurer.

The public seal is given to Rizzio, and with his own hand he signs and stamps the official papers for the king. There is no access to Mary but through Rizzio: he who would gain the ear of the one must buy the favor of the other. “He had the control,” says Froude, “of all the business of the state.” The king himself finds the door barred-David admitted, himself shut out. Whispers such as no true woman can afford to suffer circulate freely, and Mary suffers them; ugly stories, aptly illustrated by the saying of a later day, that “King James the Sixth's title to be called the modern Solomon was, doubtless, that he was the son of David, who performed upon the harp.” History does not justify these scandals. Neither can it justify the queen who suffered them. David Rizzio was not a man to entertain passion or to inspire it. His power over Mary was not that which love gives. It was that of a Jesuit father over an obedient child. To Mary, Rizzio was the pope, whose benediction he carried with him, whose secret envoy he was.

But no husband in such an issue is apt to weigh pros and cons nicely, least of all such a man as Darnley. “Handsome long man” he may have been, but he carried all his merits in his face and figure. Intriguing nobles easily played the part of lago to one who was in heart anything but an Othello. A jealous husband and an unscrupulous nobility were not slow to make common cause; and so the death of the queen's favorite was determined, and accordingly Rizzio fell a prey to both Darnley and the nobles, March 9, 1566. The assassins, of course, suffered their merited punishment. High in position and power, they were not given to the hangman, but an ever- watchful Providence meted out to all their merited award. (The charge formerly made by some [c. g. Tytler] that Knox and the Reformed clergy  were privy to this scheme to murder Rizzio has been so thoroughly exploded that it is hardly necessary for us even to all:ude to it here. Those who wish to examine particularly are referred to M'Crie, Sketches of Scottish Ch. Hist., and Hetherington, Hist. Ch. of Scotland, 1:124, 402 sq.) It was an aggravation of the murder of Rizzio that it was committed, if not in the queen's presence, at least within a few yards of her person, only three months before she gave birth (June 19, 1566) to the prince who became king James VI. As that event drew near, the queen's affection for her husband, who had unblushingly declaimed against all part in the conspiracy, seemed to revive; but the change was only momentary; and before the boy's baptism, in December, her estrangement from the king was greater than ever. Divorce was openly discussed in her presence, and even darker designs were obscurely hinted at among her friends. The king, on his part, spoke of leaving the country; but before his preparations were completed, he fell ill of the small-pox at Glasgow. This was about Jan. 9,1567. On the 25th Mary went to see him and, traveling by easy stages, brought him to Edinburgh on the 31st. He was lodged in a small mansion beside the Kirk of the Field, nearly on the spot where the south-east corner of the University now stands. There Mary visited him daily, and slept for two nights in a room below his bedchamber. She passed the evening of Sunday, Feb. 9, by his bedside, talking cheerfully and affectionately with him, although she is said to have dropped one remark which gave him uneasy forebodings — that it was much about that time twelvemonth that Rizzio was murdered. She left him between ten and eleven o'clock to take part in a mask at Holyrood, at the marriage of a favorite valet. The festivities had not long ceased in the palace, when, about two hours after midnight, the house in which the king slept was blown up by gunpowder, and in the neighboring garden was found the lifeless body of him to whom Mary, on the assassination of Rizzio, had spoken these ominous words: “I shall never rest till I give you as sorrowful heart as I have at this present.”

The chief actor in this tragedy was undoubtedly James Hepburn, earl of Bothwell, a needy, reckless, vainglorious, profligate noble, who, since Murray's revolt, and still more since Rizzio's murder, had enjoyed a large share of the queen's favor. But there were suspicions that the queen herself was not wholly ignorant of the plot, and these suspicions could not but be strengthened by what followed. On the 12th of April, Bothwell was brought to a mock-trial and acquitted; on the 24th, he intercepted the queen on her way from Linlithgow to Edinburgh, and carried her, with  scarcely a show of resistance, to Dunbar. On the 7th of May, he was divorced from the young and comely wife whom he had married little more than a twelvemonth before; on the 12th, Mary publicly pardoned his seizure of her person, and created him duke of Orkney; and on the 15th — only three months after her husband's murder — she married the man whom every one regarded as his murderer married while the stain of her husband's blood was still upon him. “Surely this is carrying quite too far the ‘indulgent temper' for which her eulogist (Meline, p. 124) praises her so highly.” Impelled by a just and burning indignation, her subjects rose in rebellion, led by nobles of both the Protestant and Romish factions. Surrounded at Borthwick Castle, Bothwell escaped under cover of the night, Mary following him dressed in male attire. They hastily gathered the Royalists about them, but such a cause enlisted few followers. Yet the few were mustered, and, however sparse in number, Mary hesitated not to brave the storm; she even dared to eliter the lists against her opponents, but on the field of Carberry (June 15) the army melted away in sight of the enemy, and no alternative was left to her but to abandon Bothwell, and surrender herself to the confederate lords. She was now escorted by the nobles as a prisoner to Edinburgh, where the insults of the rabble and grief at parting with Bothwell threw her into such a frenzy that she refused all nourishment, and, rushing to the window of the room in which she was kept prisoner, called for help, and showed herself to the people half naked, with her hair hanging about her ears. From Edinburgh she was hurried to Loch Leven, where, on the 24th of July, she was prevailed upon to sign an act of abdication in favor of her son, who, five days afterwards, was crowned at Stirling SEE JAMES I; while to her brother Murray was entrusted the government during the minority of her successor on the throne. Barred windows and iron doors proved no confinement to Mary.

She soon found ways to communicate with the world, and made even the very prison-keeper her friend and confidant. May 2,1568, she finally succeeded in making her escape from the island-prison, and once more she made a call to arms, this time to enter the lists life for life. An army gathered, and in a few days she found herself at the head of 6000 men. Elizabeth of England, whose great political maxim was “that the head should not be subject to the foot,” would gladly have extended aid to Mary had she not feared the power of the perspicacious and firm leader of the Protestants who had imprisoned Mary — her own half-brother, Murray. On the 12th of May it finally came to a battle between the Royalists and the insurgents at Langside, near Glasgow. Mary was completely routed, and  obliged to flee the kingdom. She entered England, and threw herself on the protection of Elizabeth. The queen of England, however, had always had cause to fear the presence of her rival on English ground. Mary had never vet renounced her claim to the crown which Elizabeth wore. Moreover, “Mary Stuart was the center of the hopes of the enemies of Protestant England and of Elizabeth. Their plots looked to the elevation of Mary to the throne which Elizabeth filled” (Fisher, p. 382). Political ambition and religious fanaticismr controlled both parties, and should the stronger yield to the weaker?

Mary had come hoping to secure her cousin's sympathy and aid. But that cousin feared for her own life and the security of her throne, and therefore persistently denied the ardent and persevering solicitations of Mary fir an interview, on the agreeable pretense that she should first clear herself of the crime imputed to her. A criminal, then, she was made a prisoner, and, after an immense amount of deceptive diplomacy, a commission was appointed, nominally to investigate the charges of Mary against her rebellious lords, really to investigate the charges of the lords against their queen. Before this commission Murray represented the Scottish government. At first he laid the guilt of the murder on Bothwell alone, and defended the insurrection only as one against the infamous, ambitious, and tyrannical earl. But as the trial proceeded he changed his ground. He hesitated, procrastinated, faltered. At length he openly charged his sister with the murder of her husband; and he produced, in confirmation of this charge, the since famous “casket letters.” Of their discovery he told this story: The earl of Bothwell — so said lord Murray, and so said the lords he represented — fleeing from Edinburgh, sent back a confidential messenger to the castle to bring thence a silver casket from a certain drawer. James Balfour — that Balfour who drew the deed for Darnley's murder-had received the captaincy of the castle as the price of his crime. He delivered the casket; he at the same time sent the lords a hint of the fact. The messenger was intercepted and the casket seized. This casket, with its contents, was the witness Murray produced before the English commission against the Scottish queen. Its contents were eight letters and twelve sonnets, written in French, apparently in Mary's handwriting. Among the commissioners were more than one of Mary's friends, one of them that duke of Norfolk who subsequently attested the strength of his attachment by the sacrifice of his life: if these letters were a forgery, they were not so declared by them. Of these letters one gave a full account of Mary's interview with Darnley at Glasgow; of his unsuspicious confidence; of her own mournful sense of shame and guilt. Another advised the earl  when and where to abduct her, and cautioned him to come with force sufficient to overcome all resistance. All breathed the language of passionate devotion, with here and there a flash of fierce jealousy. They were true to nature, but to a lost, though not a shameless one. Their language was that of a once noble but now ruined woman unveiling her heart's secrets in unsuspecting confidence. If forged, the forger was a consummate master of his art. True or false, they were equally remarkable as contributions to the language of passion. Mary denounced them as forgeries. She demanded to see the originals. Elizabeth granted the reasonableness of the demand, but never complied with it. She demanded to face her accusers.

Elizabeth half promised that she should do so, but never fulfilled the pledge. The commission broke up without a verdict. Elizabeth had no interest to press for either acquittal or conviction. Murray was glad to return to his regency. Mary alone had any reason to demand the completion of the investigation, but Mary was a prisoner, and her access to the public not the most easy. Though inconclusive, the trial had revealed enough to strengthen the worst suspicions of the Scottish people, and no one thought of finding fault with Elizabeth for retaining Mary a prisoner. For nineteen years Mary Stuart thus passed life. “For nineteen years both captive and captor are made miserable by plots and counterplots; and whether Mary in prison or Mary at large is the more dangerous to the security of Protestant England is a question so hard to decide that Elizabeth never fairly attempts to determine it. At length a plot is uncovered more deadly than any that has preceded. Half a score of assassins band themselves together to attempt Elizabeth's life, and to put Catholic Mary on the vacant throne. The blessing of the pope is pronounced upon the enterprise. ‘The Catholic powers of Europe stand ready to welcome its consummation. Mary gives it her cordial approbation. ‘The hour of deliverance,' she writes exultingly, ‘is at hand.' But plots breed counterplots. In all the diplomatic service of Europe there is no so ingenious spy as Walsingham, Elizabeth's prime minister. Every letter of Mary's is opened and copied by his agents before sent to its destination. The conspiracy is allowed to ripen. Then, when all is ready for consummation, the leaders are arrested, the plot is brought to the light of day. Mary, with all her faults, never knew fear; no craven heart was hers. The more dangerous was she because so brave. She battles for her life with a heroism well worthy a nobler naturebattles to the last, though there be no hope. She receives the sentence of death with the calmness of true courage, not of despair. With all her treachery, never recreant to her faith — never  but once, when her infatuated love of Bothwell swerved her from it for a few short weeks-she clings to her crucifix till the very hour of death. Almost her last words are words of courage to her friends. ‘Weep not,' she says; ‘I have promised for you.' Her very last are a psalm from her Prayer- book — ‘In thee, O Lord, have I put my trust.' And then she lays her head upon the block as peacefully as ever she laid it upon her pillow. No ‘grizzled, wrinkled old woman,' but in the full bloom of ripened womanhood — forty-five, no more — Mary Stuart pays on the scaffold at Fotheringay [whither she had been removed for trial of conspiracy from Charpley in September, 1586] the penalty of her treachery at Edinburgh, May 8,1587. The spirit of the stern old Puritans is satisfied, and the prophecy of the Good Book receives a new and pregnant illustration — ‘Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed.'“ Five months after the execution her body was buried with great pomp at Peterborough, whence, in 1612, it was removed to king Henry VII's Chapel at Westminster, where it still lies in a sumptuous tomb erected by king James VI.

“Whoever has attended but little to the phenomena of human nature has discovered how inadequate is the clearest insight which he can hope to attain into character and disposition. Every one is a perplexity to himself and a perplexity to his neighbors; and men who are born in the same generation, who are exposed to the same influences, trained by the same teachers, and live from childhood to age in constant and familiar intercourse, are often little more than shadows to each other, intelligible in superficial form and outline, but divided inwardly by impalpable and mysterious barriers.” Thus Froude opens the fourth volume of his History of England, when about to pass in review the affairs of Scotland and Ireland in the 16th century. Yet, when this same writer comes to speak of Mary Stuart, he “writes almost as a public prosecutor of the Scottish queen, and sometimes sacrifices historical accuracy to dramatic effect.” The truth is that the character of Mary was long one of the most fiercely- vexed questions of history, and is still in debate; hence the difficulties which beset any attempt to tell correctly the story of her career, or analyze aright her character. The student of history finds no impartial witnesses; few in her own time who are not ready to tell and to believe about her the most barefaced lies which will promote their own party. During her life she was calumniated and eulogized with equal audacity. Since her death the same curiously-contradictory estimates of her character have been  vigorously maintained — by those, too, who have not their judgment impaired by the prejudices which environed her. On the one hand, we are assured that she was “the most amiable of women;” “the upright queen, the noble and true woman, the faithful spouse and affectionate mother;” ‘“the poor martyred queen;” “the helpless victim of fraud and force;” an “illustrious victim of state-craft,” whose “kindly spirit in prosperity and matchless heroism in misfortune” award her “the most prominent place in the annals of her sex.” On the other, we are assured, by men equally competent to judge, that she was “a spoiled beauty;” “the heroine of an adulterous melodrama:” “the victim of a blind, imperious passion;” an “apt scholar” in “the profound dissimulation of that school of which Catharine de' Medici was the chief instructor;” “a bad woman, disguised in the livery of a martyr,” having “a proud heart, a crafty wit, and indurate mind against God and his truth;” “a bold, unscrupulous, ambitious woman,” with “the panther's nature — graceful, beautiful, malignant, untamable.” The great preponderance of authority, however, seems now to be on the side of those who believe in her criminal love for Bothwell and her guilty knowledge of his conspiracy against her husband's life.

The question of her guilt as to the murder of her husband does certainly not rest on the authenticity of the “casket letters,” however much these may be matter of historical interest. “Evidence which her own day deemed clear,” says the writer in Harper whom we had occasion to quote before, “history deems uncertain. Circumstances which, isolated, only created a widespread suspicion in her own times, put together by history, form a net-work of evidence clear and conclusive. A wife learns to loathe her husband; utters her passionate hate in terms that are unmistakable; is reconciled to him for a purpose; casts him off when that purpose is accomplished; makes no secret of her desire for a divorce: listens with but cold rebuke to intimations of his assassination; dallies while he languishes upon a sick-bed so long as death is near; hastens to him only when he is convalescent; becomes, in seeming, reconciled to him; by her blandishments allays his terror and arrests his flight, which nothing else could arrest; brings him with her to the house chosen by the assassins for his tomb-a house which has absolutely nothing else to recommend it but its singular adaptation to the deed of cruelty to be wrought there; remains with him till within two hours of his murder; hears with unconcern the story of his tragic end, which thrills all other hearts with horror; makes no effort to bring the perpetrators of the crime to punishment; rewards the suspected with places and pensions, and the chief criminal with her hand in marriage while the blood is still wet on his. That  the world should be asked to believe her the innocent victim of a diabolical conspiracy affords a singular illustration of the effrontery of the Church which claims her for a martyr. That half the world should have acquiesced in the claim affords an illustration no less singular of the credulity of mankind when sentiments and sympathies are called on to render the judgment which the reason alone is qualified to render.”

The genuineness of the “casket letters” is maintained by the historians Hume, Robertson, Laing, Burton, Mviackintosh, Mignet, Ranke, and Froude. The most acute writer on the other side of the question is Hosack, an Edinburgh barrister, but he “writes in such a vein as would befit him were he indeed earning a lawyer's fee by a lawyer's service.” One of the latest writers on the ecclesiastical history of this period, Prof. Fisher (p. 376), of Yale College, thus comments on the question at issue: “No candid critic can deny, whatever may be his final verdict, that the letters contain many internal marks of genuineness which it would be exceedingly difficult for a counterfeiter to invent, and that the scrutiny to which they were subjected in the Scottish Parliament, the Scottish privy council, and the English privy council, was such that, if they were forged, it is hard to account for the failure to detect the imposture. Moreover, the character of Murray, although it may be admitted that he was not the immaculate person that he is sometimes considered to have been, must have been black indeed if these documents, which he brought forward to prove the guilt of his sister, were forged; but Murray is praised not only by his personal adherents and by his party, but by men like Spottiswoode and Melville (Spottiswoode, History of the Church of Scotland, 2:121).” Yet, however writers may differ about her moral conduct, they agree very well as to the variety of her accomplishments. She wrote poems on various occasions, in the Latin, Italian, French, and Scotch languages; “Royal advice to her son,” in two books, the consolation of her long imprisonment. A great number of her original letters are preserved in the king of France's library, in the Royal, Cottonian, and Ashmolean libraries. We have in print eleven to the earl of Bothwell, translated from the French by Edward Simmonds, of Christ-church, Oxford, and printed at Westminster in 1726. There are ten more, with her answers to the articles against her, in “Haynes's State- papers:” six more in “Anderson's Collections;” another in the “Appendix” to her life by Dr. Jebb; and some others dispersed among the works of Pius V, Buchanan, Camden, Udall, and Sanderson.  To enumerate all that has been written on Mary would fill a volume. Among the chief works are S. Jebb, De Vita et Rebus Gestis Mariae Scotorum Regince (Lond. 1725, 2 vols. fol.); J. Anderson, Collections relating to the History of Mary, Queen of Scotland (Lond. 1727-28, 4 vols. 4to); Burton, Hist. of Scotland, vol. iv; Bishop Keith, Hist. of the Affair's of Church and State in Scotland (Edinb. 1734, fol.; 1844-50, 3 vols. 8vo); W. Goodall, Examination of the Letters said to be written by Mary, Queen of Scots, to James, Earl of Bothwell (Edinb. 1754, 2 vols. 8vo); Robertson, Hist. of Scotland; W. Tytler, Inquiry into the Evidence against Mary, Queen of Scots (Edinb. 1759, 8vo; Lond. 1790, 2 vols. 8vo); Laing, Hist. of Scotland; Chalmers, Life of Mary, Queen of Scots (Lond. 1818, 2 vols. 4to; 1822, 3 vols. 8vo); Schitz, Leben Maria Stuarts (1839); P.F. Tytler, Hist. of Scotland; Prince Labanoff, Recueil des Lettres de Marie Stuart (Lond. 1844, 7 vols. 8vo); David Laing, edition of John Knox's Hist. of the Refobrmation (Edinb. 1846-48, 2 vols. 8vo); M. Teulet, Papiers d'Etat relatifs l'Histoire de l'Ecosse (Par. 1851-60, 3 vols. 4to; 1862. 5 vols. 8vo); Miss Agnes Strickland, Lives of the Queens of Scotland (Edinb. 1850-59, 8 vols. 8vo); M. Mignet, Histoire de Marie Stuart (Par. 1852, 2 vols. 8vo); A. de Montaiglon, Latin Themes of Mary Stuart (Lond. 1855, 3vo); Prince Labanoff, Notice sur lae Collection des Poritrits de Marie Stuart (St. Petersb. 1856); M. Cheruel, Marie Stuart et Catherine de Medicis (Par. 1858, 8vo); Ms. Teulet, Lettres de Marie Stuart (Par. 1859, 8vo); Joseph Bobertson, Catalogues of the Jewels, Dresses, Furniture, Books, and Paintings of Mary, Queen of Scots (Edinb. 1863, 4to); Hosack, Mary, Queen of Scots and her Accusers (2d ed. Lond. 1870, 2 vols. 8vo); Meline, Mary, Queen of Scots, and her latest English Historian (N.Y. 1872, 8vo), a polemic against Froude, assails the English historian very bitterly, and shows him to be inaccurate in some minor details; but Meline's own “intense partisanship unfits him for the office of a critic and he entirely fails in his narrative.” (J. H. W.)

## Mary, The (Wife) Of Clopas[[@Headword:Mary, The (Wife) Of Clopas]]

             (Μαρία ἡ τοῦ Κλωπᾶ, A. V. “of Cleophas”), described by John as standing by the cross of Jesus in company with his mother and Mary Magdalene (Joh 19:25). The same group of women is described by Matthew as consisting of Mary Magdalene, and Mary [the mother] of James and Joses, and the mother of Zebedee's children” (Mat 27:56); and by Mark, as “Mary Magdalene, and Mary [the mother] of James the Little and of Joses, and Salome” (Mar 15:40). From a  comparison of these passages, it appears that “Mary of Clopas,” and “Mary of James the Little and of Joses,” are the same person, and that she was the sister of Mary the Virgin. The arguments, preponderating on the affirmative side, for this Mary being (according to the A.V. translation) the wife of Clopas or Alphaeus, and the mother of James the Little, Joses, Jude, Simon, and their sisters, have been given under the heading SEE JAMES.

To solve the difficulties of this verse the following supposition has been suggested:

(1) That the two clauses “his mother's sister” and “Mary of Clopas” are not in apposition, and that John meant to designate four persons as present, namely, the mother of Jesus; her sister, to whom he does not assign any name; Mary of Clopas; and Mary Magdalene (Lange). It has been further suggested that this sister's name was Salome, wife of Zebedee (Wieseler). This is avoiding, not solving a difficulty. John could not have expressed himself as he does had he meant more than three persons. It has been suggested

(2) that the word ἀδελφή is not here to be taken in its strict sense, but rather in the laxer acceptation, which it clearly does bear in other places. Mary, wife of Clopas, it has been said, was not the sister, but the cousin of Mary the Virgin (see Wordsworth, Gr. Test., Preface to the Epistle of St. James). There is nothing in this suggestion which is objectionable, or which can be disproved. But it is hardly consistent with the terms of close relationship assigned to the connected members of the holy family. SEE BRETHREN OF OUR LORD. By many, therefore, it has been contended

(3) that the two Marys were literally sistersgerman. “That it is far from impossible for two sisters to have the same name may be seen by any one who will cast his eye over Betham's Genealogical Tables. To name no others, his eye will at once light on a pair of Antonias and a pair of Octavias, the daughters of the same father, and in one case of different mothers, in the other of the same mother. If it be objected that these are merely gentilic names, another table will give two Cleopatras. It is quite possible, too, that the same cause which operates at present in Spain may have been at work formerly in Judaea. MIRIAM. the sister of Moses, may have been the holy woman after whom Jewish mothers called their daughters, just as Spanish mothers not unfrequently give the name of Mary to their children, male and female alike, in honor of Mary the Virgin.  (Maria, Maria-Pia, and Maria-Immacolata, are the first names of three of the sisters of the late king of the Two Sicilies.) This is on the hypothesis that the two names are identical, but, on a close examination of the Greek text. we find that it is possible that this was not the case. Mary the Virgin is Μαριάμ; her sister is Μαρία. It is more than possible that these names are the Greek representatives of two forms which the antique מַרְיָם had then taken; and as in pronunciation the emphasis would have been thrown on the last syllable in Μαριάμ, while to the final letter in Μαρία would have been almost unheard, there would, upon this hypothesis, have been a greater difference in the sisters' names than there is between Mary and Maria among ourselves. The ordinary explanation that Μαριάμ is the Hebraic form, and Μαρία the Greek form, and that the difference is in the use of the evangelists, not in the name itself, seems scarcely adequate: for why should the evangelists invariably employ the Hebraic form when writing of Mary the Virgin, and the Greek form when writing about all the other Marys in the Gospel history? It is true that this distinction is not constantly observed in the readings of the Codex Vaticanus, the Codex Ephraemi, and a few other MSS.; but there is sufficient agreement in the majority of the codices to determine the usage. That it is possible for a name to develop into several kindred forms, and for these forms to be considered sufficiently distinct appellations for two or more brothers or sisters, is evidences by our daily experience.” “We find that the high-priest Onias III had a brother also named Onias, who eventually succeeded him in his office under the adopted name of Menelaus.

We have the authority of the earliest traditions for the opinion that our Lord's mother had at least one sister called Mary. Indeed, it is an old opinion that Anna, the mother of the Virgin Mary, had three daughters of that name by different husbands; and Dr. Routh, in his Reliquiae Sacrae, gives us from Papias, the scholar of John (ex Cod . MS. Bib. Bodl. 2397), the following enumeration of four Marys of the N.T.: 1. Maria, Mater Domini; 2. Maria, Cleophae sive Alphaei uxor, que fiuit mater Jacobi Episcopi et Apostoli, et Simonis, et Thadsei, et cujusdam Joseph; 3. Maria Salome, uxor Zebedaei, mater Johannis evangelista et Jacobi; 4. Maria Magdalene. It is further stated, in this fragment of Papias, that both Mary, the wife of Cleophas, and Mary Salome, were aunts of our Lord, and consequently sisters of the Virgin Mary” (Kitto). Finally, most interpreters, regarding all the above positions as untenable, or, at least, improbable, suppose (4) that the two Marys were sisters-in-law by virtue of having married brothers, i.e. Joseph and Alphaeus or Clopas, and afterwards, perhaps by a Levirate marriage,  having become the wives of the same husband, namely, Joseph the survivor. SEE ALPHAEUS.

The only knowledge we have of this Mary, besides the above facts of her sons, and of her presence at the crucifixion, is that she was that “other Mary” who, with Mary Magdalene, attended the body of Christ to the sepulcher when taken down from the cross (Mat 27:61; Mar 15:47; Luk 23:55). She was also among those who went on the morning of the first dav of the week to the sepulcher to anoint the body, and who became the first witnesses of the resurrection (Mat 28:1; Mar 16:1; Luk 24:1). A.D. 29.

## Mary, The Magdalene[[@Headword:Mary, The Magdalene]]

             (Μαρία ῆ Μαγδαληνή. A. V. “Mary Magdalene”), one of the most interesting, but at the same time most contradictorily-interpreted characters  in the N.T. In the following statements respecting her we largely follow the article in Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, s.v.

I. The Name. — Four different explanations have been given of this.

(1) That which at first suggests itself as the most natural, that she came from the town of Magdala. The statement that the women with whom she journeyed followed Jesus in Galilee (Mar 15:41), agrees with this notion. Magdala was originally a tower or fortress, as its name indicates, the situation of which is probably the same with that of the modern village of el-Mejdel, on the western shore of the Lake of Tiberias (Stanley). But Lightfoot starts another supposition, both with regard to the place of residence and to the identity of Mary Magdalene. He shows that there was a place called Magdala very near Jerusalem, so near that a person who set up his candles in order on the eve of the Sabbath, might afterwards go to Jerusalem, pray there, and return and light up his candles when the Sabbath was now coming in (Exercit. Joh 12:3). This place is stated in the Talmud to have been destroyed on account of its adulteries. Now, it is argued by Baronius, that Mary Magdalene must have been the same person as Mary the sister of Martha and Lazarus, and on this point Lightfoot entirely agrees with him, and he thinks that, Bethany and Magdala being both near Jerusalem, she may have married a mall of Magdala. and acquired the dissolute morals of the place; or that Magdala may have been another name for Bethany. All this, however, is full of improbabilities.

(2) Another explanation has been found in the fact that the Talmudic writers, in their calumnies against the Nazarenes, make mention of a Miriam Megaddela (מגדלא), and, deriving that word from the Piel of גָּדִל, to twine, explain it as meaning “the twiner or plaiter of hair.” They connect with this name a story which will be mentioned later; but the derivation has been accepted by Lightfoot (Hor. Heb. on Mat 26:56; Harm. Evang. on Luk 8:3) as satisfactory, and pointing to the previous worldliness of “Miriam with the braided locks” as identical with “the woman that was a sinner” of Luk 7:37. It has been urged in favor of this that the ἡ καλουμένη of Luk 8:3 implies something peculiar, and is not used where the word that follows points only to origin or residence.

(3) Either seriously, or with the patristic fondness for paronomasia, Jerome sees in her name, and in that of her town, the old Migdol (“a  watch-tower”), and dwells on the coincidence accordingly. The name denotes the steadfastness of her faith. She is “vere πυργίτης, vere turris candoris et Libani, que prrospicit in faciem Damasci” (A)ist. ad Principi.ame). He is followed in this by later Latin writers, and the pun forms the theme of a panegyric sermon by Odo of Clhgni (Acta Sanctorumz , Antwerp, 1727, July 12).

(4) Origen, lastly, looking to the more common meaning of גָּדִל (gadal', to be great), sees in her name a prophecy of her spiritual greatness as having ministered to the Lord, and been the first witness of his resurrection (Tract. in Matthew 35). SEE MAGDALENE.

II. Scripture Incidents. —

1. Mary Magdalene comes before us for the first time in Luk 8:2 (A.D. 28). It was the custom of Jewish women (Jerome on 1Co 9:5) to contribute to the support of rabbis whom they reverenced, and, in conformity with that custom, there were among the disciples of Jesus women who “ministered unto him of their substance.” All appear to have occupied a position of comparative wealth. With all the chief motive was that of gratitude for their deliverance from “evil spirits and infirmities.” Of Mary it is said specially that “seven daemons (δαιμόνια) went out of her,” and the number indicates, as in Mat 12:45, and the “legion” of the Gadarene daemoniac (Mar 5:9), a possession of more than ordinary malignity. We must think of her, accordingly, as having had, in their most aggravated forms, some of the phenomena of mental and spiritual disease which we meet with in other daemoniacs — the wretchedness of despair, the divided consciousness, the preternatural frenzy, the long-continued fits of silence. The appearance of the same description in Mar 16:9 (whatever opinion we may form as to the authorship of the closing section of that Gospel), indicates that this was the fact most intimately connected with her name in the minds of the early disciples. From that state of misery she had been set free by the presence of the Healer, and, in the absence, as we may infer, of other ties and duties, she found her safety and her blessedness in following him. The silence of the Gospels as to the presence of these women at other periods of the Lord's ministry, makes it probable that they attended on him chiefly in his more solemn progresses through the towns and villages of Galilee, while at other times he journeyed to and fro without any other attendants than the Twelve, and sometimes without even them.

2. In the last journey to Jerusalem, to which so many had been looking with eager expectation, they again accompanied him (Mat 27:55; Mar 15:41; Luk 23:55; Luk 24:10), A.D. 29. It will explain much that follows if we remember that this life of ministration must have brought Mary Magdalene into companionship of the closest nature with Salome, the mother of James and John (Mar 4:40), and even also with Mary, the mother of the Lord (Joh 19:25). The women who thus devoted themselves are not prominent in the history: we have no record of their mode of life or abode, or hopes or fears, during the few momentous days that preceded the crucifixion. From that hour they came forth for a brief two days' space into marvelous distinctness. They “stood afar off, beholding these things” (Luk 23:49), during the closing hours of the agony on the cross. Mary Magdalene, Mary, the mother of the Lord, and the beloved disciple, were at one time not afar off, but close to the cross, within hearing. The same close association which drew them together there is seen afterwards. She remains by the cross till all is over, waits till the body is taken down, and wrapped in linen-cloth and placed in the garden- sepulchre of Joseph of Arimathnea. She remains there in the dusk of the evening, watching what she must have looked upon as the final resting- place of the Prophet and Teacher whom she had honored (Mat 27:61; Mar 15:47; Luk 23:55). Not to her had there been given the hope of the resurrection. The disciples to whom the words that spoke of it had been addressed had failed to understand them, and were not likely to have reported them to her. The Sabbath that followed brought an enforced rest, but no sooner is the sunset over than she, with Salome and Mary, the mother of James, “bought sweet spices that they might come and anoint” the body, the interment of which on the night of the crucifixion they regarded as hasty and provisional (Mar 16:1).

The next morning, accordingly, in the earliest dawn (Mat 28:1; Mar 16:2), they came with Mary, the mother of James, to the sepulcher, and successively saw the “vision of angels” (Mat 28:5; Mar 16:5). A careful comparison of the relative time of the several appearances of Christ on his resurrection makes it evident that the term “first,” applied by Mark (Mar 16:9) to the appearance to Mary. must not be taken so strictly as to exclude the prior appearance to the other females who had accompanied her to the sepulcher (see Meth. Quart. Rev. 1850, p. 337 sq.). SEE APPEARANCES OF CHRIST.

To her, however, after the first moment of joy, it had seemed to be but a vision. She went  with her cry of sorrow to Peter and John (let us remember that Salome had been with her), “They have taken away the Lord out of the sepulcher, and we know not where they have laid him” (Joh 20:1-2). But she returns there. She follows Peter and John, and remains when they go back. The one thought that fills her mind is still that the body is not there. She has been robbed of that task of reverential love on which she had set her heart. The words of the angels can call out no other answer than that — “They have taken awav my Lord, and I know not where they have laid him” (Joh 20:13). This intense brooding over one fixed thought was, we may venture to say, to one who had suffered as she had suffered, full of special danger, and called for a special discipline. The spirit must be raised out of its blank despair, or else the “seven devils” might come in once again, and the last state be worse than the first. The utter stupor of grief is shown in her want of power to recognize at first either the voice or the form of the Lord to whom she had ministered (Joh 20:14-15). At last her own name uttered by that voice, as she had heard it uttered, it may be, in the hour of her deepest misery, recalls her to consciousness; and then follows the cry of recognition, with the strongest word of reverence which a woman of Israel could use, “Rabboni,” and the rush forwards to cling to his feet. That, however, is not the discipline she needs. Her love had been too dependent on the visible presence of her Master. She had the same lesson to learn as the other disciples. Though they had “known Christ after the flesh,” they were “henceforth to know him so no more.” She was to hear that truth in its highest and sharpest form. “Touch me not, for I am not yet ascended to my Father.” For a time, till the earthly affection had been raised to a heavenly one, she was to hold back. When he had finished his work and had ascended to the Father, there should be no barrier then to the fullest communion that the most devoted love could crave. Those who sought, might draw near and touch him then. He would be one with them, and they one with him. This is the last authentic record of the Magdalene. On her character, see the Journ. of Sac. Lit. Oct. 1866.

II. Proposed Identifications with other Females mentioned in the N. T —

1. The questions which meet us connect themselves with the narratives in the four Gospels of women who came with precious ointment to anoint the feet or the head of Jesus. Each Gospel contains an account of one such anointing, and men have asked, in endeavoring to construct a harmony, “Do they tell us of four distinct acts, or of three, or of two, or of one only? On any supposition but the last, are the distinct acts performed by the same  or by different persons, and if by different persons, then by how many? Further, have we any grounds for identifying Mary Magdalene with the woman or with any one of the women whose acts are thus brought before us?” This opens a wide range of possible combinations, but the limits of the inquiry may, without much difficulty, be narrowed. Although the opinion seems to have been at one time maintained (Origen, Tractr. in Matt. 35), few would now hold that Matthew 26 and Mark 14 are reports of two distinct events. Few, except critics bent like Schleiermacher and Strauss on getting up a case against the historical veracity of the evangelists, could persuade themselves that the narrative of Luke 7, differing as it does in well-nigh every circumstance, is but a misplaced and embellished version of the incident which the first two Gospels connect with the last week of our Lord's ministry. The supposition that there were three anointings has found favor with Origen (1. c.) and Lightfoot (Harm. Evang. ad loc., and Hor. Heb. in Matthew xxvi); but while, on the one hand, it removed some harmonistic difficulties, there is, on the other, something improbable, to the verge of being inconceivable, in the repetition within three days of the same scene, at the same place, with precisely the same murmur and the same reproof. We are left to the conclusion adopted by the great majority of interpreters, that the Gospels record two anointings, one in some city unnamed (Capernaum and Nain have been suggested), during our Lord's Galilean ministry (Luke 7), the other at Bethany, before the last entry into Jerusalem (Matthew 26; Mark 14; John 12).

We come, then, to the question whether in these two narratives we meet with one woman or with two. The one passage adduced for the former conclusion is Joh 11:2. It has been urged (Maldonatus, in Matthew 26, and Joan. 11:2; Acta Sanctorum, July 22) that the words which we find there (“ It was that Mary which anointed the Lord with ointment... whose brother Lazarus was sick”) could not possibly refer by anticipation to the history which was about to follow in ch. 12, and must therefore presuppose some fact known through the other Gospels to the Church at large, and that fact, it is inferred, is found in the history of Luke 7. Against this it has been said, on the other side. that the assumption thus made is entirely an arbitrary one, and that there is not the slightest trace of the life of Mary of Bethany ever having been one of open and flagrant impurity. There is, therefore, but slender evidence for the assumption that the two anointings were the acts of one and the same woman, and that woman the sister of  Lazarus. That she may have been in the later scene is probable, but certainly not in the earlier. See No. 3, below.

There is, if possible, still less reason for the identification of Mary Magdalene with the chief actor in either history. When her name appears in Luk 8:3, there is not one word to connect it with the history that immediately precedes. Though possible, it is at least unlikely that such a one as the “sinner” would at once have been received as the chosen companion of Joanna and Salome, and have gone from town to town with them and the disciples. Lastly, the description that is given — “Out of whom went seven devils” — points, as has been stated, to a form of suffering all but absolutely incompatible with the life implied in ἁμαρτωλός, and to a very different work of healing from that of the divine words of pardon — “Thy sins be forgiven thee.” To say, as has been said. that the “seven devils” are the “many sins” (Greg. Mag. Hom. in Evang. 25 and 53), is to identify two things which are separated in the whole tenor of the N.T. by the clearest line of demarcation. The argument that because Mary Magdalene is mentioned so soon afterwards, she must be the same as the woman of Luke 7 (Butler's Lives of the Saints, July 22), is simply puerile. It would be just as reasonable to identify “the sinner” with Susanna. Never, perhaps, has a figment so utterly baseless obtained so wide an acceptance as that which we connect with the name of the “penitent Magdalene.” It is to be regretted that the chapter-heading of the A. V. of Luke 7 should seem to give a quasi-authoritative sanction to a tradition so utterly uncertain, and that it should have been perpetuated in connection with a great work of mercy.

2. The belief that Mary of Bethany and Mary Magdalene are identical is yet more startling. Not one single circumstance, except that of love and reverence for their Master, is common. The epithet Magdalene, whatever may be its meaning, seems chosen for the express purpose of distinguishing her from all other Marys, No one evangelist gives the slightest hint of identity Luke mentions Martha and her sister Mary in 10:38, 39, as though neither had been named before. John, who gives the fullest account of both, keeps their distinct individuality most prominent. The only simulacrum of an argument on behalf of the identity is that, if we do not admit it, we have no record of the sister of Lazarus having been a witness of the resurrection.

III. Traditions. —  1. On the above Identification. — This lack of evidence in the N.T. itself is not compensated by any such weight of authority as would indicate a really trustworthy tradition. Two of the earliest writers who allude to the histories of the anointing — Clement of Alexandria (Poedag. 2:8) and Tertullian (De Pudic. chap. 8) — say nothing that would imply that they accepted it. The language of Irenaeus (3:4) is against it. Origen (l. c.) discusses the question fully, and rejects it. He is followed by the whole succession of the expositors of the Eastern Church: Theophilus of Antioch, Macarius, Chrysostom, Theophylact. The traditions of that Church, when they wandered into the regions of conjecture, took another direction, and suggested the identity of Mary Magdalene with the daughter of the Syro- Phoenician woman of Mar 7:26 (Nicephorus, H. E. 1:33). In the Western Church, however, the other belief began to spread. At first it is mentioned hesitatingly, as by Ambrose (De Virg. Vel., and in Luc. lib. 6), and Jerome (in Mat 26:2; contr. Jovin. c. 16). Augustine at one time inclines to it (De Consenss. Evany. c. 69), at another speaks very doubtingly (Tract. in Joann. 49).

At the close of the first great period of Church history, Gregory the Great takes up both notions, embodies them in his Homilies (in Esv. 25, 53), and stamps them with his authority. The reverence felt for him, and the constant use of his works as a text-book of theology during the whole mediaeval period, secured for the hypothesis a currency which it never would have gained on its own merits. The services of the Feast of St. Mary Magdalene were constructed on the assumption of its truth (Brev. Romans in Jul. 22). Hymns, and paintings, and sculptures fixed it deep in the minds of the Western nations, France and England being foremost in their reverence for the saint whose history appealed to their sympathies. (See below.) In particular, that passage in Luke has been adopted as the lesson of the day for her festival (Meyer on Luk 7:37), and her name has passed into all the languages of Western Christendom as expressive of a female penitent. Deyling (Obss. Sacr. 3:261) gives a history both of the progress of the identification and of those controversies, especially in the Gallic Church, which resulted in the distinction being again drawn between them; and a testimony to the success with which this was done will be found in Daniel (Thesaurus Hymnologicus, 2:129), who tells us that in the missals of various churches, the words “Peccatricem absolvisti” were substituted for those which unquestionably belong to that noble hymn, the Dies Irae, in its original condition, “Qui Mariam absolvisti.” Well-nigh all ecclesiastical writers, after the time of Gregory the Great (Albert the Great and Thomas Aquinas are exceptions), take it  for granted. When it was first questioned by Fevre d'Etaples (Faber Stapulensis) in the early Biblical criticism of the 16th century, the new opinion was formally condemned by the Sorbonne (Acta Sanctorum, l. c.), and denounced by bishop Fisher of Rochester. The Prayer-book of 1549 follows in the wake of the Breviary; but in that of 1552, either on account of the uncertainty or for other reasons, the feast disappears. The Book of Homilies gives a doubtful testimony. In one passage the “sinful woman” is mentioned without any notice of her being the same as the Magdalene (Sermon on Repentance, part 2); in another it depends upon a comma whether the two are distinguished or identified (ibid. part 2). The translators under James I, as has been stated, adopted the received tradition. Since that period there has been a gradually accumulating consensus against it. Calvin, Grotius, Hammond, Casaubon, among older critics, Bengel, Lampe, Greswell, Alford, Wordsworth, Stier, Meyer, Ellicott, Olshausen, among later, agree in rejecting it. Romanist writers even (Tillemont, Dupin, Estius) have borne their protest against it in whole or in part; and books that represent the present teaching of the Gallican Church reject entirely the identification of the two Marys as an unhappy mistake (Migne, Dict. de le Bible). ‘The mediaeval tradition has, however, found defenders in Baronius, the writers of the Acta Sanctorum, Maldonatuls, bishop Andrewes, Lightfoot, Isaac Williams, and Dr. Pusey.

2. It remains to give the substance of the legend formed out of these combinations. At some time before the commencement of our Lord's ministry, a great sorrow fell upon the household of Bethany. The younger of the two sisters fell from her purity and sank into the depths of shame. Her life was that of one possessed by the “seven devils” of uncleanness. From the city to which she then went, or from her harlot-like adornments, she was known by the new name of Magdalene. Then she hears of the Deliverer, and repents, and loves, and is forgiven. Then she is received at once into the fellowship of the holy women and ministers to the Lord, and is received back again by her sister and dwells with her, and shows that she has chosen the good part. The death of Lazarus and his return to life are new motives to her gratitude and love; and she shows them, as she had shown them before, anointing no longer the feet only, but the head also of her Lord. She watches by the cross, and is present at the sepulcher, and witnesses the resurrection. Then (the legend goes on, when the work of fantastic combination is completed), after some years of waiting, she goes with Lazarus, and Martha, and Maximin (one of the seventy) to Marseilles.  SEE LAZARUS.

They land there; and she, leaving Martha to more active work, retires to a cave in the neighborhood of Arles, and there leads a life of penitence for thirty years. When she dies a church is built in her honor, and miracles are wrought at her tomb. Clovis the Frank is healed by her intercession, and his new faith is strengthened; and the chivalry of France does homage to her name as to that of the greater Mary.

Such was the full-grown form of the Western story. In the East there was a different tradition. Nicephorus (H. E. 2:10) states that she went to Rome to accuse Pilate for his unrighteous judgment; Modestus, patriarch of Constantinople (Hom. in Marias), that she came to Ephesus with the Virgin and St. John, and died and was buried there. The emperor Leo the Philosopher (cir. 890) brought her body from that city to Constantinople (Acta Sanctorum, l. c.), and deposited it in the church of St. Lazarus. The day of her festival, in both the Eastern and Western Church, is July 22.

The name appears to have been conspicuous enough, either among the living members of the Church at Jerusalem or in their written records, to attract the notice of their Jewish opponents. The Talmudists record a tradition, confused enough, that Stada or Satda, whom they represent as the mother of the Prophet of Nazareth, was known by this name as a “plaiter or twiner of hair;” that she was the wife of Paphus ben-Jehudah, a contemporary of Gamaliel, Joshua, and Akiba; and that she grieved and angered him by her wantonness (Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. on Matthew 26; Harm. Evang. on Luk 8:3). It seems, however, from the fuller report given by Eisenmenger, that there were two women to whom the Talmudists gave this name, and the wife of Paphus is not the one whom they identified with the Mary Magdalene of the Gospels (Entdeckt. Judeuth. 1:277). There is a pretended history of her said to have been written in Hebrew by Marada, servant of Martha, but there is no doubt that it is a forgery (Calmet's Dictionary of the Bible).

There is, lastly, the strange supposition (rising out of an attempt to evade some of the harmonistic difficulties of the resurrection history) that there were two women both known by this name, and both among those who went early to the sepulcher (Lampe, Comm. in Joann; Ambrose, Comm. in Luk 10:24).

## Mary, The Mother Of John, Surnamed Mark[[@Headword:Mary, The Mother Of John, Surnamed Mark]]

             (Μαρία ἡ μήτηρ Ι᾿ωάννου τοῦ ἐπικαλουμένου Μάρκου, Act 12:12). A.D. 44. The woman known by this description must have been among the earliest disciples. We learn from Col 4:10 that she was sister to Barnabas, and it would appear from Act 4:37; Act 12:12. that, while the brother gave up his land and brought the proceeds of the sale into the common treasury of the Church, the sister gave up her house to be used as one of its chief places of meeting. The fact that Peter went to that house on his release from prison indicates that there was some special intimacy (Act 12:12) between them, and this is confirmed by the language which he uses towards Mark as being his “son” (1Pe 5:13). She, it may be added, must have been, like Barnabas, of the tribe of Levi, and may have been connected, as he was. with Cyprus (Act 4:36). It has been surmised that filial anxiety about her welfare during the persecutions and the famine which harassed the Church at Jerusalem, was the chief cause of Mark's withdrawal from the missionary labors of Paul and Barnabas. The tradition of a later age represented the place of meeting for the disciples, and therefore probably the house of Mary, as having stood on the upper slope of Zion, and affirmed that it had been the scene of the wonder of the day of Pentecost, had escaped the general destruction of the city by Titus, and was still used as a church in the 4th century (Epiphan. De Pond et Mens, 14; Cyril Hierosol. Catech. 16). SEE MARK.

6. A Christian female at Rome, mentioned by Paul as having formerly treated him with special kindness (Rom 16:6). A.D. 54. As this is the only Hebrew name in the list (Jouatt, ad loc.), and as the reading εἰς ἡμᾶς  in the same verse is disputed, it is possible that she was not a native of Rome.

## Mary, The Sister Of Lazarus[[@Headword:Mary, The Sister Of Lazarus]]

             For much of the information connected with this name, SEE LAZARUS and SEE MARY MAGDALENE.

The facts strictly personal to her are but few. She and her sister Martha appear in Luk 10:40 as receiving Christ in their house. The contrasted temperaments of the two sisters have already been in part discussed. SEE MARTHA.

Mary sat listening eagerly for every word that fell from the divine Teacher. She had chosen the good part, the life that had found its unity, the “one thing needful,” in rising from the earthly to the heavenly, no longer distracted by the “many things” of earth. The same character shows itself in the history of John 11. Her grief is deeper, but less active. She sits still in the house, She will not go to meet the friends who come on the formal visit of consolation. But when her sister tells her secretly, “The Master is come and calleth for thee,” she rises quickly and goes forth at once (Joh 11:20; Joh 11:28). Those who have watched the depth of her grief have but one explanation for the sudden change: “She goeth to the grave to weep there!” Her first thought, when she sees the Teacher in whose power and love she had trusted, is one of complaint. “She fell down at his feet, saying, Lord, if thou hadst been here, my brother had not died.” Up to this point her relation to the divine Friend had been one of reverence, receiving rather than giving, blessed in the consciousness of his favor. But the great joy and love which her brother's return to life called up in her, poured themselves out in larger measure than had been seen before. The treasured alabaster-box of ointment was brought forth at the final feast of Bethany (Joh 12:3). A.D. 29. Matthew and Mark keep back her name. SEE ANOINTING.

Of her after-history we know nothing. The ecclesiastical traditions about her are based on the unfounded hypothesis of her identity with Mary Magdalene.

## Masaccio[[@Headword:Masaccio]]

             called MASO DA SAN GIOVANNI, one of the earliest and the most celebrated of the Italian painters of the second or middle age of modern painting, the unquestioned founder of the Florentine school, was born at San Giovanni, in Val d'Arno, in the year 1401. He was a disciple of Masolino da Panicale, to whom he proved as much superior as his master was to all his contemporaries. He had great readiness of invention, with unusual truth and elegance of design. He made nature his constant study; and he gave in  his works examples of that beauty which arises from a judicious and pleasing choice of attitudes, accompanied with spirit, boldness, and relief. He was the first who studied to give more dignity to his draperies, by designing them with greater breadth and fullness, and omitting the multitude of small folds. He was also the first who endeavored to adapt the color of his draperies to the tints of his carnations, so that they might harmonize with each other. Masaccio was remarkably well skilled in perspective, which he was taught by Brunelleschi. His works procured him great reputation, but excited the envy of his competitors. He is supposed to have been poisoned, and died about 1443. Fuseli savs of him: “Masacchio was a genius, and the head of an epoch in the art. He may be considered as the precursor of Raphael, who imitated his principles, and sometimes transcribed his figures.” His most perfect works are the frescoes of St. Pietro del Carmine at Florence. “where vigor of conception, truth and vivacity of expression, correctness of design, and breadth of manner are supported by a most surprising harmony of color;” and the picture of Christ curing the Daemoniacs. The “Arundel Society” has lately published these frescoes in a series of superior chromo-lithographs. See Vasari, Lives of the Painters; Mrs. Jameson, Memoirs of Early Italian Painters.

## Masada[[@Headword:Masada]]

             (Μασάδα), a very strong fortress not far south of Engedi (Josephus, War; Ant. 1:12, 1), on the west of the Dead Sea (Pliny, v. 17), in a volcanic region (Strabo, 16, p. 764), minutely described by Josephus in various places, especially in the account of its final tragedy (War, 7:8). It was built by Jonathan Maccabaeus on an almost inaccessible rock, and was probably one of his “strongholds in Judaea” (1Ma 12:35), as it had possibly been in earlier times a refuge of David (1Sa 23:14; 1Sa 23:29; comp. 2Sa 5:17). It was much enlarged and strengthened by Herod the Great, who placed Marianne here for safety when he was driven from Jerusalem by Antigonus (Josephus, War, 1:13, 7). It resisted, at that time, the attack by the Parthians (ib. 15, 3), but was afterwards taken from the Romans through treachery by Judas the Galilaean (ib. 17, 2). It was the last stronghold of the Jews in the final struggle with the Romans under Flavius Silva, who took it by assault, the garrison, in their desperation, having immolated themselves (ut sup.). The site was conjectured by Dr. Eli Smith to be that of the modern Sebbeh (Robinson, Researches, 2:24); which has  been abundantly confirmed by later travelers, who have attested the prodigious strength of the place, and its exact agreement with the description of Josephus (Traill's Josephus. 2:109 sq.; Biblioth. Sacra, 1843, p. 62 sq.; Van de Velde, Narrative, 2:97 sq.; Tristram, Land of Israel, p. 293 sq.).

The description of Josephus, in whose histories Masada plays a conspicuous part, is as follows: A lofty rock of considerable extent, surrounded on all sides by precipitous valleys of frightful depth, afforded difficult access only in two parts — one on the east, towards the Lake Asphaltis, by a zigzag path, scarcely practicable, and extremely dangerous, called “the Serpent,” from its sinuosities; the other more easy, towards the west, on which side the isolated rock was more nearly approached by the hills. The summit of the rock was not pointed, but a plain of 7 stadia in circumference, surrounded by a wall of white stone, 12 cubits high and 8 cubits thick, fortified with 37 towers of 50 cubits in height. The wall was joined within by large buildings connected with the towers, designed for barracks and magazines for the enormous stores and munitions of war which were laid up in this fortress. The remainder of the area, not occupied by buildings, was arable, the soil being richer and more genial than that of the plain below; and a further provision was thus made for the garrison in case of a failure of supplies from without. The rain-water was preserved in large cisterns excavated in the solid rock. A palace, on a grand scale, occupied the north-west ascent, on a lower level than the fortress, but connected with it by covered passages cut in the rock. This was adorned within with porticoes and baths, supported by monolithic columns; the walls and floors were covered with tessellated work. At the distance of 1000 cubits from the fortress, a massive tower guarded the western approach at its narrowest and most difficult point, and thus completed the artificial defenses of this most remarkable site, which nature had rendered almost impregnable. In attacking the fortress, the first act of the Roman general was to surround the fortress with a wall, to prevent the escape of the garrison. Having distributed sentries along this line of circumvallation, he pitched his own camp on the west, where the rock was most nearly approached by the mountains, and was therefore more open to assault; for the difficulty of procuring provisions and water for his soldiers did not allow him to attempt a protracted blockade, which the enormous stores of provisions and water still found there by Eleazar would have enabled the garrison better to endure. Behind the tower which guarded the ascent was  a prominent rock of considerable size and height, though 300 cubits lower than the wall of the fortress, called the White Cliff.

On this a bank of 200 cubits' height was raised, which formed a base for a platform (βῆμα) of solid masonry, 50 cubits in width and height, and on this was placed a tower similar in construction to those invented and employed in sieges by Vespasian and Titus, covered with plates of iron, which reached an additional 60 cubits, so as to dominate the wall of the castle, which was quickly cleared of its defenders by the showers of missiles discharged from the scorpions and balistae. The outer wall soon yielded to the ram, when an inner wall was discovered to have been constructed by the garrison- framework of timber filled with soil, which became more solid and compact by the concussions of the ram. This, however, was speedily fired. The assault was fixed for the morrow, when the garrison anticipated the swords of the Romans by one of the most cold-blooded and atrocious massacres on record. At the instigation of Eleazar, they first slew every man his wife and children; then, having collected the property into one heap, and destroyed it all by fire, they cast lots for ten men, who should act as executioners of the others while they lay in the embrace of their slaughtered families. One was then selected by lot to slay the other nine survivors; and he at last, having set fire to the palace, with a desperate effort drove his sword completely through his own body, and so perished. The total number, including women and children, was 960. An old woman, with a female relative of Eleazar, and five children, who had contrived to conceal themselves in the reservoirs while the massacre was being perpetrated, survived, and narrated these facts to the astonished Romans when they entered the fortress the following morning, and had ocular demonstration of the frightful tragedy. On the present ruined site the ground-plan of the storehouses and barracks can still be traced in the foundations of the buildings on the summit, and the cisterns, excavated in the natural rock, are of enormous dimensions. One is mentioned as nearly 50 feet deep, 100 long, and 45 broad. The foundations of a round tower, 40 or 50 feet below the northern summit, may have been connected with the palace, and the windows cut in the rock near by, which Mr. Wollcot conjectures to have belonged to some large cistern, now covered up, may possibly have lighted the rock-hewn gallery by which the palace communicated with the fortress. From the summit of the rock every part of the wall of circumvallation could be traced, carried along the low ground, and, wherever it met a precipice, commencing again on the high summit above, thus making the entire circuit of the place. Connected with it, at  intervals, were the walls of the Roman camps, opposite the north-west and south-east corners, the former being the spot where Josephus places that of the Roman general. A third may be traced on the level near the shore. The outline of the works, as seen from the heights above, is as complete as if they had been but recently abandoned. The Roman wall is six feet broad, built, like the fortress walls and buildings above, with rough stones laid loosely together, and the interstices filled in with small pieces of stone. The wall is half a mile or more distant from the rock, so as to be without range of the stones discharged by the garrison. No water was to be found in the neighborhood but such as the recent rains had left in the hollows of the rocks, confirming the remark of Josephus that water, as well as food, was brought thither to the Roman army from a distance. Its position is exactly opposite to the peninsula that runs into the Dead Sea from its eastern shore, towards its southern extremity. See Smith, Dict. of Class. Geog. s.v.

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

             The ruins of this stronghold, now called Sebbeh, are minutely delineated in the Memoirs accompanying the Ordnance Survey (3:417 sq.). See also Tristram, Land of Moab, page 46 sq. The following, from Conder's Tent Work (2:140), embraces the chief points:

"The rock of Masada measures 350 yard. east and west, by 690 yards north and soul, and its cliffs are 1500 feet in height above the plain on the east. Two paths lead up to the plateau on the top, that on the east being a winding ascent, now almost impassable, but by which captain Warren went up; this is apparently the path cailled the 'Serpent' by Josephus. The second path, on the west, ascends from a narrow sloping bank of white marl, which is about 1000 feet high, and which Josephus calls the 'White Promontory;' upon this rises the great ramp, about 300 feet high, which the Romans piled up against the rock during the siege, a work so laborious that it seems almost incredible that human efforts could have accomplished it in so short a time. At the top of the ramp is the masonry wall which the besiegers built as a foundation for their engines, before discovering the great tragedy that had been enacted within the fortress, where the garrison had fallen by one another's swords.

"A fatiguing climb brought us to the plateau at the top. Here is a pointed archway, indicative of Crusading masons, and scored with the tribe-marks of the Jahalin and Rushaideh Arabs, which were on a former occasion mistaken by a distinguished Frenchman for planetary signs.

"We fell to work at once with tape and compass to plan and describe the ruins. The buildings are principally on the north-west part of the rock, and they are of various dates. The most ancient appear to be the long rude walls, resembling the buildings at  Herodium (Jebel Fureidis), but the majority of the masonry is to be ascribed to the Christians of the 5th or 12th centuries. There is a chapel on the plateau, and also a cave, in which I found a curious inscription with crosses, which is, apparently, a new discovery. It is painted in red, and resenmbles some of the 12th and 13th century inscriptions near Jericho. "The most extraordinary feature of this wonderful place has yet to be noticed. The Romans in their attack on Masada followed the same method which had reduced Jerusalem. They surrounded the unhappy Jews with a wall of circumvallation. Looking down from the summit, the ruins of this wall — a drystone parapet, running across the plain and up the southern hill-slopes — could be distinctly traced.

"Two large camps, also walled with stone, lay spread out behind this line on the west and east, and six smaller ones, like redoubts, on the. low ground; the entire length of the wall was not less than 3000 yards, as measured on our plan, and the whole remains almost as it was left eighteen hundred years ago."

## Masaloth[[@Headword:Masaloth]]

             (Μαισαλώθ v. r. Μεσσαλώθ), a place in Arbela, which Bacchides and Alcimus besieged and captured on their way from Gilgal to Juduea (1Ma 9:2). Josephus, in his parallel account, omits the name (Ant. 12:11, 1); but a trace of the name is thought by Robinson (Researches, 2:398) to be found in the “steps” (מְסַלּוֹת, mresilloth') or terraces (as in 2Ch 9:11), in connection with the remarkable caverns besieged by Herod near Arbela (Josephus, War, 1:16, 4), now Kulat ibn-Maon. SEE ARBELA.

## Masaupasa[[@Headword:Masaupasa]]

             a famous fast among the East Indian pagans. The name is derived from masa, which, in the Malabarian language, signifies a mouth, and upada a fast. It is the most sacred of all their fasts, and begins with the last day of October. Such as keep the fast, having first washed and dressed themselves very clean, repair to the pagoda or temple of the god Vistnum, and the next morning, having changed their clothes, go round the temple 101 times, and the most devoted 1001 times. They repeat the same ceremony every day during the months of November and December. During this time they must eat nothing but milk and eggs, must not look upon a woman, nor think or speak of anything but what relates to the Vistnum. The next year they perform the same devotion, beginning with the first day of December, and continuing till the tenth day of January. The next year they begin with the  first day of January and end with the tenth day of February, and so on till the number of twelve years is completed, when they receive pardon for all their sins. — Broughton, Biblioth. Hist. Sac. vol. 2, s.v.

## Masbotheans[[@Headword:Masbotheans]]

             the disciples of Masbotheus, who is said by some of the ancients to have been a follower of Simon Magus (q.v.).

## Mascaron, Jules[[@Headword:Mascaron, Jules]]

             a distinguished French Roman Catholic preacher, was born at Aix in March, 1634. He studied at the college of the Oratorians in his native city, and afterwards at that of Mans, where he was appointed professor of rhetoric in 1656. About the same time he commenced preaching at Saumur, and soon attracted attention. He afterwards preached successively at Marseilles, Aix, and Nantes, and then at Paris, in the churches of the Oratory, of the Louvre, and of St. Andre des Arts. In 1666 he preached, in presence of Francis de Harlay, archbishop of Rouen, the funeral sermon of the queen dowager, Anne of Austria. This discourse was so much admired that, aided by the influence of De Harlay, Mascaron was admitted at Versailles. Louis XIV was greatly pleased with him, and appointed him court preacher. He was made bishop of Tulle in 1671, but his bulls arrived only two years afterwards. In the mean time Mascaron preached three other funeral sermons: those of the duke of Beaufort, of Henrietta of England, and of chancellor Seguier (the two first are considered his best). He finally went into his diocese, and wrote there, in 1675, the funeral sermon of marshal Trenne, eulogized by La Harpe as a chef-d'oeuvre. Made bishop of Agen in 1678, he founded there a theological seminary and a hospital. He only left his diocese once, to preach his last sermon before Louis XIV. He died Nov. 20,1703. His Oraisons funebres passed through a large number of editions (Paris, 1704, 12mo; reprinted in 1740, 1745, 1785, 1828, etc., and in 1734, together with those of Bossuet and Flechier). See A. de Bellecombe, L'Agenois illustre; Dict. of Biog. s.v. Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 34:125. (J. N. P.)

## Masch, Andreas Gottlieb, D.D.[[@Headword:Masch, Andreas Gottlieb, D.D.]]

             a noted German pulpit orator, was born at Beseritz, in Mecklenburg, Dec. 5,1724. His father was himself a minister of the Gospel, and instructed Andreas in the preparatory branches of study. In 1743 he went to the University of Rostock; two years later removed to Halle, and there enjoyed the favor and society of the celebrated Baumgarten and Semler. The latter desired that Masch should remain at the university as instructor, but his health failing he decided to return to his father's. In 1752 he was made the  assistant preacher, in 1756 pastor of a church at New Strelitz, and only four years after this he was honored with the appointment of “court preacher.” He died Oct. 26, 1807. His most important literary remains are embodied in the Bibliotheca Sacra, which, originally edited by Le Long, he continued upon the same plan (now in 5 vols. 4to) — a work of great labor and merit, which had been discontinued for want of patronage. Le Long had published 2 vols, 8vo (Paris, 1709; republished by Borner, of Leipsic, with additions). Dr. Masch began its continuation in 1778, and completed it in 1790. It gives a full account of the literary history of the Bible, the various editions of the original, and the ancient and modern versions. Dr. Masch also wrote several dissertations of considerable value, particularly a treatise on the Religions of the Heathen and of Christians (Gedunken von der Geofgezbarten Religion, Halle, 1750, 8vo), intended as an argument against the naturalists. For a complete list of his works, see Döring, Gelehrte Theologen Deutschlands d. 18ten iu. 19ten Jahrb. 2:422 sq.

## Maschil[[@Headword:Maschil]]

             (Heb. maskil', מִשְׂכַיל, instrlucting, Hiph. part. of שָׂכִל, to be wise; used as a noun in Psa 47:7, זִמְּווּ מִשְׂכַיל, sing ye a poem, Peshito, sing praise, but the Sept.,Vulg., and Auth.Vers. “sing ye with understanding”) occurs in the titles or inscriptions of Psalms 32, 42, 44, 45, 52, 53, 54, 55, 74, 78, 88, 89, 142. The origin of the use of this word is uncertain, and it has been variously interpreted. The most probable meaning of maschil is a poem, song, which enforces intelligence, wisdom, piety, q. d. didactic; which is true of every sacred song, not excepting Psalms 45, where everything is referred to the goodness of God. It occurs elsewhere as an adjective, and is accordingly rendered “wise,” or some other term equivalent to instruction (1Sa 18:14-15; 2Ch 30:22; Job 22:2; Psa 14:2; Psa 41:1; Psa 53:2; Pro 10:5; Pro 10:19; Pro 14:35; Pro 15:24; Pro 16:20; Pro 17:2; Pro 19:14; Pro 21:12; Jer 1:9; Dan 1:4; Dan 11:33; Dan 11:35; Dan 12:3; Dan 12:10; Amo 5:13). For other derivations from the Arabic, see Gesenius, Thes. Heb. p. 1331. SEE PSALMS, BOOK OF.

## Masclef, Francois[[@Headword:Masclef, Francois]]

             a noted Roman Catholic divine and Orientalist, was born at Amiens in the year 1662. He very early devoted himself to the study of Oriental languages, and attained in them an extraordinary degree of proficiency. Educated for service in the Church, he became first a curate in the diocese  of Amiens, but afterwards obtained the confidence of De Brou, bishop of Amiens, who placed him at the head of the theological seminary of the district, and made him a canon. De Brou died in 1706, and Masclef, whose opinions on the Jansenistic controversy were not in accordance with those of the new prelate Sabbatier, was compelled to resign his place in the theological seminary and retire from public life. From this time he devoted himself to study with such close application as to bring on a disease, of which he died, on Nov. 24, 1728, when only in his prime. Though austere in his habits, he was amiable and pious. Masclefs chief work is the Grammatica Hebraica, a punctis aliisque inventis Massorethicis libera, still considered one of the best works of the kind; it embodies an elaborate argument against the use of the vowelpoints. The first edition was published in 1716, and speedily called forth a defense of the points from the abbé Gutarin, a learned Benedictine monk. In the year 1731 a second edition was published at Paris, containing an answer to Guarin's objections, with the addition of grammars of the Syriac, Chaldee, and Samaritan languages. Other works of Masclef are, Ecclesiastical Conferences of the Diocese of Amiens: — Catechism of Amiens: — and in manuscript, Courses of Philosophy and Divinity; not printed because it is thought to contain Jansenistic opinions.

## Mash[[@Headword:Mash]]

             (Heb. id. מִשׁ, signif. unknown; Sept. Μοσόχ, Vulg, Mes), the last named of the four sons of Aram (B.C. post 2513), and a tribe descended from him, who gave their name to a region inhabited by them (Gen 10:23); probably, therefore, to be sought in Syria or Mesopotamia. In the parallel passage (1Ch 1:17) the name of MIESHECH has been erroneously substituted. Josephus (Ant. 1:6, 4) understands the Mesancei (Μησαναῖοι), and states that their locality “is now called Charax of Spasinus.” evidently the same place (Χάραξ Πασινοῦ, Ptol. 6:3, 2), situated, according to others, at the junction of the Tigris and Euphrates (Plin. 6:26, and 31, ed. Hardouin). Most interpreters, however, following Bochart (Phaleg, 2:11), understand to be meant the inhabitants of Mount Malsius, which lies north of Nesibis, and forms part of the chain of Taurus separating Media from Mesopotamia (Strabo, 11:527; Ptol. v. 18, 2), of zwhich latter the Shemites occupied the southern part (Micilaelis, Spicileg. 2:140 sq.). “Knobel (Volkertajel, p. 237) seeks to reconcile this view with that of Josephus by the supposition of a migration from the north of  Mesopotamia to the south of Babylonia, where the race may have been known in later times under the name of Meshech: the progress ef the population in these parts was, however, in an opposite direction, from south to north. Kalisch (Comm. on Genesis p. 286) connects the names of Mash and Mysia: this is, to say the least, extremely doubtful; both the Mysians themselves and their name (Mosia) were probably of European origin” (Smith). “It is remarkable that among the Asiatic confederates of the Kheta or Sheta, i.e. Hittites, who are enumerated as conquered by Rameses II at Kedesh on the Orontes, is found the prince of Maso or Masa (Brugsch, Hist. Deuteronomy 1'Egypte, 1:140, 142).” SEE ETHNOLOGY.

## Mashal[[@Headword:Mashal]]

             (1Ch 6:74 [59]). SEE MISHAL.

## Masham, Lady Damaris[[@Headword:Masham, Lady Damaris]]

             a lady celebrated for her attainments in divinity, daughter of the celebrated Cudworth, was born at Cambridge, England, in 1658. Her father, perceiving the bent of her genius, took particular care of her education, so that she was early distinguished for piety and uncommon learning. She became the second wife of Sir Francis Masham, of Oates, in Essex; and repaid her father's care of her in the admirable pains she took in the education of her only son. In the study of divinity and philosophy she was greatly assisted by Locke, who lived in her family most of his last years, and who died in her house. She died in 1708. Lady Masham wrote a discourse concerning the Love of God (1691, 12mo); and Occasional Thoughts in reference to a Virtuous or Christian Life (1700, 12mo); and drew up the account of Mr. Locke published in the great Historical Dictionary. See Lord King, Life of Locke; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth. s.v.

## Masias[[@Headword:Masias]]

             (Μασίας v. . Μισαίας), one of the “servants of Solomon” whose descendants returned with Zorobbabel from Babylon (1Es 5:34). Nothing corresponding to the name is found in the Heb. text (Ezra 5:55 sq.).

## Masius, Andr?[[@Headword:Masius, Andr?]]

             a very learned Orientalist, was born near Brussels in 1516. He was a man of excellent parts, an accomplished lawyer, and counselor to the duke of Cleves. He died in 1573. Masius translated a variety of articles from the Syriac, which may be found in the Supplement to the Critica Sacra, compiled a Syriac Lexicon and Grammar, and a learned Commentary on Joshua and part of Deuterononmy. The former contains the readings of the Syriac Hexaplar version. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Masius, Hector Gottfried[[@Headword:Masius, Hector Gottfried]]

             a Lutheran theologian, was born April 13, 1653. He studied at different universities, went to France in 1682 as chaplain to the Danish embassy, and was made in 1685 doctor and professor of theology at Copenhagen. He died September 20, 1709, leaving, Defense de la Religion Lutherienne: — Bericht von denm Unterschied der lutherischen and reformirten Lehre: — De Profanatione Hostiae Consecratae: — De Pallio Pauli: — Schediasmata Tria Sacra, Scilicet 1, De Contemtut Concilii Tridentini; 2, De Polynathia Scriptorum Sacrorum; 3, De θηριομαχίᾷ Pauli. See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:345, 353. (B.P.)

## Mask[[@Headword:Mask]]

             or NOTCH-HEAD, is the technical term in ecclesiastical architecture for a kind of corbel, the shadow of which bears a close resemblance to that of the human face. It is common in some districts in work of the 13th and 14th centuries, and is usually carved under the eaves as a corbel-table. A good example occurs in Portsmouth Church, where it is mixed with the tooth-ornament. It is a favorite ornament in Northamptonshire in the cornices of the broad spire, and under the parapet of the chancel; but it is by no means confined to any particular district. — Parker, Glossary of Architecture, s.v.

## Masman[[@Headword:Masman]]

             (Μασμάν v. r. Μαασμάν), a corrupt reading (1Es 8:43; compare Σαμαίας, 1Es 8:44) for the SHEMAIAH SEE SHEMAIAH (q.v.) of the Heb. text (Ezr 8:16).

## Mason[[@Headword:Mason]]

             (גּוֹדֵר, goder', a wall-builder, 2Ki 12:12; 2Ki 22:6; “epairer,” Isa 58:12; חוֹצֵב, chotseb', 1Ch 22:2; 2Ch 24:12; Ezr 3:7; a “hewern”' of wood, Isa 10:15; or a stone-cutter, 2Ki 12:13; or of both, 1Ki 5:15; חָרִשׁ אֶבֶן, charash' e'ben, 2 Samuel v. 11, a “carver or worker of stone,” as in 1Ch 22:15; חָרִשׁ קַיו, charash' kir, 1Ch 14:1, a wallworkman), a stone- mason or artificer in stone. From 2 Samuel v. 11, which states that “Hiram,  king of Tyre, sent messengers to David, and cedar-trees, and carpenters, and masons, and they built David a house,” we may infer that the Hebrews were not so skillful in architecture as the Tyrians, though they had long sojourned in Egypt, where that art attained a high degree of perfection at a very early period. The ruins of immense temples and palaces at the present day fill the traveler in Egypt with wonder and astonishment. The sculptures on the granite, basalt, and hard limestone still remain undefaced. Upon the ancient monuments of Egypt the various processes of the building art are very numerous. Masons, carpenters, blacksmiths, brickmakers, etc., may be seen hard at work, and appear to be depicted with minute fidelity, and some of these seem to explain to us a curious circumstance mentioned by the sacred historian in the account of the erection of Solomon's Temple: “And the house, when it was in building, was built. of stone made ready before it was brought thither; so that there was neither hammer, nor are, nor any tool of iron heard in the house whilst it was in building” (1Ki 6:7). This previous squaring and preparation of the stones is frequently delineated; they are accurately measured under the superintendence of a principal architect, the shape marked on the rough block with a dark line, so as to determine the course of the stone-cutter accurately, and a mark or number is fixed to the finished stone so as to point out its place in the building. Masons' and carpenters' tools have frequently been found in the tombs. Most of the blades have been attached by linen bandages and an adhesive composition. On the blades of the larger, and handles of the smaller tools, is generally inscribed a line of hieroglyphics. Some of them are of remote antiquity, bearing the praemomen of Thothmes III. (See Wilkinson, Ancient Egyptians, 2, 305- 315.) The peculiar bevelled edges and immense size of the lower courses of the walls of Jerusalem and other cities of Palestine attest the antique art of Solomon's day. Similar advancement in the art of stonecutting is evident from the ruins discovered by Botta and Layard in Assyria. SEE HANDICRAFT; SEE SCULPTURE.

Mason, Erskine, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, son of Dr. John M. Mason, was born in New York City April 16,1805; was educated at Dickinson College (class of 1823); was ordained in October, 1826; installed over the Church at Schenectady in May, 1827; pastor of Bleecker Street Church, New York, from 1830 to 1851; and also professor of ecclesiastical history in Union Theological Seminary, New York. from 1836 to 1842. He died May 14,1851. His memoir, by Rev. Wm. Adams, is prefixed to his sermons on practical subjects, entitled A Pastor's Legacy (1853, 8vo). See also Drake, Dict. of Amer. Biog. s.v.

## Mason, Charles, D.D[[@Headword:Mason, Charles, D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal clergyman, was born July 25, 1812, at Portsmouth, N.H. He graduated with honor from Harvard College in 1832; studied  theology at the General Theological Seminary, New York city; was ordained deacon and priest by bishop Griswold; became rector of St. Peter's Church, Salem, Massachusetts, in May 1837: and of Grace Church, Boston, in 1847, which position he held until his death, March 23, 1862. For a long time he was a member of the standing committee of the diocese, and was prominent in various missionary enterprises. See Amer. Quar. Church Rev. 1862, page 735.

## Mason, Cyrus, D.D[[@Headword:Mason, Cyrus, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Nassau, N.Y., July 19, 1798. He graduated from Union College in 1824; spent two years in Princeton Theological Seminary; was ordained by the Presbytery of New York, December 7, 1826, pastor of Cedar Street Church, New York city; in 1835 became pastor of the Beneficent Congregational Church, Providence, R.I.; in 1836 professor of political economy and ethics in the University of New York, a position which he retained until 1850. He died in New York city, May 28, 1865. See Genesis Cat. of Princeton Theol. Sem. 1881, pge 50.

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

             (1), B.D., an English divine, was born in the county of Durham in 1566; was educated at Merton College, Oxford, about 1583, where he was chosen probationer fellow; became rector of Oxford, Suffolk, and chaplain to king James 1, and archdeacon of Norfolk in 1619. He died in 1621. He published Sermons (Lond. 1607, 4to; Oxford, 1634, 4to): — Vindicae ecclesiae Anglicanae (1613, fol.; published in an English dress, entitled A Vindication of the Church of England, and of the Lawful Ministry thereof, etc.; greatly enlarged by Rev. John Lindsay, with additions, 1728, fol.; 1778, fol.). This book contains a complete refutation of the Nag's Head story: — Two Sermons (1621, 8vo): — The Lawfulness of the Ordination of Ministers of the Reformed Churches beyond the Seas (Oxford, 1641, 4to). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. vol. 2, s.v.

## Mason, Francis (2)[[@Headword:Mason, Francis (2)]]

             (2), D.D., a Baptist minister, andl missionary, was born at York, England, April 2, 1799. He was a shoemaker's apprentice emigrated to Philadelphia in 1818; settled at Canton, Mo., in 1825; studied at the Theological Seminary, Newton, Mo., in 1827; and in May, 1830, having been ordained, sailed with his wife for Calcutta as a missionary to the Karens. After acquiring the language, he wrote The Sayings of the Elders, which was the first printed book in the Karen language. He prepared Pali and Burmese grammars, and acquired many of the Oriental languages. He also published a Karen translation of the Bible. He was medical adviser to this people, having studied medicine, and published a small work on materia medica and pathology in one of the Karen dialects. He also edited for many years the Morning Star, a Karen monthly, in both the Sgan and Pwo dialects, and was member of a number of literary and scientific bodies. He died at Rangoon, Burmah, March 3, 1874. His English writings are, Report of the Twvay Mission Society: — Life of Kothabyun, the Karens Apostle: — Memoir of Mrs. Helen Mil. Mason (1847): Memoir of San Quala (1850): — and Burmah, its People and Natural Productions (1852; enlarged edition, 1861).

## Mason, J. O., D.D[[@Headword:Mason, J. O., D.D]]

             A Baptist minister, was born at Fort Ann, N.J., December 25, 1813. He was converted in his eighteenth year; graduated from the Literary and Theological Institute at Hamilton, N.Y., in 1836; labored as a missionary among the Creek Indians; in 1840 became pastor at Fort Ann, and in 1844 at Greenwich, N.Y., where he died, December 16, 1881. See Cathcart, Baptist Encyclop. s.v.

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

             (1), an English dissenting divine, was born in Essex in 1705 or 1706; became pastor of a congregation at Dorking, Surrey, in 1730, and at  Chestnut, Hertfordshire. in 1746. He died in 1763. Mr. Mason published, besides a number of Sermons, various theological treatises and other works. The best known are Self-Knowledge (1754; new edition and life of the author by John Mason Good, 1811, 12mo; new edition by Tegg, 1847, 32mo; with Melmoth's Importance of a Christian Life, published by Scott, 1855, 24mo); this work was very popular for a long time, and was translated into several languages: — The Lord's Day Evening Entertainments, 52 practical discourses (1751-52, 4 vols. 8vo; 2d ed. 1754, 4 vols. 8vo): — The Student and Pastor (1755, 8vo; new edition by Joshua Toulmin, D.D., 1807,12mo) — Fifteen Discourses (1758, 8vo): — Christian Morals (1761, 2 vols. 8vo). See Allibone, Dict. Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Hook, Eccles. Biog. s.v.

## Mason, John (2)[[@Headword:Mason, John (2)]]

             (2), D.D., a minister of the Associate Reformed Church, father of the celebrated John M. Mason, was born near Mid-Calder, in Linlithgowshire, Scotland, in 1734. The great ecclesiastical agitation within the Church of Scotland occurred in his early days, and, favoring the Anti-Burgher party, he identified himself with this branch of the “Secession Church,” pursued his theological studies at Abernethy, and later became an assistant professor of logic and moral philosophy at the theological school. In 1761 he was ordained for the office of the ministry, and sent to this country as pastor of the then Cedar Street Church, New York. Believing that the causes which divided the Presbyterians of Scotland did not exist here, he labored, from the moment of his arrival in the States, for the union of all Presbyterians, and, though his course displeased his brethren at home, and the synod suspended him, he pushed his project, and on June 13, 1782, a general union of the Reformed Presbyterians was held as “the Associate Reformed Church.” Dr. Mason had the honor to be the first moderator of this body. Untiring in his services to the cause of the Church of Christ, and his own branch of it, he died April 19, 1792. “His death, like his life, was an honorable testimony to his Redeemer's power and grace.” The degree of D.D. was conferred upon him by New Jersey College, of which he was a trustee from 1779 to 1785. Dr. Mason “was a man of sound and vigorous mind, of extensive learning, and fervent piety. As a preacher, he was uncommonly judicious and instructive, and his ministrations were largely attended. As a pastor, he was specially faithful and diligent. To great learning there were united in him meekness, prudence, diligence, knowledge of the world, and an affectionate superintendence of the  interests, temporal and spiritual, of his flock” (Dr. John B. Dales, in Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 9:4 sq.).

## Mason, John Mitchell[[@Headword:Mason, John Mitchell]]

             D.D., a distinguished Presbyterian divine and noted American pulpit orator, was born in the city of New York March 19, 1770. He was educated at Columbia College, class of 1789, and having decided to devote his life to the service of the Church, went abroad, and studied theology at the University of Edinburgh. While at the “Northern Athens” young Mason became noted for piety and an exemplary life. In 1792 he was unexpectedly recalled by the sudden decease of his father, and, after his return to New York, was established in the ministry over the same Church which his father had served so long. The Associate Reformed Church, to which he belonged at this time, had been wont to celebrate the Lord's Supper but once or twice annually. Mason believed in more frequent communion, and both by his pen and his tongue, went forward to advocate reform in this respect. A pamphlet, consisting of “Letters on Communion,” which he published, brought him prominently before the religious world, and thereafter John Mitchell Mason was not an uncommon name in the assembly of American Christians. He also served his day and generation in many other ways. The Associate Reformed Church had always depended upon foreign institutions for the education of her ministry. Mason advocated the establishment of a school of the prophets on American soil. and thus became instrumental in founding the institution known as the “Union Theological Seminary.” He was appointed its first professor at the opening in 1804. In 1806 he projected the “Christian's Magazine,” the pages of which are filled with a controversy he had with bishop Hobart on the claims of the episcopacy. In 1810 he resigned his pastoral charge, for the purpose of forming a new congregation. The intimate relations he now established with the Presbyterians were objected to by many of his own denomination, and in 1811 a charge was brought against him, but the synod had sense enough to refuse all censure. Mason, however, improved the opportunity to push his favorite object, the Plea for Sacramental Communion on Catholic Principles (published in 1816). In this year (1811) he was also honored with the provostship of Columbia College, and, though already employed as preacher and professor, accepted the position, “and by his talents and energy raised that institution to a higher character than it had ever before possessed.” In 1816 failing health admonished him of the magnitude of the work he had undertaken, and he  resigned his connection with the college, and went to Europe. On his return in 1817 he again devoted himself to Gospel labors, but in 1821 exchanged the pulpit for the rostrum, as president of Dickinson College, Pa. In 1822 he transferred his ecclesiastical relation to the Presbyterian Church. In 1824 he resigned his position at college, and returned to New York to recuperate his health, but he was never again permitted to assume any official connection. He died Dec. 26, 1829. Besides the literary enterprises already mentioned, Dr. Mason wrote a number of essays, reviews, orations, and sermons, published at different times. They were collected by his son, the Rev. Ebenezer Mason, and published in 4 vols. 8vo, in 1832 (new ed., with many additions, 1849). A memoir, with some of his correspondence, was published by his son-in-law, J. Van Vechten, D.D., in 1856, 2 vols. 8vo. The mind of Dr. Mason was of the most robust order, his theology Calvinistic, and his style of eloquence powerful and irresistible as a torrent. When Robert Hall first heard him deliver before the London Missionary Society, in 1802, his celebrated discourse on” Messiah's Throne,” he is said to have exclaimed, “I can never preach again!” (Fisk's Pulpit Eloquence, 1857, p. 486, q.v.). “Taken altogether, no American preacher has combined more impressive qualities. His aspect was on a scale of grandeur corresponding to the majesty of mind within. Tall, robust, straight, with a head modeled after neither Grecian nor Roman standard, yet symmetrical, combining the dignity of the one and the grace of the other; with an eye that shot fire, especially when under the excitement of earnest preaching, yet tender and tearful when the pathetic cord was touched; with a forehead broad and high, running up each side, and slightly parted in the middle by a graceful pendant of hair; a mouth and chin expressive of firmness and decision ... Dr. Mason stood before you the prince' of pulpit orators” (N. Y. Observer, Nov. 1860). See also Bost. Christ. Disciple, 3:475; Dr. Spring, Power of the Pulpit; Duyckinck, Cyclop. Amer. Lit. (see Index in vol. 1); Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth. 2:1237; Princet. Review, 1856, p. 318. (J.H.W.)

## Mason, Lowell[[@Headword:Mason, Lowell]]

             doctor of music, a celebrated American composer of music, was born at Medfield, Mass., Jan. 8,1792. When but a child he exhibited extraordinary love and capacity for music, and began to teach early in life. In 1812 he removed to Savannah, Ga., and there compiled his first book of Psalmody, the celebrated Händel and Haydn collection, the success of which eliciting much persuasion of his musical friends in Massachusetts to settle in his  native state, he removed to Boston in 1827, devoted himself to the musical instruction of children and the introduction of vocal music into the public schools of New England; caused the Boston Academy of Music to be established, and also “Teachers' Institutes” for the training of teachers and leaders of choirs. He visited Europe in 1837, and acquainted himself with all the improvements in the musical teaching on the Continent. In 1855 the University of New York conferred on him the degree of doctor of music, the first ever conferred by an American college. In the later years of his life he gave much attention to congregational singing in churches, and did much to advance the interests of Church music in general. He died at his residence, Orange, N. J., Aug. 11, 1872. His publications of interest to us are Juvenile Psalmist, Juvenile Lyre, etc. (Boston, 1829, ‘30, ‘34, ‘35, 36, ‘37, ‘39, ‘40, ‘45, ‘46; New York, 1856; Phila. 1843; Lond. 1838): — several sacred and Church music-books: — The Boston Händel and Haydn Collection of Church Music (1822): — The Choir, or Union Collection (1833, etc.); etc. Dr. Mason was the author and compiler of more musical works than any other American, and contributed much towards making the Americans a nation of “singing men and singing women.” See Allibone, Dict Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Drake, Dict. Amer. Biog. s.v.

## Mason, Sumner R., D.D[[@Headword:Mason, Sumner R., D.D]]

             a Baptist minister, was born at Cheshire, Berkshire County, Massachusetts, June 14, 1819. He was for two years a member of Yale College (1838-40); then became a member of the First Baptist Church in New Haven, and devoted the next seven years to teaching, most of the time in Nashville, Tenn., where he was licensed to preach, September 7, 1844; and studied theology under Reverend Dr. Howell. He was ordained pastor of the First Baptist Church, Lockport, N.Y., August 22, 1849; then became pastor of the First Baptist Church in Cambridge, Massachusetts, March 4, 1855, where he continued an able and successful minister until his death, Aug. 26, 1871. A volume of his sermons and essays, edited by Reverend A. Hovey, D.D., with a sketch of his life and character, by Reverend O.A. Stearns, D.D., was issued by the Riverside (Cambridge) press in 1874. (J.C.S.)

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

             an English divine of some note, son of the vicar of St. Trinity Hall, was born in 1725; was educated at St. John's College, Cambridge, and made fellow of Pembroke College in 1747. In 1754 he took holy orders, became rector of Aston, Yorkshire, chaplain to the king, and was for thirty-two years precentor and canon residentiary of York. He died in 1797. His published works, both secular and religious, are chiefly in poetry, among which are Essays, Historical and Critical, on English Church Music (1795, 12mo). He also published Memoirs of Thomas Gray (1775, 4to). Mason was regarded by his contemporaries as a poet of more than ordinary genius, but the lack of classical culture prevented his rise. There is a tablet to his memory in Poet's Corner, in Westminster Abbey. His style is, to a great extent, that of an imitator of Gray; and, not being so perfect an artist in language as his master, he has been proportionally less successful. In addition to his poetical reputation, he possessed considerable skill in painting and music, and on the latter subject entertained opinions not at all consonant with those of musicians in general. He wished to reduce Church music to the most dry and mechanical style possible, excluding all such expression as should depend on the powers and taste of the organist  (Mason's Compendium of the History of Church Music). See Memoir of Mason in Johnson and Chalmer's English Poets (1840, 21 vols. 8vo); Chalmer's Biog. Dict. s.v.; Blackwood's Mag. 30:482; 26:553; Allibone, Dict. Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Masorah, Masoreth, or Massoreth[[@Headword:Masorah, Masoreth, or Massoreth]]

             (מִסּוֹרֶת מָסֹרֶת מָסֹרָה), the technical term given to a grammatico-critical commentary on the O. Test., the design of which is to indicate the correct reading of the text with respect to words, vowels, accents, etc., so as to preserve it from all corruption, putting an end to the exercise of unbounded individual fancy. In the Hebrew Masorah denotes traditions, from מסר, which is used in Chaldaic in the sense of to give over, to commnit (corresponding to the Hebrew חסגיר סגר נתן ביד; comp. Targ. on 1Sa 17:46; 1Sa 24:11; 1Ki 20:13; Exo 21:3; Amo 6:8); and hence, by the rabbinical writers, in the sense of to deliver, with reference to the oral communication of doctrine, opinion, or fact. The derivation, from אסר), to bind, to fix within strict limits, seems to have been an afterthought, suggested by the sentiment that the Masorah is a hedge to the Torah. The Masorah, however, is not confined to what is communicated by oral tradition; in the state in which it has come down to us it embraces all that has been delivered traditionally, whether orally or in writing. Its correlate is קבלה(Kabbtsalah), reception; and as the latter denotes whatever has been received traditionally, the former embraces whatever has been delivered traditionally; though in usage Kabbalah is generally restricted to matters of theologic and mystic import, SEE CABALA, while Masorah has reference rather to matters affecting the condition of the text of Scripture. It takes account not only of various readings, but also contains notes of a grammatical and lexicographical character it descends to the most minute particulars, and is a monument of prolonged industry, fidelity, and earnest devotion to the cause of sacred learning.

I. Origin of the Masorah. — The Masorah is the work of certain Jewish critics, who from their work have received the title of בעלי המסורת(Baali Hammasoreth), masters of the Masorah, or, as they are generally designated, Masoretes. Who they were, and when or where their work was accomplished, are points involved in some uncertainty. According to Jewish tradition. the work began with Moses; from him it was committed  to the wise men till Ezra and the great Synagogue, and was then transferred to the learned men at Tiberias, by whom it was transmitted to writing and called the Masorah (El. Levita, Masoreth Hammasoreth, Pref. p. 2). Some even claim Ezra as the author of the written collection (Buxtorf; Tiberias, c. 11, p. 102; Leusden, Philol. Heb. Diss. 25, sec. 4; Pfeiffer, De Masora, cap. 2, in Opp. p. 891, etc.); but the arguments which have been adduced in support of this opinion are not sufficient to sustain it. Aben-Ezra says expressly, “So was the usage of the wise men of Tiberias, for from them were the men the authors of the Masoreth, and from them have we received the whole punctuation” (Zachuth, cited by Blxtorf, Tib. c. 3, p. 9); and even Buxtorf himself unconsciously gives in to the opinion he opposes by the title he has put on his work. That various readings had been noted before this, even in pre-Talmudic times, is not to be doubted. In the Talmud itself we have not only directions given for the correct writing of the Biblical books, but references to varieties of reading as then existing (Hierosol., tr. Tacanith, f. 68, c. 1; comp. Kennicott, Diss. Genesis sec. 34; De Wette, Einleit. ins A. T. sec. 89; Hävernick, Introduct. p. 280); especial mention is made of the Ittur Sopheirn (עטור ספוים, Ablatio Scribarum; tract Nedasrim, f. 37, c. 2), of the Keri ve-lo Kethib, the Kethib ve-lo Keri, and the Keri ve-kethib (Niedarim, 1. c.; tract Sota, v. 5; Jomna, f. 21, c. 2), and of the puncta extraorldincaria, which, however, are not properly of critical import, but rather point to allegorical explanations of the passage (tr. Nasir, f. 23, c. I1; comp. Jerome, Quaest. in Genesis 18:35); and already the middle consonant, the middle word, and the middle verse of the Pentateuch are noted as in the Masorah. In the tract Sopherim, written between the Talmud and the Masorah, there are also notes of the same kind, though not exactly agreeing with those in the Masorah. But those variants had not before been formally collected and reduced to order in writing. This was the work of the Jewish scholars who, from the 6th century after Christ, flourished in Palestine. and had their principal seat at Tiberias (Zunz, Gottesdienstliche Vorträge der Juden, p. 309).

II. Contents of the Masorah. — These are partly palteographic, partly critical, partly exegetical, partly grammatical. They embrace notes concerning

1. The Consonants of the Hebrew Text. — Concerning these, the Masoretes note about thirty letters which are larger than the others, about  thirty that are less, four which are suspended or placed above the line of the others in the same word, and nine which are inverted or written upside down; to these peculiarities reference is made also in the Talmud, and the use of them as merely marking the middle of a book or section indicated (tr. Kiddushin, f. 30, c. 1; Hävernick, 1. c., p. 282). The Masoretes also note a case in which the final ם is found in the heart of a word (לםרבה, Isa 9:6); one in which the initial in is found at the end (חמ, Neh 2:13); and one in which the initial נ occurs at the end (מנ. Job 18:1) — irregularities for which no reason can be assigned (comp. Leusden, Phil. Heb. Diss. 10). They have noted how often each letter occurs; and they signalize the middle of each book, the middle letter of the Pentateuch (the וin גחו, Lev 11:42), the middle letter of the Psalter (the ע in מיער, Psalm 130:14), the number of times each of the five letters which have final forms occurs in its final and in its initial form.

2. The Vowel-points and Accents in the Hebrew Text. — Here the Masoretes note the peculiarities or anomalies in the use of the vowel- points, of the dagesh and mappik, and of the accents in the text-a fact to which Buxtorf appeals with considerable force, as proving that the authors of the Masorah, as we have it, were not the inventors of the diacritical marks by which vowels and accents are indicated in the Hebrew text; for, had they been so, they would not have confined themselves to laboriously noting anomalies into which they themselves had fallen, but would at once have removed them. SEE VOWEL-POINTS.

3. Words. — With regard to these, the Masoretes note

(1) the cases of Scriptio plena (מלאים) and defectiva (חסרים);

(2) the number of times in which certain words occur at the beginning of a verse (as, e.g., קום, which they say is nine times the first word of a verse), or the end of a verse (as הארוֹ, which they say occurs thrice as the final word of a verse);

(3) words of which the meaning is ambiguous, and to which they affix the proper meaning in the place where they occur;

(4) words which have over t the puncta extraordinaria; and  (5) words which present anomalies in writing or grammar, and which some have thought should be altered, or peculiarities which need to be explained (סבירין).

4. Verses. — The Masoretes number the verses in each book of the O. Test.. as well as in each of the larger sections of the Pentateuch, and they note the middle verse of each book of the O.T.; they also note the number of verses in which certain expressions occur, the first and last letters of each verse, and in many cases the number of letters of which it is composed; and, in fine, they have marked twenty-five or twenty-eight places where there is a pause in the middle of a verse, or where a hiatus is supposed to be found in the meaning (as, e.g., in Gen 4:8, where, after the words ויאמר קין אלאּהבל אחיו“there is in rabbinical editions of the O. Test. a space left vacant [פסקא, piska] to indicate that something is probably omitted).

5. Tikkun Sopherim (תקין סופרים, ordinatio, sive correctio Scribarum). — On the word כבודם (Psa 106:20) the Masorah has this note: the word כבודם is one of eighteen words in Scripture which are an ordination of the Scribes. These eighteen words are also enumerated in a note at the beginning of Numbers. The passages where they occur are presented in the following table:

Tikksun Sopherlin. Erronneous Reading.

Charges have been rashly advanced against these Sopherim of having corrupted the sacred text (Galatin, De Arcanis Cathol. Ver. lib. 1, c. 8), but for this there is no foundation (see ben-Chajim's Introduction to the Rabbinic Bible, translated by Ginsburg, p. 21). Eichhorn concludes from “the character of the readings” that “this recension took note only of certain errors which had crept into the text through transcribers, and which were corrected by collation of MSS.” (Einleit. ins. A. T. sec. 116). Bleek, however, thinks that this is affirmed without evidence, and that in some cases the rejected reading is probably the original one, as, e.g., in Gen 18:22, and Hab 1:12 (Einleit. ins A. T. p. 803).

6. Ittur Sopherim (עטור סופרים, ablatio Scribarum). — The Masoretes have noted four instances in which the letter וhas been erroneously prefixed to אחר-viz. Gen 18:5; Gen 24:55; Num 12:14; and Psalm 28:26; they note also that it has been erroneously prefixed to the word משפטיin Psa 36:7. Of these passages, the only one in which the injunction of the Sopherim to remove the ו has been neglected is Num 12:14 — a neglect at which Buxtorf expresses surprise (Lex. Talmud, s.v. עטר).

7. Keri and Kethib. — But not all the dicta of the Masoretes are of equal sterling value; they are not only sometimes utterly superfluous, but downright erroneous. Of its “countings” we may adduce that it enumerates in the Pentateuch 18 greater and 43 smaller portions, 1534 verses, 63,467 words, 70,100 letters, etc. — a calculation which is, however, to a certain degree at variance with the Talmud. SEE KERI AND KETHIM in this work.  III. Form of the Masorah: — The language of the Masorah is Chaldee; and, besides the difficulty of this idiom, the obscure abbreviations, contractions, symbolical signs, etc., with which the work abounds, render its study exceedingly difficult. In all probability it was composed out of notes that had been made from time to time on separate leaves, or in books, as occasion demanded. Afterwards they were appended as marginal notes to the text, sometimes on the upper and lower margin, sometimes in a more brief form on the space between the text and the Chaldee version, where, from scarcity of room, many abbreviations and symbols were resorted to, and considerable omissions were made. Hence arose a distinction between the מסורה גדולה, the Masora Magna, and the קטנה מ8, the h. Parva — the former of which comprehends the entire body of critical remark on the margins, the latter the more curt and condensed notes inserted in the intermediate space. The latter has frequently been represented as an abbreviated compend of the former; but this is not strictly correct, for the lesser Masorah contains many things not found in the greater. At an early period the scribes introduced the practice of adorning their annotations with all manner of figures, and symbols, and caligraphic ingenuities; and from this, as well as from causes connected with their method of selection and arrangement, the whole came into such a state of confusion that it was rendered almost useless. In this state it remained until the publication of Bomberg's Rabbinical Bible (Venetia, 1526: the second Bomberg Biblia Rabbin., not the first, as is sometimes stated), for which the learned R. Jacob ben-Chajim, with immense labor, prepared and arranged the Masorah. SEE JACOB BEN-CHAJIM. To facilitate the use of the Greater Masorah. he placed at the end of his work what has been called the Masora maxima or finalis, and which forms a sort of Masoretic Concordance in alphabetic order.

IV. Value of the Masorah. — While there is much in the Miasorah that can be regarded in no other light than as laborious trifling, it is far from deserving the scorn which has sometimes been poured upon it. There can be no doubt that it preserves to us much valuable traditional information concerning the constitution and the meaning of the sacred text. It is the source whence materials for a critical revision of the O.-Test. text can now alone be derived. It is a pity that it is now impossible to discriminate the older from the more recent of its contents. We would earnestly reiterate the wish of Eichhorn, that some one would undertake the “bitter task” of making complete critical excerpts from the Masorah.  V. Literature. — Elilas Levita, מסורת המסורת(Ven. 1538; German transl. by Semler, Halle, 1770; English transl. by Ginsburg, Lond. 1867); Buxtorf, Tiberias, sive Comment. Masoreth. triplex histor. didact. crit. (Basle, 1620, 4to); Cappell, Crit. Sac. lib. 3; Olaus Celsius, De Masora Disput.; Leusden, Philol. Heb., Diss. 22-25; Walton, Prolegg. in Polyglott. No. 8; Carpzov, Crit. Sacr. p. 283; Wahner, Antiq. Hebs. sec. 1, c. 36; Abr. Geiger, Zur Gesch. der Masorah (in the 3d vol. of his Jiid. Zeitschr. für Wissensch. u. Leben); Frensdorff, Das Bach “Ochlach W'ochlach” (Massora) (Hamburg, 1864, 8vo); Hupfeld, Ueber eine bisher unbekalannt gebliebene lIandschrift de' iassorah (in Zeitschr. d. deutsch. morgenl. Gesellsch. 21:201 sq.); Eichhorn, Linleit. ins A. T. vol. i, sec. 140-158; De Wette, Einleit. sec. 90-92; Havernick, Introd. to the O.T. p. 279 sq.; Bleek, Einleit. ins A. T. p. 803 sq.; Ginsburg, Introduction to the Rabbinic Bible by J. ben-Chajim, transl. in the Journal of Sacred Literature for July, 1863. SEE CRITICISM, BIBLICAL.

## Maspha[[@Headword:Maspha]]

             the name of two places mentioned in the Apocrypha.

1. (Μασσηφάθ v. r. Μασσηφά.) A place opposite to (κατέναντι) Jerusalem, at which Judas Maccabaeus and his followers assembled themselves to bewail the desolation of the city and the sanctuary, and to inflame their resentment before the battle of Emmaus, by the sight not only of the distant city, which was probably visible from the eminence, but also of the book of the law mutilated and profaned, and of other objects of peculiar preciousness and sanctity (1Ma 3:46). As the passage contains an allusion to similar acts of devotion “aforetime in Israel,” there is no doubt that it is identical with MIZPEH SEE MIZPEH (q.v.) of Benjamin, the ancient sanctuary at which Samuel had convened the people on an occasion of equal emergency (1Sa 7:5). In fact, Maspha, or, more accurately, Massepha, is merely the form in which the Sept. uniformly renders the Hebrew name Mizpeh, the modern Nebi-Samwil, a high range in the neighborhood of Jerusalem (Robinson, Researches, 2:143).

2. (Μασφά.) One of the cities which were taken from the Ammonites by Judas Maccabaeus in his campaign on the east of Jordan (1Ma 5:35). It is uncertain whether the ancient city of Mizpeh of Gilead (Jdg 11:29, etc.) or Mizpeh of Moab (1Sa 22:3) is meant.  The Svriac has the curious variation of Olim, “salt,” and one Greek MS. has εἰς ῎Αλεμα, another εἰς Σάλεμα, another εἰς Λέμα: but this seems to be a mere arbitrary correction from v. 26 by some one who thought that the place mentioned in both verses should be the same. Michaelis, however, would combine both readings, and make the place Mizpeh-Elim. Perhaps Josephus also reads מֶלִח, “salt,” as he reads Μάλλη (Ant. 12:8, 3), which Grimm thinks has arisen from transposition of letters (Handb. z. a. Apokr. ad loc.).

## Masrekah[[@Headword:Masrekah]]

             (Heb. Masrekah', מִשְׂרֵקָה, vineyard; Sept. Μασσεκκά, Μασεκκά), a place apparently in Idumuea, the native place of Samlah, one of the Edomitish kings (Gen 36:36; 1Ch 1:47). “The student will observe that while some of these kings are mentioned with the addition, ‘and the name of his town was,' others are introduced as ‘coming from' some other place. Kalisch (ad loc.) remarks that the former seems to comprise native Idumaeans, the latter foreigners. Eusebius and Jerome, however (Onomast. s.v. Masraca), locate Masrekah in Gebalene, a province embracing the northern part of Edom” (Kitto). “Interpreted as Hebrew, the name refers to vineyards — as if from Sarakc, a root with which we are familiar in the ‘vine of Sorek,' that is, the choice vine; and, led by this, Knobel (Genesis, p. 257) proposes to place Masrekah in the district of the Idumuean mountains north of Petra, and along the Haj route, where Burckhardt found ‘extensive vineyards,' and ‘great quantities of dried grapes,' made by the tribe of the Refaya for the supply of Gaza and for the Mecca pilgrims (Burckhardt, Syria, p. 418). But this is mere conjecture, as no name at all corresponding with Masrekah has been yet discovered in that locality” (Smith). According to Schwarz (Palest. p. 215), there is still a town, eight miles south of Petra, called En-Masrak, which he thinks may be the locality. He probably refers to the place marked Ain Mafrak on Palmer's Map, and Ain el-Usdaka on Kiepert's.

## Mass[[@Headword:Mass]]

             (Latin Missa) is the technical term by which the Church of Rome designates the Eucharistic service which in that Church, as well as in the Greek and other Oriental churches, is held to be the sacrifice of the new law-a real though unbloody offering, in which Christ is the victim, in substance the same with the sacrifice of the cross. It is instituted,  Romanists further teach, in commemoration of that sacrifice, and as a means of applying its merits through all ages for the sanctification of men.

Origin and Meaning of the Word. — “The first names given to the administration of the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ,” says Walcott (s.v.), “were the Breaking of Bread (Act 20:6,( 7), the Lord's Supper (1 Corinthians 2:20), or Communion (1Co 10:18). It was also called, by way of eminence, the mystery, the sacrament, the oblation or prosphora, the sacrifice, Dominicum (the Lord's), agenda (the action), synais and collecta (the assembly), the solemnities, the service, the supplication, the mystical or divine Eucharist or eulogy (the thanksgiving), the office, the spectacle, the consecration, the unbloody sacrifice, the supper, the table, the latria (worship), the universal canon; and, by the Greeks, also the hierurgia (sacred action), and the good by excellence, metalepsis (the communion), in the Apostolical Canons. These terms served either to explain to the faithful the meaning of the service, or, in times of persecution, to conceal its real nature from the profane and persecutors. In Act 13:2, it is spoken of as the liturgy.”

The term Mass is ancient, having been used by Clement I, Alexander, Telesphorus, Soter, and Felix (cir. 100-275). In a letter of St. Ambrose to his sister Marcellina (of the 4th century), we have this passage: “Ego mansi in munere, missam facere ccmpi, dum offers, raptum cognovi” (Ep. 33). Its origin and use, however, have given much trouble. There are at present three principal derivations of the word:

(1.) From the AngloSaxon moese, a feast, in which sense the word is of more ancient date than the Eucharist. It seems probable that the ancient word is embodied in such names as Christmas, Michaelmas, Martinmas; but it is very doubtful whether the suffix, as thus used, has any reference at all to the holy Eucharist, and it is much more probable that the coincidence of the Anglo-Saxon word forfeast, with mass and missa, the holy Eucharist, is purely accidental.

(2.) From the Hebrew מַסָּה, missah', which signifies an oblation, as in Deu 16:10. This derivation would tend to show an association between the original idea of the Eucharist and the oblations of the Jewish ritual; but it is extremely improbable that the Jewish word should have found its way into every language of Europe, and yet be entirely absent from the liturgical vocabulary of the Oriental churches.

(3.) From the “Ite, missa est” of the ancient liturgies of the West, which was equivalent to the Ε᾿ν εἰρήνῃ Χρυστιῦ πορευθῶμεν, “Let us depart in peace,” of the Greek liturgies. But the words “Ite, missa est,” have two senses given to them by ancient writers; thus, in Micrologus, it is said, “In festivis diebus ‘Ite, missa est' dicitur. quia tune generalis conventus celebrari solet, quli per hujusmodi denuntiationem licentiam discendi accipere solet” (Microlog. 46). St. Thomas Aquinas, on the other hand, explains the phrase as meaning that the sacrifice of the Eucharist has been sent up to God by the administration of angels (Thomas Aquinas, 3, qu. 83, art. 4). Both these meanings are combined in a very ancient exposition of the mass, printed by Hittorpius: “Tune demum a diacona dicitur, Ite, missa est, id est, Ite cum pace in domus vestras, quia transmissa est pro vobis oratio ad dominunm; et per angelos, qui nuncii dicunter, allata est in divinme conspectum majestatis” (Expos. Miss. ex vetust. cod. in Hittorp. p. 587).

The proper technical sense of the word undoubtedly is the one in which it is employed by the early Church — that of “offering” or “oblation,” which, as we have seen above, are ancient names for the Lord's Supper. In such a sense the English Church used the word, and it thus occurs in the first vernacular liturgy of the Church of England (A.D. 1549): “‘The Supper of the Lord, and the holy Communion, commonly called the Mass.” Indeed it was only abandoned by the Anglican clergy when it was found that Romanists attached to the word mass a perverted sense. It was first dropped in the revised Prayer-book of 1552. In Germany the Reformers hesitated not to protest against the accusation that they opposed mass. Thus, e.g., the Augsburg Confession “protests against any notion that it abolishes mass” (comp. Schott, Augsburgische Confession, p. 137, 141). The doctrine of the mass, as interpreted by Roman Catholics, presupposes the Eucharist, and involves the notion of a sacrifice. On the latter point hinges the controversy between Romanists and Protestants: the question being whether it is a positive sacrifice, renewed at every celebration, or only a solemn feast on a sacrifice once offered by Jesus Christ; whether Christ in body and blood is absolutely and corporally, or only spiritually and really present in the elements. SEE REAL PRESENCE; SEE TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

By primitive use, the communion of the faithful appears always, unless in exceptional cases, to have formed part of the Eucharistic service; but afterwards it came to pass that the officiating priest only communicated,  whence arose, especially in the Western Church. the practice of “private masses,” which has been in later times a ground of complaint with dissentients from Rome — even those who in other respects approach closely to the Roman doctrine. In the ancient writers a distinction is made between the “mass of the catechumens” and the “mass of the faithful;” the former including all the preparatory prayers, the latter all that directly regards the consecration of the elements and the communion, at which the “discipline of the secret” forbade the presence of the catechumens. With the cessation of this discipline the distinction of names has ceased, but the distinction of parts is still preserved, the mass of the catechumens comprising all the first part of the mass as far as the “preface.”

The mass is now in general denominated according to the solemnity of the accompanying ceremonial — a “low mass,” a “chanted mass,” or a “high mass.” In the first, a single priest simply reads the service, attended by one or more acolytes or clerks. The second form differs only in this, that the service is chanted instead of being read by the priest. In the high mass the service is chanted in part by the priest, in part by the deacon and subdeacon, by whom, as well as by several ministers of inferior rank, the priest is assisted. In all these, however, the service, as regards the form of prayer, is the same. It consists of

(1) an introductory prayer composed of the 41st Psalm, together with the “general confession;”

(2) the introit, which is followed by the thrice-repeated petition, “Lord, have mercy,” “Christ, have mercy,” and the hymn “Glory to God on high;”

(3) the collect, or public and joint prayers of priest and people, followed by a lesson either from the Epistles or some book of the Old Testament, and by the Gradual (q.v.);

(4) the Gospel, which is commonly followed by the Nicene Creed;

(5) the Offertory (q.v.), after the reading of which comes the preparatory offering of the bread and wine, and the washing of the priest's hands in token of purity of heart, and the “secret,” a prayer read in a low voice by the priest;

(6) the preface, concluding with the trisagion, or “thrice holy,” at which point, by the primitive use, the catechumens and penitents retired from the church;

(7) the “canon,” which is always the same, and which contains all the prayers connected with the consecration, the elevation, the breaking, and the communion of the host and of the chalice, as also the commemorations both of the living and of the dead;

(8) the “communion,” which is a short scriptural prayer, usually appropriate to the particular festival;

(9) the “post-communion,” which, like them collect, was a joint prayer of priest and people, and is read or sung aloud;

(10) the dismissal with the benediction; and, finally, the first chapter of John's Gospel.

A great part of the above prayers are fixed, and form what is called the “ordo” or “ordinary” of the mass. The rest, which is called the “proper of the mass,” differs for different occasions, many masses having nothing peculiar but the name: such are the masses of the saints — that of St. Mary of the Snow, celebrated on the 5th of August; that of St. Margaret, patroness of lying-in women; that at the feast of St. John the Baptist, at which are said three masses; that of the Innocents, at which the Gloria in Excelsis and Hallelujah are omitted, and, it being a day of mourning, the altar is of a violet color. As to ordinary masses, some are for the dead, and, as is supposed, contribute to release the soul from purgatory. At these masses the altar is put in mourning, and the only decorations are a cross in the middle of six yellow wax lights; the dress of the celebrant, and the very Massbook, are black; many parts of the office are omitted, and the people are dismissed without the benediction. If the mass be said for a person distinguished by his rank or virtues, it is followed with a funeral oration: they erect a chapelle ardente, that is, a representation of the deceased, with branches and tapers of yellow wax, either in the middle of the church or near the deceased's tomb, where the priest pronounces a solemn absolution of the deceased. There are likewise private masses said for stolen or strayed goods or cattle, for health, for travelers, etc., which go under the name of votive masses. There is still a further distinction of masses, denominated from the countries in which they were used: thus the Gothic mass, or missa Mosarabum, is that used among the Goths when  they were masters of Spain, and is still kept up at Toledo and Salamanca; the Ambrosian mass is that composed by St. Ambrose, and used only at Milan, of which city he was bishop; the Gallic mass, used by the ancient Gauls; and the Roman mass, used by almost all the churches in the Romish communion. The mass of the presanctified (missa praesancticatorum) is a mass peculiar not only to the Roman. but also to the Greek Church. In the latter there is no consecration of the elements; but, after singing some hymns, the bread and wine, which were consecrated on the preceding day, are partaken of. This mass is performed in the Greek Church not only on Good Friday, but on every day during all Lent, except on Saturdays, Sundays, and the Annunciation. The priest counts upon his fingers the days of the ensuing week on which it is to be celebrated, and cuts off as many pieces of bread at the altar as he is to say masses, and, after having consecrated them, steeps them in wine and puts them in a box, out of which, upon every occasion, he takes some of it with a spoon, and, putting it on a dish, sets it on the altar.

Ceremony. — The following office of the mass is extracted from the Garden of the Soul, prepared by the late bishop Challoner, and may be accepted, therefore, as the authorized rite of the English Roman Catholics: “At the beginning of the mass, the priest at the foot of the altar makes the sign of the cross, ‘In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; amen,' and then recites with the clerk the 42d Psalm — ‘Judica me, Deus,' etc. Then the priest, bowing down, says the Confiteor, by way of a general confession to God, to the whole court of heaven, and to all the faithful there present, of his sins and unworthiness, and to beg their prayers to God for him. And the clerk, in the name of the people, prays for the priest, that God would have mercy on him, and forgive him his sins, and bring him to everlasting life. Then, in the name of all there present, the clerk makes the like general confession to God, to the whole court of heaven, and to the priest, and begs his prayers.

And the priest prays to God to show mercy to all his people, and to grant them pardon, absolution, and remission of all their sins. Which is done to the end that both priest and people may put themselves in a penitential spirit, in order to assist worthily at this divine sacrifice. After the Confiteor the priest goes up to the altar, saying, ‘Take away from us, we beseech thee, O Lord, our iniquities, that we may be worthy to enter with pure minds into the holy of holies, through Christ our Lord; amen,' and kisses the altar as a figure of Christ, and the seat of the sacred mysteries. When the priest is come up to  the altar, he goes to the book, and there reads what is called the introit or entrance of the mass, which is different every day, and is generally an anthem taken out of the Scripture, with the first verse of one of the Psalms. and the Glory be to the Father, etc., to glorify the blessed Trinity. The priest returns to the middle of the altar, and says alternately with the clerk the Kyrie eleison, or Lord have mercy on us. which is said three times to God the Father; three times Christe eleison, or Christ have mercy on us, to God the Son; and three times again Kyrie eleison, to God the Holy Ghost. After the Kyrie eleison, the priest recites the ‘Gloria in Excelsis,' or Glory be to God on high, etc., being an excellent hymn and prayer to God, the beginning of which was sung by the angels at the birth of Christ. But this, being a hymn of joy, is omitted in the masses of requiem for the dead, and in the masses of the Sundays and ferias of the penitential times of Advent and Lent, etc. At the end of the Gloria in Excelsis the priest kisses the altar, and, turning about to the people, says, ‘Dominus vobiscum' (The Lord be with you). Answer: ‘Et cum spiritu tuo' (And with thy spirit). The priest returns to the book, and says, ‘Oremus' (Let us pray), and then reads the collect or collects of the day, concluding them with the usual termination, ‘Per Dominum nostrum,' etc. (Through our Lord Jesus Christ, etc.), with which the Church commonly concludes all her prayers. The collects being ended, the priest lays his hands upon the book and reads the epistle or lesson of the day, at the end of which the clerk answers, ‘Deo gratias' (Thanks be to God) — viz., for the heavenly doctrine there delivered.

Then follow some verses or sentences of Scripture, called the gradual, which are every day different. After this the book is removed to the other side of the altar, in order to the reading of the Gospel for the day; which removal of the book represents the passing from the preaching of the old law, figured by the lesson or epistle, to the Gospel of Jesus Christ published by the preachers of the new law. The priest, before he reads the Gospel, stands awhile bowing down before the middle of the altar, begging of God in secret to cleanse his heart and his lips, that he may be worthy to declare those heavenly words. At the beginning of the Gospel the priest greets the people with the usual salutation ‘Dominus vobiscum' (The Lord be with you), and then tells out of which of the evangelists the Gospel is taken, saying, ‘Sequentia S. Evangelii secundum,' etc. (What follows is of the holy Gospel, etc.). At these words both priest and people make the sign of the cross: 1st, upon their foreheads, to signify that they are not ashamed of the cross of Christ and his doctrine; 2d, upon their mouths, to signify they will ever profess it in words; 3d, upon their breasts, to signify that they will  always keep it in their hearts. The clerk answers, ‘Gloria tibi, Domine' (Glory be to thee, O Lord). At the Gospel the people stand up, to declare by that posture their readiness to go and do whatsoever they shall be commanded by the Savior in his Gospel. At the end of the Gospel the clerk answers, ‘Laus tibi, Christe' (Praise be to thee, O Christ); and the priest kisses the book in reverence to those sacred words he has been reading out of it. Then upon aln bunaays, and many other festival days, standing in the middle of the altar, he recites the Nicene Creed, kneeling down at the words The was made man,' in reverence to the great mystery of our Lord's incarnation. Then the priest turns about to the people and says, ‘Dominus vobiscum' (The Lord be with you). Having read in the book a verse or sentence of the Scripture, which is called the offertory, and is every day different, he uncovers the chalice, and, taking in his hand the paten, or little plate, offers up the bread to God; then, going to the corner of the altar, he takes the wine and pours it into the chalice, and mingles with it a small quantity of water, in remembrance of the blood and water that issued out of our Savior's side; after which he returns to the middle of the altar and offers up the chalice. Then, bowing down, he begs that this sacrifice, which he desires to offer with a contrite and humble heart, may find acceptance with God; and, blessing the bread and wine with the sign of the cross, lie invokes the author of all sanctity to sanctify this offering. At the end of the offertory, the priest goes to the corner of the altar and washes the tips of his fingers, to denote the cleanness and purity of soul with which we ought to approach to these divine mysteries, saying, ‘Lavabo,' etc. (I will wash my hands among the innocent, and I will encompass thy altar, O Lord, etc.), as in the latter part of the 26th Psalm.

Then returning to the middle of the altar, and there bowing down, he begs of the blessed Trinity to receive this oblation in memory of the passion, resurrection, and ascension of our Lord Jesus Christ, and for an honorable commemoration of the blessed Virgin and of all the saints, that they may intercede for us in heaven, whose memory we celebrate upon earth. Then the priest, kissing the altar, turns to the people and says, ‘Orate, fratres,' etc. (Brethren, pray that my sacrifice and yours may be made acceptable to God the Father Almighty). Then the priest says in a low voice the prayers called secreta, which correspond to the collects of the day, and are different every day. The priest concludes the secreta by saying aloud, ‘Per omnia saecula saeculorum' (World without end). Answer: Amen. Priest: ‘Dominus vobiscum' (The Lord be with you). Answer: ‘Et cum spiritu tuo' (And with thy spirit). Priest: ‘Sursum corda' (Lift up your hearts). Answer: ‘Habemus ad Dominum'  (We have them lifted up to the Lord). Priest: ‘Gratias agamtus Domino Deo nostro' (Let us give thanks to the Lord our God). Answer: ‘Dignum etjustum est' (It is meet and just). Then the priest recites the preface (so called because it serves as an introduction to the canon of the mass). After the preface follows the canon of the mass, or the most sacred and solemn part of this divine service, which is read with a low voice, as well to express the silence of Christ in his passion, and his hiding at that time his glory and his divinity, as to signify the vast importance of that common cause of all mankind which the priest is then representing, as it were, in secret to the ear of God, and the reverence and awe with which both priest and people ought to assist at these tremendous mysteries.

The canon begins by invoking the Father of mercies, through Jesus Christ his Son, to accept this sacrifice for the holy Catholic Church, for the pope, for the bishop, for the king, and for all the professors of the orthodox and apostolic faith throughout tie whole world. Then follows the memento, or commemoration of the living, for whom in particular the priest intends to offer up that mass, or who have been particularly recommended to his prayers, etc. To which is subjoined a remembrance of all there present, followed by a solemn commemoration of the blessed Virgin, of the apostles, martyrs, and all the saints — to honor their memory by naming them in the sacred mysteries, to communicate with them, and to beg of God the help of their intercession, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Then the priest spreads his hands, according to the ancient ceremony of sacrifices, over the bread and wine which are to be consecrated into the body and blood of Christ, and begs that God would accept of this oblation which he makes in the name of the whole Church, and that he would grant us peace in this life and eternal salvation in the next. After which he solemnly blesses the bread and wine with the sign of the cross, and invokes the Almighty that they may be made to us the body and blood of his most beloved Son. our Lord Jesus Christ. And so he proceeds to the consecration, first of the bread into the body of our Lord, and then of the wine into his blood; which consecration is made by Christ's own words, pronounced in his name and person by the priest, and is the most essential part of this sacrifice, because thereby the body and blood of Christ are really exhibited and presented to God, and Christ is mystically immolated.

Immediately after the consecration follows the elevation, first of the host, then of the chalice, in remembrance of Christ's elevation upon the cross. At the elevation of the chalice the priest recites those words of Christ, ‘As often as you do these things, you shall do them for a commemoration of me.' Then he goes on,  making a solemn commemoration of the passion, resurrection, and ascension of Christ, and begging of God to accept this sacrifice, as he was pleased to accept the oblation of Abel, Abraham, and Melchisedek; and to command that it may, by his holy angel, be presented upon the altar above, in presence of his divine Majesty, for the benefit of all those that shall partake of these mysteries here below. Then the priest proceeds to the memento, or commemoration of the dead, saying, ‘Remember also, O Lord, thy servants N. and N., who are gone before us with the sign of faith, and repose in the sleep of peace;' praying for all the faithful departed in general, and in particular for those for whom he desires to offer this sacrifice. After this memento or commemoration of the dead, the priest, raising his voice a little, and striking his breast, says, ‘Nobis quoque peccatoribus,' etc. (And to us sinners, etc.), humbly craving mercy and pardon for his sins, and to be admitted to some part and society with the apostles and martyrs through Jesus Christ. Then kneeling down, and taking the sacred host in his hands, he makes the sign of the cross with it over the chalice, saying, ‘Through him, and with him, and in him, is to thee, O God, the Father, in the unity of the Holy Ghost, all honor and glory;' which last words he pronounces, elevating a little the host and chalice from the altar, and then kneels down, saying, with a loud voice, ‘Per omnia secula sculorum” (Forever and ever). Answer, Amen. After which he recites aloud the Pater Noster, or Lord's Prayer, the clerk answering at the end, ‘Sed libera nos a male' (But deliver us from evil). After this the priest breaks the host over the chalice, in remembrance of Christ's body being brcken for us upon the cross; and he puts a small particle of the host into the chalice, praying that the peace of the Lord may be always with us. Then kneeling down, and rising up again, he says, ‘Agnus Dei,' etc. (Lamb of God, who takest away the sins of the world, have mercy on us). He repeats this' thrice; but at the third time, instead of ‘Have mercy on us,' he says, ‘Grant us peace.' After the Agnus Dei, the priest says three short prayers, by way of preparation for receiving the blessed sacrament; then kneeling down, and rising again, he takes up the host, and, striking his breast, he says thrice, ‘Domine, non sum dignus,' etc. (Lord, I am not worthy that thou shouldest enter under my roof; speak only the word, and my soul shall be healed). After which he makes the sign of the cross upon himself with the host, saying, ‘The body of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve my soul to life everlasting. Amen.' He so receives it. Then, after a short pause in mental prayer, he proceeds to the receiving of the chalice, using the like words, ‘The blood of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve my soul to life everlasting.  Amen.' Then follows the communion of the people, if any are to receive. After the communion, the priest takes the lotions, or ablutions, of wine and water in the chalice, in order to consummate whatever may remain of the consecrated species.

Then covering the chalice, he goes to the book and reads a versicle of holy Scripture, called the communion; after which he turns about to the people with the usual salutation, Dominus vobiscum, and, returning to the book, reads the collects or prayers called the post- communion. After which he again greets the people with Dominus vobiscum, and gives them leave to depart with Ite, missa est; the clerk answering, ‘Deo gratias' (Thanks be to God). Then the priest, bowing down before the altar, makes a short prayer to the blessed Trinity; and then, turning about to the people, gives his blessing to them all, in the name of the blessed Trinity; and so concludes the mass, by reading the beginning of the Gospel according to St. John, which the people hear standing, till these words, ‘Et verbum caro factum est' (And the Word was made flesh); when both priest and people kneel down, in reverence to the mystery of Christ's incarnation. At the end the clerk answers, ‘Deo gratias' (Thanks be to God). And so the priest returns from the altar to the sacristy, and unvests himself, reciting in the meantime the Benedicite, or the canticle of the three children, inviting all creatures in heaven and earth to praise and bless the Lord. As the mass represents the passion of Christ, and the priest there officiates in his person, so the vestments in which he officiates represent those with which Christ was ignominiously clothed at the time of his passion. Thus the amice represents the rag or clout with which the Jews muffled our Savior's face, when at every blow they bid him prophesy who it was that struck him (Luk 22:64).

The alb represents the white garment with which he was vested by Herod; the girdle, maniple, and stole represent the cords and bands with which he was bound in the different stages of his passion. The chasuble, or outward vestment, represents the purple garment with which he was clothed as a mock king; upon the back of which there is a cross, to represent that which Christ bore on his sacred shoulders; lastly, the priest's tonsure or crown, is to represent the crown of thorns which our Savior wore. Moreover, as in the old law, the priests, that were wont to officiate in sacred functions, had, by the appointment of God, vestments assigned for that purpose, as well for the greater decency and solemnity of the divine worship, as to signify and represent the virtues which God required of his ministers, so it was proper that in the Church of the New Testament Christ's ministers should in their sacred functions be distinguished in like manner from the laity by their sacred vestments, which  might also represent the virtues which God requires in them: thus the amice, which is first put upon the head, represents divine hope, which the apostle calls the helmet of salvation; the alb. innocence of life; the girdle, with which the loins are begirt, purity and chastity; the maniple, which is put on the left arm. patient suffering of the labors of this mortal life; the stole, the sweet yoke of Christ, to be borne in this life, in order to a happy immortality; in fine, the chasuble, which is uppermost, and covers all the rest, represents the virtue of charity. In these vestments the Church makes use of five colors, viz. the white on the feasts of our Lord, of the blessed Virgin, of the angels, and of the saints that were not martyrs; the red on the feasts of Pentecost, of the invention and exaltation of the cross, and of the apostles and martyrs; the violet, which is the penitential color, in the penitential times of Advent and Lent, and upon vigils and ember days; the green on most of the other Sundays and ferias throughout the year; and the black on Good Friday, and in the masses for the dead. We make a reverence to the altar upon which mass is said, because it is the seat of these divine mysteries, and a figure of Christ, who is not only our priest and sacrifice, but our altar too, inasmuch as we offer our prayers and sacrifices through him. Upon the altar we always have a crucifix, that, as the mass is said in remembrance of Christ's passion and death, both priest and people may have before their eyes, during this sacrifice, the image that puts them in mind of his passion and death. And there are always lighted candles upon the altar during mass, as well to honor the victory and triumph of our Great King (which is there celebrated) by these lights, which are tokens of our joy and of his glory, as to denote the light of faith, with which we are to approach to him.

“The priest who is to celebrate mass must previously confess all his mortal sins, in order that he may feel morally sure that he is in a state of grace, since for the recovery of that state by such as have once fallen from it, confession, or contrition, if confession cannot be obtained, is absolutely necessary. Confession is unattainable when there is no confessor, or when there is none but an excommunicated person, or one whose powers have expired, or whose powers do not extend to absolution from the particular sins of which the penitent is guilty, or one who is justly suspected of having betrayed the secrets of confession, or who requires an interpreter, or when it is impossible to go to confession without manifest inconvenience from distance, badness of the roads, inclemency of the season, or the murmurs of the congregation impatient for mass. Even if any of these reasons can be  pleaded, no unconfessed priest ought to celebrate mass unless he be compelled by menaces of death, or through fear that a sick person may die without receiving the viaticum, or to avoid scandal when a congregation is waiting, or to finish a mass in which another priest has been accidentally interrupted. If a priest, during the celebration of mass, should recollect that he is in a state of mortal sin, excommunicated or suspended, or that the place in which he is celebrating it is interdicted, he must quit the altar, unless he has already consecrated the host; and even if he has done so, or any fear of scandal induces him to proceed (as it is morally impossible but that some such fear must arise), he must perform an act of contrition, and make a firm resolution to confess, if in his power, on the very same day. No priest, without committing venial or perhaps mortal sin, can celebrate mass before he has recited matins and lauds, unless from the necessity of administering the viaticum to the dying, or of exhorting such a one during the night, from pressure of confessions on a holiday, or to quiet murmurs among the congregation. It is a mortal sin for a priest intending to say mass to taste food, drink, or medicine after the preceding midnight. Even an involuntary transgression of such rules is a mortal sin; so that a priest offends in that degree if he celebrates mass after having been forced to eat or drink the smallest morsel or drop while the hour of midnight is striking, or a single moment afterwards. The exceptions are —

1. To save the profanation of the host; thus, if a heretic is about to profane the host, and there be no one else by who can otherwise prevent it, a priest, although not fasting, may swallow it without sin.

2. When a priest has so far proceeded in mass that he cannot stop, as when water has been accidentally put into the chalice instead of wine, and he does not perceive it till he has swallowed it, or when he recollects after consecration that he is not fasting.

3. When, after having performed the lavabo, he perceives any scattered fragments of hosts. provided he be still at the altar, these lie may eat.

4. To prevent scandal, such as a suspicion that he had committed a crime the night before.

5. To administer the viaticum.

6. To finish a mass commenced by another priest, and accidentally interrupted.

7. When he is dispensed.

It is very probably a mortal sin, by authorities, to celebrate mass before dawn. So also mass must not be celebrated after noon, and never, unless for the dying, on Good Friday. It is a mortal sin to celebrate mass without the necessary vestments and ornaments, or with unconsecrated vestments, etc., unless in cases of the uttermost necessity. These vestments lose their consecration if any portion has been torn off and sewed on again, not if they are repaired before absolute disjunction, even if it be by a downright patch. No worn-out consecrated vestment should be applied to any other purpose; but it should be burned, and the ashes thrown in some place in which they will not be trampled on. But, on the other hand, with a very wise distinction, the precious metals which have served profane uses may be applied to sacred purposes, after having been passed through the fire, which changes their very nature by fusion. No dispensation has ever yet been granted by any pope to qualify the rigid precept enjoining the necessity of an altar for mass; and this must have been consecrated by a bishop, not by a simple priest, unless through dispensation from the holy father himself. Three napkins are strictly necessary; two may suffice if such be the common usage of the country — one in very urgent cases; and even that, provided it be whole and clean, may be unconsecrated; but a lighted taper must not on any account be dispensed with, even to secure the receipt of the viaticum by a dying man. Mass must stop if the taper be extinguished and another cannot be obtained. On that account a lamp should be kept burning day and night before every altar on which the host is deposited; and those to whom the care of this lamp appertains commit a mortal sin if they neglect it for one whole day. In no case must a woman be allowed to assist a priest at the altar. Certain prevalent superstitions during the celebration of mass are forbidden — such as picking up from the ground, during the sanctus of the mass on Palm Sunday, the boxwood consecrated on that day, infusing it for three quarters of an hour, neither more nor less, in spring water, and drinking the water as a cure for the colic; keeping the mouth open during the sanctus in the mass for the dead, as a charm against mad dogs; writing the sanctus on a piece of virgin parchment, and wearing it as an amulet; saying mass for twenty Fridays running as a security against dying without confession, contrition, full satisfaction, and communion, and in order to obtain admission into heaven thirty days after decease; ordering a mass of the Holy Ghost to be said in certain churches by way of divination. If a fly or a spider fall into the cup before consecration, a fresh cup should be provided; if after consecration, it should be swallowed, if that can be done  without repugnance or danger, otherwise it should be removed, washed with wine, burned after mass, and its ashes thrown into the sacristy. There are some nice precautions to be observed in case of the accidental fall of a host among the clothes of a female communicant; if the wafer fall on a napkin, it suffices that the napkin be washed by a subdeacon; but if it be stained by no more than a single drop of wine, the office must be performed by a priest.

In the celebration of mass the priest wears peculiar vestments, five in number — two of linen, called “amice” and “alb;” and three of silk or precious stuffs, called “maniple.” “stole,” and “chasuble,” the alb being girt with a cincture of flaxen or silken cord. The color of these vestments varies with the occasion, five colors being employed on different occasions-white, red, green, purple or violet, and black; and they are often richly embroidered with silk or thread of the precious metals, and occasionally with precious stones. The priest is required to celebrate the mass fasting, and, unless by special dispensation, is only permitted to offer it once in the day, except on Christmas day, when three masses may be celebrated.

In the Greek and Oriental churches, the Eucharistic service, called in Greek Theia Leitourgia (The Divine Liturgy), differs in the order of its parts, in the wording of most of its prayers, and in its accompanying ceremonial, from the mass of the Latin Church, SEE LITURGY; but the only differences which have any importance as bearing upon doctrine, are their use of leavened bread instead of unleavened; their more frequent celebration of the “Mass of the Pre-sanctified,” to which reference has already been made; the Latin use of private masses, in which the priest alone communicates; and. in general, the much more frequent celebration of the mass in the Latin Church. The sacred vestments, too, of the Greek and Eastern rites differ notably from those of the Latin; and in some of the former — as, for example, the Armenian — a veil is drawn before the altar during that part of the service in which the consecration takes place, which is only withdrawn at the time of the communion. The service sometimes used on shipboard, and improperly called Missa Sicca (Dry Mass), consists simply of the reading of the prayers of the mass, but without any consecration of the elements. It was resorted to with a view to avoiding the danger of spilling the sacred elements, owing to the unsteady motion of the ship. It is sometimes also called Missa Nautica (Ship Mass). (For detailed information on the practices of the Russo-Greek Church, see John Glen King, Rites and Ceremonies of the Greek Church in Russia [London,  1772, 4to]. For the Eastern Church generally, see Neale, Eastern Church: Introduction.)

Frequency of the Mass. — “At first,” says Walcott (p. 366), “celebration occurred only on Sundays (1Co 16:1); and in the time of Justin Martyr, after the 2d century, the Western Christians communicated on Sundays, and Wednesdays, and Fridays. In the 4th century the Greek Church added Saturday; now it maintains daily celebration. St. Augustine says that the practice differed in various countries; in some celebration was daily, in others on Saturdays and Sundays, but in some on Sunday only; the daily celebration was practiced in Africa, Spain, and at Constantinople; in the 6th century it was general. St. Ambrose mentions three celebrations in the week, St. Francis one daily mass at Rome. After the 5th century priests were allowed on certain days, called Polyliturgic, to celebrate twice. Pope Deusdedit first enjoined a second mass in a day; Alexander I permitted a priest to celebrate only once a day; Leo IV forbade private masses, but still there were several festivals besides Christmas when the priest said mass three times in a day; Leo III sometimes celebrated seven or eight times in twelve hours. and it was not until the close of the 11th century that Alexander III directed that the same priest should say no more than one mass on the same day, Christmas excepted. The Council of Seligenstadt forbade a priest to exceed saying more than three masses in a day. From the 6th century these repeated masses said by some priest may be dated, when private masses were not in common use, and were permitted (as St. Leo says) in order to satisfy the need of crowds of communicants, and he calls it a form of tradition from the fathers. At length, when the pressure no longer existed in the 8th century, there were four masses at Christmas, two on the Circumcision, and three on SS. Peter and Paul's day, and on Maundy Thursday. In France every priest was allowed to say two masses a day in Holy Week. Three masses were said on St. John Baptist's day: one in the eve, in commemoration of his being the Lord's messenger; a second on his feast, in memorial of the baptism in the Jordan; and the third because he was a Nazarite from his birth. In 1222, in England, mass might be said by a priest twice on the same day, at Christmas, Easter, and in the offices of the dead. The three Christmas masses were in honor of Christ, as the only-begotten of the Father, his spiritual birth in Christians, and his nativity of a woman. A restriction by the Council of Autlun (613) was in force until the 10th century, against celebration by a priest at the same altar twice in one day, or where pontifical mass had been said. Priests who celebrated  more than once collected all the ablutions of their fingers in one chalice, and the contents being emptied into a cup, were drank at the last mass by a deacon, clerk, or layman in a state of grace or innocent. The day when no mass was offered, except that of the Mass of the Presanctified, was called a liturgic. The Holy Communion was celebrated at first at night, or, as Pliny says, before daybreak, and Tertullian calls the meeting the Night Convocation, or that before light. But in time the Church prescribed the mass to be said in tierce of festivals, but always after tierce in England in 1322; on common days at sexts; in Lent and on fasts at nones, or 3 P.M. In the Middle Ages the nightly celebrations were permitted on Christmas eve, on Easter eve, on St. John Baptist's, principally in France, and Saturdays in Ember weeks, when ordinations were held; and Easter and Pentecost on the hallowing of the candle. In 1483 archbishop Bourchier, from regard to his infirmity, received permission to celebrate in the afternoon. Belith says each day had its mass, commencing on Sunday; those of Holy Trinity, Charity, Wisdom, the Holy Ghost. Angels, Holy Cross, and St. Mary, and that at Rome. In the province of Ravenna the mass of Easter eve was not said until after midnight. He adds that the Greek Church excommunicated all who failed to partake of the Eucharist for three Sundays. SEE INVITATORY.

Literature. — The most noted writers on this subject are Bona, Gerbert, Gavanti, Binterim, Augusti. Besides these, see Bochart, Traite de sacrifice de la Messe; Derodon, Le Tombeau de la hesse; Du Moulin, Pratique des ceremonies de la Messe; Fechtius, De orig. et superstitione Missarumn; Jaeger, Suppositio missae sacrificio; Killian, Tract. de sacrificio nissatico (Roman Cath.); Kosling, Lithurg. Vorles. 2nd. heil. Messe (2d ed.); Michaelis, Frohnleichnahm u. Messopfer; Griser. Die rom. — Kathol. Lit. (Halle, 1829); Hirscher, Missae genuina notio (Tüb. 1821); Mornay, De doctrine de l'Eucharistie quannd etpars quels degres la messe s'est introduite a sa place; Bauer, Prüfung der Griinde; Baur, Gegensatz des Katholicissus u. Protestantismus (Tub. 1836, 2d edit.); Baler, Symbolik der röm. — Kathol. Kirche (Leipsic, 1854); Anderson, The Mass (Lond. 1851, 12mo); Maguire, One Hundred Defects of the Mass; Meager, Popish Mass celeberated by Heathen Priests; Whitby, Absurdity and Idolatry of the Mass; Bible and Missal, ch. 4; Bossuet's Variations, vol. i; Siegel, Christliche Alterthümer (see Index in vol. 4, s.v. Messe); Riddle, Christian Antiquities; Walcott, Sac. Archaeol. s.v.; Coleman, Christ. A ntiq.; Willet, Synop. Pap. (ed. Cumming, Loud. 1852); Forbes,  Considerations, 2:562; English Rev. 10:344; Retrospective Rev. 12:70; Westm. Rev. 1866 (July), p. 95; Christian Ch. Rev. 1866 (April), p. 15 sq.; Evangel. Qu. Rev. 1869 (Jan.), p. 86; Christian Remembrancer, 1866 (Jan.), p. 63; New Ensglander, 1869, p. 525; Haag, Les Dogmnes Chritiennes (see Index); Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctrines (see Index, vol. 2); Cramp, Text-Book of Popery; Blunt, Dict. of ist. and Doctr. Theol. s.v.; Eadie, Ecclesiast. Diet. s.v.; Aschbach, Kirchen-Lexikon, s.v. Messe.

## Mass Penny[[@Headword:Mass Penny]]

             a conventional name for the offering made by a chief mourner at a funeral.

## Mass Priests[[@Headword:Mass Priests]]

             mercenaries hired at a certain sum, who undertook an immoderate number of annals or trentals, and were unable to say them, and sold them to be offered by others. This abuse was forbidden in 1236 by archbishop Edmund's Constitutions (2). In 960 the mass priest was the secular, and the minister priest the conventual, and this is the earliest meaning of the term.

## Massa[[@Headword:Massa]]

             (Heb. Massa', מִשָּׂא, a liftiing up, as often; Sept. Μασσῆ), one of the sons of Ishmael (B.C. post 2061), who became the progenitor of an Arabian clan (Gen 25:14; 1Ch 1:30). The tribe is usually, and not improbably, compared with the Masani (Macavol, Ptol. v. 19, 2), inhabiting the Arabian desert towards Babylonia, doubtless the same as the lascei, a nomad tribe of Mesopotamia (Pliny, H. N. 6:30). This would confirm Forster's theory that the twelve sons of Ishmael peopled the whole of the Arabian peninsula (Geogr. of Arabia, 1:284). As Dumah is named in connection with Seir (Isa 21:11), there is some foundation for the opinion that Massa was a kingdom of considerable size, possibly reigned over by king Lemuel (Pro 30:1, הִמִּשָּׂא, “the prophecy”). SEE LEMUEL. Hitzig arbitrarily locates Dumah in wady el-Kora, about fifty miles south-east of Akabah, and then places Massa between it and Mount Seir (Zeller's Johrbuch, 1844, p. 288). SEE DUMAH.

## Massa Candida[[@Headword:Massa Candida]]

             the name given to 300 Christians who. during the persecution of Valerian, and in the time of bishop Cyprian, were put to death by being burned in a lime-kiln. ‘The name Massa, says Augustine, was given them “ob numeri multitudinemn,” and that of candida “ob causae fulgorem.” Baronins remarks: “Dicti sunt hi Massa candida, eo quod in formae calcaria martvrium consumarint.” Vincentius Bellovacensis, on the other hand, designates the Massa candida as “locus apud Carthaginem, in quo sub Imperatoribus gentilibus et in Christianos suevientibus fovea erat calce plena, in quam Christiani gentilium Diis sacriticare renulentes paecipitabantur.” Augustine also uses the expression, “Uticensis Massa candida,” which Baronius explains: “Uticau prcecipue agebatur horum solemnitas, atque ea de causa S. Augustinus Massam candidam Uticensem dictam esse refert.” Aurelius Prudentius Clemens refers to the Massa candida in his hymn on St. Cyprian (Lib. Persistephanon, Hymn 13) in the following glowing description:

“Fama refert foveam campi in medio patere jussam, Calce vaporifera Summos prope margines refertam Saxa recocta vomunt ignem niveusque pulvis ardet, Urere tacta potens; et mortifer ex odore flatus. Appositam memnorant aram, fovea stetisse summa, Lege sub hac salis aut micalm, jecur ant suis litarent Christicolae, ant niediae sponte irruerent in ima fossue. Prosiluere alacres cursu rapido simul trecenti. Gurgite pulvereo mersos liquor aridus voravit, Praecipitemque globum fundo tenns implicavit imo. Corpora candor habet, candor vehit ad superna mentes. Caedida Massa dehinlc dici meruit per omne seclumn.”

The festival is commemorated Aug. 24. — Herzog, Real-Encyklopädie, 9:142.

## Massagetae[[@Headword:Massagetae]]

             an ancient nomadic people, who inhabited the broad steppes on the north- east of the Caspian Sea, to the northward of the river Araxes or Jaxartes. Herodotus says that they had a community of wives; that they sacrificed and devoured their aged people; that they worshipped the sun, and offered horses to him; that they lived on the milk and flesh of their herds, and on fish; and fought on horseback and on foot with lance, bow, and double-  edged axe. Cyrus is said to have lost his life in fighting against them, B.C. 530. Niebuhr and Böckh are of opinion that they belonged to the Mongolian,but Humboldt and others, to the IndoGermanic or Aryan family.

## Massah[[@Headword:Massah]]

             (Heb. Massah', מִסָּה, trial, as often; Sept. πειρασμός, πείρα; Vulg. tentatio), a name given to the spot in Rephidim where the Israelites provoked Jehovah by murmuring for want of water; otherwise called MERIBAH (Exo 17:7; Deu 6:16; Deu 9:22; Deu 28:8). The name also occurs (in the Heb.), with mention of the circumstances which occasioned it, in Psa 95:8-9, and its Greek equivalent in Heb 3:8.

## Massalians[[@Headword:Massalians]]

             (from מצלין) or Messalians, also called Enthusiasts, were a sect which sprung up about the year A.D. 360, in the reign of the emperor Constantius. They were mainly roaming mendicant monks, and flourished in Mesopotamia and Syria. They maintained that men have two souls, a celestial and a diabolical; and that the latter is driven out by prayer. They consequently conceived the Christian life as an unintermitted prayer, despised the moral law and the sacraments, and claimed to enjoy perfection. The Gospel history they declared a mere allegory. But they concealed their pantheistic mysticism and antinomianism under external conformity to the Catholic Church. From those words of our Lord, “Labor not for the meat that perisheth,” it is said that they concluded they ought not to do any work to get their bread. We may suppose, says Dr. Jortin, that this sect did not last long; that these sluggards were soon starved out of the world; or, rather, that cold and hunger sharpened their wits, and taught them to be better interpreters of Scripture. Towards the close of the 4th century the Church discovered the real tendency of the Massalians, and they were sorely persecuted; but, notwithstanding all opposition, they perpetuated themselves to the 7th century, and reappeared in the Euchites and Bogomiles (q.v.) of the Middle Ages. See Buck, Theol. Dict. s.v.; Neander, Ch. Hist. 2:240-247; Schaff, Ch. Hist. 2:199.

## Massarius[[@Headword:Massarius]]

             a chamberlain of the massa communis, which was the common fund of a cathedral.

## Massaroon, Robert, D.D[[@Headword:Massaroon, Robert, D.D]]

             an Irish Methodist preacher, was born at Londonderry in 1790. He joined the Methodist society in his eighteenth year, and in 1811 entered the ministry of the Irish Conference. He was a pious, prudent, intelligent, and devoted Methodist preacher for nearly fifty years, and in 1859, from failing  health, became a supernumerary, but as a scholar and gentleman he continued to labor as treasurer of the Methodist Annuitant Society and Auxiliary Fund, and closed his useful life in Dublin, March 3, 1871. He filled several official positions in Irish Methodism, was an able advocate of the British and Foreign Bible Society, and a useful guide to young ministers in studying the original text of the Holy Scriptures.

## Masseketh[[@Headword:Masseketh]]

             SEE TALMUD.

## Massias[[@Headword:Massias]]

             (Μασσίας vr. Α᾿σσεαίς), given (1Es 9:22) in place of the MAASSELAH (q.v.) of the Heb. list (Ezr 10:22).

## Massie, James William, D.D., Ll.D.[[@Headword:Massie, James William, D.D., Ll.D.]]

             a minister of the English Independents, for some time engaged in the missionary field, was born in Ireland in 1799. He was educated for the ministry by Dr. Bogue, and went out as a missionary to India. After laboring there a few years he returned to Great Britain, was pastor for a time at Perth, Scotland, and subsequently at Dublin, Ireland, and Salford, England, from which latter place he removed to Laondon, to act as secretary of the Home Missionary Society. Deeply interested in all the public rmovements of the day, he took a prominent part in the and-slavery movement. and was an active member of the Union and Emancipation societies formed during the late war in the United States. He visited this country several times, and was twice delegated from the Independents to our Congregationalists and Presbyterians. He died at Kingston, Ireland, May 8, 1869. Dr. Massie was the author of several works, among which were Continental India (1839, 2 vols. 8vo; 1840, 2 vols. 8vo): — Recollections, illustrating the Religion, etc., of the Hindus (2 vols.): — The Nonconformists Plea for Freedom of Education (1847): — The Evangelical Alliance, its Origin and Development (1847): — Liberty of Conscience illustrated, etc. (1847): — Social Improvement among the Working-Classes affecting the entire Body Politic (1849): — Slavery the Crime and Curse of America (1852): — The Contrast – War and Christianity: Martial Evils and their Remedy (1855): — Christ a Learner (1858): — Revivals in Ireland: Facts, Documents, and Correspodence (1859-60): — Revival Work (1860): — The American Crisitian Relation to the Anti-slavery Cause (1862): — America, the Origins of her present Conflict; her Prospect for the Slave, and her Claim for Anti-slavery  Sympathy, illustrated by Incidents of Travel during a Tour in the Summer of 1863 throughout the United States (1864); etc.

## Massieu, Guillaume[[@Headword:Massieu, Guillaume]]

             a learned French writer was born April 13,1665, at Caen, where he finished his classical studies. At sixteen he began. a course of philosophy at the college of the Jesuits. As he proved himself an apt pupil, the Jesuits desired to attach him to their order, and sent him to Rennes to teach rhetoric, designing him ultimately for the professorship of theology; but his studies were not congenial to his tastes, and, his love for belies-lettres far exceeding that for theology, he forsook the society after he had actually joined it, and returned to the world. His remarkable gifts soon gained him friends. and he found work as an instructor. While at Paris he made the acquaintance of the abbot De Tourreil, whom he aided in translating the works of Demosthenes; through his influence also he became a pensioner of the Academy of Inscriptions in 1705, and in the same year was elected professor royal of the Greek language in the College of France, where he distinguished himself during the twelve years that he held the position by his profound knowledge and a pure and delicate taste. In 1714 the French Academy was opened to him. His oration delivered on this occasion is printed in the collections of the academy. Having translated Pindar, he naturally defended the writers of antiquity against the attacks of Perrault and of Lamothe. The Memoires de l'Academie des Inscriptions (vol. i, ii, and iii) contain a great number of dissertations from the abbe Massieu. They are still read with pleasure, although they are more distinguished for delicacy of finish than for profound erudition; the principal are, Les Graes Le pries, Les Buespe ris es , LeBocliers vot Les . ments chez les Anciens, and a Parallele entre Homer. — et Platon. His most valuable work is L'Histoire de la Poesie Frangoise, a partir du onziemze siecle. Massieu was one of the many distinguished literary men who are obliged all through life to maintain an incessant struggle with poverty. In his old age he suffered many bodily grievances, and two cataracts deprived him of his sight. He rendered valuable service to Biblical literature by his edition of the New Testament in Greek (printed at Paris, 1715, in 2 vols. 12mo). He died Sept. 26, 1722, at Paris. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, vol. 34, s.v.

## Massilians[[@Headword:Massilians]]

             a school of theologians in Southern Gaul, who, about the year 425, with John Cassian of Marseilles (Massilia), a pupil of Chrysostom, at their head, asserted the necessity the the cooperation of divine grace and the human will, maintained that God works differently in different men, and rejected the doctrine of predestination as a vain speculation of mischievous tendency. They were called at first Massilians; afterwards, by scholastic writers, Semi-Pelagians; although, far from taking that name themselves, they rejected all connection with Pelagianism. Cassian recognized the universal corruption of human nature as a consequence of the first transgression, and recognized grace as well as justification in the sense of St. Augustine, whom he opposed on the question of election. See Riddle, Eccl. Chron.; Eden, Theol. Dict.; Neander, Hist. of the Christian Religions and Church, 2:261, 627-630; Schaff, Ch. Hist. 3:859 sq.; Wiggers, Gesch. des Semi-Pelagianismus, 2:7 sq.; Guericke, Ch. Hist. 1:391 sq.; Neander, Hist. of Christian Dogmas, 2:375; Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctr. vol. 1. SEE SEMI-PELAGIANS and SEE CASSIANUS.

## Massillon, Jean Baptiste[[@Headword:Massillon, Jean Baptiste]]

             prominent among the most eloquent divines of the French Roman Catholic Church, was born at Hieres, in Provence, June 24, 1663. His father was a notary in moderate circumstances, and at first intended his son for the same profession, but subsequently allowed him to receive the instructions of the Fathers of the Oratory, and when eighteen years of age the young man joined that order. Soon after, forsaking the world altogether, he entered an abbey under the rule of La Trappe. Here, however, his talents attracted the attention of the bishop, afterwards cardinal de Noailles, who induced him to re-enter the Oratory, in which he soon achieved great eminence. Yet his success was more the fruit of labor than of spontaneous genius, and his last efforts are much superior to his first. In 1696 he went to Paris as principal of the Seminary of St. Magloire, the renowned school of the Oratory. Here, in the midst of the prevailing laxity of morals, he commenced his career as a pulpit orator, the delivery of his “Ecclesiastical conferences” to ecclesiastical students affording him an opportunity of developing his talent. He admired the austere eloquence of Bourdaloue, but chose for himself a different style, characterized by profound pathos, and an insight into the most secret motives of the human heart. He was shortly noted as the preacher of repentance and penitence; and it was declared by able  contemporaries of his sermons that “they reach the heart, and produce their due effects with much more certainty than all the logic of Bourdaloue.” He delivered the customary Lent sermons at Montpellier in 1698, and the following year at Paris.

The latter were warmly applauded, and induced the king to invite Massillon to preach the “Advent” at court. On this occasion king Louis XIV paid him the highest compliments. He said, “I have heard many talented preachers in my chapel before, and was much pleased with them; but every time I hear you, I feel much displeased with myself.” He again preached the Lent sermons before the court during the years 1701 to 1704, but afterwards he received no calls to appear before them until the death of the king: so fearless and plain-spoken a preacher would have been ill suited to the gallant and profligate court of “the great king.” At the death of Louis XIV, Massillon was requested to preach his funeral sermon; in other words, to pronounce a eulogy of this prince. This was an arduous task for the uncourtierlike preacher; yet he undertook it, and in his discourse lauded the fame and piety of the king, yet deplored the evils suffered by the nation in consequence of the wars and the looseness of morals. Invited now to preach the Lent sermons before the young king, Louis XV, then but eight years of age, he took advantage of the occasion to censure the manners of the court; and morality, rather than the passion of Christ, formed the subject of his sermons. These are tell in number, and being short, to accommodate them to the youth of his royal hearer, are known under the name of Le petite carenie. In 1717 Massillon became bishop of Clermont. and in 1719 member of the French Academy. Two years after he preached at St. Denis the funeral sermon of the duchess Elizabeth Charlotte of Orleans, daughter of the elector of Palatinate, and mother of the regent. This is considered one of the best of his six Oraisons Funebres. Thereafter he remained quietly in his diocese, diligently fulfilling his pastoral duties until his death. Less ambitious than Bossuet, he did not wish to remain connected with the court, or in any way to take part in temporal affairs. His life was a model of Christian virtue and gentleness; he never disputed against any but infidels, and the Roman Catholics will not forgive him for having, in his eulogy of Louis XIV, after praising this monarch for his efforts to destroy heresy, alluded to the massacre of St. Bartholomew's eve and pronounced it a bloody wrong, to be ever condemned in the name of religion as well as of humanity. Preaching from the fulless of his heart, he did not consider the rank of those lie addressed, but spoke to them with nobleness of purpose in all simplicity and fervor. He carefully instructed the clergy of his diocese by holding numerous  conferences and by synodal discourses. He died Sept. 18,1742. D'Alembert pronounced his eulogy before the French Academy.

The fame of this celebrated man stands perhaps higher than that of any preacher who has preceded or followed him, by the number, variety, and excellence of his productions, and their eloquent and harmonious style. Grace, dignity, and force, and an inexhaustible fecundity of resources, particularly characterize his works. His A vent et Carerme, consisting of six volumes, may be justly considered as so many “chef-d'oeuvres.” His mode of delivery contributed not a little to his success. “We seem to behold him still in imagination,” said they who had been fortunate enough to attend his discourses, “with that simple air, that modest carriage, those eyes so humbly directed downwards, that unstudied gesture. that touching tone of voice, that look of a man fully impressed with the truths which he enforced, conveying the most brilliant instruction to the mind, and the most pathetic movements to the heart.” The famous actor, Baron, after hearing him, told him to continue as he had begun. “You,” said he, “have a manner of your own; leave the rules to others.” At another time he said to an actor who was with him, “My friend, this is the true orator; we are mere players.” Voltaire is said to have kept a volume of Massillon's sermons constantly on his desk, as a model of eloquence. He thought him “the preacher who best understood the world — whose eloquence savored of the courtier, the academician, the wit, and the philosopher.” Massillon's works, consisting mainly of sermons, have been collected and published under the title (Euves completes (Paris, 1776, 15 vols. 12mo). In English we have, Sermons on the Duties of the Great, translated from the French; preached before Louis XV during his minority; by William Dodd, LL.D. (Lond. 1776, 2d ed. sm. 8vo): — Sermons, selected and translated by William Dickson (Lond. 1826, 8vo): — Charges, with two Essays, translated by T'heophilus St. John [the Rev. S. Clapham] (Lond. 1805, 8vo): — Sermons on Death, Psa 89:47, translated (T. Wimbolt, Sermons): — Ecclesiastical Conferences, Synodical Discourses, and Episcopal Mandates, etc., translated by C. H. Boylan, of Mavnooth College (1825, 2 vols. 8vo). See La Harpe, Cours de Litterat.; Maury, Eloquence de la Chaire; F. Theremin, Demosthenes und Meissillon (1845); D'Alembert, Eloge de Malssillon; Sainte-Beuve, Causeries de Lundi; Talbert, Eloge de Massillon (1773); Hoefer, Nouv. Liog. Generale, s.v.; Christian Remembrancer, 1854 (Jan.), p. 104; Presb. Rev. 1868 (April), p. 295. (J. H.W.)

## Massoch, Stephen C., D.D[[@Headword:Massoch, Stephen C., D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal clergyman, first appears in the records as a missionary in St. Louis, Missouri, in 1857, and remained there until 1859, when he was appointed to the "Mission of the North-west," which was then under the jurisdiction of Joseph C. Talbot, D.D., missionary bishop. Dr. Massoch was especially to minister to the Germans and Bohemians in Osage, Nebraska. Shortly after, he removed to Arago, devoting himself to the same work, and remained in this sphere of labor until 1866, when he removed to Baltimore, Maryland. In 1868 he was a resident of Covington, Kentucky. He died May 30, 1870. See Prot. Episc. Almanac, 1871, page 118.

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

             a minister of the Reformed Church, who was a native of France, whence he emigrated to England after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes. He then settled in Holland, and assisted in a critical journal entitled Histoire Critique de la Republique de Lettres from 1712 to 1721. He also wrote lives of Horace, Ovid, and Pliny the Younger, in Latin; and Histoire de Pierre Huyle et de ses Ouvrages (12mo). He died in England about 1760.

## Masson, John (2)[[@Headword:Masson, John (2)]]

             an English Congregational minister, was born at Aberdeen, Scotland, October 29, 1806. His education was received in King's College, Aberdeen, and Homerton College, London. In 1834 he began his labors as a minister of the Gospel, and served successively Harray in Orkney, Brechin, Letham, and Dundee, retiring in 1878. In 1876 he was chairman of the Congregational Union of Scotland, and from 1868 to 1870 one of the secretaries of the Ministers' Provident Fund. He was also, for a time, editor of the Scottish Congregational Magazine, and also of the publications of the Scottish Temperance League. He died February 20, 1893. See (Lond.) Cong. Year-book, 1894.

## Masson, Philip[[@Headword:Masson, Philip]]

             a relative of the preceding, who assisted in the same journal, and was also the author of a critical dissertation designed to show the utility of the Chinese language in explaining various passages of the Old Testament.

## Masson, Samuel[[@Headword:Masson, Samuel]]

             brother of John, was pastor of the English Church at Dort, and conductor of the above journal.

## Massorah[[@Headword:Massorah]]

             SEE MASORAH.

## Massuet, Rene[[@Headword:Massuet, Rene]]

             a French Benedictine monk of the Congregation of St. Maur, was born at St. Ouen, in Normandy, in 1665. He studied philosophy and theology in different Benedictine convents; was made licentiatus juris at Caen; and came to the abbey of St. Germain des Pres, at Paris, in 1703. Here he commenced his scientific labors, which secured him a distinguished place in that learned congregation. After the death of Ruinart, Massuet was entrusted with the continuation of the annals of the order, and he furnished the fifth volume. The principal work from his pen is an edition of the works of Irenaeus, published under the title Santcti Irencti, episcopi Lugdunensis, contra Haereses Libri v (Paris, 1710, fol.); considered as having been the best edition of this Church father that had appeared up to Massuet's time. He prefaced the works of Irenaeus by three dissertations, which give good proof of the editor's penetration and judgment. In the first dissertation the person, character, and condition of Irenaeus are considered, setting forth particularly the writings and heretics he encountered; in the second, the life, actions, martyrdom, and writings of this saint are treated of; and in the  third his sentiments and doctrines are reviewed. Massuet took an active part in the Jansenistic controversies. Having undertaken to defend the edition of the works of St. Augustine against the attacks of the Jesuit Langlois, he wrote Lettre d'un Ecclesiatstique au R. P. E. L. L. sur celle qu'il a ecrite aux R. P. Benedictins de la Cong. de Saint-Maur (Osnabruck, 1699). He is also the author of a Lettre a M. I'evequ e de ryeux, sur son mandement du 5 Mai 1707 (La Haye, 1708, 12mo); and a book entitled Augustinus Graecus, in which he defends the opinions of his order on grace and free agency, but which was never published. He died at Paris, Jan. 11, 1716. See Hist. Litter. de la Cong. de St. Matiur, p. 375; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 34:217; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 9:145.

## Mast[[@Headword:Mast]]

             is the rendering in the Auth. Vers. of two Heb. words. חַבֵּל (chibbel', so called from the ropes and stays with which it is fastened), occurs only in Pro 23:34, “Thou (that tarriest long at the wine) shalt be as he that lieth down in the midst of the sea, or as he that lieth upon the top of the mast” (Sept. éσπερ κυβερνήτης ἐν πολλῷ κλύδωνι, Vulg. quasi sopitus gubernator amnisso cleano), doubtless correctly as referring to an intoxicated sailor falling asleep at the mast-head in a storm at sea. תֹּרֶן (to'ren, prob. l.q. אֹרֶן, a pine-tree) the mast of a ship (Isaiah 23:23; Eze 27:5; Sept ἰστός,Vulg. malus); also a signal-pole set up on mountains for an ensign (Isa 30:17; Sept. ἰστός,Vulg. malus, Auth. Vers. “beacon”). Ancient vessels had ofter two or three masts (see Smith's Dict. of Class. Antiq.v. Malus). SEE SHIP.

## Master[[@Headword:Master]]

             is the rendering in the A.V. of the following Heb. and Greek words: אָדוֹן, adon', κύριος, properly lord, as usually rendered; בִּעִל, baual, an owner hence master in the prevalent sense, δεσπότης; also רִב, rsab, great or chief, usually in combination; שִׂר; ‘sar, prince or captain, ἐπιστάτης; finally διδάκαλος, teacher. On ‘masters of assemblies” (Ecc 12:11), SEE ASSEMBLY. For master of the feast, SEE ARCHITRICLINUS.

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

             in a Christian point of view, is a person who has servants under him; a ruler or instructor. ‘The duties of masters relate, 1. To the civil concerns of the family. They are to arrange the several businesses required of servants; to give particular instructions for what is to be done, and how it is to be done; to take care that no more is required of servants than they are equal to; to be gentle in their deportment towards them; to reprove them when they do wrong, to commend them when they do right; to make them an adequate recompense for their services, as to protection, maintenance, wages, and character. 2. As to the morals of servants. Masters must look well to their servants' characters before they hire them; instruct them in the principles and confirm them in the habits of virtue; wsatch over their morals, and set them good examples. 3. As to their religious interests. They should instruct them in the knowledge of divine things (Gen 14:14; Gen 18:19); pray with them and for them (Jos 24:15); allow them time aetl leisure for religious services, etc. (Eph 6:9). See Stennett, On Domestic Duties, ser. 8; Paley's Moral Philosophy, 1:233, 235; Beattie's Elements of Moral Science, 1:150, 153; Doddridge's Lectures, 2, 266.

## Masters Of The Church[[@Headword:Masters Of The Church]]

             a name given (1) to the learned clergy who sat as advisers of the bishops in synods; (2) also to the residentiaries in a minister, as master of the lady chapel, being its keeper; master of the choristers, master of the common hall, califactory, or parlor; master of converts, the superintendent of lay- brothers; the master of the novices, always an elderly monk; master of the song-school; master of the shrine, masters of the order or custodes, the great officers of the monastery.

## Mastiaux, Caspar Anton Von[[@Headword:Mastiaux, Caspar Anton Von]]

             a Roman Catholic theologian, was born at Bonn, Germany, March 3, 1766. He became a canon at Augsburg in 1786. and was ordained to the priesthood, rand appointed preacher at the cathedral of Augsburg, three years later. After filling several subordinate positions, he was made privy- councillor to the king of Bavaria in 1806. He received the degree of master of philosophy in 1784, doctor of laws in 1786, doctor of divinity in 1790, and was admitted as an honorary member to several academies and learned socieiees. His published works embrace De veterum Ripuarlior um statu  civili et ecclesiastico commentatio historica (Bonn, 1784): — A historical and Geographical Description of ihe Archbishopric of Cologne: — On the negative Character of Religious Principle among the Modern Frensch: — A Sketch of Borroneo, Archbishop of Milan and Cardinal in the Romish Church: — The Passionweek, according to the Ritual of the Roman Church: — An Essay on Chorals and Hymns for the Church: — Several Collections of Hymns, and of Ancient and Modern Tunes: — A number of Sermons, and of miscellaneous Speeches in German and Latin. He served for a time as editor of Felder's Literaturzeitung, for teachers of the Roman Catholic faith, and was noted for his pointed and satirical style. The year of his death, which occurred at Munich, is not exactly known; it is supposed to have been 1828. Wetzer und Welte, Kirchen-Lex. 6:921.

## Mastic[[@Headword:Mastic]]

             (σχῖνος, Vulg. lentiscus, A.Vers. “massticktree”) occurs but once, and that in the Apocrypha (Susan. v. 54), where there is a happy play upon the word. “Under what tree sawest thou them?... under a mastic-tree (ὑπὸ σχῖνον). And Daniel said... the angel of God hath received the sentence of God to cut thee in two (σχίσει σε μέσον).” This is unfortunately lost in our version; but it is preserved by the Vulgate, “sub schino... scindet to;” and by Luther, “Linde . . finden.” A similar play occurs in v. 8, 59, between πρῖνον and πρίσαι σε. For the bearing of these and similar characteristics on the date and origin of the book, see SUSANNA. Tlhere is no doubt that the Greek word is correctly rendered, as is evident from the description of it by Theophrastus (Hist. Plant. 9, i, § 2, 4, § 7, etc.), Pliny (A. H. 3:36; 24:28), Dioscorides (1:90), and other writers. Herodotus (4:177) compares the fruit of the lotus (the Rhanmnus lotus, Linn., not the Egyptian Nelumbium speciosumn) in size with the mastic berry, and Babrius (3, 5) says its leaves are browsed by goats. The fragrant resin known in the arts as “mastic,” and which is obtained by incisions made in the trunk in the month of August, is the produce of this tree, whose scientific name is Pistacia lentiscus. It is used with us to strengthen the teeth and gums, and was so applied by the ancients, by whom it was much prized on this account, and for its many supposed medicinal virtues. Lucian (Lexiph. 12) uses the term σχινοτρώκτης of one who chews mastic wood in order to whiten his teeth. Martial (Eop. 14:22) recommends a mastic toothpick (dentiscalpium).

Pliny (24:7) speaks of the leaves of this tree  being rubbed on the teeth for toothache. Dioscorides (1:90) says the resin is often mixed with other materials and used as tooth-powder, and that, if chewed, it imparts a sweet odor to the breath. It is from this use as chewing-gum that we have the derivation of mastic, from μαστίχη, the gum of the σχῖνος, and μάσταξ, μαστιχάω, μασάομαι, “ to chew,” “to masticate.” Both Pliny and Dioscorides state that the best mastic comes from Chios, and to this day the Arabs prefer that which is imported from that island (comp. Niebuhr, Beschr. von A rab. p. 144; Galen, Defac. Simpl. 7, p. 69). Tournefort (Voyages, 2:58-61, transl. 1741) has given a full and very interesting account of the Lentisks or Mastic plants of Scio (Chios): he says that “the towns of the island are distinguished into three classes, those del Campo, those of Apanomeria. and those where they plant Lentisk-trees, whence the mastic in tears is produced.” Tournefort enumerates several lentisk-tree villages. Of the trees he says, “These trees are very wide-spread and circular, ten or twelve feet tall, consisting of several branchy stalks which in time grow crooked. The biggest trunks are a foot diameter, covered with a bark, grayish, rugged, chapt... the leaves are disposed in three or four couples on each side, about an inch long, narrow at the beginning, pointed at their extremity, half an inch broad at the middle. From the junctures of the leaves grow flowers in bunches like grapes; the fruit, too, grows like bunches of grapes, in each berry whereof is contained a white kernel. These trees blow in May; the fruit does not ripen but in autumn and winter.” This writer gives the following description of the mode in which the mastic gum is procured. “They begin to make incisions in these trees in Scio the first of August, cutting the bark crossways with huge knives, without touching the younger branches; next day tie nutritious juice distils in small tears, which by little and little form the mastic grains; they harden on the ground, and are carefully swept up from under the trees. The height of the crop is about the middle of August, if' it be dry, serene weather, but if it be rainy the tears are. all lost. Likewise towards the end of September the same incisions furnish mastic, but in lesser quantities.” Besides the uses to which reference has been made above, the people of Scio put grains of this resin in perfumes, and in their bread before it goes to the oven. Mastic is one of the most important products of the East, being extensively used in the preparation of spirits, as juniper berries are with us, as a sweetmeat, as a masticatory for preserving the gums and teeth, as an antispasmodic in medicine, and as an ingredient in varnishes. The hardened mastic, in the form of roundish straw-colored tears, is much chewed by Turkish women. It consists of resin, with a  minute portion of volatile oil. The Greek writers occasionally use the word σχῖνος for an entirely different plant, viz. the Squill (Scilla maritima) (see Aristoph. Plutt. 715; Sprengel, Flor. Hippoc. 41; Theophr. Hist. Plant. v. 6, § 10). The Pistucia lentiscus is common on the shores of the Mediterranean. According to Strand (Flor. Palaest. No. 559), it has been observed at Joppa, both by Rauwolf and Pococke. The mastic-tree belongs to the natural order Anacardiaceae. — Smith, s.v. See Tristram, Nat. Hist. of Bible, p. 362; Buxtorf, Lex. Chald. col. 1230; Belon, Observ. 2:81.

## Mastricht, Peter Von[[@Headword:Mastricht, Peter Von]]

             a Dutch theologian, was born in 1630. He studied at Duisburg and Utrecht, was for some time professor of Hebrew and of theology at Frankfort, and in 1669 professor at Duisburg. In 1677 he was called to Utrecht, and died February 10, 1706. He wrote, Theologia Theoretico-Practica (2 volumes): — Exercitationes Analyticae et Exegeticae ad Esa. 53: — Syntagma de Fide Salvifica: — Vindiciae Veritatis et Autoritatis Sacrae Scripturae in Rebus Philosophicts contra Wittichium: — Acadenzice Ultrajectince Votum Symbolicum. See Moller, Cimbria Litterata; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:304. (B.P.)

## Masudi, Abul Hasan[[@Headword:Masudi, Abul Hasan]]

             (Ali ben-Husein ben-Ali), one of the most celebrated Arabian savants, an early writer in the department of comparative religion, from the Mussulman stand-point, was born, according to his own statement, at Bagdad in the 3d century of the Hegira, or the 9th of the Christian aera, and was the descendant of an illustrious family, who were among the early and devout followers of the Prophet of Mecca. Masudi was gifted with great talents, which he applied at an early age to learned pursuits. He gathered an immense stock of knowledge in all branches of science; and his learning was not mere book learning, but he improved it in his long travels through all parts of the East, Turkey, Eastern Russia., and Spain. In A.H. 303 he visited India, Ceylon, and the coast of China, where the Arabs had founded numerous small colonies; thence he went to Madagascar and Southern Arabia: thence through Persia to the Caspian; he also visited the Khazors in Southern Russia. In A.H. 314 he was in Palestine; from 332 to 334 in Syria and Egypt; and he says in 345, when he wrote his last book, the second edition of his Golden Meadows, he was in Egypt, and had been a long time absent from his native country, Irak. He says he traveled so far to the west (Morocco and Spain) that he forgot the east, and so far east that he forgot the west. Masudi died probably at Kahirah (Cairo), A.H. 345 (A.D. 956); and, since he visited India as early as A.H. 303, it is evident that those who say he died young are mistaken.

No Arabian writer is quoted so often, and spoken of with so much universal admiration. The variety of subjects on which he wrote astonishes even the learned, and the philosopher is surprised to see this Arab of the Middle Age resolving questions which remained problems to Europeans for many centuries after him. Masudi knew not only the history of the Eastern nations, but also ancient history, and that of the Europeans of his time. He had thoroughly studied the different religions of mankind-  Mohammedanism, Christianity, the doctrines of Zoroaster and Confucius, and the idolatry of barbarous nations. No Arabian writer call boast, like him, of learning at once profound and almost universal. Unfortunately, however, Masudi wanted method in arranging the prodigious number of facts which a rare memory never failed to supply him with while he was writing. He illustrates the history of the geography of the West with analogies or contrasts taken from China or Arabia; he avails himself of his knowledge of Christianity to elucidate the creeds of the different Mohammedan sects; and, while he informs the reader of the mysteries of the extreme North, he will all at once forget his subject, and transfer him into the Desert of Sahara. For a list of his works, which are mostly extant only in MS., see the English Cyclopaedia, s.v.

## Matahiti[[@Headword:Matahiti]]

             (Maoa Roa), the ripening or completing of the year, a festival regularly observed in Huahine, Polynesia. Men, women, and children attended this festival, but the females were not allowed to enter the sacred enclosure. They held a sumptuous banquet annually, the time of which was regulated by the blossoming of reeds. When the prayers were finished at the marae, and the banquet ended, each individual returned to his home or family marwe to offer special prayers for the spirits of departed relatives, that they  might be liberated from the po, or state of night, and ascend to rohutunoanoa, the mount Meru of Polyfesia, or return to this world, by entering into the body of one of its inhabitants.

## Matali[[@Headword:Matali]]

             in Hindu mythology, is the charioteer of Indra. See Williams, Translation of Sakûntela, Act VI.

Mater Dolorosa, or Leady of Sorrow,

is the technical term given to such portraits of the Virgin Mary as represent her alone, weeping or holding the crown of thorns. “She appears alone,” says Mrs. Jameson (Legends of the Madonnsa, p. 36), “a seated or standing figure, often the head or half-length only, the hands clasped, the head bowed in sorrow, tears streaming from the heavy eyes, and the whole expression intensely mournful. The features are properly those of a woman in middle age; but in later times the sentiment of beauty predominated over that of the mother's agony, and I have seen the sublime Mater Dolorosa transformed into a merely beautiful and youthful maiden, with such an air of sentimental grief as might be felt for the loss of a sparrow.” It is common also to represent the Virgin with a sword in her bosom, and even with seven swords, in allusion to the seven sorrows (Luk 2:35) — a version of the allegorical prophecy which the Romanists have found quite profitable for the interests of the hierarchy. There are few Roman Catholic churches without this representation of Mary. SEE STABAT MATER.

## Matamoros, Manuel[[@Headword:Matamoros, Manuel]]

             a Spanish Protestant, was born October 8, 1835, at Lepe, in the province of Huelva. In 1850 he entered the military school at Toledo, but the life of the soldiers which he witnessed there caused such a dislike for a military career that he left the school and went to Malaga, where his mother was then residing. On a visit to Gibraltar he casually attended a service held by Francisco de Paula Ruet (q.v.), who impressed him so deeply that Matamorose bought a New Test., which convinced him of the errors of Romanism. Through Ruet, Matamoros came into relations with a committee in Edinburgh, and later, with one in Paris, which prosecuted the evangelization of Spain. He went, under commission of the latter, to Granada, Seville, and Barcelona (1860). At Granada he became acquainted with Jose Alhama, a hat-maker, who had been converted through the instrumentality of an American tract, and was preaching the gospel. When arrested letters were found on his person from Matamoros, Morin, Carrasco, and Gonzalez, all of whom were likewise imprisoned. Two years Matamoros was kept at Granada awaiting his trial. Through the influence of a deputation of the Evangelical Alliance, and the efforts of queen Elizabeth of Prussia, Matamoros was released, May 28, 1863, on condition that he should leave the country. He went on a visit to England, where he was cordially welcomed, and afterwards to Lausanne, where he attended the theological seminary. On a visit to Pau, in southern France, he made the acquaintance of an American lady, whom he induced to establish there a Spanish school. Returning to Lausanne in May 1866, he died just a few days before the time set for his ordination, July 31, and two years before his country was opened to Protestant missions (1868). His name will not be forgotten beside that of Ruet, Carrasco, Alhama, and other evangelists in Spain. See Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v.; Plitt- Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v. (B.P.)

## Mateer, Joseph, D.D[[@Headword:Mateer, Joseph, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Hill Head parish, County Down, Ireland. He graduated from Belfast College, and after removing to the United States entered Princeton Theological Seminary, remaining one year,  and then went to the Western Theological Seminary, where he graduated in 1854. He was ordained, and installed pastor of the church of Leatherwood, Pa., and also of the Licking Church. After twenty-one years of successful labor he was released, and installed over Sligo Church, from whence he was transferred to New Bethlehem, where he remained till 1881. He died in Bethlehem, October 1, 1883. See Necrol. Report of Princeton Theol. Sem. 1884, page 38.

## Mater Speciosa[[@Headword:Mater Speciosa]]

             or Lady of Joy, the counterpart of the hymn of “Mater Dolorosa'.” SEE STABAT MATER.

## Materialism[[@Headword:Materialism]]

             may be defined as that system of philosophy which considers matter as the fundamental principle of all things, and consequently denies absolutely the independence and autonomy of the spirit. It is sometimes considered as synonymous with Naturalism, yet this is erroneous, for there is a difference between the notions of nature and matter. It is also called by some Sensualism, which is more correct, yet only expresses one of the characteristics of the theory of materialism. In a more extended sense, the expression materialism is made to signify the whole of the practical results which, consciously or unconsciously, flow from such philosophy, and whose final object, although sometimes restrained by considerations of prudence or expediency, is sensual enjoyment in its fullest sense.

Materialism, strictly viewed, is the doctrine that all spirit, so called, is material in its substance, and is subject to the laws which govern the composition of material particles and the activity of material forces. Strictly construed, it is a psychological doctrine or theory; but, as it implies certain philosophical assumptions or principles, it makes a place for itself in the domain of speculative philosophy. Its assumptions and conclusions are also fundamental to theology. If its positions are tenable, theology is impossible. If the human soul is but another name for an aggregation of material particles, it cannot exist when these particles are sundered. Although it is conceivable that these particles may be so minute as not necessarily to be disturbed by the dissolution of the larger particles which constitute the body, yet this is too improbable to relieve the materialistic theory from the charge of being inconsistent with the possibility of a future life. The moral relations of the soul must be entirely inconsistent with its subjection to the laws whichs govern matter ands its activities, and these moral relations give to theology — certainly to Christian theology — all its interest. If the assumptions of materialism are correct, there can be no intelligent and personal Creator. Creation itself is inconceivable, and therefore impossible.

A significant fact, which strikes one at first on the study of the history of materialism, is that it never appears as a power among the masses in the early stages of civilization. On the contrary, we find that in all nations a more or less perfect spiritual contemplation of nature forms the first step towards religious consciousness. This fact is a sufficient answer in itself to the assertion that materialism is the original and true form of human consciousness. On the other hand, we find materialism spreading among  the masses in the nations which have attained the culminating point of their civilization. It becomes, then, the premonitory sign of their downfall, being already an evidence of their moral and spiritual decay.

The materialistic theory was in some sense sanctioned by those earlier Greek philosophers who referred the origin of all things — the spirit of man included — to some attenuated form of matter, as water, air, or fire. From these rude speculations philosophy emerged by successive efforts, till in the Socratic school the soul of man was held to be distinct in its essence from matter, to be superior to matter, and indestructible by the dissolution of the body. The Socratic school also emphasized the doctrine that mind has infused order into the universe. The Platonic philosophy enforced these doctrines with glowing appeals to the nobler sentiments, and embellished them with a great variety of mythological representations. Aristotle, more cautious and exact in his statements, asserted for the higher forms of intellectual activity an essence distinct from matter. The philosophers of the Epicurean school were avowed materialists. They taught explicitly and earnestly the doctrine that what is called the soul is composed of atoms, and must necessarily be dissipated at death. The universe itself likewise consists of atoms, and all its phenomena are the results of fortuitous combinations of atoms. Sensation, intelligence, and desire are the effects of the action and reaction of the atoms within and the atoms without the body. These doctrines are elaborately set forth by the celebrated Lucretius (B.C. 95-44) in his poem De rerum natura. The Atomic Materialism of Epicurus, and the Imaginative and Rational Spiritualism of Plato and Aristotle, separated the Greek philosophers into two leading divisions, with various unimportant subordinate sections. Among the Jews, the Sadducees denied thlat there was either angel or spirit, or existence after death; but there is no evidence that they supported these doctrines by any philosophical materialistic theories.

The Christian philosophy was necessarily antimaterialistic. With the revival of learning and of the ancient philosophies, the Epicurean materialism found many adherents, against whose influence the pronounced. spiritualism of Descartes furnished a positive and most efficient check. Hobbes was the opponent of Descartes, and all his conceptions of the soul and of the laws of its activity are materialistic, reducing all spiritual phenomena to bodily motions. Spinoza made spiritual beings to be modes of the universal substance which is Gods — every spiritual operation being the necessary counterpart of some materialistic phenomenon. But the rise of the mechanical or new  philosophy of nature, to which Descartes incidentally contributed, and which Sir Isaac Newton so triumphantly established, had no little influence in developing the materialism of modern philosophy. The speculations of Locke indirectly furthered this tendency; although, with Descartes, he asserted the authority of consciousness for the reality of spiritual phenomena. But still he contended, as against Descartes, that no man has the right to affirm that God could not endow matter with the capacity to think. The free-thinking Deists of England, who called themselves the disciples of Locke, were in many cases materialists, and advanced their speculations against the possibility of a separate existence of the soul in connection with their attacks upon the Christian doctrine of to resurrection. There were few advocates of philosophical materialism among the English writers of the 18th century. David Hartley (1704-1757) made many phenomena of the soul to depend on vibrations of the brain, but expressly denied the inference that the soul is material in its substance. Joseph Priestley (1733-1804) was led, in the course of his speculations, to assert that the soul is nothing but the organized body, and that this doctrine is essential to the rational acceptance of the Christian system (Disquisitions relating to Matter and Spirit, Lond, 1777, 2 vols. 8vo). In France the influence of the spiritualistic doctrines of Descartes was gradually displaced in the schools by the system of Condillac, which found its logical termination in the extreme materialism of La Mettrie (1709-1751). L'Homme machine; Histoire naturelle de l'ame, and of baron Holbach (1723-1789), Systeme de la Narture, in which all spiritual essence and activity are resolved into matter and motion. Here the Encyclopaedists Diderot (q.v.) and D'Alembert (q.v.) deserve special mention; nor should the noted Helvetius (q.v.) be forgotten.

In more recent times, materialism has been both metaphysical and physiological. Metaphysical materialism has resulted in some cases by logical deduction, or, rather, a logical tendency, from the idealistic assumption that matter and spirit are identical. The argument which seeks to make matter and spirit one, lends plausibility to the conclusion that it is indifferent whether matter should be resolved into spirit, or spirit resolved into matter. The extreme idealism of some of the German schools has prepared the way for the materialism with which they would seem to have had the least possible sympathy. The real pantheism of Spinoza and the logical pantheism of Hegel have furnished axioms and a method, which have been applied in the service of materialism. It is in physiology,  however, that modem materialism has found its most efficient ally. Physiology has renewed the previously-exploded doctrine of vibrations, which again has found confirmation in that view of the correlation of forces which resolves every agency of nature into some mode of motion. If heat, and light and electricity are but modes of motion, why not nervous activity? and if nervous activity, why not vital energy? and if vital energy, why not spiritual judgments and emotions? This argument has been urged with great earnestness and pertinacity by certain physiologists both of the German and English schools. Conpicuous among them are Carl Vogt, Physiologische Briefe fur Gebildete; Kohler-Glaube und Wissenschafj, 1855; J. Moleschott, Physiologie des Stoffwechsels; Der Kreislau' des Lebens, etc.; Louis Buchner, Kraft und Stoff (1855); Natur u. Geist, etc.; Hackel, NaturlichScrhsoyfungsgeschichte; Ueber die Entstchungq und den Staunzbau des Menschengeschlechts, etc. T. H. Huxley, On the Physical Bases of Life, edit. 1868 (compare J. H. Sterling, As regards Protoplasnm, etc., edit. 1869-72), and H. Maudsley, Physiology and Pathology of the Hlumanz Miind (Lond. and N.Y. 1867), approximate to the same opinions among the English. Alexander Bain (The Senses and the Intellect, Lond. 1855, 1864); The Emotions and the Will, 2d ed. 1865; Mental and Moral Science, Lond. 1867) sympathizes with these tendencies, treating the soul in the main as though it were but a capacity in the nervous system for special functions which obey physiological laws. The doctrine of evolution by natural selection in the struggle for existence, which has been derived by the celebrated Darwin from a limited cycle of physiological facts, and extended by him to explain the production of all complex forms of being, inorganic and organic, is materialistic in its assumptions and its conclusions, even if neither of these are recognized or confessed by its advocates. The metaphysical doctrine of development by successive processes of differentiation and integration, which has been hardened into an axiom by Herbert Spencer, and applied to the explanation of all forms of being, and even of the primal truths of metaphysical science itself, can lead to no other than a materialistic psychology. The doctrine of unconscious cerebration, which is taught more or less explicitly by Dr. W. 1B. Carpenter and other eminent physiologists, though not necessarily involving the materialistic hypothesis, is yet materialistic in its tendencies and associations. The positive school of Comte teaches directly that the brain is the only substance of the soul, and that what are usually called spiritual activities are simply biological phenomena. J. S. Mill, though not avowedly a materialist, follows Hume in reducing matter and mind to  idealistic formulae, which, as conceived by him, are not distinguishable from physiological phenomena or products.

According to the materialistic philosophy, as developed by whatever writer, but especially in its once popular form of Epicureanism, the perception of our senses is the only source of all human knowledge. The remembrance of many previous perceptions of the same nature gives rise to general views, and the comparison of these to judgments. Ethics are thus but the doctrine of happiness, and its highest maxim: Seek joy, avoid pain! Yet Epicurus sought to give a certain moral tendency to this fundamental axiom of his system, by declaring every pleasure objectionable which is followed by a greater unpleasantness, and every pain is desirable which is followed by a greater pleasure; according to which principle freedom from care and insensibility to bodily pain become the highest aim of man. See Lutterbeck, Neutestamentliche Lehrbegrinle (Mainz, 1852), 1:38-58; H. Ritter, Gesch. d. Philosophie; Fries, Gesch. d. Philosophie, vol. 1. SEE EPICIUREAN PHILOSOPHY. In Boston a paper entitled The Investigator is now published in the interests of materialism. The German-Americans are also quite active in this work. They have two papers — the Pionier (Boston) and the Neue Zeit (New York). The editor of the former, Karl Heinzen, is frequently before the public all over the country to press the interests of his abominable work. Recently Dr. G. C. Hiebeling published a pamphlet entitled Naturwissenschaft gegen Philosophic (New York, Schmidt, 1871, 12mo) to controvert Hurtmann's Philosophy of the Unknown.

The defects of the materialistic hypothesis are manifold. It considers only the similarities, and overlooks the differences of two classes of actual phenomena. Through its overweening desire of unity, it becomes one-sided and imperfect in all its conceptions and conclusions, and fails to do justice to the peculiarities of spiritual experiences, which are as real as the more obtrusive and palpable phenomena of matter. Moreover, it fails to discern that the intellectual and moral functions not only have a right to be recognized in their full import, but that they have a certain supremacy and authority over all others, inasmuch as the agent which knows must furnish the principles and axioms which all science assumes and on which all science must rest. If the soul is only a function of matter, then to know is one of the functions of matter. It follows that the authority of knowledge itself may be as changeable and uncertain as the changes of form, the varieties of motion, the manifold chemical combinations, or the more or  less complex developments of which matter is capable. The materialistic hypothesis not only overlooks and does injustice to the facts which are open to common apprehension, but it is a suicidal theory, which destroys, by its own positions and its method, the very foundations on which any science can stand — even the scientific theory of materialism itself. SEE SOUL.

Literature. — Lange (Frdr. A.), Gesch. des Materialismus, etc. (Iserlohn, 1867, 8vo); Schaller, Leib. u. Seele (3d. ed. 1858); Wagner, Kanmpf um die Seele (1857); Frauenstadt, Der Materialismus; Fabri (Dr. Friedrich), Briefe gegene den Materialisnmus (Stuttg. 1856; 2d ed. 1864, 8vo; comp. Bibl. Sac. 1865, p. 525); Janet, The Materialism of the Present Day (a critique of Dr. Buchner, Lond. and N. Y. 1866, 12mo); Lotze, Medicinische (Leipsic, 1852); also his Mikrokosmus (Leipsic, 1856); Ulrici, Gott und die Natur (Leipsic, 1862); also his Gott und der Mensch (Leipsic, 1866); Fichte, Zur Seelenfr(sqge (Leipsic, 1859); Seelenfoitdauer, etc. (Leipsic, 1867); Psychologie (Leipsic, 1864); Trendelenburg, in the Denkschriften d. K. A kad. (1849); also Hist. Beitriye (1855); Jahr, Die wvichtigsten Zeitfragen; Die Natur, der slenschengeist und sein Gottesbe.grif (Leipsic, 1869, 8vo); Weiss (Dr. L.), Anti-Materialisnzus; Vortrgye aus dens Gebiete der Philosophie (Berlin, 1869, 1871, 2 vols. 8vo); Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctrines, 2:222, 475; Pearson, On Infidelity; Farrar, Crit. Hist. of Free Thought; Buckle, Hist. of Civilization; Mansel, Limits of Religious Thought, Lect. v; Porter, Humnan Intellect, p. 18 sq.; Liddon, Our Lord's Divinity, p. 451; Cudworth, Intellectual Systems of the Universe; Leckey, Hist. of Rationalism; Hamilton, Discussions; Fichte, in the Zeitschr.f. die Philosophie, 1860; Christ. Exam. 1859 (Nov.); North Brit. Rev. 1860 (Nov.); Amer. Presb. Rev. 1869, p. 193; 1872, p. 194; Bibl. Sac. 1860, p. 201; 1865 (July); Theol. Eclect. 1869 (Nov.), p. 55; Princet. Rev. 1869 (Oct.), p. 616; Kitto, Journ. Sac. Lit. 25:25; Westminzster Rev. 1864 (July), p. 90; 1870 (Oct.), p. 225; Rosenkranz, in Zeitschr.fiir wissenschafl. Theol. 1864, vol. iii, art. i; Journ. Specul. Philippians vol. i, No. 3, art. vi; Catholic World, 1870 (Aug.). SEE MATTER. (N. P.)

## Maternus[[@Headword:Maternus]]

             SEE FIRMICUS.

## Maternus I Bishop Of Cologne[[@Headword:Maternus I Bishop Of Cologne]]

             SEE COLOGNE.

## Math[[@Headword:Math]]

             the residence of a monastic community among the Hindus. It consists of a number of buildings, including a set of husts or chambers for the Mahaot or superior, and his resident Chdelas or disciples; a temple sacred to the deity whom they worship, or the Samadh, or shrine of. the founder of the sect, or some eminent teacher; and one or more sheds or buildings for the accommodation of the mendicants or travellers who are constantly visiting the Mat'h, both ingress and egress being free to all. The number of permanent pupils in a Mat'h varies from three or four to thirty or forty; besides whom there is also a considerable number of outdoor members. Most of the Mat'hs have a small endowment of land, which they either let at a fixed rental, or cultivate on their own account. Besides this they often receive generous contributions from lay votaries, alms gathered by members who go out to seek them, and the profits arising from traffic covertly carried on.

## Mathema[[@Headword:Mathema]]

             (μάθημα, a lesson), a name usually given in the ancient Greek writers to the creed, probably because the catechumens were obliged to learn it.

## Mather, Alexander[[@Headword:Mather, Alexander]]

             one of Mr. Wesley's most useful preachers, was born at Brechin, North Britain, in Feb. 1733. When a boy he had some instruction at a Latin school, and afterwards ran away with the rebels, and was in the battle of Culloden. On account of this he was treated with great harshness by his father, and deprived of all educational advantages. In 1751 he left home and went to Perth, and in 1752 to London, to earn his living as a mechanic. Here, in 1753, he married. He had been religiously inclined from boyhood, and had long followed his convictions in many moralities and means of grace; finally converted under a sermon of John Wesley's, April 14, 1754, he soon became very useful as a band and class leader and local preacher. In 1757 he began itinerating under Mr. Wesley, and with great success, though often in peril from mobs stirred up by the Establishment. Sometimes he was beaten nearly to death, and often stoned, but grace triumphed, and so much the more grew the word of God and multiplied. In 1757 he experienced the blessing of “the great salvation,” or perfect love, and from that time labored with increased unction and usefulness. He was persecuted by some of his brethren on. this account, but Mr. Wesleye defended him and held him up. He traveled on nearly all the circuits of England, and, during forty-three years, was present at thirty-nine Conferences. Most of the time he was in prominent relations in the Church, and active in all its interests. He was the principal member of Mr. Wesley's select committee, and his clear, strong sense and judgment were of great weight in all things. “His disinterestedness was shown in the fact that, though ordained by Wesley as a superintendent or bishop, and an advocate of the claim of the people for the sacraments, he made no attempt to secure any defense for his peculiar office, but even opposed the immediate adoption of Coke's episcopal scheme, as proposed at the Litchfield meeting” (Stevens). He died at London, Aug. 22, 1800 (?). — Jackson, Early Methodist Preachers, 1:369; Stevens, Hist. of Methodism, 2:142; 3:27, 40, 155 sq.

## Mather, Cotton[[@Headword:Mather, Cotton]]

             a very celebrated American divine of colonial days, the most noted of the Mather family, the grandson of Richard Mather and son of Increase, is one of the trio spoken of in the old doggerel tombstone inscription:

“Under this stone lies Richard Mather,

Who had a son greater than his father,

And eke a grandson greater than either.”

Cotton Mather was born at Boston Feb. 12, 1662-63. His early education he received under the eye of his father, and as a lad of twelve he entered at Harvard. At this time he is spoken of as a fine classical scholar. Four years afterwards, when he graduated, Dr. Oakes, the president of the college, addressed him in a Latin speech, lauding in glowing terms his past conduct and attainments, and predicting a glorious future. But it was not in worldly knowledge only that he was so advanced a student. The descendant of a line of ministers, he seemed to be himself, by his aptness in learning and early seriousness, specially marked out for the ministry. When only in his fourteenth year, Cotton Mather's mind had begun to be greatly exercised with religious thoughts. He at this time laid down a system of rigid fasts, which he continued to practice monthly or weekly, and sometimes oftener through the rest of his life, of strict and regular self-examination, and of prolonged times of prayer, to which he afterwards added frequent nightly vigils. It is necessary to mention these things in order to understand some points in his character and conduct in future years. For awhile he was diverted from his purpose of becoming a minister by a growing impediment in his speech, and he began to study medicine. But being shown how by a “dilated deliberation” of speech he might avoid stammering, he returned to his theological studies, and commenced preaching when scarcely eighteen years old. In 1680 he received a unanimous call from his father's congregation, then the largest in Boston, to become assistant pastor, and in January, 1682, was settled as a colleague of his father. His labors in the ministry were characterized by great zeal and earnestness, and he soon came to be considered a prodigy of learning and ability. He was not only a most attentive pastor, but a superior preacher, and withal found time for a large amount of literary labors: he published three hundred and eighty-two distinct works, most of them of course small, consisting, besides his sermons, of devotional works, and other contributions to practical religion. In addition to all these labors he was engaged in the accumulation of  material for greater works. Nor did he any more than his father shrink from the political duties which the ministerial office had been supposed to cast upon those who held it. “New England,” he wrote, “being a country whose interests are remarkably enwrapped in ecclesiastical circumstances, ministers ought to concern themselves in politics.” When, therefore, his father was sent to England to seek relief from the arbitrary proceedings of Charles II and James II, Cotton Mather regarded himself as the natural leader of the citizens, and on their seizing and imprisoning the obnoxious governor, he drew up their declaration justifying that extreme measure.

The freedom of thought in politics, however, made its inroads into the Church also, and fearing a falling away from the purity of the old faith, and fancying that he saw the evil one busy in turning away the hearts of the people, he was led to a life of asceticism, which involved him in religious controversies.

The daughter of one Goodwin, a respectable mechanic of Boston, accused a laundress of having stolen some of the family linen. The mother of the suspected person, an Irish emigrant, expostulated in no very gentle terms against such a charge, and, as was averred, not content with abuse, cast a spell over the accuser. The younger children soon began to suffer similarly, and the poor Irishwoman was denounced as a witch. Cotton Mather, fearing that the excesses of superstition would have a still more derogatory effect on the religious life of the colonists, determined to investigate this case of witchcraft. He took the eldest girl, then about sixteen years old, into his house, and her vagaries soon left on his mind no doubt that she was really under the influence of an evil spirit. The poor Irishwoman was tried, condemned, and executed; and Mather printed a relation of the circumstances, and an account of such influences in other places. The book, which was published with the recommendation of all the ministers of Boston and Charlestown, was entitled Memorable Providences relating to Witchcraft and Possessions, with Discoveries and Appendix (Lond. and Bost. 1689, 8vo; 2d edit. 1691, 12mo; Edinb. 1697, 12mo). Both in the colony and in England the book was read by everybody. In the old country it had the honor to be introduced by the eminent divine, Dr. Richard Baxter, who wrote a preface for the work, and argued that it was “sufficient to convince all but the most obdurate Sadducees.” The question here arises whether or not Cotton Mather was himself a believer in witchcraft, and whether or not he wrote the book simply to explode the “delusion” which was fast making converts, especially in and about  Massachusetts. Even to our day this question has not been satisfactorily solved.

Mr. Bancroft, our great historian, has treated Cotton Mather as guilty of having provoked the excitement known as the “Salem witchcraft delusion.” Within the last few years, however, one of our ablest writers, Mr. Poole, formerly librarian of the “Boston Library,” has come forward to clear Cotton Mather of any and all insinuations, holding that “the opposite” of what is generally charged against Mr. Mather “is the truth.” “His gentler treatment,” we are told, “cured and Christianized them [the believers of witchcraft]. He opposed, with his father and the rest of the clergy — with but three exceptions — the course of the judges in deeming every possessed person guilty, the ministry holding that the devil might enter innocent persons, and that the fact of their improper conduct was no ground for adjudging them criminals. He also opposed taking spectral testimony, or the words of a confessed witch. It must be ordinary legal witnesses and testimony that could alone convict. He also offered to take six of the accused persons into his own house, at his own expense, and to make upon them the experiment of prayer and fasting which had been so successful with the Goodwin children of his own congregation.” Mr. Poole also proves or makes it quite credible that it was Mather and not Mr. Willard who wrote the most vigorous tract of the times against the Salem movements, and who made the Boston and Salem treatment noted for their difference even at that day. SEE SALEM; SEE WITCHCRAFT.

There can hardly be any question about the fact that Cotton Mather is, in a measure at least, responsible for the blood that was shed at Salem between 1685 and 1692. But it is folly indeed to question his goodness, as some have done, or even to bring charges against his sincerity because of his fanatical treatment of the deluded Salemites. We need only remember that even the very men who built up the Church of Protestantism in the 16th century were not entirely free from mistakes, and failed in a manner very much like their good Puritan descendant. Sublimely ridiculous, then, appears the judgment pronounced by a writer in a late number of Zion's Herald (May 20, 1869): “At twenty-three he was in the midst of this terrific panic of mortal fear and its fatal results; and, even at this boyish age, bore himself with such manly courage, prudence, and coolness that he was the only minister, and even the only person, except his father, who may have been said to have stood solidly on his feet, and who won from his contemporary the praise that ‘had his notions been hearkened to and  followed, these troubles would never have grown unto that height which they now have.” The quotation is from Poole's article in the North American Review of April, 1869. While we would not forget the merits of our ancestors, but would rather extol them and laud them for their virtues, we cannot afford to be blind to their faults and mistakes. Salem witchcraft persecution certainly must not find an advocate in the nineteenth century, surely not at the expense of the truths of history. But to turn to the brighter side of Mather's life. Says a writer in delineating his character, while acknowledging the failing we have felt constrained to condemn: “It was the great ambition of his whole life to do good. His heart was set upon it: he did not therefore content himself with merely embracing opportunities of doing good that occasionally offered themselves, but he very frequently set apart much time on purpose to devise good; and he seldom came into any company without having this directly in his view. It was constantly one of his first thoughts in the morning, What good may I do this day? And that he might more certainly attend to the various branches of so large and comprehensive a duty, he resolved this general question, What good shall I do? into several particulars, one of which he took into consideration while he was dressing himself every morning, and as soon as he came into his study he set down some brief hints of his meditations upon it. He had ordinarily a distinct question for each morning in the week. His question for the Lord's-day morning constantly was, What shall I do, as pastor of a Church, for the good of the flock under my charge? Upon this he considered what subjects were most suitable and seasonable for him to preach on; what families of his flock were to be visited, and with what particular view; and how he might make his ministry still more acceptable and useful.” He died Feb. 13,1728.

Though many of Cotton Mather's productions are indeed but small volumes, as single Sermons, Essays, etc., yet there are several among them of a much larger size; as his Magnalia Christi Americana, or the Ecclesiastical History of New England from its first Planting in 1620 to 1698 (Lond. 1702, folio; Hartford, Conn., 1820, 2 vols.8vo); his Christ. Philosopher (Lond. 1721,12mo); his Ratio Disciplinae Fratrum Nov- Anglorum; his Directions to a Candidate for the Ministry — a book which brought him as many letters of thanks as would fill a volume. Besides all these, the doctor left behind him several books in manuscript; one of which, viz. his Biblia Americana, or Illustrations of the Sacred Scriptures, was proposed to be printed in three volumes, folio. The true motive that  prompted him to write and publish so great a number of books, appears from the motto that he wrote on the outside of the catalogue which he kept of his own works, viz. Joh 15:8, “Herein is my Father glorified, that ye bear much fruit.” Dr. Mather was one of the most peculiar men that America has produced. He doubtless possessed larger learning than any other minister of his time, but his mind was better adapted to acquire than to create. He lacked in strong judgment, in original genius, and in sustained power. He had no ability to generalize, no wide and penetrating vision. The most noted benefaction of his life to the country was introducing vaccination for small-pox, which proved a great blessing. See his Life, written by his son (Bost. 1729); also by Enoch Pond and Dr. Jennings; Jones, Chris. Biog. s.v.; Sparks, Amer. Biog. 1st series, 6:161 sq.; Sherman, New England Divines, p. 76 sq.; Duyckinck, Cyclop. Of Amer. Lit. 1:59; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth. vol. ii, s.v.; Bancroft, tist. of the U. S. 3:71, 76, 95, 98; North Amer. Rev. 43:519; 46:477; 51:1; Meth. Quar. Rev. 1:430; Christian Examniner, v. 365. (J. II. W.)

## Mather, Eleazer[[@Headword:Mather, Eleazer]]

             a Puritan minister of New England, son of Richard, and brother of Increase Mather, was born at Dorchester May 13,1637; graduated at Harvard in 1656; was ordained pastor of the Church at Northampton in 1661; and there died, July 24, 1699. He was a fine scholar, a sound thinker, and a devoted and evangelical minister. Many souls were converted through his labors, and his early death was much lamented by all the churches. — Sherman, New England Divines, p. 107; Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 1:159; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth. s.v.

## Mather, Increase[[@Headword:Mather, Increase]]

             D.D., an eminent American divine, was born at Dorchester, Mass., June 21, 1639. His father, Richard Mather (q.v.), had emigrated from England to Massachusetts in 1635. In early childhood Increase exhibited signs of unusual mental endowments; he entered Harvard College at the age of twelve, and graduated with the class of 1656. Shortly after this he was converted, and determined to devote his life to the ministry. In the year following that of his graduation he went to Dublin, where his brother was preaching. There he entered Trinity College, and, after securing the degree of M.A., was chosen a fellow of the college, an honor, however, which he declined. The climate of Ireland being unfavorable to his health, he  removed to England, and preached there for a while. At the time of the Restoration he was residing in the island of Guernsey, as chaplain to an English regiment; but when, as a commissioned officer, he was required to sign a paper declaring “that the times then were and would be happy,” and he refused to comply, his salary was so greatly reduced that soon after this he returned to his native country, and was called and settled as pastor of the North Church in Boston. In this city he married. in 1662, a daughter of the Rev, John Cotton, and from this marriage sprang Cotton Mather, one of the most celebrated divines of his day. In the controversy as to “l who are the legitimate subjects of baptism,” he opposed his father, and likewise the decision of the synod of 1662, until caused to change his views by the arguments of Mr. Mitchell, of Cambridge. Largely by his instrumentality the government was induced to call the general synod of 1679 from the whole colony, for the purpose of ‘correcting the evils that had provoked God to send judgment on New England.”

The synod had its second session the following year, and Mr. Mather acted as moderator. At this meeting the Confession of Faith was agreed upon, and he prepared a preface to it. On the death of president Oakes of Harvard University, Mather temporarily supplied the place. By the sudden death of the appointee, president Rogers, Mather was, in 1684, again called to the head of the college. This time he accepted, and combined his presidential duties with his pastoral. In 1692 he was presented with a diploma of doctor of divinity, “the first instance in which such a degree was conferred in British America.” On the accession of Charles II Massachusetts was thrown into trouble. His majesty required full submission of their charter to his pleasure, on pain, in case of refusal, of having a quo warranto issued against it. To this oppression Mather was stanch in his opposition, and before an assembly in Boston dissuaded his countrymen from yielding their liberties tamely. As a result of their resistance, judgment was entered against the charter of the Massachusetts colony. About this time Charles died, and James II, being his successor, published his specious declaration for liberty of conscience. This produced temporary relief, and Mather was delegated to convey to his majesty in England the grateful acknowledgment of the churches. and to sue for a further redress of their wrongs. James received him kindly, and promised him more than he ever granted. Mather remained, however, until the close of the revolution of 1688, which deposed James and placed William and Mary on the throne of England.

After much diplomacy with the prince of Orange, a new charter was at length procured in lieu of the old one, and Mather himself was allowed the privilege of nominating the governor,  lieutenant governor, and board of council. After four years thus spent among the nobility at Whitehall, Dr. Mather returned to Boston with the consciousness of having faithfully discharged his duty and rendered his country an important service. He found the Church in great excitement about witchcraft, which called forth his work entitled Cases of Conscience concerning Witchcraft. He retained his natural bodily and mental vigor until past his eightieth birthday. After this he endured great bodily and consequent mental derangements for four years, during all of which time his great burden seemed to be, not his suffering, but the painful sense of his inability to labor. At last, on Aug. 23, 1723, he died peacefully in the arms of his eldest son. His loss was deeply mourned by those for whom he had spent his long and laborious life. According to Sprague, “he was the last of more than twenty-two hundred ministers who had been ejected and silenced on the restoration of Charles II and on the Act of Uniformity.” He was an industrious student, and published ninety-two separate works, most of which are now very scarce. A noted writer thus comments upon him in fhe North Amer. Rev. 1840 (July), p. 5: “Increase Mather not only stood most conspicuous among the scholars and divines of New England, as president of Harvard College and pastor of a church in Boston, but by his political influence was supposed at times to have controlled the administration of the government.” He was a learned, earnest, and devoted minister, whose piety was deep, warm, and full of love. His sermons were elaborate and powerful, and many souls were converted by his labors. He studied earnestly for sixty years, and was regarded as the most learned American minister of his day. — Sherman, New England Divines, p. 57; Allibone, Dict. Brit. and Amer. Auth. s.v.; Bancroft, Hist. U. S. (see Index in vol. 3); Drake, Dict. Amer. Biogs. s.v.; Duyckinck, Cyclop. Amer. Lit. vol. 1.

## Mather, Moses[[@Headword:Mather, Moses]]

             D.D., a Congregational minister, was born at Lyme, Connecticut, March 6, 1719; graduated at Yale College in 1739, and soon after was licensed to preach by the New London Association. In 1742 he commenced preaching in a Congregational church in Middlesex, now Darien, Connecticut, and in 1744 was ordained pastor of the Congregational Church, and this position he held until his death in 1806. Dr. Mather was a fellow of Yale College from 1777 to 1790. He warmly espoused the cause of the Colonies in the Revolutionary War, and was twice taken by the British and Tories, carried to New York, and confined in the provost prison. He published a Reply to  Dr. Bellamy on the Half-way Covenant: — Infant Baptism Defended (1759): — A Sermon, entitled Divine Sovereignty displayed by Predestination (1763); and was the author of a posthumous work, A Systematic View of Divinity (1813, 12mo). See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 1:425, s.v.

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

             an English minister, a brother of Increase Mather, was born in Lancashire in 1630; graduated at Harvard College, 1647, and spent his ministerial life in England and Holland. He died in 1697. He published Two Sermons (Oxon. 1694, 4to; Lond. 1718, 12mo): — A Discussion on the Lawfulness of a Pastor's Officiating in Another Church: — A Fast Sermon: — and Sermons preached at Pinzer's Hall and Lime Street (1701). “In his public discourses there was neither a lavish display nor an inelegant penury of oratorical excellence, while the dignity of his subjects superseded the necessity of rhetorical embellishments.”Calamy, Continuation of the Nonconformists' Memorial; Wilson, Dissenters; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth. s.v.

## Mather, R. Cotton, LL.D[[@Headword:Mather, R. Cotton, LL.D]]

             an English Congregational minister, was born at New Windsor, Manchester, November 8, 1808. He graduated from Glasgow University, studied two years at Homerton Theological College, was ordained June 1, 1833, and the same year proceeded to India in the service of the London Missionary Society, settling in Benares, where he resided till May 1838, then left for Mirzapore, in order to establish a new mission in that city, laboring ee there the rest of his missionary life with great success. He wrote tracts, theological treatises, and works of a varied character, both in Hindu and Urdu. He died April 21, 1877. See (Lond.) Evangelical  Magazine, July 1877, page 420; — (Lond.) Cong. Yearbook, 1878, page 325.

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

             an Episcopal and later a Puritan minister, was born at Lowtown, Lancashire, Eng., in 1596; was converted when a young man; spent two years at Oxford; entered the ministry in 1618, near Liverpool, and at the end of fifteen years of devoted and successful labor was suspended for nonconformity. He then emigrated to Massachusetts, and became pastor of a congregation at Dorchester. There he died, April 22, 1669. He was a sound and earnest preacher, not captivating, but solid, pious, and very useful. He was an active theologian, and a member of every synod in New England after his arrival. He was studious, a good scholar, and a very able and valuable man. Richard Mather assistd Elliot in the New England version of the Psalms, and furnished the synod of 1648 a model of Church Discipline. He published a discourse on the Church Covenant (1639), a treatise on Jusfictication (1652), and an elaborate defense of the churches of New England. See Increase Mather, Life and Death of Robert Mather (1670, 4to); Drake, Cyclop. of Amer. Biog. s.v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth. vol. 2, s.v.; Roger, New England Divines; Sherman, New England Divines, p. 26.

## Mather, Samuel[[@Headword:Mather, Samuel]]

             (1), brother of Increase Mather, was born in Lancashire, England, May 13, 1626; gralduated at Harvard College in 1643; was for some time assistant pastor to Rev. Mr. Rogers, in Rowley; and was pastor of the North Church, Boston, in 1649. In 1650 he returned to England, and was appointed chaplain of Magdalen College, Oxford; preached in Scotland and Ireland; went to Dublin in 1655, and became senior fellow of Trinity College, Dublin, and minister of the Church of St. Nicholas. Soon after the Restoration he was suspended on a charge of sedition, but afterwards continued to preach to a small congregation privately. He died Oct. 29, 1671. Mr. Mather held the first rank as a preacher. He published Sermons and Tracts: — Old Testament Types Explained and Improved (Lond. 1673, 4to), rewritten by Caroline Fry, as Gospel of the Old Testament (1833, 1851): — Life of Nathaniel Matrher (1689). See Drake, Dict. of Amer. Biog. s.v.; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. vol. ii, s.v.

## Mather, Samuel (2)[[@Headword:Mather, Samuel (2)]]

             (2), D.D., minister of the Trinitarian Congregational Church, son of Cotton Mather, was born in Boston, Oct. 30, 1706; graduated at Harvard College in 1723, having studied theology probably under the direction of his father; was licensed to preach, and in 1732 became colleague-pastor with the Rev. Mr. Gee, of the Second Church in Boston, and was ordained in the same year. In 1741 a dissatisfaction arose against him in this church, partly from the charge of looseness of doctrine, and also of impropriety of conduct, and he, with the smaller part of his membership, withdrew, and established a separate Church in Hanover Street, on the corner of North Bennet. “The fact,” says Robbins, in his History of the Second Church, “that so many persons of good character supported Mr. Mather, affords good reason to doubt whether the charges of impropriety were well founded.” He sustained his relation as pastor of Hanover Street Church usntil his death, June 27,1785. Dr. Mather published A Sermon on the Death of Cotton Mather (1728): — Life of Cotton Mather (1729): — An Essay concerning Gratitude (1732): — Vita A. H. Franckii, cui adjecta est narratio rerum memorabilium in Ecclesiis Evangelicis per Germaniam, etc. (1733): — An Apology for the Liberties of the Churches in New England (1738): — and Sermons on various Subjects (1738, ‘39, ‘40, ‘51, ‘53, ‘60, ‘2, ‘66, and ‘68. Also a Poem, in five parts, The Sacred Minister, by Aurelius  Prudentius Americanus (1773): — Answer to a Pamphlet entitled Salvation for all Men (1782). — Sprague, Annals Amer. Pulpit, 1:371.

## Mathesius, Johann[[@Headword:Mathesius, Johann]]

             a German Protestant theologian, was a native of Saxony. He studied at Wittenberg in 1528, and was there for a while Luther's fellowboarder. He was appointed rector of Joachimsthal in 1532, pastor in 1545, and died in 1564. He had witnessed many abuses resulting from the misconception of the doctrine of salvation by grace: we learn from him that there were parties in the Church who claimed, on the strength of it, that faith alone was necessary, and that works were of no importance whatever, so that it did not matter whether the actions of believers were good or bad. Matthesius strongly opposed such heretical views, and thus became involved in controversies which embittered the end of his life. He is especially known by seventeen sermons on the doctrine, the confession, and the death of Luther (Nuremberg, 1588; in recent times the biographical portions were collected and published under the title, J. Marthesius, d. Leben d. Dr. Martin Luther, mit einer Vorrede von G. H. v. Schubert, Stuttgart). He wrote also various other sermons, a tract on justification, a catechism, and several hymns. His biography was published by Balthasar Mathesius in 1705. See Jicher, Gelehrten-Lexikon, and Dollinger, Die Reformation, 2:127; Herzog, Real- Encyklopadie, 9:160; Winkworth, Christian Singers of Germany, p. 140 sq. (J. N. .)

## Mathetae[[@Headword:Mathetae]]

             (Μαθηταί, disciples) is one of the names by which the early followers of our Lord were known among their contemporaries. All the common appellations of the professors of the Christian religion which occurr in the N.T. were expressive of certain dispositions and privileges belonging to the sincere professor of the Gospel. SEE CHRISTIANS; SEE DISCIPLE.

## Mathew, Father Theobald[[@Headword:Mathew, Father Theobald]]

             the celebrated apostle of temperance, a Catholic priest, was born in the county Tipperary, Ireland, Oct. 10, 1790; was educated at the Roman Catholic seminary in Maynooth; was appointed, after his ordination, to a missionary charge at Cork, where he established a charitable association on the model of that of St. Vincent de Paul. About 1838 he became president of a temperance society, and in a few months administered the pledge to  150,000 persons in Cork alone. He afterwards visited different parts of Ireland, the cities of London, Manchester, and Liverpool, and the United States of America, and was everywhere received with enthusiasm. For these eminent services in the cause of religion and morality, queen Victoria bestowed upon father Matthew an annuity of £500. He died Dec. 6, 1856, at Queenstown. Ireland. See Maguire, Father Mathew, a Biography (Lond. 1863); Morris, Memoirs of the Life of Theobald Mathew (New York, 1841); Henshaw, Life of Father Mathew (New York, 1849), s.v.; Harriet Martineau, Biographical Sketches, (1869); Fraser's Magazine for January, 1841; Thomas Dict. Biog. and Mythol. s.v.

## Mathews, James M., D.D.[[@Headword:Mathews, James M., D.D.]]

             minister of the (Dutch) Reformed Church, was born in Salem, N. Y., in 1785; graduated at Union College in 1803; at the Seminary of the Associate Reformed Church in 1807; was licensed to preach the Gospel by the Associate Reformed Presbytery in New York in 1807; became assistant professor in the theological seminary of his great preceptor, Rev. Dr. John M. Mason, in 1809, and continued there until 1818. After supplying the South Dutch Church in Garden Street, New York, for one year, he became its pastor in 1812, and retained that relation until 1840. Thereafter he never again took a pastoral charge. He was the principal founder of the University of the City of New York, and was its first chancellor — 1831 to 1819. The elegant marble edifice of the university and the adjoining Reformed church on Washington Square are monuments of his architectural taste and liberal projects. Dr. Mathews published, in addition to various occasional pamphlets, a book of Autobiographical Recollections, a volume of lectures On the Relations of Science to Christianity, and another on The Bible and Men of Learning (1855). He was a man of noble presence and courtly manners, scholarly in his tastes and habits, a powerful preacher, and fertile in large plans of Christian usefulness. His last labors were given for many months before his decease to preparations for an evangelical council, held in New York, composed of representatives from most of the American churches, and over which he presided, in October, 1869. He was a zealous advocate of the Evangelical Alliance, and of other forms of Christian union; and it is believed that his latest efforts in this cause exhausted his strength and hastened his end. Dr. Mathews was naturally a leader of men. His learning was extensive, his tact and skill were great, and his zeal was ardent. Associated with prominent men and events for more than threescore years, he bore an active part in  nearly all of the great religious and philanthropic movements of our country during this period. He died January, 1870, after a brief illness, in the city of New York, where his life was spent. (W. J. R. T.)

## Mathieu, Jacques Marie Adrien Cesaire[[@Headword:Mathieu, Jacques Marie Adrien Cesaire]]

             a French prelate, was born at Paris, January 26, 1796. He first studied law, but afterwards betook himself to the study of theology, entered the seminary of St. Sulpice, was ordained priest, and became secretary to the bishop ῥof Envreux in 1823. In 1833 he was appointed bishop of Langres, and in the following year he was raised to the archiepiscopal see of Besanoni. In 1850 he was made cardinal. As a member of the senate he was a zealous defender of the rights of the Church, and, in spite of the. interdict of the government, he published the papal encyclical of December 8, 1864. Mathieu died at Besancon in 1875. Of his brochures we especially mention Le Pounvoir Temporel des Papes Justifie par l'Histoire (1863). See Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Mathilda[[@Headword:Mathilda]]

             a Roman Catholic saint, and queen of Germany, was born in Westphalia, towards the close of the 9th century. She was the daughter of Theodoric. count of Oldenburg, a descendant of the famed Wittikind, and of a princess of Denmark. She was educated by her grandmother, abbess of the convent of Herword. In 909 she was married to Henry, afterwards king of Germany. On the throne she preserved the piety and simplicity which distinguished her from her youth. A great part of her time was spent in prayer. She gave liberally to the poor, whom she often nursed herself. She had three sons: the emperor Otho the Great; Henry, duke of Bavaria; and Bruno, archbishop of Cologne. One of her daughters, Hecdwige, was married to Hugh the Great, duke of France, and became mother of Hugh Capet. After the death of her husband, Otho and Henry of Bavaria quarreled concerning the crown of Germany. Henry, for whom his mother showed great partiality on this occasion, having subsequently become reconciled with Otho, joined him in despoiling Mathilda of her dowry and of all her possessions, under pretense that she was squandering the money of the state in giving alms to the poor. Her property was, however, subsequently returned to her through the interference of Edith, wife of Otho. The remainder of her life was passed in meditation and works of charity. She founded several convents, and died at Quedlinburg, March 14, 968. See Acta Sanctorum, March 14; Baillet, Vie des Saints; Mabillon, Saecula Ordinis Benedictorum; Schwarz, De Mathilda, abbatissa Quedlimburgensi (Altdorf, 1736, 4to); Breitenbatch, Leben d. Kaiserin Mathilde (Reval, 1780, 8vo); Treitschke, Heinrich I und Mathilde (Lpz. 1814, 8vo); Mathilde Gemahlin Heinrichs I (Augsburg, 1832, 8vo). — Herzog, Real-Encyklopadie, 9:161; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 34:250. (J. N. P.)

## Mathilda Countess Of Tuscany[[@Headword:Mathilda Countess Of Tuscany]]

             well known in history through her close political connection with pope Gregory VII (q.v.), was a daughter of Boniface, count of Tuscany, and was born in 1046. She is said to have married Godfrey (surnamed Il Gobbo, or the “Hunchback”), duke of Lorraine, in 1069, by procuration;  but, if so, her husband did not make his appearance in Italy until four years after the wedding ceremony, and the two, if they were ever united, soon afterwards separated. Godfrey went back to his duchy, and became a supporter of the emperor Henry IV, while Mathilda made herself conspicuous by the zeal with which she espoused the cause of Gregory VII. She became his inseparable associate, was ever ready to assist him in all he undertook, and to share every danger from which she could not protect him. In 1077, when Henry had suddenly made his appearance in Italy, and Gregory was fearing for his safety, she gave the pontiff shelter in her own castle. This intimacy of Mathilda with the pope has given rise to much scandal, though every unprejudiced mind will clear both of the guilt they stand accused of. Both the countess and the vicar were pure in character. if their correspondence may serve as an index of their thoughts. (See on this point Neander, Ch. Hist. 4:113, 86.) In 1079 Mathilda made a gift of all her goods and possessions to the Church. In 1081 she alone stood by the pope, when Henry poured his troops into Italy, burning to avenge his humiliation at Canossa; she supported him with money when he was besieged in Rome; and after his death at Salerno boldly carried on the war against the emperor. She died at the Benedictine monastery of Polirone in 1115. Her death gave rise to new feuds between the emperor and pope Paschal III on account of her gift to the Church, which finally resulted in the former wresting from the latter a portion of Mathilda's possessions, but even what remained constituted nearly the whole of the subsequent “Patrimony of Peter.” See PATRIMONIUM PETRI. (J. H. W.)

## Mathurins[[@Headword:Mathurins]]

             or BRETHREN OF THE HOLY TRINITY, an order of monks which arose at the end of the 12th century, and got this name from having a church at Paris which claims St. Mathurin for its patron saint. All their churches were dedicated to the Holy Trinity. Sometimes they are called Brethren of the Redemption of Captives, because, originating at the period of the Crusades, they gave their labor and a third of their revenue to liberate Christian captives from Mohammedan masters. Their founders were two French recluses in the diocese of Mileaux — Jean de Mattia and Felix de Valois. By some they seem to have been called the Order of Asses, as they were permitted to use those animals only, and were debarred from riding on horses. A similar order was founded in Spain in 1228, and there called the Order of St. Mary. SEE TRINITARIANS.

## Mathurists[[@Headword:Mathurists]]

             SEE TRINITARIANS.

## Mathusala[[@Headword:Mathusala]]

             (Luk 3:37). SEE METHUSELAH.

## Matins, Or Matutina[[@Headword:Matins, Or Matutina]]

             the “new morning service,” or the first of the morning services, and so called in contradistinction from the “old morning service,” which was before day, whereas this was after day began. Cassian says this was first set up in Bethlehem. for till that time the old morning service used to end with the nocturnal psalms, and prayers, and daily vigils; after which they used to betake themselves to rest till the third hour, which was the first hour of diurnal prayer. The name for morning prayer, in more modern Church- language, is matins. Before the Reformation the hours of prayer were seven in number, namely, matins, the first or prime, the third, sixth, and ninth hours, and vespers, and compline. The office of matins in the Church of England is an abridgment of her ancient services for matins, lauds, and prime. Ritualists divide the office of matins, or morning prayers, into three parts: first, the introduction, which extends from the beginning of the office to the end of the Lord's Prayer; secondly, the psalmody and lessons, extending to the end of the Apostles' Creed; thirdly, the prayers and collects, which occupy the remainder of the service. See Farrar, Eccles. Dict. s.v.; Eadie, Eccles. Dict. s.v.; Neale, Introd. East. Church. SEE HOURS, CANONICAL.

## Matlack, Lucius C., D.D[[@Headword:Matlack, Lucius C., D.D]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Baltimore, Maryland, April 28, 1816. He was converted when sixteen years of age: licensed to preach in 1837, but refused admittance the same year and also the one following into the Philadelphia Conference, on account of his anti-slavery sentiments; in 1840 was admitted into the New England Conference; in 1842 withdrew from the Methodist Episcopal Church and joined in the organization of the Wesleyan Methodist Connection; was admitted into the Philadelphia Conference in 1867, and labored successfully until his death, at Cambridge, Maryland, June 24, 1883. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1884, page 79; Simpson, Cyclop. of Methodism, s.v.

## Matred[[@Headword:Matred]]

             (Heb. Matred', מִטְרֵד, propelling; Sept. Ματραϊvθ, Ματράθ), the daughter of Mezahab and mother of Mehetabel, which last was wife of one of the Edomitish kings (Gen 36:39; 1Ch 1:50). B.C. prob. ante 1619.

## Matri[[@Headword:Matri]]

             (Heb. Matri', מִטְרַי[but with the def. art.], prob. expectant; Sept. Ματταρί, Vulg. Metri), a Benjamite, the head of the ancestry of Kish, the father of Saul (1Sa 10:21). B.C. prob. cir. 1612.

## Matricula[[@Headword:Matricula]]

             a list or register of the church, called in Greek κανών and κατάλογος ἱερατικός; in Latin, album, matricula, tabula clericorum. The use of the word matricula to designate entry at college or university record of a new student is due to this early adaptation of the word. Because the names of all the clergy and other persons were enrolled in the matricula, they were called canonici. — Farrar, Eccles. Dict. s.v.; Eadie, Eccles. ict. s.v. SEE CANONICI; SEE DIPTYCHS.

## Matricularii[[@Headword:Matricularii]]

             subordinate servants of the clergy, who were entrusted with the care of the church in which they were accustomed to sleep: they had also offices to perform in public processions. — Farrar, Eccles. Dict. s.v.; Eadie, Eccles. Dict. s.v. SEE SACRISTAN.

## Matrimony Or Marriage[[@Headword:Matrimony Or Marriage]]

             as A SACRAMENT. The Church of Rome regards the act of matrimony not only as a religious contract, but also as a sacrament. We need hardly step aside to explain the meaning of the word sacrament, but it may be proper here to say that the Romanists hold seven sacraments as established by the Council of Trent, teaching also that “each sacrament confers grace peculiar to itself, so that it has the special effect of conferring grace subservient to that end.” This distinction is called by the divines “sacramental grace.” SEE SACRAMENT.

The clergy of the Church of England of High-Church tendency incline to hold a like view on this point, but there is certainly nothing in the XXXIX Articles to warrant any such interpretation of the marriage-contract. The Roman view of marriage is based by the school men on the expression of Paul in writing to the Ephesians (Eph 5:32), τὸ μνστήριον τοῦτο μέγα ἐστίν, or, as it runs in the Vulgate, “Sacramentum hoc magnum est.” “Thus viewed, the external part or sign, the ‘pars sensibilis' is the expression of a mutual consent involving, as is necessary in all sacramental ordinances, a real present intention; and the inward part or gift is the grace which unites the hearts, or, according to another view, the grace to resist concupiscence, sometimes entirely, judging by St. Thomas Aquinas's remark that carnal intercourse is not a necessary part of marriage, because there was none in Paradise.” The following more general considerations are also urged from Scripture in favor of the sacramental theory: “the union between the husband and wife  is spoken of as analogous to the union between Christ and the Church. The husband is the head of the wife even as Christ is the head of the Church; therefore, as the Church is subject unto Christ, so let the wives be to their own husbands in everything (Eph 5:23-24). Now if this figure has any meaning it must be this, that the external sign of alliance between bride and bridegroom signify that there should henceforth exist between them a union as holy, as close, and as indissoluble as that between Christ and the Church, a union which could not be maintained without a special gift from God. That such a gift exists is made evident by Paul, who says, while drawing a comparison between marriage and celibacy, ‘Every man hath his proper gift of God, one after this manner and another after that' (1Co 7:7); and what would the gift be which is alluded to in the case of married persons but the grace which unites their hearts, and enables them to be fitting emblems of Christ and the Church? Again, the presence of our Lord at the marriage in Cana of Galilee (Joh 2:1-11) is sometimes referred to as having elevated the ceremony into the dignity of a sacrament” (Blunt, Dict. of Theol. s.v.).

Those who regard marriage as a sacrament are not themselves agreed as to what is the essential part of matrimony constituting it a sacrament. The prevailing opinion we take to be that the essential part, as well as the efficient cause, is the consent of the two parties, which must be expressed in words as the “pars sensibilis” of the sacrament, and must imply a real present, and not a future consent. There are others who would make the words of the priest the essential element whereby the marriage union is created, “Ego vos in matrimonium conjungo,” etc.; in the English office, “Those whom God has joined together let no man put asunder,” followed by the declaration of complete union, “I pronounce that they be man and wife together, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.” If the previous consent had made the two persons man and wife, these words on the priest's lips would seem to be, strictly speaking, superfluous. From primitive times it has been the custom to acquaint the Church beforehand with an intended marriage, which is evident from the passages above quoted. The object was to prevent unlawful marriage; not that the Church claimed any absolute power to grant or refuse leave to marry, but that in case a person was about to marry a Jew, or a heathen, or a heretic, or one within the forbidden degrees of consanguinity, etc., the marriage might be prevented, or at, least not obtain the sanction of the Church. The earliest allusion to the necessity of such notice in England is  contained in the eleventh canon of the Synod of Westminster (A.D. 1200), which enacts that no marriage shall be contracted without banns thrice published in church (Johnson, Canons, 2:91). SEE BANN.

The existing law of the Church of England is expressed in the sixty-second canon: “No minister, upon pain of suspension ‘per triennium ipso facto,' shall celebrate matrimony between any persons without a faculty or license granted by some of the persons in these our constitutions expressed, except the banns of matrimony have been first published three several Sundays or holy-days in the time of divine service in the parish churches and chapels where the said parties dwell, according to the book of Common Prayer.” The only substitute for banns recognized by the Church of England is an ordinary or special license. The power of granting the former has belonged to English bishops from a very early date, being confirmed to them by 25 Henry VIII, c. 21. The right to grant special licenses, which are free from all restrictions as to time or place, was originally a privilege of the archbishop of Canterbury, as “legatus natus.” The ritual of the Church of Rome teaches that “the end of the sacrament of marriage is that man and wife may mutually help and comfort each other, in order that they may spend this life in a holy manner, and thereby gain a blessed immortality; and to contribute to the edification of the Church by the lawful procreation of children, and by the care of procuring them a spiritual regeneration, and an education suitable to it. Every person, before entering into wedlock, is required to beseech God to join him with such a person as he may work out his salvation with, and examine whether or no the person he has fixed his affections on has the fear of God before her eyes; is prudent, discreet, and able to take care of a family.”

The Council of Trent, at its twenty-fourth session, held Nov. 11 1563, legislated upon the subject of matrimony in twelve canons, as follows:

“Canon 1. Whoever shall affirm that matrimony is not truly and properly one of the seven sacraments of the evangelical law, instituted by Christ our Lord, but that it is a human invention, introduced into the Church, and does not confer grace: let him be accursed.

“2. Whoever shall affirm that Christians may have more wives than one, and that this is prohibited by no divine law; let hill be accursed.

“3. Whoever shall affirm that only those degrees of consanguinity or affinity which are mentioned in the book of Leviticus can hinder or disannul the marriage contract; and that the Church has no power to  dispense with some of them, or to constitute additional hinderances or reasons for disannulling the contract; let him be accursed.

“4. Whoever shall affirm that the Church cannot constitute any impediments, with power to disamnnul matrimony, or that in constituting them she has erred; let him be accursed.

“5. Whoever shall affirm that the marriage-bond may be dissolved by heresy, or mutual dislike, or voluntary absence from the husband or wife; let him be accursed.

“6. Whoever shall affirm that a marriage solemnized but not consummated is not disannulled if one of the parties enters into a religious order; let him be accursed.

“7. Whoever shall affirm that the Church has erred in teaching, according to the evangelical and apostolic doctrine, that the marriage-bond cannot be dissolved by the adultery of one of the parties, and that neither of them, not even the innocent party, who has given no occasion for the adultery, can contract another marriage while the other party lives; and that the husband who puts away his adulterous wife, and marries another, commits adultery, and also the wife who puts away her adulterous husband, and marries another (whoever shall affirm that the Church has erred in maintaining these sentiments); let him be accursed.

“8. Whoever shall affirm that the Church has erred in decreeing that fir various reasons married persons may be separated, as far as regards actual cohabitation, either for a certain or an uncertain time; let him be accursed.

“9. Whoever shall affirm that persons in holy orders, or regulars, who have made a solemn profession of chastity, may contract marriage, and that the contract is valid, notwithstanding any ecclesiastical law or vow; and that to maintain the contrary is nothing less than to condemn marriage; and that all persons may marry who feel that, though they should make a vow of chastity; they have not the gift thereof; let him be accursed; for God does not deny his gifts to those who ask aright, neither does he stiffer us to be tempted above that we are able.

“10. Whoever shall affirm that the conjugal state is to be preferred to a life of virginity, of celibacy, and that it is not better and more conducive to happiness to remain in virginity, or celibacy, than to be married; let him be accursed.

“11. Whoever shall affirm that to prohibit the solemnization of marriage at certain seasons of the year is a tyrannical superstition, borrowed from the superstition of the pagans; or shall condemn the benedictions and other ceremonies used by the Church at those times; let him be accursed.

“12. Whoever shall affirm that matrimonial causes do not belong to the ecclesiastical judges; let him be accursed.”

Marriage as a Sacrament unbiblical. —

1. In many most important points respecting marriage, Protestants and Roman Catholics agree; yet, when the Church of Rome advances matrimony to a sacrament instituted by Christ, and endows it with sacramental qualities, there are several points of considerable importance to Christianity in which Protestant and Romanist must disagree. The latter asserts that matrimony as a sacrament was instituted by Christ, and confers grace, and supports this dogma by quoting Eph 5:32 : “This is a great μυστήριον; but I speak in Christ and in the Church,” where the Douay translation renders by sacrament the word μυστήριον, which we Protestants prefer to translate mystery. “Or, indeed, if we render the word ‘sacrament,' still they have no advantage, inasmuch as the original word μυστήριον, ‘mystery,' which they read ‘sacrament,' is employed on other subjects as ‘mystery of godliness' (1Ti 3:16), ‘a mystery, Babylon the great' (Rev 17:5). Papists must know that there is no force in their argument. The text, as found in their version, can only influence the minds of ignorant persons, who know not the Scriptures. The apostle does not say that marriage is a mystery, for he speaks concerning Christ and the Church. It is acknowledged that marriage is instituted of God, and is a sign of a holy thing, yet it is no sacrament; the Sabbath was ordained of God, and signified the rest in Christ (Heb 4:8), yet it was no sacrament. All significant and mystic signs are not necessarily sacraments” (Elliott, Romanism, p. 428). “Romanists,” says the same able polemic whom we have just had occasion to cite, “further quote the following passage to support their doctrine: ‘She shall be saved in childbearing, if they continue in faith and love' (1Ti 2:15), inferring that the grace of sanctification is given to the parties married. To this we answer:

(1.) We deny that any sacraments give or confer grace; they are only means or instruments of its communication.

(2.) It is allowed that God does give to pious married persons grace to live in piety and holiness; but it is unnecessary to constitute marriage into a sacrament for this purpose.

(3.) Those who are not married may possess the sanctifying grace of God, which is sufficient to preserve all in a state of inward as well as outward holiness.”

2. That marriage is no sacrament of the Gospel, speaking of such an institution in its proper scriptural acceptation, may be proved by the following arguments:

(1.) Matrimony was instituted in Paradise long before sin had entered, therefore it cannot be a sacrament of the Gospel; marriage is observed among infidels and wicked persons, who are incapable of receiving worthily the sacraments of the Church.

(2.) Papists are inconsistent with themselves in calling marriage a profanation of orders; some with consummate effrontery assert that to live in a state of concubinage is more tolerable for a priest than to marry. Can they really believe marriage to be a sacrament, which they contemn as vile and polluted? Pope Siricius applied the words of St. Paul, “They that are in the flesh cannot please God,” in favor of the celibacy of the clergy — thus proving that this pope, in common with many other pontiffs, knew but little of scriptural interpretation, seeing the reference is plainly to deep human depravity and wickedness, but not to the marriage state.

(3.) In every sacrament there must be an external sensible sign as the matter, and an appropriate order of words as the form; but in matrimony there is neither, therefore it is no sacrament.

(4.) Again, none but pious persons can be partakers of the sacraments of the Church; but piety is not a necessary condition of marriage, therefore marriage is not a sacrament. The conditions of confession and absolution. which are sometimes enjoined in the Church of Rome, cannot be pleaded as teaching that piety is required of those who are to be married; for confession and absolution are no proper concomitants of true piety, seeing the greatest part of those who confess and receive absolution are no otherwise religious than as members of the Church of Rome, and membership in that community is rather a presumption against, than in favor of true religion. It does not alter the case to introduce the distinctions  which have been made by their theologians, namely, that marriage is often a civil or natural contract, and not a sacrament. This distinction is founded on mere technicalities, and not on any scriptural authority, either direct or inferential.

3. It is necessary, as they acknowledge, that a sacrament should be instituted by Christ; but matrimony was not instituted by him. therefore, according to their own rule, it is no sacrament. It is in vain for them to say that Christ instituted the sacrament of marriage, when they are unable to produce the words of institution, or to adduce a single circumstance connected with its institution. It is true, the Council of Trent most positively, in their first canon, affirm that Christ did institute the sacrament of matrimony; but then neither chapter nor verse is given to prove the fact. Indeed, so divided among themselves are they respecting the time in which Christ converted matrimony into a sacrament, that the most discordant opinions exist. Let the Roman Catholic Dens speak on the subject: “Some,” says he, “say that it was instituted when Christ was present at the marriage in Cana of Galilee, which he is said to honor with his presence and bless it (John 2); according to others, when Christ, revoking matrimony to its primeval unity and indissolubleness, rejecting the bill of divorce, said, ‘What Gohatath joined together, let not man put asunder' (Matthew 19); but others refer its institution to the time of the forty days between the resurrection and ascension, during which Christ often taught his apostles concerning the kingdom of God, or his Church; others say the time is uncertain.” Thus the institution of marriage as a sacrament cannot be discovered by their ablest divines. The Council of Trent is unable to find the place where Christ established it; the Roman Catechism adroitly evades this point, and leaves the matter in the same uncertainty as it found it. We therefore hesitate not to affirm that, although marriage was originally instituted by Almighty God, recognised by Christ, and its duties explained and enforced by the apostles, nevertheless its institution as a sacrament cannot be found in any part of the New Testament. See, besides, Elliott's Delineation of Romanism, ch. 16; Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctrines (see Index, vol. 2); Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lexikon, art. Ehe; Herzog, Real-Encyklopädie, art. Ehe. SEE CELIBACY; SEE DISPENSATION; SEE DIVORCE; SEE MARRIAGE; SEE SACRAMENT.

## Matrinae[[@Headword:Matrinae]]

             SEE GODMOTHERS.

## Matrix Ecclesia[[@Headword:Matrix Ecclesia]]

             SEE ECCLESIA.

## Matsya[[@Headword:Matsya]]

             a Sanscrit word, signifying a fish, and forming the name, in Hindu mythology, of the first avatar of Vishnu. On that occasion the preserving deity is said to have assumed the form of a great fish shining like gold, and, according to one account, “extending a million leagues,” that he might protect the ark which contained Satyavrata and the seven Rhisis with their wives, all the rest of the human race having been destroyed by the deluge. SEE MOOR, Hind Pantheon, s.v.; Thomas, Dict. of Biog, and Mythol. s.v.

## Matsyavatara[[@Headword:Matsyavatara]]

             in Hindi mythology, is the incarnation of Vishnu as a fish, the Majafish, with the surname Cexis. The fable is told as follows: Brahma had fallen asleep; the giant Hajagriwa stole from the sleeping god the four Vedas, the laws of the world, and the lawless world now sank into the kingdom of evil. Then Vishnu saved the world in the form of a fish, by following the giant, who hid under the sea, and compelling him to surrender the books.

## Mattan[[@Headword:Mattan]]

             (Heb. Mattan', מִתָּן, a gift, as in Gen 34:12, etc.), the name of two men in the Old Testament and one in the New. SEE MITHNITE.

1. (Sept. Μαθάν, Ματθάν v. r. Μαγθάν and Μαχάν.) The priest of Baal slain before his idolatrous altar during the reformation instituted by Jehoiada (2Ki 11:18; 2Ch 23:17). B.C. 876. “He probably accompanied Athaliah from Samaria, and would thus be the first priest of the Baal-worship which Jehoram, king of Judah, following the steps of his father-in-law Ahab, established at Jerusalem (2Ch 21:6; 2Ch 21:13). Josephus (Ant. 9:7, 3) calls him Μααθάν” (Smith).

2. (Sept. Ναθάν v. r. Μαθάν.) The father of the Shephatiah who was one of the nobles that charged Jeremiah with treason (Jer 38:1). B.C. ante 589.

3. (Ματθάν, Auth.Vers. “Matthan”.) The son of Eleazar and father of Jacob, which last was father of Joseph, the husband of the Virgin Mary (Mat 1:15). According to tradition he was a priest (which disagrees with his tribal descent), and father of Anna, the mother of the same Mary (Niceph. Hist. Ev. 2:3). B.C. considerably ante 40. SEE GENEALOGY OF JESUS CHRIST.

## Mattanah[[@Headword:Mattanah]]

             (Heb. ilattanah', מִתָּנָה, a gift, as in Gen 25:6, etc.; Sept. Μανθαναείν), the fifty-third station of the Israelites on the south-eastern  edge of Palestine, between the well (Beer) in the desert and Nahaliel (Num 21:18-19). It was no doubt a Moabitish, or rather Ammonitish city, and is placed by Eussebius and Jerome (Onomast. s.v.) in the region of Arnon, twelve miles eastward of Medebah, which Hengstenberg corrects to “southward” (Bileam, p. 240), i.e. apparently in the plain of Ard Ramadan, perhaps between the branches of wady Waleh. Leclerc (ad loc.) suggests that Mattanah may be the same with the mysterious word Vaheb (Num 21:14; A.V. “what he did”), since the meaning of that word in Arabic is the same as that of Mattanah in Hebrew. This is nearly the same with the explanation of the Targums of Onkelos and Pseudo-Jonathan, who make it an appellative for the well or Beer just mentioned, as being a gift of God (see Kennicott, Remarks on O.T. p. 60). SEE EXODE.

## Mattaniah[[@Headword:Mattaniah]]

             (Heb. Mattanyah', מִתִּנְיָה, gift of Jehovah, also in the prolonged form Mattanya'hul, מִתִּנְיָהוּ, 1Ch 25:4; 1Ch 25:16; 2Ch 29:13; Sept. Ματθανίας or Ματθανία v. r. Μαθθάν and Βατθανίας), the name of several men.

1. A Levite, one of the sons of Heman, appointed by David Temple singers, and head of the ninth class of musicians (1Ch 25:4; 1Ch 25:16). B.C. 1014. He is possibly the same with the father of Jeiel, and ancestor of the Jahaziel who predicted Jehoshaphat's victory over the Moabites (2Ch 20:14).

2. A Levite of the descendants of Asaph, who assisted in purifying the Temple at the reformation undertaken by Hezekiah (2Ch 29:13). B.C. 726.

3. The original name of ZEDEKIAH SEE ZEDEKIAH (q.v.), the last king of Judah (2Ki 24:17). In like manner Pharach had changed the name of his brother Eliakim to Jehoiakim on a similar occasion (2Ki 23:34), when he restored the succession to the elder branch of the royal family (comp. 2Ki 23:31; 2Ki 23:36).

4. An Israelite of the “sons” (residents) of Elam, who divorced his Gentile wife after the captivity (Ezr 10:26). B.C. 459.

5. Another Israelite of the “sons” (residents) of Zattu, who did the same (Ezr 10:27). B.C. 459.

6. Another Israelite of the “sons” (i.e. inhabitants) of Pahath-Moab, who did likewise (Ezr 10:30). B.C. 459.

7. Another Israelite of the descendants (or residents) of Bani, who acted similarly (Ezr 10:37). B.C. 459.

8. A descendant of Asalph (but named as one of “the priests' sons,” i.e. perhaps assistants, for Asaph was only a Levite), and great-grandfather of the Zechariah who assisted in celebrating upon trumpets the completion of the walls of Jerusalem (Neh 12:35). B.C. much ante 446. His father's name, Michaiah, and grandfather's, Zaccur, present features of identity with Nos. 9 and 10, but in other respects the notices are different. Some interpreters suspect a corruption of the text, and in that case all discrepancies may be removed.

9. A Levite, son of Micah, of the family of Asaph, resident in the neighborhood of Jerusalem after the exile (1Ch 9:15). B.C. cir. 440. He is evidently the same with the leader of those who offered prayer and praise in the Temple after the captivity (Neh 11:17; Neh 12:8), and also guarded the gates (Neh 12:25). He also appears to be the same with the father of Hashabiah and great-grandfather of Uzzi, mentioned as one of the chief Levites in the same connection (Neh 12:22), but in that case he must have been a very aged man at the time. See also No. 8.

10. A Levite; father of Zaccur, and grandfather of the Hanan whom Nehemiah set over the distribution of the tithes (Neh 13:13). B.C. considerably ante 410. See also No. 8.

## Mattatha[[@Headword:Mattatha]]

             (Luk 3:31). SEE MATTATHIAH, 1.

## Mattathah[[@Headword:Mattathah]]

             (Heb. Mattathah', , מִתִּתָה, probably a contraction of Mattathiah), the name of a person in the Old Test. and of another in the New.  1. (Ματταθά, Auth. Vers. “Mattatha.”) The son of Nathan and grandson of David, among Christ's maternal ancestry (Luk 3:31). B.C. post 1014.

2. (Sept. Μαθθαθά v. r. Ματθαθά .) An Israelite of the “sons” (i.e. inhabitants) of Hashun, who divorced his Gentile wife after the return from Babylon (Ezr 10:33). B.C. 458.

## Mattathias[[@Headword:Mattathias]]

             (Ματταθίας), the Greek form of MATTATHIAH SEE MATTATHIAH (q.v.), and standing for several persons in the Apocrypha and New Test.

1. One who supported Ezra in reading the law (1Es 9:43), the MATTITHIAH of Neh 8:4.

2. The father of the Maccabmean brothers (1Ma 2:1; 1Ma 2:14; 1Ma 2:16-17; 1Ma 2:19; 1Ma 2:24; 1Ma 2:27; 1Ma 2:39; 1Ma 2:45; 1Ma 2:49; 1Ma 14:29). SEE MACCABEE.

3. The son of Absalom and brother of the Maccabean Jonathan, the high- priest (1Ma 11:70; 1Ma 13:11). In the battle fought by the latter with the forces of Demetrius on the plain of Nasor (the old Hazor), his two generals Mattathias and Judas alone stood by him when his army was seized with a panic and fled, and with their assistance the fortunes of the day were restored.

4. The son of Simon Maccabueus, who was treacherously murdered, together with his father and brother, in the fortress of Docus, by Ptolemueus, the son of Abubus (1Ma 16:14). SEE MACCABEE.

5. One of the three envoys sent by Nicanor to treat with Judas Maccabueus (2Ma 14:19). SEE MACCABEE.

6. Son of Amos, in the genealogy of Jesus Christ (Luk 3:25). 7. Son of Semei, in the same catalogue (Luk 3:26). For both these last, SEE MATTITHIAH, 5, 6.

## Mattei[[@Headword:Mattei]]

             MARIUS, a noted Roman Catholic prelate, lately the presiding officer of the College of Cardinals at Rome, and in ecclesiastical dignity ranked next to the pope himself, was born at Pergola, States of the Church, Sept. 6, 1792; was educated at Rome, and entered the priesthood in 1814. In 1832 he  received his appointment as cardinal. In December, 1860, he became the bishop of Ostia and legate of Velletri. Among other eminent distinctions, he held the post of “archpriest” to the Church of the Vatican, and was the prefect of the commission for the preservation of St. Peter's Church. He died Oct. 8, 1870. Cardinal Mattei was a great favorite of pope Pius IX, and owed most of his distinctions to his friend “the infallible.”

## Matteis (Or Mattei)[[@Headword:Matteis (Or Mattei)]]

             PAOLO, an Italian painter and engraver, was born near Naples in 1662, and died in 1728. Among his masterpieces are the pictures of the “Savior and St. Gaetano,” in the church of St. Paul at Pistoia, and the “Meeting of Erminia and the Shepherds,” in the Museum of Vienna. See Lanzi, History of Painting in Italy.

## Mattenai[[@Headword:Mattenai]]

             (Heb. Mattenay', מִתְּנִי, prob. contracted for Mattaniah; Sept. Μαθθαναϊv, Ματθαναϊv, the name of three men after the exile.

1. An Israelite of the “sons” (citizens) of Hashun, who divorced his Gentile wife after the return from Babylon (Ezr 10:33). B.C. 459.

2. Another Israelite of the “sons” (or inhabitants) of Bani, who did the same (Ezr 10:37). B.C. 459.

3. A priest, “son” (descendant or representative) of Joiarib, among those last registered in the Old Test. (Neh 12:19). B.C. post 536.

## Matter[[@Headword:Matter]]

             as opposed to mind or spirit (q.v.), is that which occupies space, and with which we become acquainted by means of our bodily senses or organs. Everything of which we have any knowledge is either matter or mind, i.e. spirit. Mind is that which knows and thinks. Matter is that which makes itself known to mind by certain properties. “The first form which matter assumes is extension, or length, breadth, and thickness; it then becomes body. If body were infinite there could be no figure, which is body bounded. But body is not physical body, unless it partake of or is constituted of one or more of the elements, fire, air, earth, or water” (Monboddo, Ancient Metaphys. b. 2, c. 2). According to Des Cartes the essence of mind is thought, and the essence of matter is extension. He said,  Give me extension and motion, and I shall make the world. Leibnitz said the essence of all being, whether mind or matter, is force. Matter is an assemblage of simple forces or monads. His system of physics may be called dynamical, in opposition to that of Newton, which may be called mechanical; because Leibnitz held that the monads possessed a vital or living energy. We may explain the phenomena of matter by the movements of ether, by gravity and electricity; but the ultimate reason of all movement is a force primitively communicated at creation, a force which is everywhere, but which, while it is present in all bodies, is differently limited; and this force, this virtue or power of action, is inherent in all substances material and spiritual. Created substances received from the creative substance not only the faculty to act, but also to exercise their activity each after its own manner. See Leibnitz, De Primae Philosophiae Emendatione et de Notione Substantia, or Nouveau Systeme de la Nature et de la Communication des Substances, in the Journal des Savans, 1695. On the various hypotheses to explain the activity of matter, see Stewart (Outlines, pt. 2, ch. 2, sect. 1, and Act. and Mor. Pow. last edit., vol. 2, note A). SEE PERCEPTION.

The properties which have been predicated as essential to matter are impenetrability, extension, divisibility, inertia, weight. To the senses it manifests color, sound, smell, taste, heat, and motion; and by observation it is discovered to possess elasticity, electricity, magnetism, etc. Metaphysicians have distinguished the qualities of matter into primary and secondary, and have said that our knowledge of the former, as of impenetrability and extension, is clear and absolute; while our knowledge of the latter, as of sound and smell, is obscure and relative. This distinction taken by Des Cartes, adopted by Locke and also by Reid and Stewart, was rejected by Kant, according to whom, indeed, all our knowledge is relative. Others who do not doubt the objective reality of matter, hold that our knowledge of all its qualities is the same in kind. See the distinctions precisely stated and strenuously upheld by Sir William Hamilton (Reid's Works, note D), and ingeniously controverted by Mons. Emilie Saisset, in Dict. des Sciences Philosoph. art. “Matiere.” SEE MATERIALISM.

The metaphysical history of this term, like that of most others, begins with Aristotle; its theological significance may be said to begin with the first two verses of Genesis. Three questions of theological as well as philosophical interest grow out of this subject.  I. Popular language, in spite of Berkeley's own appeal to popular opinion, must be admitted to be framed on the hypothesis that matter exists in itself, independently of any mind perceiving it; and theologians have in general been content to accept popular language on the point, so that the language of theologians represents the popular opinion. But as Berkeley's system does not, when understood, contradict any of the ordinary facts of experience, so the language of theologians, like that of other non- Berkeleyans, does not become meaningless in consequence of the system being accepted. For a system invented or advanced from a theological motive, it affects theology singularly little.

It can hardly be denied, that a belief in the reality of matter, however reality may be defined, is necessary to orthodox Christianity. The narrative of the Creation becomes meaningless, or at least deceptive, if the things created be no more than “permanent possibilities of sensation,” things that would be perceived, or rather groups of phenomena that would make impressions, if there were any minds placed ready to observe them, which there are not; and, to tell the truth, even Berkeley's system confuses or obscures the notion of creation. The existence of a material substance means, according to him, that some mind or minds are affected with certain sensations, from a cause external to themselves. Now in this there is nothing to conflict with Christian doctrine; when we say that God created all material substances, we shall mean, on this hypothesis, that he is the sole and ultimate cause of the laws, external to created minds, whereby their consciousness is modified in the various ways which we ascribe to the presence of matter.

So far, then, all is clear. If Berkeley has not yet given any support to the doctrines of religion, he certainly has not assailed them. But when we come to the part of his theory which was to confute atheism, it is more possible to bring him into collision with that Revelation which he undertakes to defend. Matter, it is said, exists in virtue of being perceived by a mind: e.g. “my inkstand exists,” means “my mind has a group of sensations, simultaneous or successive, which I describe as seeing and feeling a glass inkstand, hearing it ring when struck or thrown down, etc., or otherwise as being conscious of the presence of a hard, smooth, round, hollow body, of a heavy, grayish, transparent substance.” But if I go out of the room, I believe that my inkstand still exists, though no longer perceived by me. What do I mean by this, on the idealistic hypothesis? We have rejected the answer, “You mean that you believe that, if you went into the room again,  you would again experience the same sensations.” In the first place, I do mean more than that, though I am unable to prove that anything more than that is true. And further, as has been said above, unless the inkstand exists when not seen, how is it true that the Creator caused the flint, sand, alkali, copper and zinc ore, etc., of which it is made, to exist ages before they were discovered I and used, and sustains the manufactured product of his works in being now?

To these objections the sensationalist has no answer: the Berkeleyan has. “When you say that the inkstand exists in your absence, you mean that when it is not perceived by your mind, it is perceived by some mind or other. Your only notion of existence (except the existence of a mind, a conscious subject) is of existence as the object of consciousness of a mind. If you believe, as you doubtless do, that matter exists absolutely, not only in relation to the finite minds that perceive it, you are bound to admit that there is an infinite mind, which always perceives all matter existent, even what is perceived by no other mind.”

Injustice is done to Berkeley by a sensationalist philosopher, if he regards the negative part of his system, the denial of an objective substratum to material phenomena, as separate from this, its positive part. Berkeley was a real idealist, not a mutilated or inconsistent sensationalist; and any one who denies an objective substratum to matter, but does not recognize its absolute existence as an object of consciousness to a necessarily existing mind, is not taking half Berkeley's system and leaving the other half, but framing a new one, suggested, it may be, by Berkeley's, but essentially different from it. His religious philosophy was not an amiable excrescence on his metaphysical, but an essential correlative to it; and therefore his system has no skeptical tendency. Neither does it seem fair to charge it with a tendency to pantheism (Mansel's Prolegomena Logica, App. B); for God is distinguished adequately, on the one hand, from the created objects, i.e. groups of ideas, which he perceives; on the other, from the created minds which he causes to perceive the same objects. But it seems doubtful whether the system, sublime as is the picture it gives of the Creator's relation to his universe, does not really, by implication, lower our view of his nature and his dealings with it.

What, on this hypothesis, do we mean when we say that God made the material world? That he caused, and, having begun, continues to cause, created intelligences to receive certain impressions, under certain laws of  sequence and coexistence. But more than this. We mean also that God himself, when he created, began to perceive certain ideas as real. Now this is almost shockingly contradictory to the generally-received notion of an eternal present in the divine mind; and it is hard to see that it does not contradict the doctrines of his eternal foreknowledge and immutability. Doubtless God began (on this hypothesis) to be conscious of the world at his own mere will, and not, as we do, from an external cause. But his nature seems lowered, if we confess that by his creating we mean that he caused certain ideas to become present to his mind, which therefore were not present to it before. We have, in fact, a curious converse of pantheism. Pantheism (as the term is commonly used) merges the personal God in union with the universe, a universe consisting of matter, or spirit, or both. Here the personality as well as the spirituality of the Eternal is preserved; but instead of his being so merged in the world as to deify it, the world is so merged in him as to introduce its own finite and mutable qualities into his nature.

Creation is a mystery on any hypothesis. On any hypothesis, God. at some finite time, came into new relations with things that are not God. He assumed new characters (as those of Creator, Preserver, Ruler, Judge) which he had not before; and we must believe this to be without any change in his nature, or even in his purpose. Whether this necessary difficulty is aggravated by the above form of stating it; whether the theory of creation in the divine mind implies more of a change of nature than that of a creation of things external to it, may be a question. It is one that at least deserves to be stated. If it be admitted that idealism is not logically opposed to Christianity on this ground, there remain only two slighter objections to it.

Existence has, on this hypothesis, a twofold aspect. Things material exist, absolutely as being perceived by God, relatively as being caused by God to be perceived by his sensitive creatures. Now if, to avoid the objection above stated, it be said that while creation existed eternally in the purpose of God, so that his works were always known to him, yet it may be said that creation had a beginning in time, when God first made it known to other intelligences than his own. In itself, no doubt, this would be inadequate as an account of creation, however fair a defense it might be against the charge of introducing change into the divine purpose or thought. And it just stops short of making the world eternal, though it comes dangerously near to it. It may be added that the hypothesis of a  subjective creation is not invented on behalf of this system. One of the recognized explanations of the double account of the creation in Genesis is that the former or Elohistic narrative describes the order in which God's purpose was made known to the holy angels, the second that in which' it was executed.

But the reality (in whatever sense) of the material universe is presupposed, not only in the doctrine of the creation, but in that of the sacraments, insomuch that “matter” is used as a technical term in relation to them, describing one of their essential requisites. Speaking generally, any hypothesis that allows the reality of matter would be sufficient, and therefore the idealistic, since it does make matter, in an intelligible sense, real. The command to use certain material substances, and the promise of certain spiritual effects to follow on their use, is not evacuated if we describe their use as “taking the known means to occasion, to our own mind and others, including the divine, certain states of consciousness.” But it seems hard to see how the theory call fail to affect the doctrine of the holy Eucharist. If the presence of a body means the fact that its bodily properties are manifest to all intelligences capable of observing them, then a presence of a body, real but not sensible, becomes self-contradictory. . If; however, the point be urged with sufficient boldness. that absolute truth is not “truth relative to all intelligences,” but truth relative to the Infinite intelligence, then it is of course possible to believe that God regards that as present which man does not recognize as present by the ordinary test of manifesting the properties, in manifesting which bodily presence consists; and this will, by an adherent of the system, be regarded as constituting a real but not sensible presence.

II. Whether matter exists only in virtue of minds to which it bears relation, or whether it exists in itself, the source of its being must be determined. For not even, if it be said that matter is a mode of the mind of a spirit, is it yet proved that matter is not self-caused or eternal: it might be a necessary mode of an eternal Spirit's thought, and so coeternal with his being. However, the motives that have led to the belief in the eternity of matter have been, in general, such as would involve a belief in its independence. It is conceding either too much or too little to make matter merely the thought of God, yet a thought which he never was without, and without which he could not have existed. Eternal matter was usually conceived as an antitheistic power, whether active or passive; sometimes so passive as to be no more than an imperfect medium for the divine operation. It is hardly  worth while to frame a system in which matter should have a subjective eternity, since such a system has never yet been received. It has already been pointed out, however, that such a system is a conceivable corollary of Berkeley's. But, supposing matter to be something external to the divine mind which (all theists will probably admit) knows or contemplates it, what is the relation between the two? Is one the work of the other, or are they both independent?

Strictly speaking, there are three possible answers to this question, viz. that matter is the product of mind, that mind is the product of matter, and that the two are independent. But the second, in this exact form, has probably never been maintained. Matter, being inactive, cannot be conceived as producing, unless it be first personified. Materialism, however, or regarding mind as a mode of matter, is a fair representative of this view. Setting this on one side, we come to the choice between the two other alternatives, that matter is the work of .mind, and that it is coeternal with mind — between theism and dualism.

The Jewish and Christian religions are theistic: most other religions of any claim to depth or speculative value are dualistic. Attempts to import dualism into Christianity have been numerous, but it has in every age been so obvious that the hybrid system was inconsistent — for if Christianity was a coherent system, its authoritative documents denounced dualism, and its instinctive consciousness rejected it — that it is unnecessary to reopen a question which is practically closed. All who claim to be, strictly speaking, theists, would now admit the prerogative of creation to belong to God in the fullest sense. It will be enough here to classify the forms of dualism which have either been opposed to the theistic doctrine of Christianity, or which it has been sought to amalgamate with it, as they refer to the subject before us, all of them being separately and fully noticed elsewhere. SEE DUALISM.

1. The Buddhistic dualism assumes two eternal and impersonal principles, matter and spirit. Finite and (eminently) human nature exists in virtue of the union or collision of the two; they are not only the good and evil, but the positive and negative elements of existence: existence consists in partaking of both, as the Hegelian system makes it consist in the union of being and nothing. The victory of the human spirit is to be free from matter, and one with all pure spirit; but since matter as well as spirit is necessary to  existence, this pure being, though not conceived as nothingness, is undistinguishable from it.

2. The Manichaean dualism (to use the name of its most famous and permanently vital form, for a system not confined to the Manichaean sect, or those affiliated to it) assumes two eternal principles, matter and spirit, of which both are more or less distinctly personified. The strange and grotesque mythology by which the Manichaeans (in the stricter sense) accounted for the intermixture of good and evil in the world, may have been meant to be understood allegorically; but this is hardly likely-the allegory is too vivid to have been less than a myth, in the minds of its hearers, if not of its inventors. Two powers which make war on each other, which devour and assimilate from each others' substance, or create and beget from their own, are strangely personal if regarded as abstractions: indeed, the best reason for thinking them so is that, if the Manichaean cosmogony be taken literally, the eternal Spirit is wonderfully carnal. But because a system is unphilosophical or inconsistent, if understood in the natural way, it does not follow that it ought to be understood otherwise: there being such things as inconsistent systems. It, however, is to be remembered that Manichaeanism always maintained an esoteric doctrine, which may have allegorized the known gross one.

3. The Platonic dualism (if one may take a title from a single enunciation of it — it does not appear to have been a consistent or permanent conviction with Plato) assumes an eternal personal Spirit, acting on an eternal impersonal matter. Out of this he produces all things that are: not deriving them from his own being, lest he should impoverish himself, yet being in a real sense their author. Matter is conceived as negatively but not positively evil — unable to be made entirely good, even by the entirely good Spirit — and passively but not actively resisting his will.

4. The general character of Gnostic systems was not strictly dualistic. They assumed two eternal principles of spirit and matter, of which the first at least was conceived, more or less distinctly, as personal: but matter was made into finite beings, not by the action of the eternal Spirit, but of a created or generated one; who, though not eternal, held a place so exalted as to be practically a third God; and usurped, more or less, the bad eminence of the eternal matter, since, in opposition to orthodox Christians, it was necessary to distinguish him from the eternal Spirit. SEE DEMIURGE.  The most ancient form of dualism, the Persian, does not come in for consideration here, as its antithesis is not between spirit and matter, but between light and darkness. Owing to its antiquity, the distinction between personal and impersonal principles is not formulated in it.”

III. Has matter ever existed abstracted from those conditions of concrete form in which we meet with it? The third and fourth of the forms of dualism just enumerated make their cosmogony depend on the distinction devised by Anaxagoras, and formulated by Aristotle, between matter and form. If matter be conceived as eternal, and yet a creation by a spiritual Being be in some sense admitted, this is necessary. If matter be believed to be itself the work of a Spirit, it is possible, but by no means necessary, still to believe that he first created matter, and then formed it. Such was, perhaps, the general view of the scholastic period in the widest sense of the term: the belief recognized absolute creation by God out of nothing, while it left a meaning for the Aristotelian distinction which was familiar. It seemed to derive direct support from the narrative of the creation in Gen 1:2. But it is evident that the word ‘“without form,” in this passage, is not to be pressed in so strict a philosophical sense: if the meaning of the word were less general, it would still follow from the fact that the “formless” matter is already called (not the universe merely, but) “the earth.” It therefore follows that the scriptural or Christian doctrine of creation admits, but does not require, the complication of this intermediate step. It probably is ignored by almost all modern thought on the subject: in the last age of scholasticism, Sir Thomas Browne still continued to assume it, and his critic Digly thought it needless. SEE CREATION.

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

             a noted French historian and philosopher, was born in Alt-Eckendorf, Alsace, May 31, 1791. His parents were Germans, and, though living under French rule, remained true to the fatherland. Jacques, however, was taught French from his childhood, as he was expected to take a position under the French government. He was intended for the legal profession, and, after enjoying the best educational advantages of private instructors, was sent to the gymnasium at Strasburg, and then entered as a student at the University of Gottingen, Germany, where he enjoyed the instruction and association of Heeren, the noted historian, and Eichhorn, the celebrated Orientalist. He removed to Paris with a diplomatic career in view, attended the lectures of the Faculty of Letters, and wrote his Essai historique sur lecole d'Alexandrie (published in 1820), which, crowned by the academy in 1816, gave him a reputation among those French scholars who were interested in German erudition. By favor of Royer-Collard and Guizot, he received in 1819 a professorship in the College of Strasburg, which he exchanged two years afterwards for the directorship of the gymnasium and the professorship of ecclesiastical history in the Protestant academy of the same city.

Applying himself to the study of ecclesiastical history and philosophy, he wrote Histoire critique du Gnosticismze (Paris, 1828, 2 vols. 8vo; 2d ed. 1843-44, 3 vols. 8vo), and Histoire universelle de l'Eglise Chretienne (1829-32, 3 vols.; 2d edit. 1838). In 1828 he was appointed inspector of the Academy of Strasburg, and, in 1831, corresponding member of the Academy of Inscriptions. His treatise De l'influence des sooeurs sur les lois et des lois sur les moeurs (Paris, 1832) received from the academy the extraordinary prize of 10,000 francs. In 1832 he was appointed by Guizot general inspector of the University of Paris, and removed to that city. Among his later productions are, Histoire des doctrines morales et politiques des trois derniers siecles (1836-37, 3 vols.): — De l'affaiblissement des idees et des etudes morales (1841): — Schellig et la philosophie de la nature (1842): — De l'etat morale politique et litteraire de l'Allemagne (1847, 2 vols.): — listoire de la philosophic dans ses rapports avec la religion (1854): -Philosophie de la religion (1857, 2 vols): — Morale, philosophie des moeurs (1860): — St. Martin, philos. inconnu (1862): — Emmnanuel de Swedenborg (1863): — Le Mysticisme en France aux temps de Fenelon (1864). He has also written occasional treatises concerning schools and education, and  numerous articles in the Dictionnaire de la conversation and other cyclopaedias. He died at Strasburg June 23, 1864.

## Matteson, L.J., D.D[[@Headword:Matteson, L.J., D.D]]

             a Baptist minister, was born at Laurens, Otsego County, N.Y. He pursued his studies at Hamilton, graduating from the college there in 1858, and from the theological seminary in 1860. His pastorates were at Watertown and Sing Sing, Brattleboro, Vermont, and Troy and Cortland, N.Y., where he died, May 5, 1878. (J.C.S.)

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

             co-emperor of Constantinople, was the eldest son of the far-more illustrious John V Cantacuzenus (Johannes VI). At twenty-one, four years before he was of age, he was associated by his father in the supreme government as a means of checking the rebellion of John Palaeologus. This measure of Cantacuzenus. however, owing to the popularity of Palaeologus, failed in its design, and in 1355 the associate emperors, father and son, were compelled to abdicate the throne in favor of their rival. Matthaeus now retired with his father to a monastic life in the convents of Mount Athos. He married Irene Palueologina, and became the father of six children. His death, preceding that of his father, occurred towards the end of the 14th century. He was a man of much learning, and the author of various works, mostly Biblical commentaries, several of which are still extant in MS. The one entitled Commentarii in Cantica Canticorun has been published. See Smith, Dict. of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology, s.v.

## Matthai, Christian Friedrich Von[[@Headword:Matthai, Christian Friedrich Von]]

             a noted German theologian, was born in Thuringia in 1744; was educated at the University of Leipsic, and immediately upon the completion of his studies became rector of the Gymnasium at Moscow. While here he devoted himself to a critical study of the Greek fathers of the Church, and published editions of the writings of Chrysostom, Basil the Great, and others. He was promoted to a professorship in the university about 1776, but in 1785 gladly accepted the position of rector at Meissen — this affording him an opportunity to return to his fatherland. In 1789 he was called to the University of Wittenberg, whence he again returned to Moscow in 1805. He died in Russia Sept. 26,1811.

Matthai, besides patristic studies, devoted himself largely to exegesis. He edited the commentary of Euthymius Zigabenus on the Gospels, with notes, and Nemesius of Emesa on the Nature of Man. But his most celebrated critical labor is his edition of the Greek Testament, for which he made an extensive collation of manuscripts; though, as he chiefly followed the authority of one class, the Byzantine, his edition is less valuable in itself than as a collection of materials for the further labors of the critical editor. A second edition of this Testament appeared in 1803-7, in 3 vols. 8vo. The work is entitled Novum Test. Graece et Latine: Textum denuo recensuit, varias Lectiones numquam antea vulgatas collegit, scholia Graeca addidit, animadversiones criticas adjecit, etc. (Rigse, 1782-88, 12 vols. 8vo). The competent judgment of Michaelis pronounces its great value in few words. He says: “He has made his collection of various readings with great labor and diligence; he found in his MSS. a confirmation of many readings, which I should have hardly expected, because they are found in MSS. of a different kind and of a different country from those which he used; nay, even those of the Western edition, of which he speaks with the utmost contempt, he has corroborated by the evidence of his Moscow MSS. This edition is absolutely necessary for every man who is engaged in the criticism of the Greek Testament.” See Doring, Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands d. 18ten u. 19ten Jarh. vol. 2, s.v.; Home, Introd. to the Crit. Study of the Scriptures; Kitto, Cyclop. Bibl. Lit. vol. 3, s.v.

## Matthai, Georg Christian Rudolph[[@Headword:Matthai, Georg Christian Rudolph]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born in 1798 at Hameln, and died at Gottingen, November 20, 1872, professor of theology. He published, Synopse der vier Evangelien nebst Kritik iharer Wundererzahlungen (Gottingen, 1826): — Der Religionsglaube der Apostel Jesu (ibid. 1826- 30, 2 volumes): — Die Lehre vom Geiste wider ihre Gegner (ibid. 1834): — Neue Aislegung der Bibel zur Erforschung und Darstellung ihres Glanbens (ibid. 1831): — Der Mysticismus nach seinem Begriffe, Ursprunge, und Unwerth (ibid. 1832): — Auslegung des Evangeliums Johannes (ibid. 1837): — Die Macht und Wurde des Fursten, auf christlichen Standpunkte (Leipsic, 1841): — Doctrina Christi de Jurejurando (1847): — Das Verhaltniss des Christenthums zur Politik (1850): — Die Auslegung des Vaterun. ser nach dem hochsten Grundsatze der Auslegung des Neuen Testaments (1853). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2:859; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:109, 245, 294, 365, 433. (B.P.)

## Matthan[[@Headword:Matthan]]

             (Mat 1:15). SEE MATTAN.

## Matthat[[@Headword:Matthat]]

             (Ματθάτ, prob. some form of the name Matthan), the name of two men mentioned only in the New Test. as maternal ancestors of Jesus. SEE GENEALOGY OF JESUS CHRIST.

1. The son of Levi and father of Jorim, of the private line between David and Zerubbabel (Luk 3:29). B.C. post 623.

2. The son of another Levi, and father of the Eli who was the father of the Virgin Mary (Luk 3:24). B.C. considerably ante 22.

## Matthelas[[@Headword:Matthelas]]

             (Μαθήλας v r. Μαηλάς,Vulg. Mareas), a corrupt Greek form (1Es 9:19) of the MAASEIAH SEE MAASEIAH (q.v.) of the Hebrew text (Ezr 10:8). “The reading of the Sept., which is followed in the A.V., might easily arise from a mistake between the uncial Θ and Σ (C).”

## Matthes[[@Headword:Matthes]]

             KARL, a Lutheran minister in the duchy of Altenburg, in Germany, was born Dec. 26, 1811, at Eisenberg. His early studies were pursued at the lyceum of his native town, and in 1830 he entered the University of Jena as a student of theology. After completing his studies in 1833, he spent several years in the capacity of family tutor and as a teacher, and finally, in 1843, became the pastor of Ober-Arnsdorf. In 1864 he was transferred to Bornshain, where he died suddenly July 3, 1865. Matthes possessed in a rare degree the love and esteem of his acquaintances, who applied to him the saying of Luther, “He lived what we preach.” His ripe culture, theological knowledge, and penetrating judgment find expression in his works, which comprise a Leben Philip Melancthon's (of which a second edition appeared in 1846) and a Vergleichende Symbolik (published in 1854). In the latter year he assumed the publication of the Allgemeine kirchliche Chronik, a brief but comprehensive annual, reviewing important matters in the field of Church and theology.

## Mattheus[[@Headword:Mattheus]]

             (or "Machabaeus), a Scotch prelate, was consecrated bishop of the see of Ross in 1272, and, while attending a council at Lyons, died there in 1274. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 186.

## Matthew[[@Headword:Matthew]]

             (Ματθαῖος v. r. Μαθθαῖος), one of the apostles and evangelists. In the following account of him and his Gospel we have endeavored to collect and arrange all that is definitely known on the subject.

I. His Name. — According to Gesenius, the names Matthaeus and Matthias are both contractions of Maittathias (מִתַּתְיָה, “gift of Jehovah;” Θεόδωρος, θεόδοτος), a common Jewish name after the exile. SEE MATTITHIAH.

Matthew had also the name of Levi (Mar 2:14; Luk 5:27). In the catalogues — Mar 3:18; Luk 6:15 -he is coupled with Thomas, which has given rise to the not altogether unfounded conjecture that Matthew was the twin brother of Thomas ( תְּאוֹם a twin), whose real name, according to Eusebius, H. E. 1:13, was Judas, and that they were both “brethren of our Lord” (Donaldson, Jashar, p. 10; comp. Mat 13:55; Mar 6:3). This last supposition would account for Matthew's immediate obedience to the call of Christ, but is hardly consistent with the indefiniteness of the words with which he is introduced- ἄνθρωπον Ματθ. λεγόμ. (Mat 9:9); τελώνην ὀνόματι Λευϊvν (Luke v. 27) — or the unbelief of our Lord's brothers (Joh 7:5). Heracleon, as quoted by Clem. Alex (Strom. 4:11), mentions Levi as well as Matthew among the early teachers who did not suffer martyrdom.  Origen also (Contr. Cels. 1, sec. 62 [48]) speaks of ὁ Λεβὴς τελώνης ἀκολουθήσας τῷ Ι᾿ησὂυ, together with “Matthew the publican;” but the names Λεβής and Δευϊvς are by no means identical, and there is a hesitation about his language which shows that even then the tradition was hardly trustworthy. The attempt of Theod. Hase (Bibl. Brem. v. 475) to identify Levi with the apostle Lebbseus is an example of misapplied ingenuity which deserves little attention (comp. Wolf. Cur. ad Marc. 2:14).

The distinction between Levi and Matthew has, however, been maintained by Grotius (though he acknowledges that the voice of antiquity is against him, “et sane congruunt circumstantiae”), Michaelis, De Wette, Sieffert, Ewald, etc. But it is in the highest degree improbable that two publicans should have been called by Christ in the same words, at the same place, and with the same attendant circumstances and consequences; and that, while one became an apostle, the other dropped entirely out of memory. Still less can we acquiesce in the hypothesis of Sieffert (Urspir. d. erst. Kanon. Ev. p. 59) and Ewald (Drei Erst. Ev. p. 344: Christus, p. 289, 321) that the name “Matthew” is due to the Greek editor of Matthew's Gospel, who substituted it by an error in the narrative of the call of Levi. On the other hand, their identity was assumed by Eusebius and Jerome, and most ancient writers, and has been accepted by the soundest commentators (Tischendorf, Meyer, Neander, Lardner, Ellicott, etc.). The double name only supplies a difficulty to those who are resolved to find such everywhere in the Gospel narrative. It is analogous to what we find in the case of Simon Peter, John Mark, Paul, Jude, etc., which may all admit of the same explanation, and be regarded as indicating a crisis in the spiritual life of the individual, and his passing into new external relations. He was no longer לֵוַיbut מִתִּי, not Levi but Theodore — one who might well deem both himself and all his future life a veritable “gift of God” (Ellicott, Hist. Lect. p. 172; compare Meyer, Comment. 1:2; Winer, R. W. B. s.v. Matthiius, Name). See Michaelis. Einleit. 2:934; Kraft, Observ. sacr. v. 3; Bid, in the Bibl. Brenl. 6:1038; Heumann, Erklar. d. N.T. 1:538; Frisch, Diss. de Levi c. Matth. non confundendo (Leips. 1746); Thiers, Krit. Comment. 1:90; Sieffert, Urspir. d. Kanon. Evang. p. 54. SEE NAME.

II. Scripture Statements respecting him. — His father's name was Alphaeus (Mar 2:14), probably different from the father of James the son of Mary, the wife of Cleophas, who was a “sistef” of the mother of Jesus (Joh 19:25). SEE ALPHAEUS. His call to be an apostle (A.D. 27) is related by all three evangelists in the same words, except that  Mat 9:9 gives the usual name, and Mar 2:14 and Luk 5:27 that of Levi. Matthew's special occupation was probably the collection of dues and customs from persons and goods crossing the Lake of Gennesareth. It was while he was actually engaged in his duties, καθημένον ἐπὶ τὸ τελώνιον, that he received the call, which he obeyed without delay. Our Lord was then invited by him to a “great feast” (Luk 5:29), to which perhaps, as Neander has suggested (Life of Christ, p. 230, Bohn; comp. Blunt, Undes. Coincid. p. 257), by way of farewell, his old associates, ὄχλος τελώνων πολύς, were summoned. The publicans, properly so called (publicani), were persons who farmed the Roman taxes, and they were usually, in later times, Roman knights, and persons of wealth and credit. They employed under them inferior officers, natives of the province where the taxes were collected, called properly portitores, to which class Matthew no doubt belonged. These latter were notorious for impudent exactions everywhere (Plautus, Menoech. 1:2, 5; Cic. ad Quint. Fir. 1:1; Plut. De Curios. p. 518 e); but to the Jews they were especially odious, for they were the very spot where the Roman chain galled them, the visible proof of the degraded state of their nation. As a rule, none but the lowest would accept such an unpopular office, and thus the class became more worthy of the hatred with which in any case the Jews would have regarded it. The readiness, however, with which Matthew obeyed the call of Jesus seems to show that his heart was still open to religious impressions. We find in Luk 6:13, that when Jesus, before delivering the Sermon on the Mount, selected twelve disciples, who were to form the circle of his more intimate associates, Matthew was one of them. On a subsequent occasion (Luke v. 29), Matthew gave the parting entertainment to his friends. After this event he is mentioned only in Act 1:13. A.D. 29.

III. Traditionary Notices. — According to a statement in Clemens Alexandrinus (Paedagog. 2:1), Matthew abstained from animal food. Hence some writers have rather hastily concluded that he belonged to the sect of the Essenes. It is true that the Essenes practiced abstinence in a high degree, but it is not true that they rejected animal food altogether. Admitting the account in Clemens Alexandrinus to be correct, it proves only a certain ascetic strictness, of which there occur vestiges in the habits of other Jews (comp. Josephus, Life, 2 and 3). Some interpreters find also in Romans 14 an allusion to Jews of ascetic principles.  According to another account, which is as old as the first century, and which occurs in the Κήρυγμα Πέτρου in Clemens Alexandrinus (Stroml. 6:15), Matthew, after the death of Jesus, remained about fifteen years in Jerusalem. This agrees with the statement in Eusebius (Hist. Eccles. 3:24), that Matthew preached to his own nation before he went to foreign countries. Rufinus (Hist. Ecc 10:9) and Socrates (Hist. Eccles. 1:19) state that he afterwards went into Ethiopia (Meroe); but Ambrose says that God opened to him the country of the Persians (In Psalms 45); Isidore, the Macedonians (Isidore Hisp. De Sanct. 77); and others the Parthians, the Medes, the Persians of the Euphrates (comp. Florini Exercit. hist. phil. p. 23; Credner, Einl. ins N.T. I, 1:58). There also he probably preached specially to the Jews. See Abdiae, Histor. Apost. 7, in Fabricii Cod. apocrs. 1:636; Perionii Vit. Apost. p. 114; comp. Martyrol. Roma. Sept. 21. According to Heracleon (about A.D. 150) and Clemens Alexandrinus (Stronz. 4:9), Matthew was one of those apostles who did not suffer martyrdom, which Clement, Origen, and Tertullian seem to accept: the tradition that he died a martyr, be it true or false, came in afterwards (Niceph. II.E. 2:41). Tischendorf has published the apocryphal “Acts and Martyrdom of Matthew” (Acta Apocrypha, Lips. 1841). SEE ACTS, SPURIOUS.

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

             (Matthaeus) OF PARIS, an English monastic, of great celebrity as a chronicler of England's early history, was born about the end of the 12th century. He took the religious habit in the Benedictine monastery of St. Albans in 1217. Almost the only incident of his life that has been recorded is a journey he made to Norway, by command of the pope, to introduce some reforms into the monastic establishments of that country, which mission he has the credit of having executed with great ability and success. He is said to have stood high in the favor of Henry III, and to have obtained various privileges for the University of Oxford through his influence with that king. His acquirements embraced all the learning and science of his age; besides theology and history; oratory, poetry, painting, architecture, and a practical knowledge of mechanics, are reckoned among his accomplishments by his biographers or panegyrists. His memory is  preserved mainly by his history of England, entitled Historia Major, really a continuation of a work begun at St. Albans by Roger of Wendover (who died in May, 1236), and which was subsequently entitled Chronica Major, or Chronica Majora Sancti Albani. Roger's name, however, was obscured by that of our subject, Matthew of Paris, who, though he adopted the plan of Roger's work, really furnished a most valuable chronicle, especially of mediaeval history.

In the British Museum, and in the libraries of Corpus Christi and Benedict colleges, Cambridge, there are manuscripts of an epitome, by Matthew of Paris himself, of his history, generally referred to by the names of the Historia Minot', or the Chronica, which, bishop Nicholson says, contains “several particulars of note omitted in the larger history.” This smaller work was for a long time ascribed to a Matthew of Westminster (q.v.). Of late, however, the question of authorship has been fairly settled by Sir Frederick Madden, who edited and published these chronicles. He pronounced the Westminster Matthew “a phantom who never existed,” and observes that even the late Mr. Buckle was so deceived by the general tone of confidence manifested in quoting this writer that he characterizes him as, after Froissart, the most celebrated historian of the 14th century. “The mystery of the ‘phantom historian,'“ says a writer in the Westminster Review (Oct., 1866, p. 238), “has been happily unveiled by Sit Frederick Madden, whose correct anticipation is unexpectedly confirmed by his discovery of the original copy of the work, now in the Chetham Library at Manchester. This manuscript establishes beyond all doubt that the largest portion of the Flores Historiarum, attributed to the pseudo Matthew of Westminster, was written at St. Albans, under the eye and by direction of Matthew of Paris, as an abridgment of his greater chronicle; and the text from the close of the year 1241 to about two thirds of 1249 is in his own handwriting. This manuscript, continued after his death by another hand on the same plan, down to the issue of the battle of Evesham in 1265, ceased after that date to be written at St. Albans, and passed eventually into the library of the Monastery of St. Peter, at Westminster. The author of the first continuation, after the manuscript had left St. Albans, was, Sir F. Madden thinks, John Bevere, otherwise named John of London. It was brought down by Bevere to the year 1306.

A special class of manuscripts, including the Eton MS. of Matthew of Westminster, implicitly follows Bevere's chronicle; but in the original copy of the Flores Historiarum, after it came to Westminster, Bevere's text is generally abridged, although under some years there are additions. The entire work is carried on to the year 1305. ‘It was,' says Sir Frederick, ‘no doubt from  the fact that the latter portion of the Flores Historiarum was composed by a Westminster monk, that the entire work was afterwards attributed to a Matthew of Westminster, for the name of Matthew really belonged to Matthew of Paris, whilst the affix of Westminster was supplied by conjecture; and this pseudonyme having been recognized by Bale and Joscelin, and adopted by archbishop Parker, the error has been perpetuated to our own time.'“ Besides this edition by Madden, entitled Matthei Parisiensis, Monachi Sancti Albani, Historia Anglorum, sive ut vulgo dicitur, Historia Minor, item, ejusdem abbreviatio Chronicorum Angliae (published by the authority of the lords commissioners of her majesty's treasury, London, Longmans, 1866 sq.), we have one by archbishop Parker (London, 1571, folio; reprinted at Liguri, Zurich, 1606; London, 1640 [or in some copies 1641], fol., by Dr. William Watts; Par. 1644, fol.; Lond. 1684, fol.). Watts's edition, which is sometimes divided into two volumes, contains, besides various readings and copious indexes, two other works of the author never before printed, namely, his Duorum Offarum MerciorunRegum (S. Albani Fundatorum) Vitae, and his Viginti Trium Abbatum S. Albani Vitae, together with what he calls his Additamenta to those treatises. “Matthew of Paris writes with considerable spirit and rhetorical display, and uses remarkable freedom of speech; and his work, which is continued to the death of Henry III (1272) by William Rishanger, another monk of the same abbey, has been the chief authority commonly relied upon for the history of that reign. Its spirit, however, is somewhat fiercely and narrowly English; and from the freedom with which he inveighs against what he regards as the usurpations of the papal see, Romanist writers have always expressed strong dissatisfaction especially with his accounts of ecclesiastical affairs. With Protestant critics, on the other hand, Matthew of Paris has been a favorite in proportion to the dislike he has incurred from their opponents. At one time it used to be affirmed by the Roman Catholics that the printed Matthew of Paris was in many things a mere modern fabrication of the Reformers; but Watts, by collating all the manuscript copies he could find, and noting the various readings, proved that there was no foundation for this charge” (Engl. Cyclop. s.v.). A translation of the History of Matthew of Paris, by Dr. Giles, forms a volume of Bohn's “Antiquarian Library,” and the Flowers of History of Roger of Wendover forms two volumes of the same series. See Oudin, Scriptores Eccles. 3:204 sq.; also Herzog, Real-Encyklopadie, 9:176; Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lexikon, 6:932: North British Rev. Oct. 1869, p. 119. SEE ROGER OF WENDOVER.

## Matthew (3)[[@Headword:Matthew (3)]]

             OF WESTMINSTER, an early English chronicler, flourished in the reign of Edward II. Nothing whatever is known of his personal history except that he was a monk of the Benedictine Abbey of Westminster. He is supposed to have died about 1307 or 1377. His chronicle, written in Latin, is entitled Flores Historiarum, per Matthceum Westmonasteriensemn collecti, praecipue se Rebus Brittannicis, ab Exordio Mundi, usque ad annum 1307 (Lond. 1567; with additions, Frkf. 1601). Bohn has published an English version (Lond. 1853, 2 vols. 8vo). Another work formerly ascribed to him is now definitely settled to be the production of MATTHEW OF PARIS SEE MATTHEW OF PARIS (q.v.).

## Matthew (4)[[@Headword:Matthew (4)]]

             a Scotch prelate, was formerly archdeacon of Lothian, and became bishop of Aberdeen iln 1164. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 105.

## Matthew Of Bassi[[@Headword:Matthew Of Bassi]]

             SEE CAPUCHINS.

## Matthew Of Blatares[[@Headword:Matthew Of Blatares]]

             SEE BLATARES.

## Matthew Of Cracow[[@Headword:Matthew Of Cracow]]

             (more accurately of Krokow, in Pomerania), a noted German prelate of the Church of Rome, and worthy to be counted foremost among the forerunners of the great Reformation, was a native of Pomerania, and flourished near the opening of the 15th century. But little is known of his personal history, except that he was made by the emperor Rupert a professor in the young University of Heidelberg; afterwards became chancellor to Rupert, and through the latter's influence became bishop of Worms in 1405, and that he attended the Council of Pisa in 1409, and died in 1410. But of his labors we know enough to award him great praise as an ardent and faithful worker for reform among the clergy of his Church. Indeed, the corrupt condition of the Romish Church, and especially of the ecclesiastical body, seems to have early engaged his serious attention. In 1384 he delivered a discourse on the improvement of morals, both in priests and people, before an archiepiscopal synod in Prague; and, as he began then, so he continued through life to battle for reform and the eradication of corruption, and the abandonment of simony and other vile practices. Both with his tongue and by his pen he sought to advance the interests of the noble cause he had espoused, and, as his position secured  him great influence, his labors were certainly not in vain. For his day and generation he was no doubt another cardinal Julian (q.v.). He desired reform rather than a revolution, and therefore failed to accomplish his mission.

Matthew left behind him a number of MSS., some of which were afterwards printed. Among the most noted of his works is a treatise on the pollutions of the Romish court, which appears to have been written a little previous to the year 1409, about the period when the schism in the papacy seemed to open a door for conscientious minds to cherish doubts, at least privately, yet sufficiently to afford a leaven for the future, respecting the boasted infallibility of the popes, and the degree of implicit faith and obedience due to their appointments and decisions. It may be that the weakness occasioned by this papal schism furnished a reason why the author of so bold an attack on the prevailing corruptions did not encounter the hostility and persecution of the ecclesiastical powers. His favor with the emperor was an additional source of impunity, and probably also his early death after the publication of the work. We have no information of the effect immediately produced by the treatise, but it shows that the harvest of the 16th century was even then in its germ, and it seems like some of the seed towards the harvest, sown for a hundred years, to produce fruit in the times of Luther and Melancthon. See Ullmann, Reformers before the Reformation, vol. 1; Hodgson, Reformers and Martyrs (Phila. 1867, 12mo), p. 118 sq. (J. H. W.)

## Matthew Of York (Tobias)[[@Headword:Matthew Of York (Tobias)]]

             a noted English prelate, was born in Bristol in 1546. In childhood he manifested unusual talent, and was prepared for Oxford when only thirteen years of age. He took the bachelor's degree in 1563, and three years after the master's, and immediately entered into “holy orders” — a young man much respected for his great learning, eloquence, sweet conversation, friendly disposition, and the sharpness of his wit. In 1566 he was made university orator; in 1570, canon of Christ Church and deacon of Bath; in 1572, prebendary of Sarum and president of St. John's College, Oxford, and one of the queen's chaplains in ordinary. In 1583 he was installed dean of Durham, in 1595 he was created bishop of Durham, and in 1606 archbishop of York. He died at Cawood Castle March 29, 1628, The learning and piety of archbishop Matthew have been warmly eulogized by Camden. It is to be much lamented that his sermons, which are said to have been superior productions, were not preserved to us in print. The only publication of his is entitled Concia Apologetica contra Capianum (Oxf. 1581 and 1638, 8vo). In the cathedral church at York there is a MS. from his pen containing Notes upon all the Ancient Fathers. See Wood, Athenoe Oxonienses; Middleton, Ev. Biogr. 2:478 sq.; Hook, Eccles. Biog. s.v.

## Matthew, Gospel Of[[@Headword:Matthew, Gospel Of]]

             the first of the four memoirs of our Lord in all the arrangements. SEE NEW TESTAMENT.

I. Author. — There is no ancient book with regard to the authorship of which we have earlier, fuller, and more unanimous testimony. From Papias, almost if not quite contemporary with the apostles, downwards, we have a stream of unimpeachable witnesses to the fact that Matthew was the author of a gospel; while the quotations which abound in the works of the fathers prove that at least as early as Irenaeus — if we may not also add Justin, whose “Memorabilia of Christ” we cannot but identify with the “Gospels” he speaks of as in public use — the Gospel received by the Church under his name was the same as that which has reached us. As in the case of the other synoptists, a subsidiary argument of no small weight in favor of the correctness of this assignment may be drawn from the comparative insignificance of Matthew among the twelve. Any one desirous of imposing a spurious gospel on the Church would naturally have assumed one of the  principal apostles as its author, instead of one whose name could add but little weight or authority to the composition.

Nevertheless a number of alleged circumstances have led Strauss and others to consider the Gospel of Matthew as an unapostolical composition, originating perhaps at the conclusion of the first century; while some consider it a production of the Aramsean Matthew, augmented by some additions; others call it a historical commentary of a later period, made to illustrate the collection of the sayings of Christ which Matthew had furnished (comp. Sieffert, Ueber die Aechtheit und den Ursprung des ersten Evalgelii. 1832; Schneckenburger, Ueber den Ursprung des ersten Evangelii. 1834; Schott, Ueber die Authenticitat des Ev. Matt. 1837).

(1st.) The representations of Matthew (it is said) have not that vivid clearness which characterizes the narration of an eye-witness, and which we find, for instance, in the Gospel of John. Even Mark and Luke surpass Matthew in this respect. Compare, for example, Mat 4:18 with Luk 5:1 sq.; Mat 8:5 sq, with Luk 7:1 sq. This is most striking in the history of his own call, where we should expect a clearer representation. To this it may be replied that the gift of narrating luminously is a personal qualification of which even an apostle might be destitute, and which is rarely found among the lower orders of people; this argument, therefore, has recently been given up altogether, In the history of his call to be an apostle, Matthew has this advantage over Mark and Luke, that he relates the discourse of Christ (Mat 9:13) with greater completeness than these evangelists. Luke relates that Matthew prepared a great banquet in his house, while Matthew simply mentions that an entertainment took place, because the apostle could not well write that he himself prepared a great banquet.

(2d.) He omits some facts which every apostle certainly knew. For instance, he mentions only one journey of Christ to the Passover at Jerusalem, namely, the last; and seems to be acquainted only with one sphere of Christ's activity, namely, Galilee. He even relates the instances of Christ's appearing after his resurrection in such a manner that it might be understood as if he showed himself only to the women in Jerusalem, and to his disciples nowhere but in Galilee (Mat 26:32; Mat 28:7). But an argumentum a silentio must not be urged against the evangelists. The raising of Lazarus is narrated only by John, and the raising of the youth at Nain only by Luke; the appearance of five hundred brethren after the  resurrection, which, according to the testimony of Paul (1Co 15:6), was a fact generally known, is not recorded by any of the evangelists. The apparent restriction of Christ's sphere of activity to Galilee, we find also in Mark and Luke. This peculiarity arose perhaps from the circumstance that the apostles first taught in Jerusalem, where it was unnecessary to relate what had happened there, but where the events which had taken place in Galilee were unknown, and required to be narrated: thus the sphere of narration may have gradually become fixed. At least it is generally granted that hitherto no satisfactory explanation of this fact has been discovered. The expressions in Mat 26:32; Mat 28:7, perhaps only indicate that the Lord appeared more frequently and for a longer period in Galilee than elsewhere. In Mat 28:16, we are told that the disciples in Galilee went up to a mountain, whither Christ had appointed them to come; and, since it is not previously mentioned that any such appointment had been made, the narrative of Matthew himself here leads us to conclude that Christ appeared to his disciples in Jerusalem after his resurrection.

(3d.) He relates unchronologically, and transposes events to times in which they did not happen; for instance, the rejection at Nazareth, mentioned in Luk 4:14-30, must have happened at the commencement of Christ's public career, but Matthew relates it as late as Mat 13:53 sq. But, on the other hand, there is no reason to suppose that the evangelists intended to write a chronological biography. On the contrary, we learn from Luk 1:4, and Joh 20:31, that their object was of a more practical and apologetic tendency. With the exception of John, the evangelists have grouped their communications more according to subjects than according to chronological succession. This fact is now generally admitted. As to the particular event above referred to, namely, the rejection of Christ at Nazareth, it appears to have occurred twice; Luke (Luk 4:14-31) giving the earlier, and Matthew (Mat 13:53-58) the later instance. See Strong's Harmony of the Gospels, § 32, 60, and notes.

(4th.) He embodies in one discourse several sayings of Christ which, according to Luke, were pronounced at different times (comp. Matthew 5-7, 23). But if the evangelist arranges his statements according to subjects, and not chronologically, we must not be surprised that he connects similar sayings of Christ, inserting them in the longer discourses after analogous topics had been mentioned. These discourses are not, in fact, compiled by the evangelist, but always form the fundamental  framework to which sometimes analogous subjects are attached. Moreover, it can be proved that several sayings are more correctly placed by Matthew than by Luke (compare especially Mat 23:37-39 with Luk 13:34-35).

(5th.) He falls, it is asserted, into positive errors. In ch. i and ii he seems not to know that the real dwellingplace of the parents of Jesus was at Nazareth, and that their abode at Bethlehem was only temporary (compare Mat 2:1; Mat 2:22-23 with Luk 2:4; Luk 2:39). According to Mar 11:20-21, the fig-tree withered on the day after it was cursed; but according to Mat 21:19, it withered immediately. According to Mat 21:12, Christ purified the Temple immediately after his entrance into Jerusalem; but according to Mark he on that day went out to Bethany, and purified the Temple on the day following (Mar 11:11-15). Mat 21:7 says that Christ rode on a she-ass and on a colt, which is impossible; the other Gospels speak only of a she-ass. But it depends entirely upon the mode of interpretation whether such positive errors as are alleged to exist are really chargeable on the evangelist. The difference, for instance, between the narrative of the birth of Christ, as severally recorded by Matthew and Luke, may easily be solved without questioning the correctness of either, if we suppose that each of them narrates what he knows from his individual sources of information. The history of Christ's childhood given in Luke leads us to conclude that it was derived from the acquaintances of Mary, while the statements in Matthew seem to be derived from the friends of Joseph. As to the transaction recorded in Mat 21:18-22, and Mar 11:11; Mar 11:15; Mar 11:20-21, it appears that Mark describes what occurred most accurately; and yet there is nothing in Matthew's account really inconsistent with the true order of events.

On the other hand, some of the most beautiful and most important sayings of our Lord, the historical credibility of which no skeptic call attack, have been preserved by Matthew alone (Mat 11:28-30; Mat 16:16-19; Mat 28:20; compare also Mat 11:2-21; Mat 12:3-6; Mat 12:25-29; Mat 17:12; Mat 17:25-26; Mat 26:13). Above all, the Sermon on the Mount, although containing some things apparently not coincident in time (for instance, the Lord's prayer), is yet far more complete and systematic than the comparatively meager report of Luke. It may also be proved . that in many particulars the reports of several discourses in Matthew are more exact than in the other evangelists, as may be seen by comparing Matthew 23 with the various parallel  passages in Luke. See, generally, Kern, Ueber den Ursprung des Evanyelii Matthaei (Tubingen, 1834); Olshausen, Drei Programme, 1835; and the two Lucubrations of Harles, 1840 and 1843.

II. Time and Place of its Composition. — There is little in the Gospel itself to throw any light on the date of its composition. In Mat 27:7-8; Mat 28:15, we have evidences of a date some years subsequent to the resurrection; but these may well be additions of a later hand, and prove nothing as to the age of the substance of the Gospel. Little trust can be placed in the dates given by. some late writers — e.g. Theophylact, Euthymius Zigabenus, Eusebius's Chron., eight years after the Ascension; Niceph., Callist., and the Chron. Pasch., A.D. 45. The only early testimony is that of Irenmeus (Haer. 3:1, p. 174), that it was written “when Peter and Paul were preaching in Rome, and founding the Church.” This would bring it down to about A.D. 63 — probably somewhat earlier, as this is the latest date assigned for Luke's Gospel; and we have the authority of a tradition, accepted by Origen, for the priority of that of Matthew (ἐν παραδόσει μαθὼν.... ὅτι πρῶτον μὲν γέγραπται τὸ κατὰ τόν ποτε τελώνην ὕστερον δὲ ἀπόστ. I. Χρ. Ματθαῖον, Eusebius, H. E. 6:25). On the supposition of a Hebrew original, we may presume that that would have been written the first of all the Gospels, or soon after the Ascension-i.e. about A.D. 31; and then the present Greek edition may have been issued not much later, or shortly before Matthew's removal from Juduea, i.e. about A.D. 47. Tillemont maintains A.D. 33; Townson, A.D. 37; Owen and Tomline, A.D. 38; Davidson, Introd. N. Test., inclines to A.D. 41-43; while Hug, Eichhorn, Credner, Bertholdt, etc., identifying “Zacharias the son of Barachias” (Mat 23:35) with Zacharias the son of Baruch, whose murder is recorded by Josephus (War, 4:6, 4), place its composition shortly after the fall of Jerusalem, a theory which is rejected by De Wette and Meyer, and may safely be dismissed as untenable.

With regard to the place, there is no difference of opinion. All ancient authorities agree that Matthew wrote his Gospel in Palestine, and this has been as unanimously received by modern critics.

III. For what Readers was it Written? — The concurrent testimony of the early Church that Matthew drew up his Gospel for the benefit of the Jewish Christians of Palestine (τοῖς ἀπὸ Ι᾿ουδαϊσμοῦ πιστεύσασι, Orig. ap. Eusebius, H. E. 6:25), has been accepted without question, and may be regarded as a settled point. The statement of Eusebius is that, “having  previously preached to the Hebrews, when he was about to go to others also, he committed to writing in his native tongue his Gospel (τὸ κατ᾿ αὐτὸν εὐαγγέλιον), and so filled up by his writing that which was lacking of his presence to those whom he was departing from” (Eusebius, H. E. 3:24). The testimony of Jerome, frequently repeated, is to the same effect (Proef. ad Matt.; De Vir. III.; Comm. in Hosea 11). The passages quoted and referred to above, it is true, have reference to the supposed Aramaic original, and not to the present Greek Gospel. But whatever conclusion may be arrived at on the perplexed question of the origin of the existing Gospel, Mr. Westcott has shown (Introd. to Gospels, p. 208) that “there is no sufficient reason to depart from the unhesitating habit of the earliest writers who notice the subject, in practically identifying the revised version with the original text,” so that whatever has been stated of the purpose or characteristics of the one may unhesitatingly be regarded as applicable to the other also.

Looking, therefore, to our present Gospel for proofs of its original destination, we find internal evidence tending to confirm the traditional statement. The great object. of the evangelist is evidently to prove to his countrymen that Jesus of Nazareth was the promised Messiah, the antitype of the figures of the old covenant, and the fulfillment of all prophecy. The opening words of his Gospel declare his purpose. Jesus Christ is set forth as “the son of David” and “the son of Abraham,” fulfilling “the promises made to the fathers,” and reviving the faded glories of the nation in the heir of David's royal line, Abraham's promised seed (comp. Iren. Fragm. 29; Hear. 3:9, 1; Orig. in Johann. 4:4). In the symmetrical arrangement of the genealogy also” its divisions,” as dean Goodwin has remarked (Comm. in St. Matt., Introd.), “corresponding to the two great crises in their national life, the maximum and minimum points of Hebrew prosperity” — we have an accommodation to Jewish prejudices and Jewish habits of thought, in marked contrast with the continuous order of the universalistic Luke. As we advance, we find that the accomplishment of the promises, the proof that Jesus Christ is he of whom “Moses in the law and the prophets did write,” is the object nearest to his heart. Thus he is continually speaking of the necessity of this or that event happening, in order that a particular prophecy might be fulfilled (ἵνα πληρωθῆ τὸ ῥηθὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου ῾θεοῦ) διὰ τοῦ προφήτου, Mat 1:22; Mat 2:15; Mat 21:4; Mat 26:56; comp. Mat 2:17; Mat 3:3; Mat 4:14; Mat 8:17, etc.), while his whole Gospel is full of allusions to those passages and sayings of the O. Test. in which Christ was  predicted and foreshadowed. As Da Costa has remarked (Four Witnesses, p. 20), he regards the events he narrates as “realized prophecy,” and everything is recorded with this view, that he may lead his countrymen to recognize in Jesus their promised Deliverer and King.

It is in keeping with the destination of his Gospel that we find in Matthew less frequent explanations of Jewish customs, laws, and localities than in the other Gospels. Knowledge of these is presupposed in the readers (Mat 15:1-2 with Mar 7:1-4 : Mat 27:62 with Mar 15:42; Luk 23:54; Joh 19:14; Joh 19:31; Joh 19:42, and other places). Jerusalem is the holy city (see below, Style anud Diction). Jesus is of the elect line (Mat 1:1; Mat 9:27; Mat 12:23; Mat 15:22; Mat 20:30; Mat 21:9; Mat 21:15); is to be born of a virgin in David's place, Bethlehem (Mat 1:22; Mat 2:6); must flee into Egypt and be recalled thence (Mat 2:15; Mat 2:19); must have a forerunner, John the Baptist (Mat 3:3; Mat 11:10); was to labor in the outcast Galilee that sat in darkness (Mat 4:14-16); his healing was a promised mark of his office (Mat 8:17; Mat 12:17), and so was his mode of teaching by parables (Mat 13:14); he entered the holy city as Messiah (Mat 21:5-16); was rejected by the people, in fulfillment of a prophecy (Mat 21:42), and deserted by his disciples in the same way (Mat 26:31; Mat 26:56). The Gospel is pervaded by one principle, the fulfillment of the law and of the Messianic prophecies in the person of Jesus. This at once sets it in opposition to the Judaism of the time, for it rebuked the Pharisaic interpretations of the law (Mat 5:23), and proclaimed Jesus as the Son of God, and the Savior of the world through his blood, ideas which were strange to the cramped and limited Judaism of the Christian aera. In the Sermon on the Mount Christ is introduced declaring himself not as the destroyer but the fulfiller of the Mosaic law. When the twelve are sent forth they are forbidden to go “into the way of the Gentiles” (Mat 10:5; comp. Mat 15:24). In the same passage — the only one in which the Samaritans are mentioned — that abhorred race is put on a level with the heathen, not at once to be gladdened with the Gospel message.

But while we keep this in view, as the evangelist's first object, we must not strain it too narrowly, as if he had no other purpose than to combat the objections and to satisfy the prepossessions of the Jews. No evangelist expresses with greater distinctness the universality of Christ's mission, or does more to break down the narrow notion of a Messiah for Israel who was not one also for the whole world; none delivers stronger warnings  against trusting to an Abrahamic descent for acceptance with God. It is in Matthew that we read of the visit of the magi (Mat 2:1 sq.), symbolizing the manifestation of Christ to the Gentiles; it is he that speaks of the fulfillment of Isaiah's prophecy, when “the nations that sat in darkness saw a great light” (Mat 4:15-16), and adds to the narrative of the cure of the centurion's servant what is wanting to the universalistic Luke, that “many should come from the East and West,” etc. (Mat 8:11). The narrative of the Syro-Phoenician woman, omitted by Luke, is given by Matthew, in whom alone we also find the command to “make disciples of all nations” (Mat 28:19), and the unrestricted invitation to “all that labor and are heavy laden” (Mat 11:28). Nowhere are we made more conscious of the deep contrast between the spiritual teaching of Christ and the formal teaching of the rulers of the Jewish Church. We see also that others besides Jewish readers were contemplated, from the interpretations and explanations occasionally added, e.g. Immanuel, Mat 1:23; Golgotha, Mat 27:33; Eli, lama sabachthani, Mat 27:46.

IV. Original Language. — While there is absolutely nothing in the Gospel itself to lead us to imagine that it is a translation, and, on the contrary, everything favors the view that in the present Greek text, with its perpetual verbal correspondence with the other synoptists, we have the original composition of the author himself; yet the unanimous testimony of all antiquity affirms that Matthew wrote his Gospel in Hebrew i.e. the Aramaic or Syro-Chaldee dialect. which was the vernacular tongue of the then inhabitants of Palestine. The internal evidence, therefore, is at variance with the external, and it is by no means easy to adjust the claims of the two.

1. External Evidence. — The unanimity of all ancient authorities as to the Hebrew origin of this Gospel is complete. In the words of the late canon Cureton (Syriac Recension, p. 83), “no fact relating to the history of the Gospels is more fully and satisfactorily established. From the days of the apostles down to the end of the 4th century, every writer who had occasion to refer to this matter has testified the same thing. Papias, Irenaeus, Pantsenus, Origen, Cyril of Jerusalem, Athanasius, Epiphanius, Jerome, all with one consent affirm this. Such a chain of historical evidence appears to be amply sufficient to establish the fact that Matthew wrote his Gospel originally in the Hebrew dialect of that time, for the benefit of Jews who understood and spoke the language.” To look at the evidence more particularly —

(1.) The earliest witness is Papias, bishop of Hierapolis, in Phrygia, in the beginning of the 2d century; a hearer of the apostle, or more probably of the presbyter John, and a companion of Polycarp (Irenaeus, leur. v. 33, 4). Eusebius describes him (H.E. 3:36) as “a man of the widest general information, and well acquainted with the Scriptures” (ἀνὴρ τὰ πάντα ὅτι μάλιστα λογιώτατος καὶ γραφῆς εἰδήμων); and,though in another place he depreciates his intellectual power (σφόδρα συικρὸς ]β τὶν νοῦν, H. E. 3:39), this unfavorable view seems chiefly to have reference to his millennarian views (comp. Irenaeus, Haer. v. 33, 3), and can hardly invalidate his testimony on a matter of fact. Papias says, it would seem on the authority of John the Presbyter, “Matthew compiled his Gospel (or ‘the oracles') in the Hebrew dialect; while each interpreted them according to his ability” (Ματθαῖος μὲν ουν ῾Εβραϊvδι διαλέκτῳ τὰ λόγια συνεγράψατο; ἡρμήνευσε δ᾿ αὐτὰ ὡς ην δυνατὸς ἕκαστος). In estimating the value of this testimony, two important points have to be considered-the meaning of the term λόγια, and whether Papias is speaking of the present or the past. On the latter point there can be little doubt. His use of the aorist, ἡρμήνευσε, not ἑρμηνεύει, evidently shows that the state of things to which he or his original authority referred had passed away, and that individual translation was no longer necessary. It would seem, therefore, to follow, that “an authorized Greek representative of the Hebrew Matthew” had come into use “in the generation after the apostles” (Westcott, Introd. p. 207, note). The signification of λόγια has been much controverted. Schleiermacher (Stud. u. Krit. 1832, p. 735) was the first to explain the term of a supposed “collection of discourses” which is held to have been the basis that, by gradual modification and interpolation, was transformed into the existing Gospel (Meyer, Comm. 1:13). This view has found wide acceptance, and has been strenuously maintained by Lachmann (Stud. u. Krit. 1835), Meyer, De Wette, Credner, Wieseler, B. Crusius, Ewald, Renan, etc., but has been controverted by Lucke (Stud. u. Krit. 1833), Itug, Ebrard, Bauer, Delitzsch, Hilgenfeld, Thiersch, Alford, Westcott, etc. But λόγια, in the N.T., signifies the whole revelation made by God, rather than the mere words in which that revelation is contained (Act 7:38; Rom 3:2; Heb 5:12; 1Pe 4:11); and, as has been convincingly shown by Hug and Ebrard, the patristic use of the word confirms the opinion that, as used by Papias, both in this passage and in the title of his own work (λογίων κυριακῶν ἐξήγησις), it implies a combined record of facts and discourses corresponding to the later use of the word gospel.

(2.) The next witness is Irenaeus, who, as quoted by Eusebius (II. F. v. 8), says that “Matthew among the Hebrews published also a written Gospel in their own language” (τῇ ἰδίᾷ αὐτῶν διαλέκτῳ). Hug and others have attempted to invalidate this testimony, as a mere repetition of that of Papias, whose disciple, according to Jerome, Irenaeus was; but we may safely accept it as independent evidence.

(3.) Pantaenus, the next witness, cannot be considered as strengthening the case for the Hebrew original much; though, as far as it gods, his evidence is definite enough. His story, as reported by Eusebius, is that “he is said to have gone to the Indians (probably in the south of Arabia), where it is reported that the Gospel of Matthew had preceded him among some who had there acknowledged Christ, to whom it is said the apostle Bartholomew had preached, and had left with them the writing of Matthew in Hebrew letters ( ῾Εβραίων γράμμασι τὴν τοῦ Ματθαίου καταλεῖψαι γραφήν), and that it was preserved to the time mentioned.” Jerome tells the same tale, with the addition that Pantaenus brought back this Hebrew Gospel with him (De Vir. Ill. 36). No works of Pantaenus have been preserved, and we have no means of confirming or refuting the tale, which has somewhat of a mythical air, and is related as a mere story (λέγεται, λόγος εὑρεῖν αὐτόν), even by Eusebius.

(4.) The testimony of Origen has already been referred to. It is equally definite with those quoted above on the fact that the Gospel was “published for Jewish believers, and composed in Hebrew letters” (ἐκδεδωκότα αὐτὸ τοῖς ἁπὸ Ι᾿ουδαϊσμοῦ πιστεύσασι, γράμμασιν ῾Εβραικοῖς συντεταγμένον, Eusebius, 1 H. E. 6:25). There is no reason for questioning the independence of Origen's evidence, or for tracing it back to Papias. He clearly states what was the belief of the Church at that time, and without a doubt as to its correctness. (For a refutation of the objections brought against it by Masch and Hug, etc., see Marsh's Michaelis, 4:128, 135 sq.)

(5.) We have already given the testimony of Eusebius (H. E. 3:24), to which may be added a passage (ad Marin. quaest. ii, p. 941) in which he ascribes the words ὀψὲ τοῦ σαββάτου to the translator (παρὰ τοῦ ἑρμηνεύσαντος τὴνγραφήν), adding, “For the evangelist Matthew delivered his Gospel in the Hebrew tongue.” This is very important evidence as to the belief of Eusebius, which was clearly that of the Church generally, that the Gospel was originally composed in Hebrew.

(6.) Epiphanius (Haer. 29:9, p. 124) states the same fact without the shadow of a doubt, adding that Matthew was the only evangelist who wrote ῾Εβραϊστί καὶ ῾Εβραϊκοῖς γράμμασιν. The value of his evidence, however, is impaired by his identification of the Hebrew original with that employed by the Nazarenes and Ebionites, by whom he asserts it was still preserved (ἐτὶ σώζεται).

(7.) The same observation may also be made concerning the testimony of Jerome, whose references to this subject are very frequent, and who is the only one of the fathers that appears to have actually seen the supposed Hebrew archetype (Proef ad Matt.; De Vir. Ill. 3 and 36; in Quat. Ev. ad Dam. praef.; Ep. Dam. de Osanna; Ep. ad Hedib. quaest. viii; Comm. in Hosea 11). A perusal of these passages shows that there was a book preserved in the library collected by Pamphilus at Caesarea, which was supposed to be the Hebrew original (“ipsum Hebraicum”), and was as such transcribed and translated into Greek and Latin by Jerome, about A.D. 392, from a copy obtained from the Nazarenes at the Syrian city of Bercea. Afterwards, about A.D. 398 (Comm. in Mat 12:13), he speaks more doubtfully of it, “quod vocatur a plerisque Matthew authenticum.” Later on, A.D. 415 (Confr. Pelay. 3:1), he modifies his opinion still further, and describes the book used by the Nazarenes, and preserved in the library at Cuesarea, as “Ev. juxta Hebraeos... secundum Apostolos, sive ut plerique autumant juxta Matthueum” (comp. Edinb. Rev. July, 1851, p. 39; De Wette, Einl. p. 100).

While, then, we may safely accept Jerome as an additional witness to the belief of the early Church that Matthew's Gospel was originally composed in Hebrew (Aramaic), which he mentions as something universally recognised without a hint of a doubt, we may reasonably question whether the book he translated had any sound claims to be considered the genuine work of Matthew, and whether Jerome himself did not ultimately discover his mistake, though he shrunk from openly confessing it. We may remark, in confirmation of this, that unless the Aramaic book had differed considerably from the Greek Gospel, Jerome would hardly have taken the trouble to translate it: and that while, whenever he refers to Matthew, he cites it according to the present text, he never quotes the Nazarene Gospel as a work of canonical authority, but only in such terms as “quo utuntur Nazareni,” “quod lectitant Nazaruei,” “quod juxta Heb. Nazar. legere consueverunt,” and still more doubtingly, “qui crediderit evangelio, quod secundum Hebrueos editum nuper  transtulimus;” language inconsistent with his having regarded it as canonical Scripture.

(8.) The statements of later writers, Cyril of Jerusalem, Athanasius, Chrysostom, Augustine, Gregory Nazianzen, etc., merely echo the same testimony, and need not be more particularly referred to.

An impartial survey of the above evidence leads to the conclusion that, in the face of so many independent witnesses, we should be violating the first principles of historical criticism if we refused to accept the fact that Matthew wrote his Gospel originally in Hebrew. But whether this original was ever seen by Jerome or Epiphanius is more than questionable.

2. Internal Evidence. — What, then, is the origin of our present Gospel? To whom are we to ascribe its existing form and language? What is its authority? These are the questions which now meet us. and to which it must be confessed it is not easy to give a satisfactory answer. We may at the outset lay down as indisputable, in opposition to Cureton (who asserts, ut sup., that “a careful critical examination of the Greek text will afford very strong confirmation of the Hebrew original), that the phenomena of the Gospel as we have it-its language, its coincidences with and divergences from the other synoptists, the quotations from the Old Test. it contains, and the citations made from it by ancient writers, all oppose the notion of the present Greek text being a translation, and support its canonical authority.

(1.) An important argument may be drawn from the use made of the existing Gospel by all ancient writers. As Olshausen remarks (Clark's ed., 1, 28), while all the fathers of the Church assert the Hebrew origin of the Gospel, they without exception make use of the existing Greek text as canonical Scripture, and that without doubt or question, or anything that would lead to the belief that they regarded it as of less authority than the original Hebrew, or possessed it in any other form than that in which we now have it.

(2.) Another argument in favor of the authoritative character of our present Gospel arises from its universal diffusion and general acceptance, both in the Church and among her adversaries. Had the Hebrew Gospel been really clothed with the authority of the sole apostolic archetype, and our Greek Gospel been a mere translation, executed, as Jerome asserts, by some unknown individual (“quis postea in Grecum transtulerit non satis certum  est,” De Vir. Ill. 3), would not, as Olshausen remarks, ut sup., objections to it have been urged in some quarter or other, particularly in the country where Matthew himself labored, and for whose inhabitants the Hebrew was written? Would its statements have been accepted without a cavil by the opponents of the Church? No trace of such opposition is, however, to be met with. Not a doubt is ever breathed of its canonical authority.

(3.) Again, the text itself bears no marks of a translation. This is especially evident in the mode of dealing with the citations from the Old Test. These are of two kinds: (a) those standing in the discourses of our Lord himself, and the interlocutors; and (b) those introduced by the evangelist as proofs of our Lord's Messiahship. Now if we assume, as is certainly most probable (though the contrary has been maintained by Hug, the late duke of Manchester, and more recently by the Rev. Alexander Roberts, whose learned and able “Discussions on the Gospels” demand attentive consideration from every Biblical student), that Aramaic, not Greek, was the language ordinarily used by our Lord and his Jewish contemporaries, we should certainly expect that any citations from the Old Test., made by them in ordinary discourse, would be from the original Hebrew or its Aramaic counterpart, not from the Septuagint version, and would stand as such in the Aramaic record; while it would argue more than the ordinary license of a mere translator to substitute the Sept. renderings, even when at variance with the Hebrew before him. Yet what is the case? While in the class (b), due to the evangelist himself, which may be supposed to have had no representative in the current Greek oral tradition which we assume as the basis of the synoptical Gospels, we find original renderings of the Hebrew text; in the class (a), on the other hand, where we might, a priori, have looked for an even closer correspondence, the citations are usually from the Sept., even where it deviates from the Hebrew. In (a) we may reckon 3:3; 4:4, 6, 7, 10; 15:4, 8, 9; 19:5, 18; 21:13, 42; 22:39, 44; 23:39; 24:15; 26:31; 27:46. In (b), called by Westcott (Introd. p. 208, note 1) “Cyclic quotations,” 1:23; 2:6,15, 18; 4:15, 16; 8:17; 12:18 sq.; 13:35; 21:5; 27:9, 10). In two cases Matthew's citations agree with the synoptic parallels in a deviation from the Sept., all being drawn from the same oral groundwork. Matthew's quotations have been examined by Credner, one of the soundest of modern scholars, who pronounces decidedly for their derivation from the Greek (Einzleit. p. 94; comp. De Wette, Einzl. p. 198). We may therefore not unwarrantably find here additional evidence that in  the existing Greek text we have the work, not of a mere translator, but of an independent and authoritative writer.

(4.) The verbal correspondences between Matthew and the other synoptists in their narratives, and especially in the report of the speeches of our Lord and others, are difficult to account for if we regard it as a translation. As Alford remarks (Gr. Test. Proleg. 1:28), “The translator must have been either acquainted with the other two Gospels, in which case it is inconceivable that, in the midst of the present coincidences in many passages, such divergences should have occurred, or unacquainted with them, in which case the identity itself would be altogether inexplicable.” Indeed, in the words of Credner (Einzleit. p. 94, 95), “the Greek original of this Gospel is affirmed by its continual correspondence with those of Mark and Luke, and that not only in generals and important facts, but in particulars and minute details, in the general plan, in entire clauses, and in separate words-a phenomenon which admits of no explanation under the hypothesis of a translation from the Hebrew.”

(5.) This inference in favor of an original Greek Gospel is strongly confirmed by the fact that all versions, even the Peshito Syriac, the language in which the Gospel is said to have been originally written, are taken from the present Greek text. It is true that canon Cureton (Syriac Recens. p. 75 sq.) argues with much ability against this, and expends much learning and skill in proof of his hypothesis that the Syriac version of Matthew published by him is more ancient than the Peshito, and may be regarded as, in the main, identical with the Aramaic Gospel of Matthew; which he also considers to have been identical with the Gospel according to the Hebrews, used by the Nazarenes and Ebionites, “modified by some additions, interpolations, and perhaps some omissions.” His statement (p. 42) that “there is a marked difference between the recension of Matthew and that of the other Gospels, proving that they are by different hands — the former showing no signs, as the others do, of translation from the Greek” — demands the respect due to so careful a scholar; but he fails entirely to explain the extraordinary fact that, in the very country where Matthew published his Gospel, and within a comparatively short period, a version from the Greek was substituted for the authentic original; nor have his views met with general acceptance among scholars.

3. Having thus stated the arguments in favor of a Hebrew and Greek original respectively, it remains for us to inquire whether there is any way  of adjusting the claims of the two. Were there no explanation of this inconsistency between the external assertions and the internal facts, it would be hard to doubt the concurrent testimony of so many old writers, whose belief in it is shown by the tenacity with which they held it in spite of their own experience.

(1.) But it is certain that a Gospel, not the same as our canonical Matthew, sometimes usurped the apostle's name; and some of the witnesses we have quoted appear to have referred to this in one or other of its various forms or names. The Christians in Palestine still held that the Mosaic ritual was binding on them, even after the destruction of Jerusalem. At the close of the first century one party existed who held that the Mosaic law was only binding on Jewish converts; this was the Nazarenes. Another, the Ebionites, held that it was of universal obligation on Christians, and rejected Paul's Epistles as teaching the opposite doctrine. These two sects, who differed also in the most important tenets as to our Lord's person, possessed each a modification of the same Gospel, which no doubt each altered more and more, as their tenets diverged, and which bore various names-the Gospel of the twelve Apostles, the Gospel according to the Hebrews, the Gospel of Peter, or the Gospel according to Matthew. Enough is known to decide that the Gospel according to the Hebrews was not identical with our Gospel of Matthew; but it had many points of resemblance to the synoptical Gospels, and especially to Matthew.

What was its origin it is impossible to say: it may have been a description of the oral teaching of the apostles, corrupted by degrees; it may have come in its early and pure form from the hand of Matthew, or it may have been a version of the Greek Gospel of Matthew, as the evangelist who wrote especially for Hebrews. Now this Gospel, “the Proteus of criticism” (Thiersch), did exist; is it impossible that when the Hebrew Matthew is spoken of, this questionable document, the Gospel of the Hebrews, was really referred to? Observe that all accounts of it are at second hand (with a notable exception); no one quotes it; in cases of doubt about the text, Origen even does not appeal from the Greek to the Hebrew. All that is certain is, that Nazarenes or Ebionites, or both, boasted that they possessed the original Gospel of Matthew. Jerome is the exception, and him we can convict of the very mistake of confounding the two, and almost on his own confession. “At first he thought,” says an anonymous writer (Edinburgh Review, 1851, July, p. 39), “that it was the authentic Matthew, and translated it into both Greek and Latin from a copy which he obtained  at Bercea, in Syria. This appears from his De Vir. Ill., written in the year 392. Six years later, in his Commentary on Matthew, he spoke more doubtfully about it — ‘Quod vocatur a plerisque Matthaei authenticum.' Later still, in his book on the Pelagian heresy, written in the year 415, he modifies his account still further, describing the work as the ‘Evangelium juxta Hebraeos, quod Chaldaico quidem Syroque sermone, sed Hebraicis literis conscriptum est, quo utuntur usque hodie Nazareni secundum Apostolos, sive ut plerique autumant juxta Matthaeum, quod et in Caesariensi habetur Bibliotheca.' “There have pronounced for a Greek original — Erasmus, Calvin, Leclerc, Fabricius, Lightfoot, Wetstein, Paulus, Lardner, Hey, Hales, Hlug, Schott, De Wette, Moses Stuart, Fritzsche, Credner, Thiersch, and many others. Great names are ranged also on the other side, as Simon, Mill, Michaelis, Marsh, Eichhorn, Storr, Olshausen, and others. May not the truth be that Papias, knowing of more than one Aramaic Gospel in use among the Judaic sects, may have assumed the existence of a Hebrew original from which these were supposed to be taken, and knowing also the genuine Greek Gospel, may have looked on all these, in the loose, uncritical way which earned for him Eusebius's description, as the various “interpretations” to which he alludes? It is by no means improbable that after several inaccurate and imperfect translations of the Aramaean original came into circulation, Matthew himself was prompted by this circumstance to publish a Greek translation, or to have his Gospel translated under his own supervision. It is very likely that this Greek translation did not soon come into general circulation, so that it is even possible that Papias may have remained ignorant of its existence. See Stuart, in the Amer. Bib. Repos. 1838, p. 130-179, 315-356.

(2.) We think that Mr. Westcott — to whom the study of the Gospels owes so much-has pointed out the road to a still better solution. Not that the difficulties which beset this matter can be regarded as cleared up, or the question finally and satisfactorily settled, but a mode of reconciling the inconsistency between testimony and fact has been indicated, which, if pursued, may, we think, lead to a decision. “It has been shown,” says Mr. Westcott (Introd. p. 208, note), “that the oral Gospel probably existed from the first both in Aramaic and in Greek, and in this way a preparation for a fresh representative of the Hebrew Gospel was at once found. The parts of the Aramaic oral Gospels which were adopted by Matthew already existed in the Greek counterpart. The change was not so much a version as a substitution; and frequent coincidence with common parts of Mark and  Luke, which were derived from the same oral Greek Gospel, was a necessary consequence. Yet it may have happened that, as long as the Hebrew and Greek churches were in close connection, perhaps till the destruction of Jerusalem, no authoritative Greek Gospel of Matthew — i.e. such a version of the Greek oral Gospel as would exactly answer to Matthew's version of the Aramaic-was committed to writing. When, however, the separation between the two sections grew more marked, the Greek Gospel was written, not indeed as a translation, but as a representation of the original, as a Greek oral counterpart was already current.” This theory of the origin of the Greek Gospel, it appears to us, meets the facts of the case, and satisfies its requirements more fully than any other.

We have seen above that the language of Papias indicates that, even in his day, the Gospel of Matthew existed substantially in Greek, and its universal diffusion and general authority in the earliest ages of the Church prove that its composition cannot be placed much after the times of the apostles. May it not have been then that the two — the Aramaic and the Greek Gospel — existed for some time in their most important portions as an old tradition side by side — that the Aramaic was the first to be committed to writing, and gained a wide though temporary circulation among the Hebrew Christians of Syria and Palestine? that when, as would soon be the case, the want of a Greek Gospel for the use of the Hellenistic Jews was felt, this also was published in its written form, either by Matthew himself (as is maintained by Thiersch, Olshausen, and Lee), or by those to whom, from constant repetition, the main portions were familiar; perhaps under the apostle's eye, and with the virtual, if not the formal sanction of the Church at Jerusalem? As it supplied a need widely felt by the Gentile Christians, it would at once obtain currency, and as the Gentile Church rapidly extended her borders, while that of the Jewish believers was continually becoming confined within narrower limits, this Greek Gospel would speedily supplant its Hebrew predecessor, and thus furnish a fresh and most striking example of what Mr. Westcott, in his excellent work on The Bible in the Church (Introd. p. 8), calls “that doctrine of a divine providence separating (as it were) and preserving special books for the perpetual instruction of the Church, which is the true correlative and complement of every sound and reverend theory of inspiration.” No other hypothesis, as Dr. Lee has satisfactorily shown (Inspir. of H. Sc. Appendix M), than the Greek Gospel being either actually or substantially the production of Matthew himself, “accounts for the profound silence of ancient writers respecting the translation... or for the absence of the least  trace of any other Greek translation of the Hebrew original.” The hypotheses which assign the translation to Barnabas (Isid. Hispal., Chron. p. 272), John (Theophyl., Euthym. Zigab.), Mark (Greswell), Luke and Paul conjointly (Anastas. Sinaita), or James the brother of our Lord (Syn. Sacr. Scr. apud Athanas. 2:202), are mere arbitrary assertions without any foundation in early tradition. The last named is the most ingenious, as we may reasonably suppose that the bishop of Jerusalem would feel solicitude for the spiritual wants of the Hellenistic Christians of that city.

Those who desire to pursue the investigation of this subject will find ample materials for doing so in the Introductions of Hug, De Wette, Credner, etc.; Marsh's Michaelis, vol. iii, pt. i, where the patristic authorities are fully discussed; and they will be found, for the most part, in Kirchhofer, Quellensammlung, where will also be found the passages referring to the Gospel of the Hebrews, p. 448; also in most of the commentaries. The following have written monographs on this point: Sonntag (Altorf, 1696), Schroder (Viteb. 1699, 1702), Masch (Halle, 1755),Williams (Lond. 1790), Elsner (F. ad V. 1791), Buslaw (Vratisl. 1826), Stuart (Bibl. Repos. 1838), Harless (Erlang. 1841, also 1842, the latter tr. in Bibl. Repos. 1844), Tregelles (Kitto's Journ. 1850, and separately), Alexander (ibid. 1850), Roberts (Lond. 1864). More general discussions may be found in Lardner's Credibility, vol. v; Reuss's Gesch. d. Kanonl; Tregelles on The Original Language of St. Matthew; Rev. A. Roberts's Discussions on the Gospels; the commentaries of Olshausen, Meyer, Alford, Wetstein, Kuinol, Fritzsche, Lange, etc.; and the works on the Gospels of Norton (Credibility), Westcott, Baur, Gieseler (Entstehung), Hilgenfeld, etc.; Cureton's Syriac Recension, Preface; and Dr. W. Lee on Inspiration, Appendix M; Jeremiah Jones's Vindication of St. Matthew; Ewald, Die drei Erst. Ev.; and Jahrbuch d. Bibl. Wissensch. 1848-49.

V. Characteristics. — Matthew's is emphatically the Gospel of the Kingdom. The main object of the evangelist is to portray the kingly character of Christ, and to show that in him the ideal of the King reigning in righteousness, the true Heir of David's throne, was fulfilled (comp. Augustine, De Consens. Ev. passim). Thus the tone throughout is majestic and kingly. He views things in the grand general aspect, and, indifferent to the details in which Mark loves so much to dwell, he gathers up all in the great result. His narrative proceeds with a majestic simplicity, regardless of time and place, according to another and deeper order, ready to sacrifice mere chronology or locality to the development of this idea. Thus he brings  together events separated sometimes by considerable intervals, according to the unity of their nature or purpose, and with a grand but simple power accumulates in groups the discourses, parables, and miracles of our Lord (I. Williams, Study of Gospels, p. 28). From the formation and objects of the Gospels, we should expect that their prevailing characteristics would be indicated rather by a general tone and spirit than by minute peculiarities. Not, however, that these latter are wanting. It has already been remarked how the genealogy with which Matthew's Gospel opens sets our Lord forth in his kingly character, as the heir of the throne of David, the representative of the royal line of which he was the true successor and fulfillment. As we advance we find his birth hailed, not by lowly shepherds as in Luke, but by wise men coming to wait on him with royal gifts, inquiring, “Where is he that is born king of the Jews.” In the Sermon on the Mount the same majesty and authority appear. We hear the Judge himself delivering his sentence; the King laying down the laws of his kingdom, “I say unto you,” and astonishing his hearers with the “authority” with which he speaks. The awful majesty of our Lord's reproofs in his teaching in the Temple, and his denunciations of the Scribes and Pharisees, also evidence the authority of a king and lawgiver-” one who knew the mind of God and could reveal it;” which may also be noticed in the lengthened discourses that mark the close of his ministry, in which “the king” and “the kingdom of heaven” come forward with so much frequency (Mat 21:31; Mat 21:43; Mat 22:2 sq.; Mat 23:14; Mat 24:14; Mat 25:1). Nor can we overlook the remarkable circumstance that, in the parable of the marriage-feast, so similar in its general circumstances with that in Luke (Luk 14:16), instead of “a certain man,” it is “a king” making a marriage for his son, and in kingly guise sending forth his armies and binding the unworthy guest. The addition of the doxology also to the Lord's Prayer, with its ascription of “the kingdom, the power, and the glory,” is in such true harmony with the same prevailing tone as to lead many to see in this fact alone the strongest argument for its genuineness.

But we must not in this, or in any of the Gospels, direct our attention too exclusively to any one side of our Lord's character. “The King is one and the same in all, and so is the Son of Man and the Priest. . .. He who is the King is also the Sacrifice” (Williams, ut sup. p. 32). The Gospel is that of the King, but it is the King “meek” (Mat 21:5), “meek and lowly of heart” (Mat 11:29); the kingdom is that of “the poor in spirit,” “the persecuted for righteousness' sake” (Mat 11:3; Mat 11:10), into which “the weary and  heavy laden” are invited, and which they enter by submitting to the “yoke” of its king. He, it tells us, was to be one of ourselves, “whose brotherhood with man answered all the anticipations the Jewish prophets had formed of their king, and whose power to relieve the woes of humanity could not be separated from his participation in them, who ‘himself took our infirmities and bare our sicknesses'“ (Mat 8:17) (Maurice, Unity of N.T. p. 190). As the son of David and the son of Abraham, he was the partaker of the sorrows as well as the glories of the throne — the heir of the curse as well as the blessing. The source of all blessings to mankind, fulfilling the original promise to Abraham, the curse due to man's sin meets and centers in him, and is transformed into a blessing when the cross becomes his kingly throne; and from the lowest point of his degradation he reappears, in his resurrection, as the Lord and King to whom “all power is given in heaven and earth.” He fulfills the promise, “In thy seed shall all families of the earth be blessed;” in the command to “go and make disciples of all nations,” he “expands the I AM, which was the ground of the national polity, into the name of ‘the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost' (Maurice, ut sup. p. 221).

Once more, the kingdom he came to establish was to be a fatherly kingdom. The King he made known was one reigning in God's name, and as his representative. That God was the father of his people, as of him, in and through whom human beings were to be adopted as the children of God. This characteristic of the Gospel is perpetually meeting us. At every turn Matthew represents our Lord bringing out the mind of God and showing it to be the mind of a Father. The fatherly relation is the ground of all his words of counsel, command warning, comfort. Especially is this the casein the Sermon on the Mount. Every command, as to good works (v. 16, 45, 48), almsgiving (Mat 6:1-2), prayer (Mat 6:6; Mat 6:8), forgiveness (Mat 6:14-15), fasting (Mat 6:18), trust and faith (Mat 6:26; Mat 7:11), is based on the revelation of a Father. The twelve are sent forth in the same name and strength (Mat 10:20; Mat 10:29). The kingdom Christ came to establish is not so much a kingdom as a family — the Ecclesia, a word found only in Matthew (Mat 16:18; Mat 18:17) — “held together by the law of forgiveness and mutual sacrifice, with their elder Brother in the midst of them, and their will so identified with that which rules heaven and earth, that whatever they shall agree to ask shall be done by their Father.” This characteristic of Matthew is remarkably evidenced by a comparative survey of the usage of the  evangelists. In Mark we find our Lord speaking of or to God, as his Father, three times, in Luke twelve times, in Matthew twenty-two times; as the Father of his people, in Mark twice, in Luke five times, in Matthew twenty- two times.

Another minor characteristic which deserves remark, is Matthew's use of the plural, where the other evangelists have the singular. Thus, in the temptation, we have “stones” and “loaves” (Mat 4:3), two daemoniacs (Mat 8:28), τούς χόρτους (Mat 14:19), two blind men (Mat 20:30; comp. 9:27), the ass and her colt (Mat 21:2), servants (Mat 21:34; Mat 21:36), both thieves blaspheming (Mat 27:44). This is ingeniously accounted for by Da Costa (Four Witnesses, p. 322), though this is not universally applicable, on the idea that “his point of view — regarding the events he narrates as fulfilled prophecies — leads him to regard the species rather than the individual; the entire plenitude of the prophecy rather than the isolated fulfillment.”

VI. Relation to Mark and Luke. — In the article on Mark we have expressed our opinion that, while his Gospel is probably in essence the oldest, there is nothing seriously to invalidate the traditional statement that Matthew's was the earliest in composition — the first committed to writing. Neither does a careful review of the text of the Gospel allow us to accept the view put forth by Ewald with his usual dogmatism, and defended with his wonted acuteness, that, as we have it, it is a fusion of four different elements —

(1.) An original Greek Gospel of the simplest and briefest form;

(2.) An Aramaic “collection of sayings” (τὰ λόγια);

(3.) the narrative of Mark; and

(4.) “a book of higher history.” That our Gospel is no such curious mosaic is evident from the unity of plan and unity of language which pervades the whole, and to an unprejudiced reader Ewald's theory refutes itself.

Comparing Matthew's Gospel with those of Mark and Luke, we find the following passages peculiar to him: chap. 1 (with the exception of the great central fact), and chap. 2 entirely. The genealogy, the suspicions of Joseph, the visit of the magi, the flight into Egypt and return thence, the massacre  of the innocents, and the reason of the settlement at Nazareth, are given by Matthew alone. To him we owe the notice that “the Pharisees and Sadducees” came to John's baptism (Mat 3:7); that John was unwilling to baptize our Lord, and the words in which Jesus satisfied his scruples (Mat 3:13-15); the Sermon on the Mount in its fullest form (ch. 5, 6, 7); the prediction of the call of the Gentiles, appended to the miracle of the centurion's servant (Mat 8:11-12); the cure of the two blind men (Mat 9:27-30); and that memorable passage by which, if by nothing else, Matthew will forever be remembered with thankfulness which, as perhaps the fullest exposition of the spirit of the Gospel anywhere to be found in Holy Scripture, taught Augustine the difference between the teaching of Christ and that of the best philosophers (Mat 11:28-30); the solemn passage about “idle words” (Mat 12:36-37); four of the parables in ch. 13, the tares, the hid treasure, the pearl, and the draw-net; several incidents relating to Peter, his walking on the water (Mat 14:28-31), the blessing pronounced upon him (Mat 16:17-19), the tribute-money (Mat 17:24-27); nearly the whole of ch. 18, with its lessons of humility and forgiveness, and the parable of the unmerciful servant; the lessons on voluntary continence (Mat 19:10; Mat 19:12); the promise to the twelve (Mat 19:28); the parables of the laborers in the vineyard (Mat 20:1-16), the two sons (Mat 21:28-32), the transference of the kingdom to the Gentiles (Mat 21:43); the parable of the marriage of the king's son (Mat 22:1-14); nearly the whole of the denunciations against the Scribes and Pharisees in ch. 23; the parables of the last things in ch. 25.

In the history of the passion the peculiarities are numerous and uniform in character, tending to show how, in the midst of his betrayal, sufferings, and death, our Lord's Messiahship was attested. It is in Matthew alone that we read of the covenant with Judas for “thirty pieces of silver” (Mat 26:15); his inquiry “Is it I?” (Mat 26:25), as well as the restoration of the money in his despair, and its ultimate destination in unconscious fulfillment of prophecy (Mat 27:3-10); the cup “for the remission of sins” (Mat 26:28); the mention of the “twelve legions of angels” (Mat 26:52-54); Pilate's wife's dream (Mat 27:19), his washing his hands (Mat 27:24), and the imprecation “His blood be on us,” etc. (Mat 27:25); the opening of the graves (Mat 27:52-53), and the watch placed at the sepulcher (Mat 27:62-66). In the account of the resurrection we find only in Matthew the great earthquake (Mat 28:2), the descent of the angel, his glorious appearance striking terror into the guards (Mat 28:2-4),  their flight, and the falsehood spread by them at the instigation of the priests (Mat 28:11-15); our Lord's appearance to the women (Mat 28:9-10); the adoration and doubt of the apostles (Mat 28:17); and, finally, the parting commission and promise of his ever-abiding presence (Mat 28:18-20).

This review of the Gospel will show us that of the matter peculiar to Matthew, the larger part consists of parables and discourses, and that he adds comparatively little to the narrative. Of thirty-three recorded miracles eighteen are given by Matthew, but only two, the cure of the blind men (Mat 9:27-30) and the tribute money (Mat 17:24-27), are peculiar to him. Of twenty-nine parables Matthew records fifteen; ten, as noticed above, being peculiar to him. Reuss, dividing the matter contained in the synoptical Gospels into 100 sections, finds 73 of them in Matthew, 63 in Mark, in Luke, the richest of all, 82. Of these, 49 are common to all three; 9 common to Matthew and Mark 8 to Matthew and Luke 3 to Mark and Luke. Only 7 of these are peculiar to Matthew 2 to Mark; while Luke contains no less than 22.

Matthew's narrative, as a rule, is the least graphic. The great features of the history which bring into prominence our Lord's character as teacher and prophet, the substance of type and prophecy, the Messianic king, are traced with broad outline, without minute or circumstantial details. We are conscious of a want of that picturesque power and vivid painting which delight us in the other Gospels, especially in that of Mark. This deficiency, however, is more than compensated for by the grand simplicity of the narrative, in which everything is secondary to the evangelist's great object. The facts which prove the Messianic dignity of his Lord are all in all with him, the circumstantials almost nothing, while he portrays the earthly form and theocratic glory of the new dispensation, and unfolds the glorious consummation of the “kingdom of heaven.”

VII. Arrangement and Contents. — Matthew's order, we have already seen, is according to subject-matter rather than chronological sequence, which in the first half is completely disregarded. More attention is paid to order of time in the latter half, where the arrangement agrees with that of Mark. The main body of his Gospel divides itself into groups of discourses collected according to their leading tendency, and separated from each other by groups of anecdotes and miracles. We may distinguish seven such collections of discourses —

(1.) The Sermon on the Mount, a specimen of our Lord's ordinary didactic instruction (ch. 5-7); divided by a group of works of healing, comprising no less than ten out of eighteen recorded miracles, from

(2.) the commission of the twelve (ch. 10). The following chapters (11, 12) give the result of our Lord's own teaching, and, introducing a change of feeling towards him, prepare us for (3.) his first open denunciation of his enemies (Mat 12:25-45), and pave the way for

(4.) the group of parables, including seven out of fifteen recorded by him (ch. 13). The next four chapters, containing the culminating point of our Lord's history in Peter's confession (Mat 16:13-20), and the transfiguration (ch. 17), with the first glimpses of the cross (Mat 16:21; Mat 17:12), are bound together by historical sequence. In

(5.), comprising ch. 18, we have a complete treatise in itself, made up of fragments on humility and brotherly love. The counsels of perfection, in Mat 19:1 to Mat 20:16, are followed by the disputes with the Scribes and Pharisees (Mat 21:23 to Mat 22:46), which supply the ground for

(6.) the solemn denunciations of the hypocrisies and sophisms by which they nullified the spirit of the law (ch. 23), followed by

(7.) the prophecy of the last things (ch. 24, 25). More particularly its principal divisions are —

1. The introduction to the ministry (ch. 1-4).

2. The laying down of the new law for the Church in the Sermon on the Mount (ch. 5-7).

3. Events in historical order, showing Jesus as the worker of miracles (ch. 8, 9).

4. The appointment of apostles to preach the kingdom (ch. 10).

5. The doubts and opposition excited by his activity in divers minds — in John's disciples, in sundry cities, in the Pharisees (ch. 11, 12).

6. A series of parables on the nature of the kingdom (ch. 13).

7. Similar to 5. The effects of his ministry on his countrymen, on Herod, the people of Gennesaret, Scribes and Pharisees, and on multitudes, whom he feeds (Mat 13:53; Mat 16:12).

8. Revelation to his disciples of his sufferings. His instructions to them thereupon (Mat 16:13 to Mat 18:35).

9. Events of a journey to Jerusalem (ch. 19, 20).

10. Entrance into Jerusalem and resistance to him there, and denunciation of the Pharisees (ch. 21-23).

11. Last discourses; Jesus as lord and judge of Jerusalem, and also of the world (ch. 24, 25).

12. Passion and resurrection (ch. 26-28).

The view that Matthew's Gospel is arranged chronologically was revived by Eichhorn, who has been followed by Marsh, De Wette, and others. But it has been controverted by Hug, Olshausen, Greswell, Ellicott, and others, and is almost universally held to be untenable.

VIII. Style and Diction. — The language of Matthew is less characteristic than that of the other evangelists. Of the three synoptical Gospels it is the most decidedly Hebraistic, both in diction and construction, but less so than that of John. Credner and others have remarked the following

(1.) ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν, which occurs thirty-two times in Matthew and not once in the other evangelists, who use instead ἡ βασ. τ. θεοῦ, employed also by Matthew (Mat 6:33; Mat 12:28; Mat 21:31; Mat 21:43).

(2.) ὁ πατὴρ ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς (ὁ οὐράνιος, four times), sixteen times, only twice in Mark, not at all in Luke.

(3.) Υἱὸς Δαβίδ, to designate Jesus as the Messiah, seven times, three times each in Mark and Luke.

(4.) ῾Η ἁγία πόλις, and ὁ ἄγιος τόπος, for Jerusalem, three times; not in the other evangelists

(5.) ἡ συντελεία τοῦ αἰῶνος, “the consummation of the age” “the end of the world,” is found five times in Matthew, nowhere else in the New Test. except Heb 9:26, in the plural, αἰώνων.  (6.) ἵνα (ὅπως) πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθέν, eight times, nowhere else in the New Test. John uses ἵνα πληρ. ὁ λόγ, or ἡ γραφ; Mark once (Mar 14:49), ἵνα πληρ. αἱ γραφ.

(7.) τὸ ῥθὲν (always used by Matthew when quoting holy Scripture himself in other citations γέγραπται, with the other evangelists), twelve times; ὁ ῥηθείς, once (Mat 3:3). He never uses the singular, γραφή. Mark once uses τὸ ῥηθέν (Mar 13:14).

(8.) ἐθνικός, twice; nowhere else in the New Test.

(9.) ὀμνύειν ἐν seven times; not elsewhere, save Rev 10:6.

(10.) καὶ ἰδού, in narrative, twenty-three times; in Luke sixteen times; not in Mark. ἰδού, after a genitive absolute, nine times.

(11.) προσέρχεσθαι and πορεύεσθαι, continually used to give a pictorial coloring to the narrative (e.g. Mat 4:3; Mat 8:5; Mat 8:19; Mat 8:25; Mat 9:14; Mat 9:20, etc.; Mat 2:8; Mat 9:13; Mat 11:4, etc.).

(12.) λέγων, absolutely, without the dative of the person (e.g. Mat 1:20; Mat 3:2; Mat 3:13; Mat 3:2; Mat 3:14; Mat 3:17; Mat 5:2; Mat 6:31, etc.).

(13.) Ιεροσόλυμα is the name of the holy city with Matthew always, except matt 23:37. It is the same in Mark, with one (doubtful) exception (Mar 11:1). Luke uses this form rarely; ῾Ιερουσαλήμ frequently.

Other peculiarities, establishing the unity of authorship, may be noticed:

(1.) The use of τὸτε, as the ordinary particle of transition, ninety times; six times in Mark, and fourteen in Luke.

(2.) καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε, five times; Luke uses ὅτε δὲ ἐγένετο, or καὶ ὅτε ἐγενετο.

(3.) ἕως ου, seven times.

(4.) ἐν ἔκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ, ἐν τῇ éρᾷ ἐκ..., and ἀπὸ τ. éρ. ἐκ., scarcely found in Mark or Luke.

(5.) ἀναχωρέω, “ to retire,” ten times.

(6.) κατ᾿ ὄναρ, six times.

(7.) ποιεῖν ὡς, éσπερ, Καθώς, ὡσαύτως; Luke, ποι. ὁμοίωκ.

(8.) τάφος, six times; only Rom 3:13 besides in the N.T.

(9.) σφόδρα, and other adverbs, after the verb, except οὕτω, always before it.

(10.) προσκυνεῖν, with the dative, ten times; twice in Mark, three times in John.

Other words which are found either only or more frequently in Matthew are, μαθητεύειν, σεληνιάζεσθαι, φρόνιμος, οἰκιακός, ὕστερον, ἐκεῖθεν, διστάζειν, καταποντίζεσθαι, μεταιρεῖν, συναιρεῖν λόγον, συμβούλιον λαμβάνειν, μαλακία-κος, etc. (see Credner, Einzleit. p. 63 sq.; Gersdorf, Beitrdye z. Sprachchharact. d. N.T.).

IX. Citations from the Old Testament. — Few facts are more significant of the original purpose of this Gospel, and the persons for whom it was designed, than the frequency of citations from and references to the O.- Test. Scriptures. While in Luke and Mark, the Gentile Gospels, we have only twenty-four and twenty-three respectively, Matthew supplies no less than fifty-four. The character of the quotations is no less noticeable than the number. In Matthew the Old Test. is cited verbally no less than forty- three times, many of the quotations being peculiar to this evangelist; in Luke we have not more than nineteen direct citations, and only eight quotations (in Mark only two), which are not found elsewhere. The two classes into which these citations are distinguished — those more or less directly from the Sept., and those which give an original rendering of the Hebrew text — have been alluded to above. The citations peculiar to Matthew are marked with an asterisk (\*), and those which he quotes as having been fulfilled ill our Lord's life with (a).

X. Genuineness — Notwithstanding the doubts that have been thrown upon it, the genuineness of Matthew is as satisfactorily established as that of any ancient book whatever. See Davidson's Introd. to the N. Test., vol. 1. From the days of Justin we find perpetual quotations corresponding with the existing text of the Gospel, which prove that the book then in circulation, as of canonical authority, was the same as that we now have. Of the various recensions by which we are invited by Marsh, Hilgenfeld, Schleiermacher, Ewald, etc., to believe that the Gospel assumed its present form, there is absolutely no external evidence; while the internal, arising  from style and diction, are entirely in favor of the whole having substantially proceeded from one hand. Other supposed internal evidence varies so much, according to the subjective position of critics, and leads them by the same data to such opposite results, as to be little worth.

1. Some critics, admitting the apostolic antiquity of a part of the Gospel, apply to Matthew, as they do to Luke, the gratuitous supposition of a later editor or compiler, who, by augmenting and altering the earlier document, produced our present Gospel. Hilgenfeld (p. 106) endeavors to separate the older from the newer work, and includes much historical matter in the former; since Schleiermacher, several critics, misinterpreting the λόγια of Papias, consider the older document to have been a collection of “discourses” only. We are asked to believe that in the 2d century, for two or more of the Gospels, new works, differing from them both in matter and compass, were substituted for the old, and that about the end of the 2d century our present Gospels were adopted by authority to the exclusion of all others, and that henceforth the copies of the older works entirely disappeared, and have escaped the keenest research ever since. Eichhorn's notion is that “the Church” sanctioned the four canonical books, and by its authority gave them exclusive currency; but there existed at that time no means for convening a council, and if such a body could have met and decided, it would not have been able to force on the churches books discrepant from the older copies to which they had long been accustomed, without discussion, protest, and resistance (see Norton, Genuineness, chap. 1). That there was no such resistance or protest we have ample evidence. Irenaeus knows the four Gospels only (Haer. 3, chap. 1). Tatian, who died A.D. 170, composed a Gospel harmony, lost to us, under the name of Diatessaron (Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. 4:29). Theophilus, bishop of Antioch, about 168, wrote a commentary on the Gospels (Jerome, Ad Algasiam, and De Vir. ill.). Clement of Alexandria (flourished about 189) knew the four Gospels, and distinguished between them and the uncanonical gospel according to the Egyptians. Tertullian (born about 160) knew the four Gospels, and was called on to vindicate the text of one of them against the corruptions of Marcion. SEE LUKE.

Origen (born 185) calls the four Gospels the four elements of the Christian faith; and it appears that his copy of Matthew contained the genealogy (Comm. in Joan.). Passages from Matthew are quoted by Justin Martyr, by the author of the letter to Diognetus (see in Otto's Justin Martyr, vol. 2), by Hegesippus, Irenaeus, Tatian, Athenagoras, Theophilus, Clement,  Tertullian, and Origen. It is not merely from the matter, but the manner of the quotations, from the calm appeal as to a settled authority, from the absence of all hints of doubt, that we regard it as proved that the book we possess had not been the subject of any sudden change. Was there no heretic to throw back with double force against Tertullian the charge of alteration which he brings against Marcion? Was there no orthodox Church or member of a Church to complain that, instead of the Matthew and the Luke that had been taught to them and their fathers, other and different writings were now imposed on them? Neither the one nor the other appears.

The citations of Justin Martyr, very important for this subject, have been thought to indicate a source different from the Gospels which we now possess; and by the word (ἀπομνημονεύματα (memoirs), he has been supposed to indicate that lost work. We have not space here to show that the remains referred to are the Gospels which we possess, and not any one book; and that though Justin quotes the Gospels very loosely, so that his words often bear but a slight resemblance to the original, the same is true of his quotations from the Septuagint. He transposes words, brings separate passages together, attributes the words of one prophet to another, and even quotes the Pentateuch for facts not recorded in it. Many of the quotations from the Septuagint are indeed precise, but these are chiefly in the Dialogue with Trypho, where, reasoning with a Jew on the O.T., he does not trust his memory, but consults the text. This question is disposed of in Norton's Genuineness, vol. 1, and in Hug's Einleitung.

2. The genuineness of the first two chapters has been called in question, but on no sufficient grounds. See Meyer's note, Comment. 1:65, who adduces as arguments for their genuineness, that —

(1.) they are found in all MSS. and ancient versions, and are quoted by the fathers of the 2d and 3d centuries, Irenaeus. Clem. Alex., etc., and are referred to by Celsus (Orig. C. Cels. 1:38; 2:32).

(2.) The facts they record are perfectly in keeping with a Gospel written for Jewish Christians.

(3.) The opening of chap. 3, ἐν δὲ ταῖς ἡμ.ἐκ, refers back, by its construction, to the close of chap. 2; and Mat 4:13 would be unintelligible without Mat 2:23.

(4.) There is no difference between the diction and constructions and those in the other parts of the Gospel.

The opponents of these two chapters rest chiefly on their alleged absence from the Gospel of the Hebrews in use among the Ebionites (Epiphanius, Haer. 30:13). But Epiphanius describes that book as “incomplete, adulterated, and mutilated;” and as the Ebionites regarded Jesus simply as the human Messiah co-ordinate with Adam and Moses, the absence of the two chapters may readily be accounted for on doctrinal grounds. The same explanation may be given for the alleged absence from the Diatessaron of Tatian of these chapters, and the corresponding parts of Luke containing the genealogy, and all the other passages which show that the Lord was born of the seed of David “according to the flesh” (Theodoret, Haer. fab. 1:20). The case must be a weak one which requires us to appeal to acknowledged heretics for the correction of our canon. The supposed discrepancy between the opening chapters of Matthew and Luke, which has led even professor Norton to follow Strauss, Paulus, Schleiermacher, etc., in rejecting them, has been abundantly discussed in all recent commentaries, and by Wieseler (Synopsis), Neander (Life of Christ), Mill (Pantheism), Kern (Ursprung d. Ev. Mat.), etc., as well as in the various answers to Strauss. It is sufficient here to note the following points in reply:

(1.) Such questions are by no means confined to these chapters, but are found in places of which the apostolic origin is admitted.

(2.) The treatment of Luke's Gospel by Marcion suggests how the Jewish Christians dropped out of their version an account which they would not accept.

(3.) Prof. Norton stands alone, among those who object to the two chapters, in assigning the genealogy to the same author as the rest of the chapters (Hilgenfeld, p. 46, 47).

(4.) The difficulties in the harmony are all reconcilable, and the day has passed, it may be hoped, when a passage can be struck out, against all the MSS. and the testimony of early writers, for subjective impressions about its contents.

XI. Commentaries. — The following are the special exegetical helps on the whole of Matthew's Gospel, a few of the most important of which we  indicate by an asterisk prefixed: Origen, Commentaria (in Opp. 3:440 sq., 830 sq.); also Scholia (in Galland, Bibl. Patr. 14); Athanasius, Fragmenta (in Opp. 1, pt. 2; also 3:18); Hilarius Pictaviensis, Commentarii (in Opp. 1:669); Jerome, Commentarii (in Opp. v. 1); Faustus Rhegiensis, Super ev. Matthew (in Jerome, Opp. 11. 77, 204, 365); Chrysostom, Homilies (in Opp. [Spuria,], 6:731-980; also ed. Field, Cantab. 1839, 3 vols. 8vo; in English, in Lib. of Fathers, Oxf. 1843-51, vols. xi, xv, xxxiv); Cyril of Alexandria, T Fayogenta (in Mai, Script. vet. viii, pt. 2:142); Paschasits Ratbertus, Commentaria (in Opp. i; also in Bibl. Max. Patr. xiv); Chromatius Aquiliensis, Tractatus (in Galland, Bibl. Patr. 8:333); Bede, Expositio (in Opp. v. 1); Anselm, Enarrationes (in Opp. ed. Picard); Rupertus Tuitiensis, Super Matthceum (in Opp. 2:1); Aquinas, Commentarii (in Opp. iii); Druthmar, Expositio (in Bibl. Max. Patr. 15:86); Albertus Magnus, Commentarii (in Opp. ix); Melancthon, Commentarii (Argent. 1523, 8vo; also in Opp. iii); Munster, Annotationes (Basil. 1537, fol.; also in Critici Sacri); Luther, Annotationes [on ch.i- xviii] (Vitemb. 1538, 8vo; also in Works, both Lat. and Germ.); Sarcer, Scholia (Freft. 1538; Basil. 1540, 1541, 1544, 1560, 8vo); Bullinger, Commentarius (Tigur. 1542, fol.); Titelmann,Commentarius (Antw. 1545, 8vo; 1576; Par. 1546; Lugd. 1547,1556, 1568, fol.); Musculus, Commentarius [includ. Mark and Luke] (Basil. 1548,1556,1566,1578,1591, 1611, fol.); Bredembrach, Commentaria (Colon. 1550, fol.); Zwingle, Annotationes (in Opp. 4:1; in Germ. by Kiister, Halle, 1783, 8vo); Chytreus, Commentarius (Vitemb. 1555, 1566, 8vo); Ferus, narrationes (Mogunt. 1559, fol.; Antw. and Lugd. 1559; Par. and Ven. 1560; Complut. 1562; Par. 1564; Antw. 1570; Romans 1577; Lugd. 1604, 1610, 8vo); Hersel, Commentarius (Lovan. 1568, 1572, 8vo); Marloratus, Exposition (from the Lat. by Tymme, Lend. 1570, fol.); Junius, Expositio (in Opp. 2:1893); Brentz, Commentarii (in Opp. v); Aretius, Commentarius (Morg. 1580, 8vo); Tyndale, Notes [on i-xxi] (in Expositions, p. 227); Gualther, Homilies (Tigur. 1590-96, 2 vols. fol.); De Avendano, Commentarius (Madrid, 1592, 2 vols. fol.); Dannaus, Commentarius (Genev. 1593, 8vo); Kirsten, Notae (Vratisl. 1611, fol.); Pelargus, Illustrationes (Freft. 1612, 1617, 2 vols. 4to); Tostatus, Commentarii (in Opp.); Scultetus, Exercitationaes (Amst. 1624, 4to); Novarinus, Noted (Ven. 1629; Lugd. 1642, fol.); Gomar, Explicatio (Groning. 1631, 8vo); (Ecolampadius, Enarrationes (Basil. 1636, 8vo); Possinus and Corderius, Symbolcea (Tolos. 1646,2 vols. fol.); Episcopius, Note [on i-xxiv] (in Opp. II, 1:1); Dickson, Exposition (Lond. 1651,  12mo); De Aponte, Commentarii (Lugd. 1651, 2 vols. fol.); Bertram, Enucleatio (Arnst. 1651, 4to); MIatthias, Analysis (Ainst. 1652, fol.); Wandalin, Paraphssis (Slesw. 1654,4to); De Pise, Commentaria (Lugd. 1656, fol.); Pareus, Comnmentarius (in Opp. ii); Cocceits, Noite (in Opp. 12:3); Lightfoot, Exercitations (in Works, xi); Blackwood, Exposition [on i-x] (Lond. 1659, 4to); A. Lapide, In Matth. (Antw. 1660. fol.); Leighton, Lecturles [on i-ix] (in Worcks, 3:1); Winstrup, Pandectae (Lund. Scan. 1660, 1674; Hafn. 1699, 2 vols. fol.); Gerhard, A dnofationes (Jen. 1663, 1696, 4to); Spanheim, Vindici (i, ii, Heidelb. 1663; iii, L. B. 1685, 4to); Meisner, Exercitationes (Vitemb. 1664, 4to); Hartsoecker, A antekenigen (Amst. 1668, 4to); Saubert, Variae Lectiones, etc. (Helmst. 1672, 4to); De Veil, Explicatio [includ. Mark] (Lond. 1678, 8vo); Van Til, Notes (in Dutch,Amst. 1682; Dort, 1687, 1695; in German, Cassel, 1700; Frcft. 1705, 4to); Huysing, Exposition (in Dutch, Hague, 1684, 4to; in German, Cassel, 1710, fol.); Crell, Commentarius [on i-v] (in Opp. 1:1); Przipcovius, Cogitationes (Elesuth. 1692, fol.); Wegner, Adnotata (Regiom. 1699,17-05, 4to); Hidevger. Labores [incllud. some other books] (Tigur. 1700, 4to); Olearius, Observationes (Lips. 1713,3, 4to); Pfaff, Note (Tilbing. 1721, 4to); Klemm, Exercitia [on i-v] (Tiib. 1725, 4to); Vrimoet, Observationes [on i-v] (Fr. ad R. 1728, 8vo); D. Scott, Notes (Lond. 1741, 4to); Elsner, Commentarimus (Zwoll. 1767-9, 2 vols. 4to); Wakefield, Notes (Lond. 1782, 4to); Adam, Exposition (in Works, i); Goz, Erklscruii (Stuttg. 1785, 8vo); Wizenman, Jesus nach Matth. (Basle, 1789, 1864, 8vo); Beausobre, Com7mentary (from the French, Cambr. 1790, 8vo, and often since); Heddalus, Anmnnerkungen (Stuttg. 1792, 2 vols. 8vo); Griesbach, Commentarius (Jen. 1798, 8vo); Porteus, Lectures (Lond. 1802, and since. 2 vols. 8ev); Schulthess, Homilien (Winterth. 1805, 2 vols. 8vo); Menken, Betrachtungen (i, Frckft. 1809; ii, Bann. 1822, 8vo); Lodge, Lectures (Lond. 1818, 8vo); Meyer, Beitrage (Wien, 1818, 8vo); Gratz, Conmentnar (Tib. 1821-23, 2 vols. 8vo); Binterim, Bemner- ungen (i, Mainz, 1823, 8vo); \*Fritzsche, Commentar (Lpz. 1826, 8vo); Harte, Lectures (Lond. 1831-34, 2 vols. 12mo); Cramer, Jesus s. — ach Matthius (Lpz. 1832, 8vo); Penrose, Lectures (Lond. 1832, 12mo); — Watson, Exposition [includ. Mark] (Lond. 1833 and since; N. Y. 1846 and since, 8vo); Scholten, Ondersocking (Leyden, 1836, 8vo); Cotter, Paraphrase [includ. Mark] (Lond. 1840, 12mo); Cheke, Notes (Lond. 1843, 8vo); Perceval, Lectures (Lond. 1845,4 vols. 12mo); Ford, Illustration (Lond. 1848, 8vo); Boothroyd, Notes (Edinb. 1851, 8vo); Overton, Lectures (Lond. 1851, 2 vols. 8vo); Cumming, Readings (Lond. 1853, 8vo);  Arnoldi, Commentar (Trier, 1856, 8vo); Goodwin, Commentary (Cambr. 1857, 8vo); \*Morison, Notes (Bost. 1858, 1861; Edinb. 1870, 8vo); Shadwell, Translation (Lond. 1859, 12mo); \*Conant, Notes, etc. (Amer. Bible Union, N. Y. 1860, 4to); Conder, Commentary (Lond. 1860, 8vo); Lutteroth, Essai [on i-xiii] (Par. 1860-67, 3 pts. 8vo); \*Alexander, Explanation [on i-xvi] (N. Y. 1861, 12mo); \*Luthardt, De Compositione Matthew (Lips. 1861, 8vo); Reville, Etudes (Par. 1862, 8vo); Gratry, Commentaire (Par. 1863, 8vo); \*Nast, Commentary [includ. Mark ] (Cincinnati. 1864, 8vo); Thomas, Observations (Lond. 1864, 8vo); Klofuter, Commentarius (Vien. 1866, 8vo); Hilgenfeld, Untersuchung (in his Zeitschr. 1866, 1867); Kelly, Lectures (Lond. 1870, 8vo); Adamson, Exposition (Lond. 1871,8vo). SEE GOSPELS.

## Matthews (Saint) Liturgy[[@Headword:Matthews (Saint) Liturgy]]

             one of the twelve liturgies of the Maronites, contained in their missal.

## Matthews (St.) Day[[@Headword:Matthews (St.) Day]]

             a festal day observed in the Roman Catholic and the Anglican churches on Sept. 21, and in the Greek churches on Nov. 16, is mentioned in St. Jerome's Comes, and was first generally observed in the 11th century. — Walcott, Sac. Archaeol. s.v.

## Matthews, Alford A[[@Headword:Matthews, Alford A]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Mercer County, Pa., July 11, 1838; went to Wethersfield, Ill., in 1855, and was there converted and joined the Missionary Baptist Church. In the winter of 1862 - ‘63 he joined the Methodist Episcopal Church, after advising with his pastor and members of his own Church. Soon after he received license to  preach. In the spring of 1864, the health of the pastor of the Buda Circuit failing, the circuit was vacated, and Matthews was appointed his successor. At the close of the year he was admitted on trial into the Illinois Conference, and returned to the Buda charge. From the Conference of 1866 to that of 1868 he was in charge of the Tiskilwa Station. At the Conference of 1868 he was appointed to Chillicothe, and there he labored most acceptably to the people and most successfully for the cause to which he gave his life. He died quite suddenly at this place, Aug. 1, 1869. “From his boyhood days he was a diligent student; from his espousal of the cause of Christ, a devoted Christian; and from the time he received license to preach, a very zealous and successful minister of the Gospel. While at Buda, his first charge, he sought and found the blessing of perfect love, and lived in the enjoyment of the blessing until the day of his death.” See Conf: Minutes, 1869, p. 241.

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

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Prince George County, Md. Blessed with pious and good parents, he was early led to Christ, and connected himself with Asbury Church, in Howard County. In 1849 he moved to Baltimore, and joined the Sharp Street Church. In 1852 he was licensed to preach, and in 1857 was ordained a local deacon. In 1864 he joined the Washington Conference, just then organizing, and was appointed to Gunpowder Circuit, where he labored with great zeal for three years; was then appointed to West River Circuit, and in 1870 was stationed at Monocacy; but his health suddenly failed, and he was compelled to relinquish his arduous labors. He died Dec. 31, 1870. “Brother Matthews was a faithful, plodding, deeply conscientious minister. Wherever he went his solidity of character was acknowledged; and the firm faith which he himself reposed in the doctrines he preached, and his prayerful reliance on God, stamped on his efforts unvaried success.” See Conf. Minutes, 1871, p. 28.

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

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Beaver Co., Pa., Feb. 7, 1778. He enjoyed the advantages of a good parental training, graduated at Jefferson College, Canonsburg, Pa., in 1807, and studied theology under Rev. Dr. John McMillan. He was licensed in 1809, and in 1810 ordained pastor of Gravel Run and Waterford churches; in 1817 he became an itinerating  missionary, and took charge of the Church at Louisiana, Pike Co., Mo., where he continued itinerating, especially among the destitute of that vicinity, until 1825. when he settled at Apple Creek Church, in Cape Girardeau Co., Mo.; in 1827 he took charge of the Church at Kaskaskia, Ill., thence went to Missouri, where he labored till his health failed, and then removed to Georgetown, Ill., where he died, May 12,1861. Mr. Matthews was characterized by a cheerful and warm-hearted disposition. As a pastor he was faithful and zealous; as a friend, kind and affectionate. See Wilson, Presb. Hist, Almanac, 1862, p. 102.

## Matthews, John Daniel, D.D[[@Headword:Matthews, John Daniel, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Shepherdstown, Virginia, June 9, 1809. He graduated from Jefferson College in 1827, and from Princeton Theological Seminary in 1831. He was ordained an evangelist by the Presbytery of Georgia, became a stated supply of St. Mary's in 1832, and subsequently of the Second Church, Philadelphia. In 1833 he was installed pastor of Opequtan and Cedar churches, Virginia. He became pastor of the Church at Norfolk in 1837, and after five years removed to the McChord Church, Lexington, Kentucky. After this he supplied the churches of Hopewell, Paducah, and Henderson. For six years he was superintendent of public instruction in Kentucky, after which he supplied the churches of Jackson Street, Mobile; Second Church, Baltimore; New York Avenue Church, Washington City; Portland Avenue Church, Louisville, Kentucky, and Dennison, Texas. He died at Dallas, March 7, 1884. See Necrol. Report of Princeton Theol. Sem. 1884, page 13.

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

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Guilford County, N.C., January 19, 1772. He was licensed to preach in 1801, by the Presbytery of Orange, and crossed the desert country to Natchez, Miss., acting as a missionary there. In April 1803, he returned to North Carolina, and shortly after received a call to the churches of Nutbush and Grassy Creek, where he continued till 1806, then removed to Martinsburg, Virginia, and after a year resigned this for the charge at Shepherdstown. Here he continued till 1836, preaching as stated supply of this Church and that of Charlestown, and frequently also at Harper's Ferry. He next took a charge at Martinsburg and Charlestown, and when the theological seminary was established at Hanover, Indiana, he was invited to become professor. He died at New Albany, May 19, 1848. His publications are, Letters on the Divine Purpose, and The Influence of the Bible.

## Matthews, Joseph MDowell, D.D[[@Headword:Matthews, Joseph MDowell, D.D]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Augusta County, Virginia, December 8, 1804. At the age of ten he removed with his parents to Kentucky, and, settling on a farm, was given a thorough private academical education, which he increased by. personal effort. He joined the Church at the age of eighteen, was licensed to preach in 1825, in 1827 began a school or academy for boys in Hillsborough, Ohio, which he continued till 1831, when he entered the Ohio Conference. In 1831-32 he served the Church in Chillicothe. and in 1833 in Cincinnati. There his health failed, and he retired to a farm, where he spent nearly six years. In 1839 he opened the Oakland Female Seminary, where he did noble work until 1856, when he took charge of the Hillsborough Female College. In 1860 he. became president of Jessaminne Female College, Nicholasville, Kentucky, but in 1863 returned to Hillsborough, and opened a private boarding-school. In 1872 he again accepted a call to the presidency of Hillsborough Female College, where he remained until ill-health led him, in 1877, to resign his office, and retire to his home in the suburbs of Hillsborough, where he died, August 5, 1879. See Minutes of Annual Fall Conferences, 1879, page 15.

## Matthews, Robert C., D.D[[@Headword:Matthews, Robert C., D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Shephardstown, Virginia, April 2, 1822. He was educated in Illinois, where he practiced law until he was  converted, then, after a year or two in the theological seminary, was ordained and installed pastor of the Presbyterian Church in Monmouth, Illinois, December 20, 1852. His labors in this Church were attended with great success. He died there, November 15, 1881. See N.Y. Observer, Dec. 1, 1881. (W.P.S.)

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

             a Quaker preacher, was born in Stafford Co., Va., in 1732. His parents died when he was quite young. He entered the ministry at twenty-three years of age, and gave convincing evidence of a heavenly call. Matthews was a man of sound judgment and great Christian piety. He spent several years in ministerial work in England, Ireland, Scotland, and Wales. The exact date of his death is not known. See Janney, Hist. of Friends, 3:398.

## Matthia, Christian[[@Headword:Matthia, Christian]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born in 1584. He studied at Strasburg and Giessen, was in 1614 rector at the gymnasium in Dur!lach, in 1618 professor of theology at Altdorf, in 1629 professor at Sora, in Dellmark, in 1639 at Leyden, and in 1641 pastor of the Lutheran congregation at the Hague. In 1645 he resigned his position, retired .to Utrecht, and died January 22, 1655. He wrote, Exercitationes Mletaphysicae 12: — Methodica Scripturae Sacrae Loca Vindicandi Ratio: — Historia Patriarcharum: — Analysis Typica Evangelii Matthaei: — Antilogiae Bibliae, etc. See Moller, Cimbria Litterara; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Matthia, Johann[[@Headword:Matthia, Johann]]

             a noted Swedish prelate, was born in Ostrogothia in 1592, and after enjoying the best educational advantages of his country, entered the ministry. After filling several important positions, he became court preacher and almoner to Gustavus Adolphus. He was next appointed preceptor to Christina, the daughter of that monarch, and was created bishop of Strengnis in 16i3. He died in 1670. Matthiti wrote several moral and theological works, the most important of which are, Opuscula Theologica (Strengnias, 1661, 8vo): — Sacre Disquisitiones ad refutandos Epicureos, atheos et fanaticos (Stockholm, 1669, 4to). See Hoefer, souv. Biog. Genesis vol. 33, s.v.

## Matthiai, Wolf Christian[[@Headword:Matthiai, Wolf Christian]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Denmark, was born January 28, 1734. He studied at Kiel, was in 1762 military, preacher, in 1770 pastor at Rendsburg, in 1778 member of consistory, and died January 29, 1787. He wrote, Diss. Historic Samuelis, Sauli et Davidis, ad Annorum Rationes Digesta (Kiel, 1752): — Beschreibung der Kirchenvesfassung in den Herzogthumern Schleswig und Holstein (Flensburg, 1778-86, 2 volumes): — Schriftmassige Betrachtung uber dass Leiden und Sterben Jesu Christi (ibid. 1786). See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der-theol. Lit. 1:833. (B.P.).

## Matthias[[@Headword:Matthias]]

             (Ματθίας, a contraction of Matithiah or Matthew, a form frequently met with in Josephus [see below]), one of the constant attendants from the first upon our Lord's ministry, who was chosen by lot, in preference to Joseph Barsabas, into the number of the apostles, to supply the vacancy caused by the treachery and suicide of Judas (Act 1:23-26). A.D. 29. We may accept as probable the opinion which is shared by Eusebius (H. E. lib. 1:12) and Epiphanius (1:20) that he was one of the seventy disciples. He is said to have preached the Gospel in Ethiopia (Niceph. 2:40; according to Sophronius, “in altera Ethiopia,” i.e. Colchis; comp. Cellar. Notit. 2:309), or Cappadocia according to Cave, and to have at last suffered martyrdom (comp. Menalog. Graec. 3:198). According to another tradition, he preached in Judlea, and was stoned to death by the Jews (see Prionii Vitae Apostol. p. 178; Acta Sanctomrum, Feb. 24; comp. Augusti, Denkwuidiqgk. 3:241). There was early an apocryphal gospel bearing his name (Eusebius, H. E. 3:25, 3; Clemens Alex. Strom. 2:163; 7:318; Grabii Spicileg. patr. 2:1, p. 117; Fabric. Cod. apocr. N.T. 1:782 sq.).

“Different opinions have prevailed as to the manner of the election of Matthias. The most natural construction of the words of Scripture seems to be this: After the address of Peter, the whole assembled body of the brethren, amounting in number to about 120 (Act 1:15), proceeded to nominate two, namely, Joseph, surnamed Barsabas, and Matthias, who answered the requirements of an apostle: the subsequent selection between the two was referred in prayer to him who, knowing the hearts of men, knew which of them was the fitter to be his witness and apostle. The brethren then, under the heavenly guidance which they had invoked, proceeded to give forth their lots, probably by each writing the name of one of the candidates on a tablet, and casting it into the urn. The urn was then shaken, and the name that first came out decided the election. Lightfoot (Hor. Heb. Luk 1:9) describes another way of casting lots which was used in assigning to the priests their several parts in the service of the Temple. The apostles, it will be remembered, had not yet received the gift of the Holy Ghost, and this solemn mode of casting the lots, in accordance with a practice enjoined in the Levitical law (Lev 16:8), is to be regarded as a way of referring the decision to God (comp. Pro 16:33). Chrysostom remarks that it was never repeated after the descent of the Holy Spirit. The election of Matthias is discussed by bishop Beveridge (Works, vol. 1, serm. 2).” It would seem, however, that Paul was the divine  appointee to fill the vacancy in the college of the apostles. Monographs in Latin on his election have been written by Scharff (Viteb. 1652), Bittelmaier (ib. 1676), and Hammerschmid (Prag. 1760).

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

             is likewise the name of one person mentioned in the Apocrypha (Ματταθίας) and of several in Josephus (Ματθιας), especially as Jewish highpriests.

1. Given (1Es 9:33) in place of the Heb. MATTATHIAH (Ezr 10:33).

2. A son of Ananus, made high-priest by Agrippa (soon after the appointment of Petronius as president of Syria), in place of Simon Cantheras, after that honor had been declined by Jonathan as a second term (Josephus, Ant. 19:6, 4).

3. Son of Theophilus of Jerusalem, made high-priest by Herod in place of Simon, son of Boethius (Ant. 17:4, 2); removed again by Herod to make room for Joaza (ib. 6, 4, where Josephus relates his temporary disqualification on the day of annual atonement), and again reinstated by Agrippa in place of Jesus, son of Gamaliel (ib. 20:9, 7).

Josephus likewise mentions Matthias, son of Boethius, as “one of the high- priests” betrayed by Simon during the last siege of Jerusalem (War, v. 3, 1), but it does not appear whether he was one of the above. SEE HIGH- PRIEST.

## Matthias (3)[[@Headword:Matthias (3)]]

             a religious impostor whose real name was Robert Matthew, was born in Washington County, N. Y., about 1790. He kept a country-store, but failed in 1816, and went to New York City. In 1827 he removed to Albany, where he became much excited by the preaching of Messrs. Kirk and Finney; made himself active in the temperance cause; claimed to have received a revelation, and began street-preaching; failing to convert Albany, he prophesied its destruction, and fled secretly to New York City, where he was tried and acquitted on the charge of poisoning a wealthy disciple in wh.ose family he had lived. His impositions exposed, he soon disappeared from public view. See Matthias and his Impostures, by W. L. Stone (New York, 1835); Drake, Dict. Amer. Biog. s.v.

## Matthias I[[@Headword:Matthias I]]

             emperor of Germany, son of Maximilian II and Mary, daughter of Charles V, deserves a place here because of his relation to one of the most eventful periods in the earliest stages of modern history. He was born in 1557. In 1578 he was invited by the Romanists of the Netherlands to assume the government of that country, but he held the position only a short time. He was appointed stadtholder of Austria in 1595, and in 1611 was invited by  the Bohemians to become their ruler. On the death of his brother Rudolf, emperor of Germany, in 1612, he succeeded to the throne, and was called upon to sit in judgment between Protestant and Romanist in the ensuing contest between these two factions of his empire. He pursued a vacillating policy, and, while striving to direct, made himself distrusted by both. He concluded a disadvantageous treaty with the Turks, then in possession of Hungary (1615), and soon after caused his cousin Ferdinand to be proclaimed king of Bohemia and Hungary. In the midst of the dissensions which preceded the Thirty Years' War he died, in 1619. — See Khevenhuller, Annales Ferdinandei; P. Santoric, Vite di Ridolfo e Mattia Imperatori (1664); Vehse, Memoirs of the Court of Austria. 1:240 sq.; Coxe, House of Austria, 2:95 sq.; Kohlrausch, Hist. of Germany, p. 311 sq. SEE THIRTY YEARS WAR.

## Matthias Of Kunwalde[[@Headword:Matthias Of Kunwalde]]

             one of the first ministers of the Ancient Moravian Brethren (q.v.), flourished in the 16th century. He was appointed at the Synod of Lhota, in Bohemia, in 1467. On that, occasion nine men, of high repute for piety, were elected by ballot. Then twelve lots were prepared, nine being blank, and three inscribed with the Bohemian word Jest (He is). Thereupon a fervent prayer was offered up beseeching God to designate of these nine nominees, either one, or two, or three, as the ministers of the Church; but, if this should not be the time which he had ordained for such a consummation, to cause all the nine to receive blanks. In this event the Brethren would have deferred further action to some future period. Nine lots having been drawn singly from a vase and given to the nominees, it appeared that Matthias of Kunwalde, Thomas of Prelouc, and Elias of Chrenovic, had each received one marked Jest. The synod rose to its feet, sang a thanksgiving hymn, composed for the occasion, and accepted these three men as the future ministers of the Church. In the same year, after the episcopacy .had been secured, Matthias, although only twenty-five .years of age, was consecrated a bishop, and, upon the resignation of bishop Michael, became president of the Church Council. He administered its affairs, according to the extreme views of discipline entertained by Gregory (q.v.), until 1494, when he resigned his presidency and united with the liberal party. In 1500, while on his way to a synod in Moravia, he died at Leipnik, after having, in his last will and testament, which he addressed to the Brethren, exhorted them to avoid schisms, and to preserve the unity of the Spirit in the bonds of peace. He was buried at Prerau. (E. de S.)

## Matthias, Corvinus[[@Headword:Matthias, Corvinus]]

             king of Hungary, second son of John Hunyady (q.v.), was born in 1443, and came to the throne in 1458. His accession was hailed with the utmost enthusiasm over the whole country. But the Hungarian crown at this time was no chaplet of roses; two sovereigns, alike formidable, the one, Mohammed II, from his military talents and immense resources, the other, Frederick III, from his intriguing policy, were busily conspiring against the boy-king. To meet these dangers Matthias rapidly carried out his measures of defense, and, scarcely prepared, fell on the Turks, who had ravaged the country as far as Temesvar, inflicted upon them a bloody defeat, pursued them as far as Bosnia, took the stronghold Jaieza, there liberated 10,000 Christian prisoners, and then returned to Weisenberg, to be crowned with the sacred crown of St. Stephen, in 1464. He next suppressed the disorders of Wallachia and Moldavia; but feeling that his plans were counteracted by the intrigues of the emperor Frederick III to gain possession of Hungary, Matthias besought the assistance of pope Pius II, but to no purpose. After a second successful campaign against the Turks, he turned his attention to the encouragement of arts and letters, and adorned his capital with the works of renowned sculptors, in addition to a library of 50,000 volumes. He sent a large staff of literary men to Italy for the purpose of obtaining copies of valuable MSS. (even now the Collectio Corvina is celebrated), and adorned his court by the presence of the most eminent men of Italy and Germany. He was himself an author of no mean ability, and possessed a delicate appreciation of the fine arts. At the same time the affairs of government were not neglected. The finances were brought into a flourishing condition, industry and commerce were promoted by wise legislation, and justice was strictly administered to peasant and noble alike. But the promptings of his ambition, and the pressure exercised by the Romish party, cast an indelible blot on Matthias's otherwise spotless escutcheon; he wantonly attacked Podiebrad, his father-in-law, the Hussite king of Bohemia, to wrest from Podiebrad the scepter which he was holding by the declared will of the people. In this action Matthias was influenced especially by pope Pius II and his successor, Paul II. SEE HUSSITES, vol. 4, especially p. 424, Colossians 2. After a bloody contest of seven years' duration between these kings, the greatest generals of the age, the Hungarian power prevailed, and Moravia, Silesia, and Lusatia were wrested from Bohemia. A third war with the Turks closed as successfully as the former two. The emperor also was humiliated by Matthias, and  expiated his guilt in poverty and disgrace. Matthias was suddenly cut down in the midst of his successes at Vienna, April 5,1490. See Butler, Eccles. Hist. 2:165; Gieseler, Eccles. Hist. 3:370 sq. SEE LADISLAUS OF POLAND; SEE PIUS II.

## Matthias, John B[[@Headword:Matthias, John B]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Germantown, Pa., Jan. 1,1767; was converted while residing in New York, after his majority; was there licensed to preach in 1793; preached much and with excellent success as a local deacon until 1811, when he joined the itinerancy. Thereafter he labored very usefully until 1841, when loss of sight obliged him to superannuate. He died in great blessedness at Hempstead, L. I., May 27, 1848. He was educated a German Lutheran, and was by trade a ship- carpenter, but when he felt called to preach he prepared to the best of his ability, and for many years delivered regularly no less than three sermons a week, and many souls were converted under these labors. He was one of the most humble, pious, and loving of Christians, and the fruit of his unostentatious labors was abundant and blessed. — Minutes of Conferences, 4:224. (G. L. T.)

## Matthias, John J[[@Headword:Matthias, John J]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born at New York Jan. 17, 1796. His childhood and early youth were spent with his parents in Tarrytown. At a suitable age he went to Brooklyn to learn the art of printing, but, brought to a knowledge of converting grace, and persuaded in his own mind that he was called of God to preach the Gospel of Christ, he determined to prepare for the work. He entered the ministry when twenty-one years old, in the New York Conference at Goshen Circuit. In 1818 he was appointed to Pittsfield Circuit; in 1819 to Stow; in 1820 to  Leyden; in 1821 and 1822 to Cortlandt; in 1823 to Middlebury, Vt.; in 1824 to St.Albans; in 1825 to Pittsfield; in 1826 to Cortlandt. He was stationed in the city of New York in 1827 and 1828, and in the city of Albany in 1829 and 1830; was transferred to the Philadelphia Conference in 1831, and stationed in the city of Newark, N. J. In 1833, 1834, and 1835 he traveled the East Jersey District; in 1836 he was stationed at the Nazareth Church, in the city of Philadelphia. His health failing, he took a superannuated relation, and continued to hold it until 1841. While sustaining this relation to his Conference, the Pennsylvania and New York Colonization Societies appointed him governor of Bassa Cove, on the West Coast of Africa. He was in Africa about a year, but, subjected to severe suffering by the African fever, he returned to the States. In 1842 he was retransferred to the New York Conference, and stationed at Flushing, L. I.; in 1843 at Rockaway; in 1844 to 1847 was presiding elder of the Long Island District; in 1848 and 1849 was stationed in Williamsburgh; in 1850 and 1851 in the Twenty-seventh Street Church, New York; in 1852 was supernumerary at Hempstead, L. I.; but was given an effective relation in 1853, and stationed at Jamaica. In 1854 he was obliged again to superannuate, but his relation was changed to effective at the ensuing Conference. and in 1851 to 1857 served as chaplain to the Seamen's Friend Retreat on Staten Island. “He was held in high esteem by the managers and officers of that institution. At the bedside of the sick and in his chapel services he was felt to be well adapted to the duties of his office.” The tax upon his sympathies and the labors of the position were more than his enfeebled health could sustain, and in 1858 he resigned the chaplaincy, and received a superannuated relation. He retired to a quiet and comfortable residence in Tarrytown, where he resided until the day of his decease, Sept. 25, 1861. “Few ministers have a longer or more worthy record than this. Some of these fields of labor were very arduous, others of them very responsible. In all of them he was faithful and useful. He was a high- minded, intelligent, and honorable man. His tastes were refined, his feelings delicate, his conversation chaste, and his manners dignified but affable. His

Christian reputation is without blemish. He possessed the disciplinary attributes of a minister — “gifts, grace, and usefulness.” His preaching was practical and experimental. He sought assiduously and successfully to lead the members of his Church to a higher spiritual state, and a holy, active, religious life. As a pastor he had few superiors. Gentle, affectionate, and sympathetic in his manners, his pastoral visits were highly prized by the  people of his care. He fostered the Sabbath-school, and fed the lambs of the flock, a good minister of Jesus Christ” (bishop Janes, in the N. Y. Christian Advocate, Jan. 9, 1862). See also Smith, Memorials of the N. Y. and N. Y. East Conferences, p. 11.

## Matthiass (ST.) Day[[@Headword:Matthiass (ST.) Day]]

             a festival observed on the 24th of February in the Church of Rome, with a provision that in leap-year it should be observed on the 25th. In the Church of England it is usually observed on the 24th of February, even in leap- years. In the Greek Church St. Matthias's day is held on the 9th of August. The date of the introduction of this festival is involved in obscurity. Some suppose it was first established in the 11th century, others in the 8th. See Farrar, Eccles. Dict. s.v.; Eadie, Eccles. Dict. s.v.; Broughton, Biblioth. Hist. Sac. 2:76.

## Matthieists[[@Headword:Matthieists]]

             SEE MUNSTER, ANABAPTISTS IN.

## Matthieson[[@Headword:Matthieson]]

             SEE ANABAPTISTS.

## Mattison, Hiram, D.D.[[@Headword:Mattison, Hiram, D.D.]]

             a prominent divine of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born at Norway, Herkimer County, N.Y., Feb. 8,1811. Three years afterwards his parents, who were natives of New England, removed to Oswego County, and settled near the present city of Oswego. His mother, besides rearing her own twelve children, became the foster-mother of ten others who had not homes for themselves. The first years of his early manhood were devoted to teaching, but his conversion at the age of twenty-three turned his thoughts towards the ministry, which soon after became his lifework. He entered the Black River Conference in 1836, and filled successively several of the most important appointments in that body. In 1842 and 1843 he was stationed at Watertown; in 1844 and 1845 at Rome; in 1846 he became superannuated; the next year supernumerary; the next two years he was superannuated; in 1850 he was made secretary of the Conference, and his relation changed to effective. During this and the following year he served, by appointment of the bishop, as professor in Falley Seminary. In 1852 he was elected secretary of Conference for the third time, and his  relation was changed to superannuated. This same year, on account of ill- health and a tendency to pulmonary difficulties, he removed to New York City for the benefit of the sea air, and was pastor of John Street Church (left vacant by the death of Rev. W. K. Stopford), and afterwards of Trinity Methodist Episcopal Church in Thirty-fourth Street, which he organized, and under his administration the present church edifice was erected. His preaching was both popular and effective, being distinguished by great clearness of statement, force of argument, aptness of illustration, and earnestness of appeal. His sermon at the camp-meeting held near Morristown, N.J., in 1866, may be very justly pronounced one of the most eloquent and powerful discourses of modern times. Dr. Mattison labored with great zeal to secure action by the General Conference (of which he was a member in 1848, 1852, and 1856) against all slaveholding in the Church, but at length, despairing of success, he formally withdrew from the Methodist Episcopal Church, Nov. 1, 1861. He became the pastor of an Independent Methodist Church, for which a house of worship was built under his supervision in Forty-first Street.

This church he continued to serve till 1865, when he returned to the Methodist Episcopal Church, and was appointed to the Trinity Methodist Church in Jersey City, having been admitted a member of the Newark (N. J.) Conference, in the fellowship of which he continued till death. The last year of his life was devoted to the service of the American and Foreign Christian Union as its secretary. The fertility of his pen was amazing. Believing strongly in the power of the press for good or evil, he made free and constant use of it to aid the one and oppose the other. His publications embraced a range from the little Sunday-school card to the stately volume, all intended to aid the public movement in favor of temperance, and in opposition to slavery and Romanism. There was too much in the life and character of Dr. Mattison to admit of a summing up in the space allotted to this brief sketch. We need only say that to know him, especially to know him well, was to admire, esteem, and love him as a man, a friend, a scholar, a minister, a hero, a Christian. Bishop Thomson, in his introduction to the writer's memoir of Dr. Mattison's life (see below), thus delineates him: “Before the world he stood as the able preacher, the gifted writer, the stern controversionalist, the unsparing antagonist; but he was not without the gentler and more attractive elements of character. He was an amiable, communicative, entertaining companion, a generous friend, and loving husband and father.

‘From his rough heart a babe could press Soft milk of human tpenderness.'

On all the storms of his life were rainbows, but only his intimate friends were in position to see them.” His first book was A Scriptural Defence of the Doctrine of the Trinity, a small volume issued in 1843, and to which multum in parvo was peculiarly applicable. In the same year he began his publication of Tracts for the Times, which at length grew into a small but piquant monthly, called at first The Conservative, and afterwards the Primitive Christian. In 1846 he published a work on Astronomy, with large astronomical maps — a work of rare merit and popularity. Soon after he issued his Elementary Astronomy, and in 1850 edited a new and improved edition of Burrett's Geography of the Heavens, for which he is spoken of as “one of the most competent astronomers in the country.” In 1853 he published his High-School Astronomy, and the same year was associated with Prof. J. B. Woodbury in bringing out a musicbook, The Lute of Zion, which, becoming widely popular, led in a short time to an enlarged edition under the title of New Lute of Zion. The next year his work on Spirit Rappings was issued, and had a large circulation. In 1856 his celebrated controversy with Dr. J. H. Perry, on the Wesleyan Doctrine of Christian Perfection, was published in successive pamphlets. Three years later he issued another tune-book, Sacred Melodies, “designed for use on all occasions of public worship;” and the same year also sent forth his Impending Crisis, a stout pamphlet of pungent facts and impassioned appeals on the slavery question. In 1864 his Minister's Pocket Manual was published, and within the next two years followed with the two most elaborate theological works of his life, Immortality of the Soul, and Resurrection of the Body, books of superior and permanent value. During 1866 he published Select Lessons from the Holy Scriptures, and his Defence of American Methodism, and in the next year a timely treatise on Popular Amusements.

The year 1868, the last of his life, was perhaps the busiest, and the most prolific of results in the line of authorship. Besides editing and bringing through the press the work on Perfect Love, he wrote and published Mary Ann Smith, and a surprising number of other works on Romanism, from the tract of a few pages to the heavy pamphlet. He left an unfinished treatise on Depravity in its Relation to Entire Sanctification, and the outlines of several other theological works. His contributions to the periodical press were abundant and able. He was the author of several poems of decided merit, and among his issues from the press were various Church and Sunday-school requisites. He composed with remarkable ease and rapidity, and seldom rewrote a sentence or even a word. His busy life suddenly closed at his residence, Jersey City, N. J., in a signally triumphant  death, Nov. 24,1868. See Minutes of Conferences, 1869, p. 55 sq.; also Work Here, Rest Hereafter, or the Life and Character of Rev. Hiram Mattison, D.D., by Rev. N. Vansant, with an Introduction by bishop Thomson (New York, 1870, 8vo). (N. V.)

## Mattison, Seth[[@Headword:Mattison, Seth]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Shaftesbury, Vt., Feb. 22, 1788; joined the Methodist Church in 1805; entered the Genesee Conference in 1810; and died Oct. 18, 1845, having preached with eminent usefulness and great holiness the Gospel of Christ for thirty-four years. — Minutes of Conferences, 3:643.

## Mattison, Spencer[[@Headword:Mattison, Spencer]]

             A.M., a Methodist Episcopal minister and educator, was born at Plainfield, N. Y., Aug. 2, 1808; was converted in 1825; graduated, with first honors, at Middlebury College, Vt., in 1835; joined Troy Conference the same year, but on his second charge his health failed, and he went to Georgia. On recovery he spent five years there as principal of Vineville Academy, and then rejoined the Troy Conference in 1842. In 1846 he was elected professor of ancient languages and literature in M'Kendree College, Illinois, where he spent six years, and then resigned and re-entered the regular work of the ministry, but at the close of a year he accepted the principalship of Rock River Seminary, Mount Morris, Ill. His health again failed, and he died Nov. 5, 1853. Professor Mattison was an excellent linguist and instructor, and greatly beloved by his pupils. He was a minister of fine talents and uniform piety, and a most accomplished Christian gentleman. — Minutes of Conferences, 5:455. (G. L. T.)

## Mattithiah[[@Headword:Mattithiah]]

             (Heb. Mattithyah', מִתַּתְיָה, gift of Jehovah, compare θεόδοτος, Theodore; also in the prolonged form Mattithya'hu, מִתַּתְיָהוּ, 1Ch 15:18; 1Ch 15:21; 1Ch 25:3; 1Ch 25:21; Sept. Ματταθίας, but in Ezr 10:43 Μαθθαθίας v. r. Ματθανίας; so also Ματταθίας , 1Ma 2:1; Luk 3:25-26) the name of three or four men in the Old Test. and of one or two (Auth. Vers. “Mattathias”) in the New. SEE MATTATHAH; SEE MATTHEW; SEE MATTHIAS, etc.; and especially SEE MATTATHIAS.

1. One of the sons of the Levite Jeduthun, appointed by David chief of the fourteenth section of the Temple musicians (1Ch 25:3; 1Ch 25:21). B.C. 1014. He is probably the same with one of the Levitical wardens who were assigned to the performance of the sacred anthems on the removal of the sacred ark to Jerusalem (1Ch 15:18; 1Ch 15:21; 1Ch 16:5). B.C. cir. 1043.

2. An Israelite of the “sons” (residents) of Nebo, who divorced his Gentile wife after the Babylonian exile (Ezr 10:43). B.C. 459. He was possibly identical with No. 4.

3. The eldest son of Shallum, a Levite of the family of Korah, who had charge of the baked offerings of the Temple on the re-establishment after the exile (1Ch 9:31). B.C. cir. 440.

4. One of those (apparently chief Israelites) who supported Ezra on the right hand while reading the law to the people after the captivity (Neh 8:4). B.C. cir. 410.

5. A person named in Luk 3:26 as the son of Semei, among the maternal ancestors of Jesus; but as no such name appears in the parallel passages of the Old Test., and would here unduly protract the interval limited by other intimations of the generations, it is probably interpolated from No. 6. (See Strong's Harm. and Expos. of the Gospels, p. 16.)

6. The son of Amos and father of Joseph, among the maternal ancestry of Jesus after the close of the O.-Test. genealogy (Luk 3:25). B.C. post 406.

## Mattock[[@Headword:Mattock]]

             an old English name for an agricultural implement like a pickaxe with a wide point, for grubbing up and digging out roots and stones, is the rendering adopted in the Auth. Vers. for three Hebrew words. מִעְדֵּר(mader', an instrument for dressing or pruning a vineyard; occurs only in Isa 7:25) denotes a weeding-hook or hoe; מִחֲרֵשָׁה(machareshah', 1Sa 13:20) and מִחֲרֶשֶׁת(machare'sheth, “share,” 1Sa 13:20) are the names of two agricultural cutting instruments (for they needed sharpening by a smith), one of which is perhaps an ordinary hoe  and the other a pick-axe (from הָרִשׁ, to scrape; but the plur. of one is מַחֲרֵשׁוֹת; machareshoth', “mattocks,” 1Sa 13:21). SEE PLOUGH. חֶרֶב(che'reb, 2Ch 34:6; elsewhere usually a “sword”) signifies any sharp instrument, as a knife, dagger, chisel; and possibly a spade in the passage in question (marg. “maul”). The tool used in Arabia for loosening the ground, described by Niebuhr (Descr. de l'Arabie, p. 137), answers generally to our mattock or grubbing-axe (London, Encyclop. of Gardening, p. 617; Hasselquist, Trav. p. 100), i.e. a single-headed pickaxe, the sarculus simplex, as opposed to bicornis, of Palladius (De Re Rust. 1:43). The ancient Egyptian hoe was of wood, a and answered for hoe, spade, and mattock. The blade was inserted in or through the handle and the two were attached about the center by a twisted rope, See Wilkinson, Anc. Egypt. 2:16, 18, abridgm.; comp, Her. 2:14. SEE AGRICULTURE.

## Maturin, Charles Robert[[@Headword:Maturin, Charles Robert]]

             an Irish divine, was born in 1782, and was educated at Trinity College, Dublin. Though popular as a pulpit orator, the income. from his living — the curacy of St. Peter's, in the Irish metropolis — was inadequate to his support, and he turned aside to secular literary enterprises. He secured special distinction as a poet and dramatist. He died in 1825. Says a contemporary, “The genius of Maturin was great, but it was not always under the control of a pure taste.” He published a collection of his Sermons, besides many secular works, several of which were first brought out under the assumed name of Dennis Jasper Murphy.

## Matuta[[@Headword:Matuta]]

             in Roman mythology, was originally an ancient Italian goddess of day- dawn, and later confounded with Letucothea (q.v.), and with Albunea (q.v.). Her festival was celebrated June 11, at which mothers took the children of their sisters on their arms, because Ino (Leucothea) had brought up her sister's son, Bacchus.

## Matutinal[[@Headword:Matutinal]]

             SEE MATINS.

## Mauburne Or Momboir, Jean[[@Headword:Mauburne Or Momboir, Jean]]

             an ascetic Belgian author, was born at Brussels about 1460. After having studied grammar and music at the cathedral school of Utrecht, he joined the regular canons of Mont-Saint-Agnss, a famous monastery near Zwoll, and was employed in different positions in the congregation of Windesham. The publication of his first work, Rosetum Spirituale, gave Mauburne great renown, and induced Nicholas de Hacqueville, first president of the Parliament of Paris, to invite him to France (1497), to reform the regular canons of the kingdom. Mauburne gladly heeded the call, and restored  order to the abbeys of Saint-Severin, of Cysoing, of Saint-Euvert d'Orleans, and of Saint-Martin de Nevers; but he attached himself more particularly to that of Livri, of which he was elected prior (Nov., 1500), then regular abbot by the resignation of Nicholas de Hacqueville in his favor (Jan., 1502). The zeal of Mauburne was not confined to his own order; he was interested in that of Benedict, and labored much for the reformation of the congregation of Chezal, which served as a model to the houses of Saint-Vanne and Saint-Maur. Taken ill in consequence of the fatigue caused by his religious labors, he was carried to Paris, and died there about the beginning of the year 1503. He included among his friends Saint Francois de Paule, Geoffroi de Boussard, chancellor of Notre-Dame of Paris; the bishop Louis Pinel, Pierre de Bruges, and probably Erasmus, who addressed several letters to him. His principal works are, Rosetum exercituum spiritualium et sacrarum meditationum (Bale. 1491, et al.). “This book,” says Gence, “is the first where some passages of the Imitation have been introduced and given under the name of Kempis:” — Venatorium investigatorium sanctorum canonici ordinis, a historical manuscript which appears to be an abridgment of that of Buschius, and in which Mauburne again attributes to Kempis the book Qui sequitus me of the Imitation. We find in the ancient Gallia Christiana (t. vii, col. 281- 282) two letters addressed to this priest by Erasmus, and written at Paris. See Swurt, Athenae Belgicae, p. 447; Mastelyn, Necrol. Viridis Vallis, p. 121; Sander, Biblioth. Belgica; Gallia Christiana, 7:836-839; Moreri, Grand Dict. Hist. s.v.; Paquot, Memoires, vol. 3: — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Mauchart, Immanuel David[[@Headword:Mauchart, Immanuel David]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born June 2, 1764, at Tubingen,was in 1793 deacon at Nurtingen, in 1803 superintendent at Neuffen, Wirtemberg, and died February 6, 1826. He wrote, Aphorismen uber das Erinnerungsvermogen in Beziehung auf den Zustand nach dem Tode (Tubingen, 1792): — Kirchliche Statistik des Kdnigreichs Wurtemberg evangelisch lutherischen Antheils ( Stuttgart, 1821 ): — Andachtsbuch fur Confirmanden und Neuconfirmirte (Tubingen, 1824). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:477, 489; 2:374. (B.P.)

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

             a learned French theologian, was born at Vire, Normandy, in 1644. While still young he entered the brotherhood of the Oratorians, where for a long time he studied the classics; then he devoted himself to preaching, and instructing the country people. The study of the Bible occupied the remainder of his life. He possessed a great variety of knowledge, understood Greek well, also Hebrew and Latin, and obtained many prizes in the academical competitions of Rouen and Caen. He died at Paris January 19, 1709. Of Mauduit's works we have Traite de religion contre les Athees, les Deistes et les nouveaux Pyrrhoniens (Par. 1677, 12mo); the 2d edition (1698) has been greatly enlarged: — Melanges de diverses poesies; divises en IV livres (Lyons; the edition of 1723, 12mo, is preferable on account of the additions to it). We find in this a well-written  preface on the good use of poetry: — Dissertation sur le sujet de la goutte, avec le moyen de l'en garantir (Paris, 1687, 1689, 12mo): — Analyse des Epitres de Saint Paul et des Epitres canoniques, avec des dissertationes sur les endroits dificiles (Paris, 1691, 2 vols. 12mo; reprinted in 1702): — Analyse de l'Evangile selon l'ordre historique de la concorde (Paris, 1694, 3 vols. 12mo, et al.). This work, to which the author devoted nearly all his life, has had many editions (later editions, Malines, 1821, 7 vols. 12mo; Paris, 1843-44, 4 vols. 8vo): — Analyse des Actes des Apotres (Paris, 1697, 2 vols. 12mo): — Meditations pour une retraite ecclesiastique de dix jours (Lyons, 1723, 12mo). Mausduit also left, in MS., Analyse de l'Apocalypse and Traduction complete du Nouveau Testament. See Mercure de France, May, 1709; Moreri, Dict. Hist. s.v. — Hoefer, Nouvelle Biogr. Generale, s.v.

## Mauermann, Franz Laur[[@Headword:Mauermann, Franz Laur]]

             a German Roman Catholic prelate, was born at Neuzelle in 1780; entered the priesthood in 1797, and, after filling various positions, was in 1825 made chaplain to the royal house of Saxony, and in 1827 praeses of the Roman Catholic Consistory of the kingdom. In 1842 he was made bishop of Rome and confessor of the king of Saxony. Later he became apostolic vicar. He died in October, 1845. — Regensburger Real-Encyklopädie, s.v.

## Maui fata[[@Headword:Maui fata]]

             (altar-raising), a religious ceremony in Polynesia. Numbers of figs, with abundance of plantains, were placed upon the altars, which were-newly ornamented with branches of the sacred miro, and yellow leaves of the cocoanut-tree. These rites extended to every marae in the island, and were designed to secure rain and fertility for the country gained by conquest or recovered from invasion.

## Maukisch, Johann[[@Headword:Maukisch, Johann]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born August 14, 1617. He studied at Leipsic, and died at Dantzic, June 8, 1669, doctor and professor of theology. He wrote, Notae Philoiogico-Theologicae Notitiam Dei Naturalem ex Selectis Scripturen Dictis Explicantes: — Paulus anti- Calvinianus, Absolutum Decretum per Totam Epistolam ad Romanos Elidens: — Scripta anti-Papistica: — Exercitationes de Universali Gratia: — De Ecclesia in Genere: — Programmata de Promissione Messiae ex Psalms 40, de Adventu Messiae ex Psa 14:7. etc. See Witte, Memoriae Theologorum; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Maul Or Mall[[@Headword:Maul Or Mall]]

             is an old name for a hammer or mallet, and stands in the Auth. Vers. for the Heb. מֵפַיוֹ(mephits', only occurs in Pro 25:18; but kindred is

מִפֵּוֹ, mappets', “battle-axe,” Jer 51:20; both from פּוּוֹor נָפִוֹ, to break in pieces), a war-club, such as was anciently in common use, and even in the Middle Ages, the memory of which is still preserved in the modern mace as a sign of authority. “Probably such was that which is said to have suggested the name of Charles Martel. The mace is frequently mentioned in the accounts of the wars of the Europeans with Saracens, Turks, and other Orientals, and several kinds are still in use among the Bedouin Arabs of remoter parts (Burckhardt, Notes on Bedouins, 1:55). In their European wars the Turks were notorious for the use they made of the mace (Knollys, Hist. of the Turks)” (Smith). Various kinds of mace were used by the ancient Egyptians, either with or without a ball at the end to  give weight to the blow, and generally with a guard at the handle. The curved club or throw-stick, the Arabian lissan or “tongue,” is a very general Oriental weapon. Among the Australians, this implement is yet a formidable one, called the boomerang. Unmistakable traces of its use occur on the Egyptian and Assyrian monuments (Wilkinson, Anc. Eg. 1:365; Bonomi, Nineveh, p. 134-6). SEE ARMOR.

## Maulavi[[@Headword:Maulavi]]

             the name usually given to a Mohammedan priest in India.

## Maulbronn[[@Headword:Maulbronn]]

             originally a Cistercian convent in the bishopric of Spiers, was founded by bishop Gunther of Spiers, on a tract of land given him by Walther von Lomersheim in 1148, previously infested with robbers. The convent soon became very rich, partly through donations, and partly by the zeal and activity of the monks. It was at first placed under the jurisdiction of the empire, by Frederick I and other emperors, but in the 14th century was placed under that of the Palatinate. In 1504 it was conquered by duke Ulrich of Wurtemberg, and when the Reformation commenced, it was appointed by him for the monks of his province who wished to remain Roman Catholics; duke Christopher, in 1557, took this also from them, appointed an evangelical abbot, and established a school in it. It is yet the seat of one of the four minor theological seminaries. The remaining portions of the building, i.e. the church, cloisters, entrance-hall, and refectory, are considered among the finest specimens of German Gothic architecture.

The place has become renowned in the annals of Protestantism by its connection with two important transactions, the Colloquium Maulbrunnense, in 1564, and the Formula Maulbrunnensis, in 1576.

(1.) The introduction of Calvinism into the Palatinate by duke Frederick III after 1560, and in particular the publication of the Heidelberg Catechism in 1563, provoked great opposition on the part of the Lutherans. The authorities, and especially duke Christopher of Wurtemberg, Wolfgang of Psalzneuburg, and margrave Charles of Baden, vainly endeavored to heal the dissension by means of a colloquy held between the theologians of the Palatinate and Wurtemberg at Maulbronn in 1564. The elector of the Palatinate was accompanied by his court preacher, M. Michael Diller, and the theologians Dr. Peter Boquin, Caspar Olevian, Zacharias Ursinus, and Peter Dathenius; also the church counselor Thomas Erastus, chancellor Dr. Eheim, and notary Wilhelm Xylander, professor of Greek at Heidelberg. The representatives of Wurtemberg were Valentin Vannius, abbot of  Maulbronn, Johannes Brenz, provost of Stuttgard, Jacob Andrea, provost and chancellor of the University of Tubingen, Dietrich Schnepf; professor at Tubingen, and the court preacher Balthasar Bidembach; also as notary, Lucas Osiander, then preacher at Stuttgard, and as civil counselors chancellor John Fessler and vice-chancellor Jerome Gerhard. The colloquy lasted from April 10th to April 15th. Chancellor Eheim, in his opening speech, invited the theologians, since the object of the conference was to heal their dissensions, to avoid all merely human views and arguments, and to confine themselves to the positive testimony of Scripture on the points of controversy. Yet, instead of treating of the doctrine of the Eucharist, which was their chief point of difference, the theologians at once launched into arguments concerning the ubiquity, or, as Andrea termed it, the majestas nullo loco circumscripta, of the body of Christ. Thus all possibility of harmony was at once destroyed. During eight sessions this same question was discussed without either party coming any nearer to the views of the other. The theologians of the Palatinate, and in particular Boquin, Olevian, and Ursin, partly denied the importance of the doctrine of the ubiquity of the body of Christ, and partly refuted their opponents by the Scriptures, the articles of faith, and by an expose of the errors into which these principles must lead. Those of Wirtemberg tried especially to defend the idea of the ubiquity of Christ's body from misapprehension and misrepresentation, and treated it as a necessary consequence of unio personalis and the communicatio idiomatum; they rejected the accusation of mixing up the two natures, and accused their opponents of making a mere man of Christ. As the others asked whether, in this view, the body of Christ was considered as omnipresent even in the womb, Andrea, who was spokesman of the Wurtemberg party, drew a distinction between the possession and the use of the attribute, and asserted that Christ could not have been omnipresent in the womb, but only became so actually after his ascension — a view which the Heidelberg theologians rejected as contrary to reason and unsupported by Scripture.

At the last two sittings, finally, the question of the Eucharist was discussed, as the princes wished that the two parties should seek to arrive at some understanding concerning this important point, leaving aside all Christological questions. Yet, after a very few speeches, the question of ubiquity was again started, this time by the Reformed theologians, and the discussion receded to its original ground. The colloquy now came to a close. The protocols were compared and signed, and the two parties  separated, each holding as firmly to its own views as previous to the meeting, and considering itself as having obtained the advantage. In spite of the promise of secrecy, the Heidelberg theologians boasted of having silenced their opponents, claiming even that duke Christopher himself was now more inclined to their doctrines. The Wurtemberg party would not brook this, and Brenz wrote an account of the colloquy, denying the statements of the Heidelbergians, which was at first circulated privately, and was finally printed in the same year under the title Epitome colloquii Maulbrunnensis inter theologos Heidelbergenses et Wurtembergenses de Cana Domini et Majestate Christi, and also a Wahrhaftiger u. grundlicher Bericht v. d. Gesprach, etc., gestellt durch d. Wurtembergischen Theologen (Frankfort, 1564, 4to); in these works he accused his adversaries of having had recourse to sophistry, and, when they found it impossible longer to defend their views, to have caused the colloquy to be brought to a close. Heidelberg answered by the Epitome colloq. Maulbr. cum responsione Palatinorum ad epit. Wurtemb. (Heidelberg, 1565, 4to), and published at the same time the protocol of the conference, which was followed up by the opposite party with a new edition of the protocols, “without changes or additions;” (Tubing. 1565, 4to). Both parties now accused each other of interpolating the protocols. The theologians of Wittenberg were also drawn into the quarrel, as duke Christopher submitted to them the protocols of Maulbronn and the De Majestate Christi of Andreat and Brenz, both of which they severely condemned. The dispute lasted for several years. It was finally set at rest by the wise and Christian efforts of elector Frederick at the Diet of Augsburg in 1566. See Osiander, Histor. eccl. cent. xvi, 100:59, p. 791; Struve, Pfalz. K. Hist. p. 149 sq.; Hospinian, Hist. sacr. t. ii.; Arnold, Unpart. K. Hist. cent. xvi, § 17, p. 14; Sattler, Gesch. d. Herzogth. Wurtemberg, 4:207 sq.; Planck, Geschichte d. Prot. Lehrbegr. vol. v, pt. ii, p. 487 sq.; Heppe, Gesch. des deutsch. Protest. 2:71 sq.; Klunzinger, D. Religionsgesprach zu M. (Zeitschr. f. histor. Theolog. 1849, 1:166 sq.); Leben u. ausgewahlte Schrift. d. Vater, etc., d. reform. Kirche (Elberfeld, 1857, p. 260).

(2.) Another conference, held twelve years later at Maulbronn, between theologians from Wurtemberg, Baden, and Henneberg, secured a better result. The theologians were L. Osiander, Balthasar, Bidembach, provost of Stuttgard, Abel Scherdinger, court preacher of Henneberg, Peter Strecker, pastor at Suhl, and some others. The object of the conference was to discuss a formula of union drawn up by Osiander and Bidembach.  The meeting took place Jan. 19, 1576, and the formula itself, which may be considered as a forerunner of the Formula Concordiae, received the name of Formula Maulbrunnensis. In the early part of February it was sent, together with an address by count George Ernest of Henneberg, to the lector August of Saxony, who received also about the same time the so- called Suabian and Saxon formula of duke Julius of Brunswick. The elector submitted them both to Andrea, who declared that, in his opinion, the formula of Maulbronn was the most serviceable for the purpose of uniting the different parties. Yet in the conference held at Torgau, May 28, Andrea consented to use nominally the other formula as a basis, but took good care to include all the principal points of the Maulbronn formula into the so-called Book of Torgau. See Hutter, Concord. conc. p. 305 sq.; Osiander, Hist. Eccl. cent. 16, lib. 4, pt. 3, p. 866; Planck, Gesch. d. protest. Lehrbegr. 6:428; Heppe, Gesch. d. luth. Concordienformel, 1858, p. 73 sq.

(3.) In September of the same year (1576), still another meeting was held at Maulbronn, in which Heerbrand, Schnepf, Magirus, Bidembach, L. Osiander, Dietz, Scherdinger, and Strecker took part. Its object was to discuss the Book of Torgau, and it ended in expressing its approbation of it as a whole. See Heppe, Gesch. d. luth. Concordienformel, p. 120 sq. — Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 9:178 sq. (J. N. P.)

## Maulmont (Or Malmont), Jean De[[@Headword:Maulmont (Or Malmont), Jean De]]

             a learned Frenchman, was born in Limousin, in the 16th century, of an ancient noble family, which possessed one of the baronies of Limousin, the chateau of Maumont. Of his personal history but little is known except that he was principal of the College of Saint-Michel, otherwise called Chanac, which had been founded in 1530 by the Pompadour house for the Limousin students. According to La Croix du Maine. “Maulmont was a very learned man, master of many languages, especially the Greek, a great theologian, and a prolific orator.” He was an intimate friend of Julius Scaliger. Many of his contemporaries have pretended that he was the true author of the translation of Plutarch which bears the name of Amyot; this assertion has been refuted by La Monnoye in a note on L'Anti-Baillet of Menage. We have of Maulmont's works, Les OEuvres de Saint Justin, philosophe et martyr (Paris, 1538, fol.): — Les Histoires et Chroniques du Monde, tirees tant du gros volume de Jean Zonare, auteur Byzantin, que de plusieurs autres scripteurs Hebreux et Grecs, avec annotations (Paris, 1563, fol.):  —Les graves et saintes remontrances de l'empereur Ferdinand au pope Pie IV sur le Concile de Trente (Paris, 1563, 8vo): — Remontrances Chretiennes en forme d'epitre a la reine d'Angleterre, trad. Du Latin de Hierosme Oserias, evesque Portugalois (Paris, 1653, 8vo). The same author has written in Italian a life of Rene de Birague, chancellor of France, who died in 1583, and the Gallia Chrtistiana quotes it as a correct and usefulwork. See La Croix du Maine et DuVerdier, Biblioth. Francoises; Goujet, Biblioth. Francoises, vol. xii; Gallia Christiana, 6:571. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, vol. 34, s.v.

## Maundy Thursday[[@Headword:Maundy Thursday]]

             also known under the term DIES COENAE DOMINICAE (q.v.), is the name given to the Thursday before Easter. The origin of this name is Dies mandati — mandate Thursday; either from the commandment which our Savior gave to his disciples to commemorate the sacrament of his supper, which he instituted on this day (hence also called dies panis, day of bread; and dies lucis, day of light); or because on this day our Savior washed his disciples' feet, and gave them commandment to follow his example. Others derive it from the Saxon mand, which means a basket, and subsequently any gift or offering contained in the basket. On this day penitents who had been put out of the Church on Ash-Wednesday were readmitted. There was also a general celebration of the Lord's Supper, with which the ceremony of washing the feet was connected. Candidates for baptism publicly recited the Creed. The origin of this practice is generally referred to the 7th century, but Riddle (Christian Antiquities, p. 669) contends that “it appears to have been of much earlier institution.” SEE PEDILAVIUM.

## Maunoir, Julien[[@Headword:Maunoir, Julien]]

             a learned French ecclesiastic, was born Oct. 1, 1606, in the province of Saint-Georges de Reinthembault, diocese of Rennes. At the age of twenty he entered the Order of the Jesuits at Paris, and finished his studies at La Fleche. A professorship in the College of Quimper was offered him, but he preferred to preach, and accordingly entered the ministry. He studied the dialect of Brittany, began to travel over the country, and displayed so much zeal in his preaching that his health became impaired, and he was obliged to resume the career of teaching, which he followed at Tours. After having been ordained at Nevers, he consecrated the remainder of his life, according to a vow that he had made, to the evangelization of Brittany. For  forty-two consecutive years Maunoir labored for the accomplishment of his project. Unmoved by the injury and violence with which his devotion was often repaid, accepting or imposing on himself the rudest privations, traveling on foot, with a wallet on his shoulders, and carrying only the clothing and nourishment absolutely indispensable, he visited successively and repeatedly nearly all the parishes in the dioceses of Cornovaille and Leon, the islands of Ouessant, of Molene, of Sizein, etc., without mentioning a great number of localities in the other dioceses of Brittany, and everywhere his preaching was attended with success. He died Jan. 28, 1683, at Plevin, near Guincamp. In accordance with his expressed desire, he was buried like a pauper, but later a statue was erected to him in the church of Plevin. With the triple object in view of understanding thoroughly a language so indispensable to himself, of purifying it from the mixed dialect used by the preachers of the times, and of generalizing the learning of the language, Maunoir aided in the promotion of the colleges of Quimper and of Morlaix, where the language of Brittany was generally used.

The same motives actuated him in the composition of the following works, which have been adopted by all the ecclesiastics of the country: Canticon spirituel hac instructionon profetabl evit quisqui an hent da vont d'ar barados (Quimper): — Vita S. Corentini, Aremorici; Cosopeti (Quimper, 1685, 12mo, et al.); far from being written in Latin, as father Southwell and Le Long have supposed, this life is composed of 766 Breton verses: — Le Temple consacre a la passion de Jesus-Christ, in Breton, prose and verse (Quimper. 1679,1686, 8vo): — Le sacre College de Jesus divisi en cinq classes, ou l'on enseigne en langue Armorique les legons Chretiennes, avec les trois clefs pour y entrer. These and other works of this character are curious in a philological point of view as monuments of the changes in the Breton language. A very competent judge, M. de la Villemarque, has given the following opinion: “Born in the French part of Brittany, father Maunoir was shocked by the rudeness of certain sounds in the Breton language. In order to soften them, he suppressed or modified certain signs necessary for preserving the primitive signification of the words, and for showing their etymology, derivation, and affinities. The expressions thus disfigured, of which he makes use in his works, prevailed in the 18th century, and he left an orthography without fixed principles or method, an orthography ad libitum, which has very properly been abandoned, since Le Pelletier has substituted the ancient Breton orthography in his Dictionnaire. See Boschet, Le Parfait Missionnaire, ou la vie du P. Julien Maunoir (Paris, 1697, 12mo); Lobineau, Vie des Saints,  etc., de Bretagne, v. 23-137; G. Leroux, Recueil des vertus et des miracles du P. Julien Maunoir (Quimper, 1716, 12mo); LaVillemarque, Essai sue l'Histoire de la Langue Bretonne, at the head of his edition of the Dict. Francais-Breton de Le Gonidec (St. Brieuc, 1847, 4to). — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, vol. 34, s.v.

## Maupas Du Tour, Henri Caughon De[[@Headword:Maupas Du Tour, Henri Caughon De]]

             a French prelate, was born in 1600 at the chateau of Cosson, near Rheims. Descended from an ancient family of Champagne, he had for his godfather king Henry IV, and was scarcely sixteen years of age when he was elected abbot of Saint-Denis of Rheims, with a regular benefice. In 1636 he founded there the society of Saint Genevieve. He next became chief vicar of the diocese of Rheims, then first chaplain to the queen, Anne of Austria, and in 1641 was finally elected bishop of Puy, whence he was transferred in 1661 to the see of Evreux. In the following year, being called to Rome to solicit the beatification of Francois de Sales, he was chosen assistant prelate to the pontifical throne. January 14,1667, he founded a seminary at Evreux, resigned his bishopric in 1680, and died at Evreux August 12 of the same year. Of his works we have Vie de Mme. de Chantal (Paris, 1644, 4to): — Vie de saint Francois de Sales (Paris, 1657, 4to): — Oraison funebre de saint Vincent de Paul (Paris, 1661, 4to): — Statuts synodaux (Evreux. 1664,1665, 8vo). See Gallia Christiana, vols. 2 and 11; Le Brasseur, Hist. du Diocese d'Evreux. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, vol. 34, s.v.

## Maupertuy (or Maupertuis), Jean-Baptiste Drouet De[[@Headword:Maupertuy (or Maupertuis), Jean-Baptiste Drouet De]]

             a French ecclesiastical writer, was born at Paris in 1650. He was educated at the Jesuit college of Louis-le-Grand, and for a time dedicated himself to poetry and literature. In spite of his talents he did not achieve anything,  owing to the life of dissipation which he led, and which cost him not only his fortune but the best part of his life. At the age of forty he renounced the joys of this world and led a retired life. In 1692 he retired to the abbey of SeptFonts, and five years later was made a priest by the archbishop of Vienne. He returned to Paris, and died at St. Germain-en-Laye, March 10, 1736. He wrote, Pensees Chretiennes et Morales (1703): — Histoire de la Reforme de l'Abbaye des Sept-Fonts (1702): — Les Sentiments d'un Cihrtien Touched d'un Veritable Amour de Dieu (1716): — L'Histoire de la Sainte Eglise de Vienne. Besides, he translated into French the Institutions of Lactantius; Salvianus's treatise on Providence, etc. See Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Maupin, Milton[[@Headword:Maupin, Milton]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born in Campbell County, Tennessee, Dec. 24,1829. He was educated at Emory and Henry College, Virginia; was licensed to preach about the year 1849; and was engaged for two or three years teaching school and preaching in the local relation. He went to California in 1852, and in 1853 joined the Pacific Conference, California. In 1856 he returned to Tennessee, in 1859 joined the Holston Conference, and was appointed to Grayson Circuit, in Western Virginia; in 1860 to Newport Circuit; in 1861 to Maynardsville Circuit. In 1862 he was appointed by the Conference a missionary chaplain to a regiment in the Confederate States army; but, as the regiment was disbanded before the close of the year, he returned home, and was without regular work until 1866, when he was appointed to Knox and  Maynardsville Circuit. In 1867 he was transferred to Trinity Conference, Texas, and appointed in 1869 to Gainesville Circuit; in 1871 to Decatur Mission, where he finished his life and ministry, April 1,1871. He was faithful to his calling while his strength lasted. “He left the aroma of a good name, and the assurance that he went to his rest." — Minutes of the M. E. Church South, 1871.

## Maur (St.), Congregation Of[[@Headword:Maur (St.), Congregation Of]]

             The Benedictines afford the only example of a monastic order which, after declining from an originally high position, and after remaining, so to speak, dead for two centuries, revived and took again a leading place in the Church by its activity and learning.

As early as the latter part of the Middle Ages the Order of Benedictines had lost much of their influence. The convents had become too wealthy, and the monks, instead of devoting themselves to study and religious exercises, were entirely given up to idleness and worldly enjoyments. This state of things continued through the 16th century. In the early part of the 17th a reform took place in the Convent of St. Vannes, near Verdun, under the influence of Didier de la Cour, and it was soon imitated by the formerly renowned convents of Moyenmoutier and Senones. Clement VIII confirmed the organization of this Congregation de S. Vannes, which produced some distinguished men, among them Dom Calmet and Dom Cellier.

In 1614 the assembly of the French clergy expressed the wish that all the Benedictine convents throughout the country should connect themselves with St. Vannes; the general chapter of the congregation, however, was afraid of the consequences which might result from such extended power.

In 1618, however, Dom Benard, one of the monks of St. Vannes who had been employed in reforming other convents, obtained from Louis XIII authority to establish a congregation, which when organized took the name of St. Maur, for fear of awakening jealousy if it took that of any particular convent. This congregation was confirmed by Gregory XV in 1621, and by Urban VIII in 1627. The first convent subjected by Benard to the new regulations was that of the Blancs- Manteaux at Paris. Soon a number of others joined it.

In 1652 they counted forty convents; in the beginning of the 18th century their number reached 180, divided into six provinces. The most important of all these establishments was the convent of St. Germain des Pres, near Paris. It was the residence of the general of the order, was endowed with episcopal  authority, and possessed a library particularly rich in ancient MSS. Its statutes, drawn up to accord with the spirit of the times, the strict morality, intellectual pursuits, and great learning of its members, gained universal respect for the congregation. Amid the looseness of morals which then prevailed among the French clergy, the Congregation of St. Maur belongs to the few exceptions which reflect honor on the Church of Rome. According to the confession of a Romanist writer, they are perhaps the only order in the history of convents of which this can be said. It is also to be remembered that, conscious of serving higher and universal interests, they remained entire strangers to all persecutions both of the Jesuits and the Gallican clergy.

To secure a high degree of scholarship among the Congregation, the first general, Dom Tariffe, carefully prepared a scheme of studies; and as early as the 17th and 18th centuries the congregation counted a large number of distinguished men. Their labors were promptly directed to the gathering of materials for the history of the convents belonging to the congregation, and to that of the saints. These researches soon led them into paleological and diplomatic works. The finished education given to the novices required a large number of new books or improved reprints of old ones, which were prepared by order of the superiors by members of the congregation. Thus arose a large number of very important and valuable works. They treat of a great variety of subjects, but especially of the history of France and of the Church. The most distinguished among the monks were entrusted with the editorship, and the others were employed in gathering the materials, or making up some particular part of it: if one of them died before his task was complete, another took his place, and continued it in the same spirit and with the same learning. No other order ever made the same use of its riches: they bought the rarest MSS. and books, made journeys to visit foreign libraries and to establish relations with foreign savans. Their publications also possessed an outward finish previously unknown in typography. Their religious independence is shown in the fact that they remained in friendly relation with the recluses of Port Royal (q.v.), and suffered persecution for their refusal to endorse the bull Unigenitus (q.v.), and they were often and severely attacked by the Jesuits. The order continued in existence until the French Revolution.

The historical works of the Congregation of St. Maur are numerous, and embrace an extensive field. Dom Mabillon may be considered as the founder of diplomacy, of which he established the basis in his De re  diplomatica (1681, 6 vols. fol.); this was followed by a supplement in 1704, in consequence of the attacks of the Jesuit Germon. As these works related almost exclusively to France, a general work on the same subject was published by Dom Toustain and Dom Tassin, under the title Nouveau traite de diplomatique (1750-65, 6 vols. 4to), which is still the most perfect of the kind. To these must be added Montfaucon's Paleographia Graeca (1708, fol.), which, however, has been surpassed by subsequent publications. Chronology may almost be said to have been created by them. The Art de verifier les dates, commenced by Dantine and finished by Clemencet (1750, 2 vols. 4to), is well known to every student of history. A second edition was published by Clement (1770, fol.), and then a third (1783-92, 3 vols. fol.), each time with numerous additions. The fourth, much enlarged edition, due also to Clement, appeared first in 1818 (37 vols. 8vo), and was often reprinted; there are also an edition in folio and one in quarto. This work has justly been called the most important monument of French learning in the 18th century. Montfaucon's Antiquite expliquee en figures (1719, 10 vols. fol.) has now become somewhat antiquated in consequence of the new sources discovered since. In the domain of philology, the congregation took an active part in a yet unsurpassed work, the Glossarium mediae et infimae Latcainitatis of Dufresne Ducange (1678), which, if it did not originate with them, was at least increased one half by Dom Dantine and Don Charpentier (1733-36, 6 vols. fol., with a supplement by Charpentier, 1767, 4 vols. fol.), and acquired its full importance by their labors. This work is not only important for its philological value, but also for the information it contains on the literature, laws, and civil and ecclesiastical customs of the Middle Ages. Charpentier is also the author of the Alphabetum tyronianum (1747, fol.).

They published the sources of the history of France. Such as had been furnished by Pithon and Duchesne were insufficient, and Colbert and Louvois vainly sought to have the work continued; but D'Aguessau finally succeeded in inducing the Benedictines to apply themselves to the task. It finally came into the hands of Dom Bouquet, who completed the first eight volumes of the Scriptores rerum Gallicarum et Franicarum; Dom J. B. Haudiguier and C. Haudiguier accomplished the 9th, 10th, and 11th; Dom Clement the 12th and 13th, and Dom Brial, the last of the Benedictines of St. Maur, the 14th and 15th (17381818, fol.). The work has since been continued by the Academie des Inscriptions, which published the 21st volume in 1855. To this class of works belongs the edition of the writings of Gregoire de Tours, published by Dom Ruinart (1699, fol.). They never  gave a complete history of France, but only the beginning of it, and the history of particular parts. Dom Martin wrote La Religion des Gaulois (1727, 2 vols. 4to), and Dom de Brezillac Histoire des Gaules et des Conquetes des Gaulois (1752, 2 vols. 4to), both of little importance now. Their histories of particular provinces are more valuable. The most important are Histoire generale du Languedoc, by Vaissette and De Vic (1730-45) 5 vols. fol.); Histoire de Bretagne, by Veisserie (who subsequently became a Protestant) and Lobineau (1707, 2 vols. fol.). This was afterwards entirely remodeled, although not completed, by Maurice de Beaubois (1742, 3 vols. fol., and 2 vols. 4to); Histoire de Bourgogne, by Plancher (1739 sq., 3 vols. fol.); Histoire de la Ville de Paris, by Felibien and Lobineau (1725, 5 vols.). Finally, the Histoire litteraire de la France (1733-63, 12 vols. 4to), inaugurated by Dom Rivet and others, and continued by the order till 1814, when it was taken up by the Academie des Inscriptions; the 20th volume was published in 1842. It is a very valuable collection of documents, not only for the history of French literature, but also for that of the Middle Ages generally. The researches in the libraries of the convents, also the journeys, principally in Italy, Germany, and the Netherlands, gave occasion to publish extensive catalogues and descriptions of them. Among these we notice the Spicilegium veterum aliquot scriptorum of D'Achery (1553-1677, 13 vols. 4to; new edit. by De la Barre, 1723, 3 vols. fol.); Vetera Analecta, by Mabillon (1675-85, 4 vols. 4to); Collectio nova veterum scriptorum, by Martene (1700, 4to); Thesaurus novus Anecdotorum, by Martene and Durand (1717, 5 vols. fol.); Voyage litteraire de deux religieux Benedictins, by the same (1724, 4to); Diarium Italicum (1702, 4to), and Bibliotheca bibliothecarum manuscriptorum nova (1739, 2 vols. fol.), both by Montfaucon. In Church history, their most important works are their revision of the Gallia Christiana of the brothers De Sainte-Marthe (1656, 4 vols. fol.).

The new work was commenced by another member of that distinguished family, Dom Denis de Sainte-Marthe. It was intended as an introduction to a contemplated Orbis Christianus, for which a large amount of documents were collected, yet this work was never completed. The first volume of the Gallia Christiana appeared in 1715. Sainte-Marthe died on the completion of the third volume, in 1725. The order continued the work until the thirteenth volume, which appeared in 1785. It was then interrupted, until of late years Haureau, the author of the Histoire de la Philosophie scholastique (1850, 2 vols.), took it up again, and in 1856 he published his continuation. The Gallia Christiana was used as a model for other similar  works, such as the Italia sacra, the Espana sagrada, the Illyria sacra, etc. It also gave rise to numerous histories of special convents by others of the congregation; the greater part of them, however, remain unpublished. The only two which appeared are the Histoire de l'Abbaye de St. Denis of Felibien (1706, fol.), and the Histoire de l'Abbaye de S. Germain des Pres of Bouillart (1724, fol.). The collection of the French councils, commenced by Dom de Coniac, and afterwards continued by Dom Labat, was to be appended to the Gallia Christiana. The first volume appeared in 1789, at the moment of the outbreak of the French Revolution, and the congregation was dispersed before the second was complete. The history of martyrs was treated by Dom Ruinart in his Acta primorum martyrum (1689, 4to). Of greater interest are the works on the old liturgies and convent customs, some of which are among the earliest works of the congregation. Menard published the Sacramentarium of Gregory the Great (1642, 4to), Mabillon the Liturgia Gallicana (1645, 4to), Martene his Libri V de antiquis monachorum ritibus (1690, 2 vols. 4to), and his De antiquis ecclesiae ritibus (1700, 4 vols. 4to; 2d edit. 1736, 4 vols. fol.); finally, among the most renowned works in that line, we must mention the Acta Sanctorum Ordinis S. Benedicti, commenced by D'Achery, and continued by Mabillon and Ruinart (1668, etc., 9 vols. fol.: the tenth remained unpublished); the Annales Ordinis S. Benedicti, the celebrated work of Mabillon, completed by Massuet (1703, etc., 6 vols. fol.). The same congregation wrote also a history of their own order, which formed 3 vols. fol. in MS., but the superiors refused permission for publication. Dom Tassin published, however, an abstract from it, down to 1766. Dom Clemencet wrote a history of Port Royal, of which the first part alone appeared (1755, 10 vols. 12mo); the second part remained in MS., as being too favorable to the Jansenists.

The greatest claim of the Benedictines of St. Maur to the gratitude of theologians lies in their editions of the works of the fathers. They had at first contemplated only publishing the complete works of authors of their own order; but the favor with which their productions were received, as also the requirements of their schools, induced them to publish first the works of the Latin fathers, and afterwards of the Greek also. For this purpose they compared the various texts of the different works existing in France, Italy, England, Holland, Germany, etc. The result was a set of works which for correctness of the text remains unsurpassed, especially for the works of the most. important among the fathers. Among these works  we must not forget their valuable Latin translations of the Greek fathers, and their Indices, so important for all historical students. The first Latin father whose works they published is St. Augustine. His views afforded them powerful weapons in the Jansenistic controversy. The edition was commenced by Dom Delfau, and continued by Blampin and Constant (1679-1700, 11 vols. folio); Garet published Cassiodor (1679, 2 vols. fol.): Du Frische and Le Nourri, Ambrosius (1686-90, 2 vols. fol.); Constant, Hilarius of Poitiers (1693, fol.); Martianay, Jerome (1693-1706, 5 vols. fol.). The works of Cyprian, commenced by Baluze, who was not of St. Maur, were completed by Dom Maran (1726, fol.). In 1645 the Benedictines published the Epistle of Barnabas (4to). But it is only towards the close of the 17th century that they seriously applied themselves to this branch of ancient ecclesiastical literature. Montfaucon published the works of Athanasius, (1698, 3 vols. folio); this was followed by his Collectio nova patrum (1706, 2 vols. fol.), containing additions to Athanasius; the works of Eusebius of Caesarea, and the Topography of Cosmas. Massuet published Irenaeus (1710, fol.); Montfaucon, Chrysostom (1718-38,13 vols. fol.); Toutee, Cyril of Jerusalem (1720, fol.); Garnier, Basil the Great (1721-30, 3 vols. folio); Charles de la Rue and his nephew Vincent de la Rue, Origen (1733-59, 4 vols. folio); Maran, Justin and the other apologetists (1742, fol.). Maran commenced an edition of the works of Gregory of Nazianzum, which was continued by Clemencet, but the breaking out of the French Revolution prevented the publication of any but the first volume (1788, folio).

Among the works of writers of their order and others of the Middle Ages which they published, we notice the rule of St. Benedict of Aniane, Concordia regularum, published by Menard (1628, 4to); Lanfranc, by D'Achery (1648, fol.), and Guibert of Nogent, by the same (1651, fol.); St. Bernard, by Mabillon (1667, fol.; 2d ed. 1690, 2 vols. fol.; 3d ed. 1719, 2 vols. fol.); Anselm of Canterbury, by Gerberon (1675, fol., 2d ed. 1721) ; Gregory the Great, by Denis de Sainte-Marthe (1705, 4 vols. folio); Hildebert de Mans, by Beaugendre (1708, folio). Dom Constant compiled a collection of the letters and decrees of the popes, only the first volume of which appeared (1721, folio). To aid in the use of the Biblioth. patrum maxima of Lyon, Le Nourri wrote his Apparatus (1703, fol.), which, however, does not extend further than the 4th century; it consists of biographical, historical, and literary notices of the writers whose works are contained in the Bibliotheca. Finally, among their most valuable  publications are those relating to the ancient translations of the Bible. Such are the Hexapla of Origen, by Montfaucon (1713, 2 vols. fol.); the Bibloth. divina of Jerome, by Martianay (1693, vol. i of the works of Jerome), and the Latinae versiones antiquae, by Sahatier, Baillard, and Vincent de la Rue (1743-49, 3 vols. fol.).

Their zeal and their liberal views could not fail to involve them in numerous and bitter controversies; yet even then they generally preserved a tone of great moderation, whilst their greater learning often gave them the advantage over their adversaries. Perhaps the weakest contest they ever engaged in was their defense of the claims of their fellow Benedictine abbot Gersen as the author of the Imitatio Christi, against the attacks of the Augustinian canon regulars, SEE KEMPIS.

They ably defended themselves against the insinuations of De Rance, founder of La Trappe, who accused them of worldliness on account of their studies. Mabillon was thus provoked to publish his renowned Traite des etudes Monastiques (1691, 4to, and 1692, 2 vols. 12mo; it was translated into Latin and Italian). They also got into difficulties with the Jesuits, who accused them of Jansenism on account of their edition of St. Augustine, and otherwise attacked them in the Journal of Trevoux. During this controversy they published very important essays against the bull Unigenitus. Gerberon published the Histoire generale du Jansenisme (1700, 3 vols. 12mo), and Le Cerf the Histoire de let Constitution Unigenitus en ce qui regarde la Congregation de St. Maur. The French Revolution, in forbidding the existence of convents, dispersed also the Benedictines. Several of the works they had then on hand remained uncompleted. The Academie des Inscriptions undertook to finish such as related to the history of France. The last of the Benedictines of St. Maur, Dom Brial, died a member of the French Academy in 1833. In later times an attempt was made to revive the order. La Mennais (q.v.) with some of his friends bought the abbey of Solesmes, formerly occupied by the Benedictines of St. Maur. The pope made it the regular abbey of the restored Order of Benedictines Sept. 1, 1837, and Geranger (afterwards called Gueranger), a German professor, formerly a Protestant, was made superior-general of the order. Yet so far, the attempts of the new monks to rival the fame of their predecessors have proved unsuccessful; the ultramontanism which pervades the French clergy is not favorable to profound studies. Its first work gave evidence of the spirit which now animates the institution: Origines catholiques, origines de l'Eglise Romaine (Paris, 1836, 4to; vol. 1 only has appeared). By his  Institutions liturgiques (Paris, 1846) Gueranger helped to introduce the use of the Roman liturgy in the French dioceses, in spite of the remonstrances of the Gallican clergy. The most eminent of the new Benedictines is Pitra, yet even his works will prove of more value to the papacy than to science. In an article published in the Correspondant of 1852 he attacked the Regesta pontificum of Jaffe, and asserted that the making of the pseudo-decretals (q.v.) affords proof that the primacy of the See of Rome was then already recognized by all. Pitra has published a Histoire de St. Leger et de l'Eglise de France au 7me siecle (Paris, 1846): — Etudes sur la Collection des Actes des Saints par les Bollandistes (Paris, 1850), a valuable work. Since 1852 he has been working at a Spicilegium Solesmense, of which three volumes have been published (Paris, royal 8vo). They do not continue the important works commenced by the old order, leaving even the series of the fathers unfinished. See Petz, Biblioth. Benedicto-mauriana (Vienna, 1716, 8vo); Le Cerf, Bibliotheque historique, etc., des Auteurs de la Cong. de St. Maur (Hague, 1726, 12mo); Tassin, Histoire liter. de la Congr. de St. Maur (Paris, 1726, 4to); Herbst, Die Verdienste d. Mauriner um d. Wissenschaften (Tubinger theol. Quartalschrift, 1833, part i, ii, iii; 1834, pt. i). — Herzog, Real- Encyklopadie, 9:190 sq.

## Maurand (Or Mauran), Pierre[[@Headword:Maurand (Or Mauran), Pierre]]

             the first leader of the Albigenses in Southern France, was born at Toulouse, of a noted family, in the early part of the 12th century. From his youth he gave himself entirely to spreading the doctrines of the Albigenses (q.v.) throughout Languedoc. Rich and learned, preaching incessantly, traveling barefooted, sleeping on the ground, living in the midst of danger, he strongly impressed the southern mind, always easily excited, and in a short time made a great number of converts, whom he assembled in two of his mansions, one in the city, the other in the country. Maurand said boldly “that the clergy performed their ecclesiastical duties without learning, without morals, and without capacity; that usury was common, and that in many churches all was venal, the sacraments and the benefices; that the clerks, the priests, the canons, and even the bishops, associated publicly with abandoned women; that if the same vices were remarked in the lords and laity, it was owing to the general ignorance, an excuse which the clergy could not plead.”

As for his belief, he admitted two grand directing principles, independent and uncreated; good and evil; light and darkness. He did not consider almsgiving a means of salvation; and life should not be  an incessant commerce. He did not admit that a priest could, by a few words, transform the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, and persisted in seeing in the mass and sacrifice only a commemoration, a symbol. He rejected all the ceremonial service of the Church as an abuse which should be destroyed. He led, moreover, a most regular and sober life, prayed on his knees seven times a day and seven times each night. He did not acknowledge the remission of sins on the earth, not being able to believe that a mere mortal, a priest “all covered with the leprosy of vice,” could absolve that of which he was himself knowingly guilty each day. As for the members of the clergy, he called them net pastors, but ravishing wolves, etc. The court of Rome was not slow in being roused, and the number of heretics multiplied so prodigiously that an appeal was made to the secular arm. After having condemned the sectarians in several synods, the archbishops of Narbonne and Lyons made some arrests, and burned alive those who would not recant. After the action of the Council of Albi in 1176, pope Alexander III himself inaugurated a crusade against the heretics, who were particularly strong in the dominion of Raymond V of Toulouse.

The legate and the bishops entered Toulouse in the midst of the insulting clamors of the people. One of the prelates however preached, and attempted to refute the doctrines of the Albigenses; the latter, apparently convinced not so much by his reasoning as by fear of the count of Toulouse, did not dare to be seen or to speak in public. The legate, not contented with this success, caused the Roman Catholics to promise with an oath to denounce and deliver up all the heretics they knew. Pierre Maurand was one of the first reached by this measure. They induced him by caresses and promises to appear before the legate. In the examination to which he was obliged to submit, he declared that the bread was not the body of Christ. The inquisitors asked nothing more; they delivered him to the count of Toulouse, who immediately imprisoned him, ordering that his goods should be forthwith confiscated and his mansions demolished, whilst other punishment was yet to follow. Pierre Maurand, seeing himself on the verge of an ignominious death, promised to abjure his faith. They then brought him out of prison, and on the public square, before the assembled people, he kneeled to the legate and his colleagues; begged their pardon, and promised to submit to their orders. The next day the bishop of Toulouse and the abbot of Saint-Sernin took Maurand from his prison, naked and barefooted, and led him through the city, flogging him from time to time. Arriving at the cathedral, he paid a heavy fine, renewed the abjuration of his faith, and heard the sentence which condemned him to  start within forty days for Jerusalem, and remain there three years in the service of the poor; his goods were confiscated, half to the profit of Raymond V, half to the profit of the clergy. He was also obliged to pay a fine of five hundred pounds' weight of silver to the count of Toulouse, to make numerous gifts to religious establishments, to the poor, etc. However, when Maurand returned from Palestine, he recovered the greater part of his estates. See Dom Vaissette, Histoire de Languedoc, t. 3, chap. 19; Dict. des Heresies, article Albigeois, in the Encyclopedie theologique of the abbe Migne; Benoit, Hist. des Albigeois, t. 1; Langlois, Histoire des Croisades contre les Albigeois; Basnage de Beauval, Hist. de l'Eglise, t. 2, chap. 29. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Generale, vol. 34, s.v.

## Maurer, Franz Joseph Valentin Dominik[[@Headword:Maurer, Franz Joseph Valentin Dominik]]

             a Protestant theologian of Germany, was born at Rottweil, February 14, 1795. In 1820 he received holy orders, but in 1821 joined the Evangelical Church. For some time he was collaborator at the Thomas School in Leipsic, but afterwards retired to Stuttgart, devoting himself entirely to literary work. He died in 1856. He published, Conmmentar uber doas Buch Josua (Stuttgart, 1831): — Commentarius Grammaticus Criticaus in Vet. Testamentumn (Leipsic, 1832 sq.; volume 1 contains all the historical books, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Lamentations; volume 2, Ezekiel, Daniel, and the minor prophets; volume 3, Psalms and Proverbs. There is great disproportion in the mode of treatment. All the historical books from Genesis to Esther are comprised in two hundred. and fifty pages, and it is only after Isaiah that the treatment begins to be more ample, and is then really valuable. Maurer's work was continued by August Heiligstedt. Besides, Maurer published, Praktischer Cursus uber die Formenlehre der hebr. Sprache (Leipsic, 1837): — Kurzgefasstes hebraisches u. chaldaisches Worterbuch (Stuttgart, 1851). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:14, 194, 203; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2:861 sq.; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 2:335 sq. (B.P.)

## Maurice[[@Headword:Maurice]]

             (duke and afterwards elector) OF SAXONY, one of the most prominent characters in the history of the Reformation in the Church of Germany, a celebrated general and champion of the Protestant cause, was the eldest son of duke Henry of the Albertine line and nephew of duke George the Bearded, the most bitter opponent of the Reformation. Maurice was born at Freiburg March 21, 1521; he espoused in 1541 Agnes, daughter of the landgrave Philip of Hesse; and later in the same year succeeded his father in the duchy of Saxony and its dependencies. He was hardly well established in his dominions when a dispute arose between him and his cousin, the elector of Saxony, John Frederick, regarding their respective rights over the bishopric of Meissen, which was the common property of the Ernestine and Albertine lines; but by the influence of Luther and of the landgrave Philip a temporary reconciliation was effected. In the war with the Turks he distinguished himself as a soldier, and became the favorite of Charles V. Whether, however, Maurice was at this time the sincere friend of the emperor is a question that has never yet been determined. This much is certain that Maurice was selfish by nature, and sought rather the furtherance of his own interests than the welfare of his associates and those who befriended him. A professed Protestant, he took part in the deliberations at Smalcald (q.v.; SEE HOLY LEAGUE ), but refused to become a member of the league for fear of displeasing the emperor,  with whom he coquetted at that time to secure the protectorate of the bishoprics of Magdeburg and Halberstadt. No sooner had the emperor bestowed upon him this much-coveted favor, and honored him with the title of elector (June 19, 1546), than Maurice deserted the Protestant camp, and played the part of a most devoted adherent of the emperor's cause. In consequence of this unexpected hostility to the Protestants the imperial army gained a decisive victory at Muhlberg in April, 1547, well-nigh proving the death-stroke of the Protestant cause.

By this defeat of the Protestants, and the imprisonment of his rival, John Frederick, Maurice, according to a previous understanding with the emperor, became himself the ruler of all Saxony. Thus gratified in all the ambitious desires in which he could expect aid from Charles V, Maurice became quite uneasy in his present relation, and hesitated not to embrace the very first opportunity to seek anew the favor of the leaders he had so basely deserted. It is true as late as 1547 Maurice was still found on the side of the imperialists, for he this year supported the Interim (q.v.) of Augsburg; but gradually he lessened the hold of the Romanists upon him, and by 1551 we find him a party to a secret treaty of the Protestants with Henry II of France, at the very time that he was professing to besiege the rebellious city of Magdeburg. As treacherously and unhesitatingly as he had abandoned the cause of the Reformers he now forsook the imperial side. Poor Charles was at Innsbruck, employing himself in building up vast schemes of ambition, little dreaming of the mine which the man whom he most of all confided in was preparing to spring under his feet. When suddenly the word came to him that he must release prince Philip of Hesse, whom he had imprisoned for his opposition to the imperial cause, even before he had time to decide the case, news came to him that Maurice of Saxony was marching against him.

Without money, without troops, without allies, Charles was compelled to yield to the demands of the man whom he had himself made powerful. On April 18, by the mediation of Ferdinand, king of the Romans, a treaty was concluded at Linz granting the demands of the Protestants; but as it was not to take effect till May 26, Maurice employed himself in attacking (May 18) the camp of Reitti, in which soldiers were assembling for the emperor, defeated and wholly dispersed the imperialists, and advanced on Innsbruck with the view of taking Charles captive. Had it not been that a mutiny stopped his progress, the emperor would have been rudely handled, as Maurice knew his antagonist, and feared the consequences of his treachery. But  Maurice also was feared. His advance on Innsbruck so alarmed the members of the Council of Trent, then in session there, that they fled from the town, and the sittings were thenceforth suspended for some years. Finally came the day of convocation of the electors and princes of the empire at Passau; Maurice directing the cause of the Protestants, and Ferdinand attending to the imperial interests. To the Protestants this meeting must ever be memorable. It was here that a treaty of peace was established which secured to Protestants free exercise of worship; and it was by the Passau treaty that the Romanists of Germany agreed that the imperial chamber, from which Lutherans were not to be excluded, should render justice irrespective of religion; and that the Aulic Council should be composed exclusively of German ministers.

These conditions, which in political matters secured “Germany for the Germans,” and in religious affairs permanently established the principles of toleration, were embodied in the agreement called the Peace of Passau (Aug. 22, 1552). Charles, though he professed reconciliation, never lost an opportunity to wreak his vengeance on the elector. The latter, with his usual subtlety and address, patched up a reconciliation with the emperor, and engaged in the campaign of 1553 against the Turks, who were gradually gaining ground in Hungary. Returning soon, he found that one of his former allies, Albert, margrave of Kulmbach, had refused to accede to the treaty of Passau, and continued the war on his own account, making raids on the ecclesiastical princes of the Rhine and Franconia. Maurice also speedily discovered that behind the margrave stood the emperor, who had secured the services of the margrave because he had found in him a general and an army capable of wreaking his vengeance on the perfidious Saxon prince. But Maurice was equal to the occasion. Putting himself at the head of 20,000 men, he marched to protect his bishopric of Magdeburg against the ecclesiastical spoliator, and, falling in with him at Sievershausen, completely defeated him (July 9, 1553), but fell himself in the conflict, mortally wounded, and died July 11, 1553. “So thoughtful and reticent, so enterprising and energetic, so correct in judgment and unfailing in action, and at the same time wholly devoid of moral sentiment, he is one of the most prominent instances of power without principle which the world's history has ever presented.”

Kohlrausch has perhaps furnished the most moderate comment on the perjured life of Maurice of Saxony. “The final efforts he so patriotically made for the promotion and establishment of general tranquillity, and  his love for peace and order, which he sealed with his own blood, have in a great degree served to throw the mantle of oblivion over his earlier proceedings, and conciliated the critical voice of public opinion” (Hist. Germany, p. 296). Robertson appears to be equally anxious to laud the last act of Maurice, and to let it stand forth only as the lifework of this faithless prince. He excuses him on the ground that “his long and intimate union with the emperor had afforded him many opportunities of observing narrowly the dangerous tendency of that monarch's (Charles) schemes. He saw the yoke that was preparing for his country, and was convinced that but a few steps more remained to be taken in order to render Charles as absolute a monarch in Germany as he had become in Spain. At the same time he perceived that Charles was bent on exacting a rigid conformity to the doctrines and rites of the Romish Church, instead of allowing liberty of conscience, the promise of which had allured several Protestant princes to assist him in the war against the confederates of Smalcald. As he himself, notwithstanding all the compliances which he had made from motives of interest, or an excess of confidence in the emperor, was sincerely attached to the Lutheran tenets, he determined not to be a tame spectator of the overthrow of a system which he believed to be founded in truth” (p. 386).

Though we would gladly like to concede this point, truth compels us to dissent, from the opinion of the noted historian. We doubt very much whether Maurice of Saxony, in any period of his life, believed either Romanism or Protestantism “to be founded in truth;” we doubt even that he ever believed himself “to be founded in truth.” Let us say, rather, that he was possessed of an ambition which knew no bounds, and that, seeking honor for himself, he reaped all the glory of having concerted and completed that unexpected revolution which closed with the treaty of Passau — “that overturned the vast fabric in erecting which Charles had employed so many years, and had exerted the utmost efforts of his power and policy; that annulled all his regulations with regard to religion; defeated all his hopes of rendering the imperial authority absolute and hereditary in his family; and established the Protestant Church, which had hitherto subsisted precariously in Germany, through connivance or by expedients, upon a firm and secure basis” (p. 415; comp. p. 424, 425). It is indeed a singular circumstance that the Reformation should be indebted for its security and full establishment in Germany to the same hand which had brought it to the brink of destruction, and that both events should have been accompanied by the  same acts of dissimulation. See J. Camerarius, Vita Mauritii Electoris Saxoniae (1569); Georg Arnold, Vita Mauritii (1719); F. A. von Langenn, Moritz Herzog und Churfurst von Sachsen (1841, 2 vols.); Schlenkert, Moritz Churfurst von Sachsen (1798-1800, 4 vols.); R. von Weber, Moritz, Graf von Sachsen, etc. (Lps. 1863); Taillandier, Maurice du Saxe (Paris, 1865); Coxe, House of Austria, 1:450 sq.; Vehse, Memoirs Court of Austria, 1:254; Kohlrausch, Hist. of Germany, ch. 4; Robertson, Charles V, book 10. SEE CHARLES V; SEE INTERIM; SEE REFORMATION.

## Maurice, Antoine[[@Headword:Maurice, Antoine]]

             (1), a French Protestant theologian and Orientalist, was born at Eyguieres, in Provence, Sept. 27, 1679. He belonged to a Provencal family which had embraced the Reformed religion in the 16th century, and furnished many pastors to the churches of the south. When the revocation of the Edict of Nantes forced his father to retire to Geneva, he was not permitted to follow him, and remained for some time in the hands of priests, who hoped to educate him to the service of the Church of Rome. Two officers, friends of his family, coming to his aid, he succeeded finally in escaping the vigilance of his guardians and arrived at Vienna; being denounced during a halt, he fled alone, and arrived on foot at Bourg in Bresse (1686). Although it was in the middle of winter, he resumed his route with a faithful servant, and, after having wandered in the mountains of Jura, he succeeded in reaching Basle, from whence he was conducted to Geneva in a pitiable condition. He was then only nine years old. Consecrated to the ministry, he entered it in 1697, at Geneva, where, in 1704, he assumed pastoral duty.

Gifted with a happy memory and great talent for the study of languages, he learned the greater part of the Oriental idioms, and perfected himself by speaking them fluently with a rabbi and priest from the Levant whom he had invited to his house. He was also fond of the sciences, and abandoned the system of Des Cartes for that of Newton, of whom he became a zealous partisan. In 1710 he was elected professor of belles- lettres and of history in the Academy of Geneva, later he taught the Oriental languages, and after 1724 theology. He was twice called to the rectorship. In 1713 he was made a member of the Royal Society of the Sciences of Berlin, on the proposition of Leibnitz. Maurice died in Geneva Aug. 20, 1756. Of his works we have an edition of the Rationarium Temporum du P. Petan, with notes (Geneva, 1721, 3 vols. 8vo): — twelve Sermons (ibid. 1722, 8vo): — twenty different dissertations, among others,  De Conscientia (1725-1734, 4to): — De Resurrectione Jesu Christi (1734-1763): — Jus examinis (1740, fol): — De Suicidio (1756, 8vo). His scientific and philological works have not been published. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Maurice, Antoine (2)[[@Headword:Maurice, Antoine (2)]]

             (2), a Swiss theologian, was born at Geneva April 11, 1716. He showed at an early age a decided taste for the physical sciences; at the age of sixteen he maintained before the celebrated professors Caames and Calendrini some theses, De Actione Solis et Lunae in aerem et aquam (Geneva, 1732, 4to), which were then considered very remarkable. He became pastor in 1748, and in 1750 succeeded his father in the theological chair. He died in Geneva July 23, 1795. He has left some dissertations on philosophical and theological points: De Musica in Sacris (Geneva, 1771, 4to): — De Fide veterum Judaeorum circa futurum post hanc vitam statum (ibid. 1780, 8vo): — De Tolerantia apud Ethnicos (ibid. 1790, 4to); — and in MS. a Histoire ecclesiastique. See Senebier, Hist. litter. de Geneve; Mensel, Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Maurice, Frederick Denison[[@Headword:Maurice, Frederick Denison]]

             a very celebrated English divine of our day, the successor of Dr. Arnold as leader of the “Broad Church” party of the Anglican clergy, was born in 1805, the son of a Unitarian minister of high reputation for intelligence and philanthropic zeal. Young Maurice at an early age entered at Trinity College, Cambridge, where he formed an intimate friendship with the late Scotch divine John Sterling (q.v.), a friendship which lasted through the whole of Sterling's life, and which was made closer in the end by the marriage of the friends to two sisters. From Trinity College both Maurice and Sterling removed to the smaller corporation of Trinity Hall; and here thus early the former began to exert that singular influence, partly intellectual and partly moral, upon all who came near him, which accompanied him throughout his whole career. His examinations at college were passed with such great distinction that he was recommended for a fellowship notwithstanding his nonconformity, and when he refused, upon the ground that he could not conscientiously subscribe to the Thirty-nine Articles, he was given a year or two that he might overcome his scruples, take his degree, and enjoy a fellowship. This also he declined, on the  ground that, by holding out to himself such a prospect, he would be subjecting his intellectual independence to the risk of a temptation, and bribing his conscience. Accordingly, quitting Cambridge without a degree, he removed to London, where for some time he devoted himself to literature.

With his friend Sterling he became connected with the “Athenaeum,” then just starting, and opened a literary career that lasted for a period of forty-four years, within which “the ink of his pen was seldom dry.” Experiencing a change in his religious sentiment, he finally decided to enter the ministry of the Established Church, but, lest his motives should be misinterpreted, he went to Oxford instead of Cambridge, and there about 1828 received ordination. From that very moment his activity in the Church began, and as he commenced so he continued through life. Earnestly devoted to the interests of the Christian religion, he sought to present the truths of the Gospel in a manner that might bring within the pale of the Church the educated and the liberal. He held that the Church ought to grapple intellectually, in its theological aims and expositions, with the most advanced forms of skeptical thought, in such a manner as to evince a liberal sympathy with much that is non-theological in its apparent aspect, in order the more surely to exhibit the supremacy of religion over all, and that the Church, as an institution, ought so to grapple with contemporary forms of social evil as to exhibit Christianity as the true source of every effective social amelioration. In carrying out these ideas he necessarily came into conflict with the views of others, both in and out of the Church; his orthodoxy on various doctrinal points was questioned, and he was severely attacked by those who believed him guilty of injuring the best interests of the Church.

Mr. Maurice was holding a position as preacher, but it is especially as a writer that he exerted his influence and secured a reputation, and, as a proper estimate of this man is impossible without a glance at his works, we proceed to a hasty consideration of his written productions in the field of theology and philosophy. Omitting numerous separate sermons and occasional tracts, we note his Doctrine of Sacrifice deduced from the Scriptures: — Lectures on the Ecclesiastical History of the First and Second Centuries: — Theological Essays: — Patriarchs and Lawgivers of the Old Testament Prophets and Kings of the Old Testament: —The Unity of the New Testament: — Christmas Day and other Sermons: — On the Religions of the World: — On the Prayerbook: —The Church a Family: — On the Lord's Prayer: — On the Sabbath; and Law on the Fable of the  Bees. To the “Encyclopaedia Britannica” he contributed History of Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy, in ancient and in mediaeval times, which was afterwards collected into book form and republished (2 vols. 8vo). He also published a reply to Mansel's Bampton Lectures in 1859. Particularly noteworthy among all these productions are his Theological Essays (Lond. 1853, 8vo; N. Y. 1854). A Unitarian by birth and education, Mr. Maurice had imbibed much of the humanitarian principles. In these essays he proposed for himself the task of influencing the general religious thought of England, determined, as a faithful ambassador of his Savior, to meet the actual wants of the disturbed and reluctantly skeptical age in which he lived. Unfortunately, however, Mr. Maurice had failed to make due allowance for the moderate degree of toleration that was in vogue twenty years ago when he came forward to act as a religious and theological reformer, and for the ignorance that prevailed among his fellow-men concerning the man who sought to do this work. Now that careful inquiry and investigation have clearly revealed his character, even the most orthodox of all orthodox Christians need not hesitate to speak in terms of highest commendation of the labors and services of Frederick Denison Maurice. But not so in the days of his travail. It was the specialty of his position,” says a writer in the British Quart. Rev. (Jan. 1873, p. 30), “that he stood midway, as it were, between the professors of the Christian faith, as commonly received, and the modern skeptical and rationalizing spirit which attracted his sympathies, in so far as it was a spirit of free and earnest inquiry, aiming sincerely at the attainment of the truth. Thus he came to be considered by many as affording a sort of half-way house of shelter to those who did not or could not accept the ordinary orthodoxy, and who were yet too much in earnest about life and destiny to be satisfied with the cheerless negations of atheism or the cold comforts of a provisional skepticism. It was natural that he should meet the fate of those who strive to reconcile contraries. Disowned by orthodoxy — which is no matter for wonder — he was rejected and often also despised by skepticism. By the one party he was charged with unsettling the faith of ingenuous youth, while the others accused him of paltering with words in a double sense, and seeking to reconcile things really irreconcilable.” The Lessing of the English Church, he held many views akin with the great German writer. Seeking, like the latter, to spread truth by giving it a fair test, Mr. Maurice often went beyond reasonable limits, and unknowingly endangered the interests of the cause he so unhesitatingly served; his language respecting both the atonement and the question of eternal  punishment was made the text of many attacks, the most noted of which was that by Dr. Candlish of the Scottish Church, in a sermon entitled Examination of Mr. Maurice's "Theological Essays."

Starting from the divine center as the root and source of all, religion is to Mr. Maurice a mode of life conditioned and determined on all sides by dependence upon God — the human personality upon the divine Person. “As a life it is a series of experiences through and in which man is acted upon by God, so as to be filled full out of the Infinite fullness. But how shall there be a communion between God and man? In order to the revealing of God, there must be a revealer. This revealer must be able to manifest forth what is in God, who is the Father universal, and to do this by such means that man may thereby know him as his Father. A mediator between God and man is essential to the satisfying and fulfilling of human wants. Only one who was himself God could adequately unfold the Eternal. And he must do this by manifestation of the divine in and through the human, otherwise man could not apprehend the revelation; the light would continue shining in darkness without being comprehended of the latter.... The Father has shown us what he is by an actual man like ourselves, who told us that he came forth from the Father, and that he knew him.... He could reveal God to men because, having been ever with the Father, he had also been near to all men from their beginning, as the Light lightening every man coming into the world. He was the Root, and because he was the Root, he was also the Head of humanity. He could redeem humanity, and he alone could, because it was his own because he was in some way already one with it; because in its deepest roots the human personality was bound to him. He did not, therefore, first become a Redeemer when he came to our earth in human form. He could redeem in time, because he had been the Deliverer before his incarnation — because it was his nature to be so.” So far so well. There is, however, one great aspect of the work and mission of Christ which Mr. Maurice ignored, that brought the charge of heterodoxy to his door.

The necessity of vindicating the authority of a broken law, the obligation from which even God himself could not escape of only pardoning when justice had been satisfied, and which, therefore, magnified and made honorable the law that man had disowned and the authority he had despised, are altogether tossed aside by Mr. Maurice. According to him, it is the sin, and not alone, if at all, the penalty of the sin of the world that Christ takes away. The penalty is and must always be borne by those against whom it is directed, and cannot be endured by any  at second hand. Need we wonder that this view of the atonement exposed Mr. Maurice to much obloquy? “He transforms the atonement,” says the writer already quoted, “into a mere means of reconciling man to God by a process of education. The subjective influence of the sacrifice of Christ — its effects, that is, upon the souls of men, ethically and spiritually — was alone emphasized by him. And whatever benefits may have been wrought by bringing this aspect of the atonement into prominence, obviously it is not the whole scriptural doctrine of sacrifice, as unfolded in the work in which he seeks to deduce that from the Scriptures.” Fundamentally defective in this one great doctrine of Christianity, there are yet others in which his influence was mainly pernicious. “Grateful to him as we are for the power with which he vindicated that great truth on which Christianity rests — the incarnation of our Lord — is it not evident that he was apt to resolve this, and with it the whole work of Christ, into the fulfillment of a merely naturalistic order?... He clung to the indefinite, afraid of losing hold of the reality by putting thoughts in the place of things — opinions, theories, and speculations about the real, for true contact with and genuine apprehension (or laying hold and grasping) of it. He would not let go his hold upon reality, which somehow was brought near by being revealed to man; but he was satisfied with the somehow." And yet, while there are some points like those mentioned on which we must differ from the teachings of Mr. Maurice, we must concede that, in face of a rationalism which menaces the foundations of Christianity, Mr. Maurice might well be counted, even by the most orthodox, “a champion of revelation.” We do not so much refer to his influence upon those who, accepting his theological teaching in its entirety, may be called his disciples, as to the far more diffused influence exercised by him upon the general religious thought of England. The very corner stone of this influence lies in his vivid and unfailing apprehension of the revelation of God in Christ as a present reality, exactly fitted to accomplish all that the world needs.

Mr. Maurice held for many years the professorship of divinity in King's College. The peculiar views advocated in his Theological Essays deprived him of this position, and he was thereafter confined to the office of chaplain to Lincoln's Inn. In 1860 the queen, in addition, appointed him incumbent of the district church of Vere Street, Marylebone, and in 1866 he was honored with a call to the chair of moral philosophy at Cambridge. He died at his residence in London, April 1, 1872, the object of universal admiration. “By not a few he was ‘worshipped on this side idolatry,' while  by a large number of outsiders he was regarded with affectionate veneration. These feelings culminated at his death in a display of feeling such as it is given to few to call forth. The unanimity of the testimony borne to his character and work by the many journals, secular and religious, that chronicled his decease, was an index of the general sentiment. It was felt everywhere that England had lost a veritable hero in the battle for truth, and the Church a bright ornament and exemplar of the practical graces of the Christian life.”

It must not be believed that Mr. Maurice's labors were confined to the theological or philosophical arena. It has been truly said by the Athenaeum that he “lived during his allotted term the lives of many men.” He was the originator, or one of the originators, of the Christian socialistic movement, the design of which was to break down tie system of competitive labor, and elevate the working classes by teaching them to associate together in little companies, undertaking work in common, and sharing the proceeds. With a view to preparing working-men for such a task, he founded a working- men's college in London, to which in his last years he devoted much of his time and attention. He also took great interest in the cause of female education. Indeed, there are few social questions of any importance to which his sympathies did not extend. See Fraser's Magazine, 1854 (April); Scribner's Monthly, 1872 (Sept.); British Quart. Rev. 1873 (Jan.), art. 2; English Cyclop. s.v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; New Amer. Cyclop s. sv.

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

             D.D., an English divine, flourished near the middle of the 17th century as chaplain to the archbishop of Canterbury. He published A Vindication of the Primitive Church and Diocesan Episcopacy, in answer to Baxter's Church History of Bishops (Lond. 1682, 8vo): — Sermons (1682, 4to; 1744, 4to): — A Defence of Diocesan Episcopacy, in answer to David Clarkson's Primitive Episcopacy (Lond. 1700): — Doubts concerning Roman Infallibility. See Gibson's Preservative, 4:271; Allibone, Dict. Brit. and Amer. Authors, vol. 2, s.v.; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliogr. vol. 2, s.v.

## Maurice, St[[@Headword:Maurice, St]]

             SEE MAURITIUS.

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

             an English divine and scholar, noted particularly for his studies of the antiquities of India, was born about 1755 at Hertford, where his father was then head-master of the Christ's Hospital school. After his father's death  the family was impoverished by al unfortunate marriage of the widow, and his education proceeded irregularly till Dr. Parr, on opening his school at Stanmore, was prevailed on to receive him as a pupil, and treated him with great generosity and kindness. Destined for the Church, he entered at nineteen St. John's College, Oxford, whence he removed next year to University College. After taking his degree of B.A., he was ordained by bishop Lowth, and held for some time the curacy of the large parish of Woodford, in Essex, which in 1785 he resigned for a chapel at Epping, in order to obtain greater leisure for study. His turn for historical studies had been fostered at University College by his distinguished tutor Lord Stowell, and he now began to concentrate his attention on the history of India, for treating upon which he made proposals in 1790 in a published letter addressed to the East India directors. The irreligious spirit of the French Revolution, alarming Mr. Maurice's mind, induced him to remodel his first work after it was nearly completed, and to devote a considerable proportion of it to dissertations on the Hindu mythology. In 1791 he came before the public with two volumes of his Indian Antiquities: the rest were brought out at intervals, the completion of the work being mainly owing to the liberality of the earl of Harborough; and the seventh and last volume appeared in 1797. This work remains to our day a trustworthy book of reference. Meantime he had undertaken a History of Hindostan, the three volumes of which, in quarto, were published in 1795, 1798, 1799, and a second edition appeared in 1821. In 1798 earl Spencer presented him to the vicarage of Wormleighton, in Warwickshire; next year he was appointed assistant librarian in the British Museum; in 1800 bishop Tomline obtained for him the pension that had been held by the poet Cowper; and in 1804 he received from the lord chancellor the vicarage of Cudham, in Kent. His Modern History of Hindostan, in two volumes, appeared in 1802 and 1804. Several other volumes on Eastern history and theology, and attempts in verse, succeeded this work; and one of his last undertakings was his Memoirs, comprehending the History of the Progress of Indian Literature, and Anecdotes of Literary Characters in Britain, during a Period of Thirty Years. Of this work the three volumes appeared in 1819, 1820, and 1822. He died March 30, 1824. See English Cyclop. s.v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Gorton, Biog. Dict. s.v.

## Mauritian Creole Version Of The Scriptures[[@Headword:Mauritian Creole Version Of The Scriptures]]

             This version is intended for the mixed population of Mauritius. A translation of the gospel of Matthew was made by the Reverend S.H. Anderson, who was born in Mauritius, and spent thirty-two years on the island, ten of which he was minister to the Protestant negroes. The same gentlemen also states that the Mauritian Creole is spoken by 350,000 of the  360,000 inhabitants of the island, and that it is the only medium of communication among all the languages and dialects of the island. Mr. Anderson's translation was published during the year 1884 by the British and Foreign Bible, Society, and as the report of that society for 1885 states, "the whole consignment was bought up before it was even unpacked, and that half of it was secured by bishop Royston for the inhabitants of Seychelle." (B.P.)

## Mauritii, Friedrich Maximilian[[@Headword:Mauritii, Friedrich Maximilian]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Basle, August 17, 1724. He studied at Halle, was for some time private tutor, in 1757 rector at Minden, in 1768 professor of theology and member of consistory at Biitzow, and died March 5, 1799. He wrote, Diss. de. Perseverantia Credentium Usque ad Fineni (Halle, 1753): — Versuch einer Erklarung der schweren Stelle Zach. 12:11-14 (Rinteln, 1764, 1772): — Die Gottlichkeit der heiligen Schrift (Minden, 1765): — De Incarnatione Filii Dei (Biutzow, 1769-72): — Quantum Intersit, Jesum Resurrexisse (ibid. 1770): — De Inhabitoatione Dei (ibid. 1775). See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v. (B.P.) .

## Mauritius And The Thebaic Legion[[@Headword:Mauritius And The Thebaic Legion]]

             The legend concerning St. Mauritius and his fellow-soldiers originated with Eucherius, bishop of Lyons († about 450), and was first published in A.D. 1662, by the Jesuit Francis Chiffletus, from an old martyrology in the Abbey of St. Claude, in the Jura. A recension of this legend was admitted by Surius into his Lives of Saints in 1569, which is drawn from martyrologies of a later date, and was composed by a monk connected with the cloister of St. Maurice, who bore the same name as the bishop, but flourished nearly a century later. Much has been written for and against the authenticity of the legend, but the results of modern criticism seem to indicate that a basis of truth underlies the story. The evidence in its favor reaches to the 4th century, while the adverse proof rests chiefly on the improbability of the events narrated. It relates that during the wars of the emperor Maximian with the Gauls, a legion, known as the Thebaic, was ordered from the East to reinforce his army. It was composed entirely of Christians, and was led by Mauritius. While the emperor rested at Octodurum (now Martigny, at the foot of Mount St. Bernard), the bulk of this legion was stationed at St. Maurice, in the present canton of Wallis, excepting two cohorts, which were sent to Treves. The army was at this time employed in persecuting Christians, in which service the Thebaic legion was ordered to cooperate. They refused to obey, and the emperor, in a rage, commanded the decimation of the legion. As they remained firm, even after a second decimation, Maximian ordered the massacre of the entire body. Eucherius states that at this period a legion numbered 6600 men, and clearly asserts that the greater portion of this legion perished at St. Maurice, while the martyrology of St. Mauritius adds that officers were sent to Treves to execute a similar punishment on the two cohorts stationed there. A similar legend occurs in Simeon Metaphrastes, according to which a St. Mauritius with seventy of his soldiers was executed by order of Maximian; but this was probably a Greek adaptation of the Latin story. Grave doubts are cast upon the legend by the great number of fugitives from this massacre which constantly meet us, and by the improbability of the sacrifice of so large a body of troops in time of war. See De Lisle, Defense de la Verite du Martyre de la Legion Thebeenne (1737); the Acta SS. Surius, and the Martyrol. Usuardi, edit. J. B. du Sollier, S.J., Sept. 22, and October 4, 10, 15; also Tillemont, Memoires, tom. 4; Stolberg, 9:302 sq.; Rettberg, Kirchengesch. Deutschlands, 1, § 16. — Herzog, Real- Encyklop. 9:197 sq.; Wetzer und Welte, Kirchen-Lexikon, 6:414 sq.

## Mauritius, Caspar[[@Headword:Mauritius, Caspar]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born March 2, 1615. He studied at Rostock and Konigsberg, was in 1644 professor at Rostock, in 1650 doctor of theology, in 1662 pastor at Hamburg, and died April 14, 1675. He wrote, Exercitationes anti Calvinianae, anti-Socinianae, Logicae, Politicae: — In Formulam Concordiae: — Theses de Confessione et Absolutione Privata: — Dissertationes de Gratia Irrestsibili: — De Nestorianismo: — De Ecclesia: — De Gentilium in Veteri Testamento ad Regnum Colorum Vocatione: — De Fato Cuclvinistico: — De Simonia: — Πρῶτον ψεῦδος Socinianorum. See Moller, Cimbria Litterata; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Mauritus[[@Headword:Mauritus]]

             a Scotch prelate, was first abbot of Inchaffray, and became bishop of the see of Dunblane in 1319. He was bishop there in 1333. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 175.

## Mauro[[@Headword:Mauro]]

             ura (the red sash), a very sacred relic, held in the highest estimation by the natives of Tahiti, one of the Society Islands. It "was a piece of network, about seven inches wide and six feet long, upon which the red feathers of the paroquet were neatly fastened. It was used at the inauguration of their greatest kings, just as the crown is with us, and the most honorable appellation which a chief could receive was, Arii mauro ura, 'King of the Red Sash.' A new piece, about eighteen inches in length, was attached at the inauguration of every sovereign; to accomplish which several human victims were required. The first was for the mau raa titi, or the stretching it upon pegs in order to attach to it the new piece. Another was necessary for thefatu raa, or attaching the new portion;. and a third for the piu raa, or twitching the sacred relic off the pegs. This not only invested the sash itself with a high measure of solemn importance, but also rendered the chiefs who wore: it most noble in public estimation." See Williams, Narrative of Missionary Enterprises in the South Sea Islands.

## Maurus[[@Headword:Maurus]]

             a pupil of Benedict of Nursia, is chiefly known by the account given of him by the monks of the Congregation of St. Maur (q.v.). His history is mainly legendary. He is said to have been the first to introduce the Benedictine rule into France; to have founded its first convent in France at Glanfeuil, in the province of Anjou, and to have died in 584, after having performed a great number of miracles. Such at least are the main points to be gathered from his biography, much mixed up indeed in regard to dates, which appeared in the 9th century. Gregory of Tours makes no mention of him whatever. This, however, appears certain, that France was the field of his labors, for his name was known there before his biography appeared. Yet all the Maurimonasteria do not lead us back to him; thus, for instance, that at the foot of the Vosges is named after an abbot of the 8th century. Mabillon and Ruinart vainly tried to prove the correctness of the old biography (Acta Sanctorum ord. S. Bened. sec. 1:274 sq.; Annales ord S. Bened. saec. 1:107 sq., 629 sq.), whilst not only Protestant but also Roman Catholic writers have found ample reason to doubt its genuineness. — Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 9:201. (J. N. P.)

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

             SEE RABANUS.

## Maury, John Siffrein[[@Headword:Maury, John Siffrein]]

             a French prelate, and noted also as a pulpit orator, was born June 26, 1746, at Vaureas, in the Venaissin, of poor but respectable parents. He displayed at a very early age great eagerness for learning, and being destined by his parents for the ecclesiastical profession, he was placed at the Seminary of St. Garde, at Avignon, to pursue his theological studies. About 1766 he proceeded to Paris, in the expectation of earning a subsistence by the cultivation of his talents. Though he was without friends in that city, his first publication attracted considerable notice. Encouraged by this early success he took orders, and devoted himself to the study of pulpit eloquence. In 1772 an Eloge on Fenelon, which he published, was favorably received by the French Academy, and caused him to be appointed vicar-general of the bishop of Lombez. He however soon returned to Paris, where he became very popular as a preacher. A panegyric of St. Louis, which he delivered before the French Academy, and one of St. Augustine before an assembly of the clergy, met with so much  success that king Louis XVI appointed him preacher to the court, and presented him with the living of the abbey Frenade, in the diocese of Saintes. In 1785 he delivered his panegyric on St. Vincent de Paul, which is esteemed a masterpiece; shortly after he had the honor to be chosen a member of the Academy in the place of the lyric poet Lefranc de Pompignan, and the following year the valuable benefice of the priory of Lioris was conferred upon him. At the assembly of the States-General in 1789 he was named deputy of the clergy for the bailiwick of Peronne, and soon took a prominent part in the debates. From the first he enlisted himself on the aristocratic side, where his energetic eloquence and peculiar talent at reply rendered him a formidable antagonist to Mirabeau.

His impressive and impassioned oratory, though it expressed opinions hostile to the great majority of the assembly, was often listened to with admiration and greeted with applause. His great moral courage and firm adherence to the principles which he had adopted, and which, in spite of the most violent opposition and in the face of the greatest danger, he earnestly advocated, secured for him the respect and esteem of the more enlightened portion of his enemies. November 27, 1790, a decree was passed in the National Assembly, by which every ecclesiastic in the kingdom was required to take an oath to maintain with all his power the new constitution; and, in case of any priest's refusal, it was declared that he should be held to have renounced his benefices. To this constitution the pope had refused his sanction, on account of its hostility to the interests of the Church, and the oath was indignantly refused by the great majority of the clergy. When the day arrived for the taking it by the bishops and clergy of the Assembly, an infuriated mob surrounded the hall, threatening death to all who should refuse. On this occasion also Maury displayed his usual intrepidity, and boldly advocated the independence of his order. “Strike, but hear me,” was his exclamation, when the last efforts of his impassioned eloquence in that Assembly were interrupted by the incessant cries of his political antagonists. At the close of the stormy session of the National Assembly, Maury, who could lend no further aid to the prostrate cause of royalty and religion, quitted his native country, and, at the invitation of Pius VI, took up his residence at Rome. He was there received with the highest distinction, and the loss of his benefices in France was more than compensated by his speedy elevation to the highest positions in the gift of the Roman Church. In 1792 he was named archbishop of Nicaea “in partibus infidelium,” and afterwards appointed apostolical nuncio to the diet held at Frankfort for the election of the emperor Francis II. This  mission accomplished, in 1794 he was elevated to the dignity of a cardinal, and was instituted to the united sees of Monte-Fiascone and Corneto. On the invasion of Italy by the French in 1798, though every effort was made to seize cardinal Maury, he escaped under disguise to Venice, where he assisted at the conclave assembled for the election of Pius VII. In 1799 he returned to Rome upon the conquest of Italy by Suwarrow, and was accredited as ambassador to his exiled king, Louis XVIII, at that time a resident of Mittan. This office he resigned on the reconciliation of the Church of Rome with the government of France under Napoleon (in 1804); thereafter he embraced the cause of the first consul, and was permitted to return to France. This position, which was deemed not to be in unison with the tenor of his former conduct, subjected him in after times to the reproaches and persecutions of the party whom he had served with so much personal hazard. Napoleon gladly received the approaches of so distinguished a member of the Church whose establishment he was restoring in France; an interview took place between them at Genoa, and in May, 1806, Maury reappeared at Paris.

The flattering reception he there met with was calculated to attach him to the interests of this chief, who admitted him to his intimacy, and availed himself of his counsels in ecclesiastical matters. He received the pension assigned to the dignity of a French cardinal, and was appointed first almoner of Jerome Bonaparte. In 1807 he was elected a member of the Institute in the place of Target, one of the advocates of the unfortunate Louis XVI. His acceptance in 1810 of the archbishopric of Paris subjected him to the displeasure of Pius VII, between whom and Napoleon there had arisen much disagreement. Cardinal Maury was a warm and sincere admirer of the emperor, and he not only espoused his cause in the disputes with the head of the Church, but took every occasion, which the frequent victories of this chief afforded him, of testifying his gratitude by expressions of admiration in his mandates to the clergy of his diocese. These mandates, written in a style of the most florid eloquence, do not remind us of the impressive and energetic orator of the National Assembly: they were severely criticized by the adherents of the ancient regime, and by the witty frequenters of the Parisian saloons, who styled them “archiepiscopal despatches,” in allusion to their military tone, and their imitation of the style and manner of Napoleon's bulletins. After the capitulation of Paris on the 30th of March, 1814, Maury was deprived by the Bourbons of the administration of his diocese; and, in their resentment for his adherence to Napoleon's fortunes, they forgot his former daring and powerful support of their tottering throne. He then  returned to Rome, where he was imprisoned during one year by the orders of the pope; he was afterwards allowed to live in retirement on a pension which was given to him in compensation for his resignation of the see of Monte Fiascone. In this retirement, deeply affected by the ingratitude of his former party, and that of the pontiff, to whose elevation he had been instrumental, he died on the 11th of May, 1817. “Notwithstanding his extraordinary eloquence,” says the duchess of Abrantes, who knew him intimately, “the abbe Maury had been before the Revolution, what he was in proscription, what he continued under the empire, a man of talent rather than a man of sense, and a curate of the time of the League, rather than an abbe of the reign of Louis XIV.” She adds that his figure was in the highest degree disagreeable, but the description she gives of it appears rather a caricature than a portrait. His principal work, Essais sur l'Eloquence de la Chaire (3 vols. 8vo), published after his death by his nephew, Louis Siffrein Maury, still maintains its well-merited popularity. His mind was formed to appreciate the eloquence of Massillon, Bossuet, and Bourdaloue, and his criticisms on the other French divines are in general as correct as they are temperate. In his review, however, of English pulpit oratory, he manifests a want of acquaintance with the writings of its most celebrated preachers, such as Jeremy Taylor, Sherlock, and Barrow. He selected Blair as the best model of English eloquence, and the comparison which he draws between him and Massillon is necessarily most unfavorable to Blair. His own panegyric of St. Augustine is esteemed one of the finest pieces of French pulpit eloquence. He is also supposed, conjointly with the abbe de Boismont, to be the author of a work entitled Lettres sur l'Etat actuel de la Religion et du Clerge en France. See Vie du Cardinal Maury (1827), by Poujoulat; Le Cardinal Maury, sa Vie et ses OEuvres (1855); Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.; Monthly Review, vol. 69 (1812), Appendix; English Cyclop s.v.

## Mausoleum[[@Headword:Mausoleum]]

             a name originally applied to the magnificent sepulchre erected by Artemisia, at Halicari nassus, B.C. 352, to the memory of her husband, Mausolus, king of Caria. The term has now come to denote any costly tomb.

## Maut (or Mut)[[@Headword:Maut (or Mut)]]

             a chief Egyptian goddess, the wife of Amen-Ra, and the second member of the great Theban triad. She was considered as the mother goddess par excellence, or the great receptive female principle; aid she was generally represented as seated upon a throne, wearing either the Pshent, or sacred double crown, or else the body and plumes of a vulture as her head.dress. She was dressed in a long robe, often richly ornamented, and she held in her right hand the usual Crux-ansata, and in her left the papyrus staff of the goddesses. Her chief titles were, "The Mother," "The Lady of Heaven," and "The Regent of all the Gods." The vulture was both her symbol and her sacred bird. Her analogues were in some of her attributes the Hera and Cybele and Thermuthis of the Greeks, and possibly the Bona Dea of the Romans.

## Mautuan, Baptist[[@Headword:Mautuan, Baptist]]

             a famous Italian monastic and poet, was born at Mantua in 1448; joined the Carmelites, became general of the order, quitted it in 1515, and devoted himself for the remainder of his life to belles-lettres. He died in 1516. His works were published at Paris in 1513 (3 vols. fol.), with the Commentaries of S. Murrhon, S. Brant, and J. Badius; and at Antwerp in 1576 (4 vols. 8vo), under the title, J. Baptistae Mantuani, Carmelitae, theologi, philosophi, poeta, et oratoris clarissimi, opera omnia, pluribus libris aucta et arestituta. — Gen. Biog. Dict. 9:51, s.v.

## Mauzzim[[@Headword:Mauzzim]]

             מָעֻזַּיםSept. Μαωζείμ v. r. Μαωζεί, Vulg. Maozim). The marginal note to the A. V. of Dan 11:38, “the God of forces," gives, as the equivalent of the last word, “Mauzzim, or gods protectors, or munitions.” The Geneva version renders the Hebrew as a proper name both in Dan 11:38-39, where the word occurs again (marg. of A. V. “munitions”). In the Greek version of Theodotion, given above, it is treated as a proper name, as well as in the Vulgate. The Sept., as at present  printed, is evidently corrupt in this passage, but ἰσχυρά (Dan 11:37) appears to represent the word in question. In Jerome's time the reading was different, and he gives “Deum fortissimum” for the Latin translation of it, and “Deum fortitudinum” for that of Aquila. He ridicules the interpretation of Porphyry, who, ignorant of Hebrew, understood by “the god of Mauzzim" the statue of Jupiter set up in Modin, the city of Mattathias and his sons, by the generals of Antiochs, who compelled the Jews to sacrifice to it, “the god of Modin.” Theodoret retains the reading of Theodotion (Μαζωείμ being evidently for Μαωζείμ), and explains it of Antichrist, “a god strong and powerful.” The Peshito-Syriac has “the strong god,” and Junius and Tremellius render it “Deum summi roboris,” considering the Hebrew plural as intensive, and interpreting it of the God of Israel. There can be little doubt that “Mauzzim” is to be taken in its literal sense of “fortresses,” just as in Dan 11:19; Dan 11:39, “the god of fortresses” being then the deity who presided over strongholds. But beyond this it is scarcely possible to connect an appellation so general with any special object of idolatrous worship. Grotius conjectured that Mauzzim was a modification of the name ῎Αζιζος, the war-god of the Phoenicians, mentioned in Julian's hymn to the sun (Beyer, Addit. ad Seldenii "De Dea Syria," p. 275). Calvin suggested that it denoted “money,” the strongest of all powers. By others it has been supposed to be Mars, the tutelary deity of Antiochus Epiphanes, who is the subject of allusion. The only authority for this supposition exists in two coins struck at Laodicea, which are believed to have on the obverse the head of Antiochus with a radiated crown, and on the reverse the figure of Mars with a spear. But it is asserted, on the contrary, that all known coins of Antiochus Epiphanes bear his name, and that it is mere conjecture which attributes these to him; and, further, that there is no ancient authority to show that a temple to Mars was built by Antiochus at Laodicea. The opinion of Gesenius is more probable, that “the god of fortresses” was Jupiter Capitolinus, for whom Antiochus built a temple at Antioch (Livy, 41:20). By others it is referred to Jupiter Olympius, to whom Antiochus dedicated the Temple at Jerusalem (2Ma 6:2). SEE JUPITER.

Furst (Handw. s.v.), comparing Isa 33:4, where the reference is to Tyre, “the fortress of the sea,” makes מָעֻזַּים equivalent to מָעוֹז הִיָּם, or even proposes to read for the former מָעֹז יָם, the god of the “stronghold of the sea,” i.e. Melkart, the Tyrian Hercules. A suggestion made by Mr. Layard (Nineveh, 2:456, note) is worthy of being recorded, as being at least as well founded as any already mentioned. After describing Hera, the Assyrian Venus, as “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,” he adds in a note, “May she be connected with the ‘El Maozem,' the deity presiding over bulwarks and fortresses, the ‘god of forces,' of Dan 11:38?” Pfeiffer (Dub. Vex. cent. 4, loc. 72) will only see in it “the idol of the mass!"

## Maw[[@Headword:Maw]]

             (קֵבָה, kebah', hollow, only occurs in Deu 18:3), the rough ventricle or echinus of ruminating animals, which is the second of their four stomachs (Aristotle, Hist. anim. 2:17). So the Vulg., Onkelos, Saadias, and Kimahi interpret; but Josephus (Ant. 4:4), Philo (2:235, ed. Mang.), after the Sept. (ἔννυστρον, i.e. ἤννυστρον), understand the fourth stomach, or omaum, esteemed a great delicacy (like tripe) among the ancients (comp. Bochart, Hieroz. 1:571 ed. Lips.).

## Mawmoisine Or Malvoisine, William De[[@Headword:Mawmoisine Or Malvoisine, William De]]

             a Scotch Roman Catholic prelate, supposed to be a native of France, flourished in Scotland about the opening of the 13th century. He was made bishop of St. Andrew's in 1202; established many monasteries in that country, and was active in promoting a crusade to the Holy Land.

## Mawson, Matthias, D.D.[[@Headword:Mawson, Matthias, D.D.]]

             an English divine of the 18th century, became master of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, in 1732; subsequently rector of Hadstock, Essex; bishop of Llandaff in 1738; was translated to Chichester in 1740, and in 1754 to Ely. He died about 1771. Bishop Mawson published only occasional Sermons (Lond. 1732, ‘33, ‘40, ‘41, ‘43, ‘46, ‘50). See Allibone, Dict. Brit. and Amer. Authors, vol. 2, s.v.

## Maxcy, Jonathan, D.D.[[@Headword:Maxcy, Jonathan, D.D.]]

             a Baptist minister and noted American educator, was born in Attleborough, Mass., Sept. 2,1768; graduated at Brown University in 1787, and immediately became a tutor in that institution. Deciding for the ministry, he was licensed to preach April 1, 1790, and was on Sept. 8, 1791, ordained pastor of the First Baptist Church of Providence, R. I. He was on the same day also elected both a trustee and professor of divinity in the college, and in July, 1792, became president. His pastoral relations he severed September 8, 1792. In 1802 he accepted the presidency of Union College;  and in 1804, the newly-established South Carolina College having chosen him for its first president, he heeded the call, in the hope that a Southern climate would improve his health, which had become much impaired. Over this institution he continued to preside, with almost unprecedented popularity, until his death, June 4, 1820. Dr. Maxcy was one of the most accomplished pulpit orators and. scholars this country has produced. He was well versed in philology, criticism, metaphysics, logic, politics, morals, and philosophy. His character was very amiable and his piety sincere. His death was that of the believer in Jesus, and his memory is widely revered. He published a large number of sermons, addresses, orations, etc., which after his death were gathered in a volume, entitled The Literary Remains of the Rev. Jonathan Maxcy, D.D., with a Memoir of his Life, by Romeo Elton, D.D. The most valued of his publications were his sermons on the existence of God, frequently republished. See Sprague, Annals, 6:297; Christian Review, vol. 9; Allibone, Dict. Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Drake, Dict. Amer. Biog. s.v.

## Maxentius[[@Headword:Maxentius]]

             SEE CONSTANTINE.

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

             a noted early Methodist lay-preacher, flourished in the latter part of the 18th century. He was one of Wesley's converts at Bristol, and was appointed to pray and expound the Scriptures, but not to preach, at the Foundery, in London, during Mr. Wesley's absence. Maxfield, however, being a young man of “much fervency of spirit, and mighty in the Scriptures,” greatly edified the people, who, assembling in vast crowds, and listening with earnest attention, insensibly led him to deviate from this restriction and begin to preach. Wesley was informed of this irregularity, and hastened to London in alarm to check him, his prejudices for “Church order” being still strong. The mother of Wesley counseled him to hear Maxfield preach before reproving him, adding, “But take care what you do respecting that young man; he is as surely called of God to preach as you are.” Wesley heard him and, his prejudices yielding to the power of truth, he objected no longer. Thus Maxfield became the first of the innumerable itinerant lay-preachers, who have spread the Gospel throughout the world more successfully than any other class of the Christian community. Wesley promoted his welfare in every way, introduced him in London to a social  position superior to his birth, by which he was enabled to make an advantageous marriage, and obtained ordination for him in Ireland from the bishop of Londonderry, who favored Wesley in that country. Maxfield was present at the first Methodist Conference, which was held at the Founders, London, June 25, 1774. Maxfield also attended the third Conference assembled at Bristol, May, 1746.

He shared the persecution to which the followers of Wesley were subjected; was at one time seized and imprisoned for the king's service, thrown into a dungeon, and offered to the commander of a ship of war. In 1763, during a revival in London, great excitement was produced by an honest madman, Bell, formerly a life- guardsman, who had become a local preacher, and supposed that he had performed a miraculous cure. Possessing more enthusiasm than judgment, he became fanatical in public meetings, and greatly excited his hearers. He unfortunately obtained much influence over Maxfield — the latter was not naturally an enthusiast — and made him a companion in his fanaticism. Both the Wesleys conversed with Maxfield on the subject, telling him what they disliked in his conduct. In some matters he had been unjustly blamed, in others he promised to change; the evil, however, was not remedied, but seemed rather to increase. Then Mr. Wesley wrote a long letter to Maxfield, plainly telling him of the errors of his preaching and conduct, and of its tendency towards a separation from the Wesleyans. The doctrines advocated by Maxfield and Bell were erroneous, inasmuch as they taught that a person saved from sin need not examine himself, need not pray in private, need only believe; that believing makes man perfect, and that the pure in heart cannot fall from grace. They said no one thus saved could be taught by anyone who was not. They were thus led to consider themselves the only persons really capable of interpreting the Gospel and qualified to teach it, and soon regarded themselves as inspired, mistaking the workings of their own imaginations for the voice of the Spirit, and neglecting knowledge, reason, and wisdom generally. Maxfield finally decided to separate from Mr. Wesley, and accordingly gave up his work at the Foundery, and took with him one hundred and seventy persons who had embraced the Wesleyan cause. He now opened an independent chapel, and preached for twenty years. Towards the close of Maxfield's life, Wesley, in his travels through England, found him sinking under paralysis and the weight of years, prayed with him, invoking God's blessing on his last days, and subsequently preached in his chapel. See Stevens, Hist. of Methodism (Index in vol. 3); Smith, Hist. of Wesley and his Time; Tyerman, Life of Wesley (see Index in vol. 3).

## Maximian[[@Headword:Maximian]]

             SEE DIOCLETIAN.

## Maximianists[[@Headword:Maximianists]]

             a considerable party among the Donatists who separated from the main body of that sect, and arrogated to themselves the exclusive possession of those qualities of perfection and infallibility to which the whole sect had made pretensions when they separated from the Catholic Church. SEE DONATISTS.

## Maximilian I[[@Headword:Maximilian I]]

             one of the most distinguished of the German emperors, the son and successor of Frederick III, the forerunner of Charles V, was born at Neustadt, near Vienna, March 22,1459. In his nineteenth year he married Maria, the only child and heiress of Charles the Bold, duke of Burgundy, who died in 1482. Maximilian had hoped to enjoy the estates of his father- in-law, but Louis XI of France attempted to seize some of these possessions, and thus involved our German prince in a contest which, when it promised to end favorably for Maximilian, was suddenly turned in favor of Louis XI by the dexterous intrigues of the latter among the Netherlanders. It was not until 1493 that peace was finally established at Senlis. This very year his father the emperor died, and Maximilian succeeded to the government of the vast possessions of the Teutonic realm, so soon to become the theater of one of the greatest revolutions the world has ever been called upon to witness — the Reformation of the 16th century — an event that was ushered in just as Maximilian himself was fast fading as the shades of evening. In 1494 the newly-crowned emperor married Bianca Sforza, daughter of the duke of Milan, which alliance gave rise to a succession of wars in Italy.

Shortly after he joined the League of Cambray, formed between pope Julius II, Ferdinand of Spain, and Louis XII of France, against the Venetians; but that republic having soon after become reconciled to the pope, Maximilian joined the so-called Holy League between England, Spain, Venice, and the pope, in opposition to the French, who were signally defeated by the forces of Henry VIII and the emperor in the “battle of the spurs,” near Guinegate (1513). The ascension of Francis I to the throne of France somewhat modified matters in favor of the French. The new king of the Franks captured Milan, and compelled Maximilian to give up Verona to the Venetians for 200,000 ducats. By the  treaty of Basle (1499) he had been obliged to acknowledge the independence of Switzerland. Though thus unsuccessful in his wars, he had the fortune to see the hereditary dominions of his house increased during his reign by several peaceful additions; and the marriage of his son Philip with the infanta Juana, and of his daughter Margaret with the infant Juan of Spain, led to the subsequent union of Spain with Austria, while the marriage of two of his grandchildren with the son and daughter of Ladislaus, king of Hungary and Bohemia, brought both these kingdoms to the Austrian monarchy. The closing activity of his reign was displayed against the rising heresy. Luther had just come forward and attacked Tetzel (1517), and, as Leo X was inclined to make light of the opposition of the little Augustine friar, Maximilian addressed the Roman pontiff, and persuaded him to heed this difficulty as “a question which was dividing Germany.” But in the very year in which the discussion at Leipzic came off Maximilian died (1519), and left it for his successor Charles V to further the cause of Protestantism by a blind obedience to the dictates of an incompetent Roman pontiff. Maximilian I was a liberal patron of literature, and learned men were greatly encouraged by him. Indeed he was himself an author, producing several works in prose and verse. See Hegewisch, Gesch. d. Regierung Maximilians I (1782; new ed. Leipz. 1818); Haltaus, Gesch. d. Kaisers Maximilian (1850); Klupfel, Kaiser Maximilian I (Berl. 1864); Lichnowsky, Gesch. d. Hauses Habsburg; Vehse, Memoirs of Austria, 1:2-33; Coxe, Hist. of the House of Austria, 1:278 sq.; Kohlrausch, Hist. of Germany, p. 234 sq.

## Maximilian II[[@Headword:Maximilian II]]

             emperor of Austria, son of emperor Ferdinand I, and of Anna of Hungary, was born at Vienna Aug. 1, 1527. He was educated in Spain by Charles V; took part in the war of Smalcald (1544-48) against the French; became viceroy of Spain in 1549; on his return to Germany, about 1551, he made the treaty of Passau, and in 1552 became governor of Hungary. In September, 1562, he was crowned king of Bohemia; elected king of Rome at Frankfort in November of the same year; king of Hungary at Presburg in 1563; and finally succeeded his father as emperor of Germany in July, 1564. He made war against the Turks, in Hungary, until 1567, but afterwards reigned in peace. During his youth his preceptor, Wolfgang Stiefel, had made him acquainted with the Protestant tenets, and he showed himself favorable to the Reformation, living on very friendly terms with the Protestant princes (Fisher, Hist. of the Reformation [N.Y. 1873, 8vo], p. empire, as the majority in the states was opposed to it, and the Protestants themselves, divided into Lutherans and Calvinists, were engaged in strife with each other. From the manner in which he sought the friendship and alliance of Romish princes, it must appear that Maximilian II never allowed his private convictions to rule him as a monarch, but that all was made subservient to the interests of the empire. Some will even have it. as Vehse (see below), that he was at one time a convert to the Protestant religion (comp. Baker, Eccles. Hist. 2:211). He, however, granted the Protestants in 1568 liberty to worship God according to their conscience throughout Austria, and commissioned D. Chytraeus to draw up a Protestant liturgy for Austria. Although he was opposed to the Jesuits, and subjected them to many restrictions, he yet, by his toleration, permitted them access and great influence in his own family. He died Oct. 12, 1576. See J. F. Miller, Epistolae Ferdinandi I et M. II (Pesth, 1808); Koch, Quellen z. Gesch. M. II (Leipz. 1857-61); Ranke, Historischpolitischer Zeitschr. (1832, p. 278 sq.); and the same reprinted in Deutsche Gesch. (1868), vol. 6; Bernard Raupach, Evang. Oesterreich. vol. 1 and 2; Lebret, Magazin z. Gebrauch d. Staaten und Kirchengesch. (Ulm, 1785), vol. 9; Maurenbrecher, in Sybel's Histor. Zeitscshrift, 1862, p. 351 sq.; E. Reimann, in the same journal, 1866, p. 1 sq.; Coxe, Hist. of the House of Austria, 2:4 sq.; Vehse, Memoirs of the House of Austria, 1:217 sq.; Pierer, Universal-Lexikon, 11:29; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 9:204.

## Maximin I[[@Headword:Maximin I]]

             JULIUS VERUS, Roman emperor, was a native of Thrace, and a shepherd in his youth. His fine figure, great height, and strength attracted the notice of the emperor Severus, who enrolled him in his guards. Maximin advanced rapidly, but did not serve under either Miacrinus or Hieliogabalus. During the reign of Alexander Severus he came to Rome, was made senator and chief of a newly-formed legion, took an active part in the wars against the Persians and Allemans, and soon gained great influence over the soldiers. When Alexander Severus was killed at Mayence, March 19, 235, the troops appointed Maximin his successor, and the senate, frightened, confirmed the election. He remained, however, with the army, and made several expeditions into Germany. His disposition was naturally cruel, and he gave full scope to discovered led to fearful massacres; in the first, it is said, over four thousand persons were executed. He also opposed Christianity, and particularly persecuted the bishops who had been most favored by Alexander. About the same time some earthquakes occurred in the empire, particularly in Cappadocia, and the people became enraged against the Christians, whom they accused of being the cause of all the evils which befell them, and the emperor allowed free scope to all barbarities the people chose to inflict on them. The persecution, indeed, broke out only in some parts of the empire, so that Christians could flee before it; but as the Christians had of late become used to toleration, this sudden visitation of persecution fell severely upon their heads, and caused much suffering (comp. Eusebius, Eccles. Hist. 6:28; Firmilian, in Cypr. Ep. 75; Origen, Comment. in Mat 24:9). Finally his soldiers, tired of his tyranny and cruelty, murdered him, together with his son, at Aquileia, March, 238. Maximin was only regretted by the inhabitants of Thrace and Pannonia, who were proud of having an emperor of their own; the other parts of the empire rejoiced over his death. The legendary poesy of the 10th century assigns to the reign of Maximin the fabulous martyrdom of St. Ursula, a British princess, and her company of eleven thousand (according to others, ten thousand) virgins, who, on their return from a pilgrimage to Rome, were murdered by heathens in the neighborhood of Cologne. “This incredible number has probably arisen from the misinterpretation of an inscription, like Ursula et Undecimilla' (which occurs in an old missal of the Sorbonne), or ‘Ursula et XI M. V., i.e. Martyres Virgines, which, by substituting millia for martyres, was increased from eleven martyrs to eleven thousand virgins. Some historians place the fact, which seems to from the basis of this legend, in connection with the retreat of the Huns after the battle of Chalons, 451” (Schaff). See Herzog, Real-Encyclop. 9:207; Smith, Dict. of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology, 2:983; Schaff, Church Hist. 1:170; Gieseler, Ecclesiastical History, 1:115.

## Maximin II[[@Headword:Maximin II]]

             DAZA, Roman emperor, was originally an Illyrian peasant, who served in the Roman armies, and was raised by Galerius, who was his relative,  to the rank of military tribune, and lastly, A.D. 303, at the time of the abdication of Diocletian and Maximian, to the dignity of Caesar, receiving for his share the government of Syria and Egypt. After the death of Galerius, in 311. Maximin and Licinius divided his dominions between them, and Maximin obtained the whole of the Asiatic provinces. Both he and Licinius behaved ungratefully towards the family of Galerius, their common benefactor. Valeria, the daughter of Diocletian and widow of Galerius, having escaped from Licinius into the dominions of Maximin, the latter offered to marry her, and on her refusal banished her with her mother into the deserts of Syria. He gained unenviable notoriety by his severity towards his Christian subjects, and made war against the Armenians. A new war having broken out between Licinius and Maximin, the latter advanced as far as Adrianople, but was defeated, fled into Asia, and died of poison at Tarsus in 313. — English Cyclop. s.v.

## Maximus Of Jerusalem[[@Headword:Maximus Of Jerusalem]]

             (Hierosolymitanus), a Greek ecclesiastical writer, flourished in the latter part of the 2d century. Jerome (De Viris Illustr. 100:47) speaks of Maximus as writing on the questions of the origin of evil and the creation of matter, and as having lived under the emperors Commodus (A.D. 180- 193) and Severus (A.D. 193-211), but he does not designate what office he held in the Church, or whether he held any; nor does he connect him with any locality. Honorius of Autun (De Scriptor. Eccles. 1:47), extracting from Jerome, mentions the name of Maximinus; and Rufinus, translating from Eusebius, who has a brief passage relating to the same writer (H. E. 5:27), gives the name in the same form; but it is probably incorrect. A Maximus, bishop of Jerusalem, lived in the reign of Antoninus Pius or Marcus Aurelius, or the early part of that of Commodus, somewhere between A.D. 156 and A.D. 185; another Maximus occupied the same see from A.D. 185, and the successive episcopates of himself and seven successors occupy about eighty years, the duration of each episcopate not being known. The date of this latter Maximus of Jerusalem accords sufficiently with the notice in Jerome respecting the writer; but it is remarkable that though both Eusebius and Jerome mention the bishop (Eusebius, Chronic. and Jerome, Euseb. Chronic. Interpretatio), they do not either of them identify the writer with him; and it is remarkable that in the list given by Eusebius of the bishops of Jerusalem, in his Histor. Eccles. (5:27), the names of the second Maximus and his successor Antoninus do not appear. It is uncertain, therefore, whether the writer and the bishop are the same, though it is extremely probable they were. The title of the work of Maximus noticed by Jerome and Eusebius (for the two questions of the origin of evil and the creation of matter appear to have been comprehended in one treatise) was De Materia. Eusebius has given a long extract from it (Praep. Evang. 7:21, 22). A portion of the same extract is inserted, without acknowledgment, in the Dialogus Adamantii de recta in Deum Fide, or Contra Marcionitas, sect. 4, commonly attributed to Origen, but in reality written long after his time. It is also quoted in the Philocalia, 100:24, compiled by Gregory Nazianzen and Basil the Great almost entirely from the works of Origen. In the inscription to the chapter they are said to be from the Praeparatio Evangelica of Eusebius; and their being contained also in the supposed work of Origen, De Recta Fide, is affirmed in a probably interpolated sentence of the concluding paragraph of the chapter (Delarue, Opera Origenis, 1:800 sq.). This passage, apparently the  only part of Maximus's work which has come down to us, is given in the Bibliotheca Patrum of Galland (2:146), who identifies the author with the bishop, and gives his reasons for so doing in the Prolegomena to the volume, 100:6 ; see also Cave, Hist. Litt. ad ann. 196, 1:95; Tillemont, Memoires, 2:706, note 13 on Origen.

There was a third bishop of Jerusalem of this name, besides the two previously mentioned, who lived in the reign of Constantine the Great and his sons. He suffered in one of the later persecutions of the heathen emperors, apparently under Maximnian Galerius (Philostorgius, H. E. 3:12). His sufferings in the cause of Christianity, and the great excellence of his character, so endeared him to the people of Jerusalem, among whom he officiated as priest, that when he was appointed by Macarius, bishop of that city, to the vacant bishopric of Diospolis, the multitude would not permit his departure, and Macarius was forced to nominate another in his place. According to some accounts, Macarius repented almost immediately of the nomination of Maximus to Diospolis, and readily acquiesced in his remaining in Jerusalem, taking him for his assistant in the duties of the episcopal office (Sozomen, Hist. Ecc 2:20). Upon the death of Macarius (some time between A.D. 331 and 335), Maximus succeeded him, and was present at the Council of Tyre, A.D. 335, when Athanasius was condemned. Sozomen records (Hist. Ecc 2:25) that at this council Paphnutius, a bishop of the Thebais or Upper Egypt, and himself a confessor, took Maximus by the hand, and told him to leave the place; “for,” said he, “it does not become us, who have lost our eyes and been hamstrung for the sake of religion, to join the council of the wicked.” This appeal was in vain, and Maximus was induced, but unfairly, to subscribe to the decree condemning Athanasius. But he soon regretted this step, and, at a synod of sixteen bishops of Palestine, joyfully admitted Athanasius to communion when returning from the Council of Sardica, through Asia, to Alexandria. Sozomen relates (Hist. Eccles. 4:20) that Maximus was deposed by the influence of Acacius of Caesarea and Patrophilus (A.D. 349 or 350), and Cyril (St. Cyrillus of Jerusalem) appointed in his place; but if there is any truth in this statement, the death of Maximus must have very shortly followed his deposition (Socrates, Hist. Ecc 2:8; Sozomen, l. c., and 3:6; Theodoret, l. c.; Philostorgius, l. c.; Le Quien; Oriens Christianus, vol. 3, col. 156). — Smith, Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog. vol. 2, s.v.

## Maximus Of Tyre[[@Headword:Maximus Of Tyre]]

             a Neo-Platonic philosopher, surnamed after the place of his abode, flourished in the 2d century as teacher of philosophy and rhetoric, first in Greece and afterwards in Rome, whither he made two journeys, one under the reign of Antoninus, another under that of Commodus. He may be ranked with Phaedrus, Quintus Curtius, and others, of whom their contemporaries have scarcely made mention, and therefore of whom very little is known. We have extant of his works forty-one Διαλέξεις, or dissertations, upon various arguments, a MS. copy of which was first brought out of Greece into Italy by Janus Lascaris, and presented to Lawrence de Medicis. From this copy a Latin translation was made, and published by Cosmus Paccius, archbishop of Florence, in 1519; then in Greek by Henry Stephens in 1557; then in Greek and Latin by Daniel Heinsius in 1607; by J. Davis in 1703; by Reiske in 1774, and since, in 4to. These dissertations are entertaining, curious, and instructive, and have gained the author high encomiums among the learned. The following examples will give some idea of the subject of Maximus's dissertations: “On Plato's Opinion respecting the Deity;” “Whether we ought to return Injuries done to us;” “Whether an Active or a Contemplative Life is to be preferred;” “Whether Soldiers or Husbandmen are more useful in a State;” “On the Daemonium of Socrates;” “Whether Prayers should be addressed  to the Deity,” etc. The dissertations have been translated into French by Morel (Paris, 1607), by Forney (1764), and by Dounais (1802); into Italian by Petro de Bardi (Venice, 1642); and into German by C. T. Damm (Berlin, 1764). There is, we believe, no English translation of this author. Isaac Casaubon, in the epistle dedicatory of his Commentaries upon Persius, calls him “mellitissimus Platonicorum;” and Peter Petit represents him as “auctorem imprimis elegantem in philosophia ac disertum” (Misc. Observat. lib. 1, 100:20). He has spoken a good deal of himself in his thirty-seventh dissertation, and seemingly in a style of panegyric, for which his editor Davis has accused him of indecency and vanity; but Fabricius (Bib. Graec. lib. 4, 100:23) has defended him very well upon this head by observing that Davis did not sufficiently attend to Maximus's purpose in speaking thus of himself; “which was,” he says, “not at all with a view of praising himself, but to encourage and promote the practice of those lessons in philosophy which they heard from him with so much applause.” Some have confounded Maximus of Tyre with Maximus Ephesius, the preceptor of Julian the Apostate. See Genesis Biog. Dict. s.v.; Smith, Dict. Greek and Roman Biog. and Mythol. s.v.; English Cyclopaedia, s.v.

## Maximus Philosophus[[@Headword:Maximus Philosophus]]

             Different parties of that name are known in ancient history.

1. A heathen eclectic-Platonic philosopher and conjuror, who was teacher to the emperor Julian, and had great influence over him.

2. Also a heathen, of Madaura, in Africa, is known to us by an interesting letter to Augustine. In consequence of his consciousness of the downfall of heathenism, he seeks to uphold a philosophical but impotent monotheism, which, in the worship of several deities, sees only the adoration of a higher or supreme deity who imparts to them their power; but he reproaches the. Christians with wishing to have that God all to themselves, and visiting the graves of the dead (martyrs). Regardless of the new life which Christianity awakened, or of the divine energy testified by its exclusiveness, he finally exclaims, wearily, “Trahit sua quemque voluntas.” The answer of Augustine is somewhat haughty and ironical (August. Opp. 2:25 sq., ed. Venet.).

3. Eusebius mentions a Christian philosopher of that name in the 2d century, giving an interesting fragment of a work of his on the question, then much discussed, of the origin of evil (Praep. Evang. 7:21 fin., 22; Hist. Eccles. 5:27). He has been by some considered as the author of the Dialogus c. Marcion., formerly and erroneously attributed to Origen; but Gieseler (Stud. u. Krit. 1830-32, p. 380) successfully opposed this view.

4. Another Maximus, who represented himself both as a philosopher (cynic) and a Christian, and gave much trouble to Gregory of Nazianzum, at Constantinople. — Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 9:208.

## Maximus, Alexandrinus[[@Headword:Maximus, Alexandrinus]]

             called also the Cynic Philosopher, was born in the fourth century, in Alexandria, of Christian parents of rank. He united the faith of an orthodox believer with the appearance and conduct of a cynic philosopher, and was greatly respected by the leading theologians of the orthodox party. Athanasius, in a letter written about A.D. 371 (Epist. ad Maxim. Philosoph. in Opp. 1:917, etc., ed. Benedict.), compliments him on a work written in defense of the orthodox faith. Tillemont and the Benedictine editor of the works of Gregory Nazianzen (Monitum ad Orat. xxv), misled by the virulent invectives of that father, attempt to distinguish between this Maximus and the one to whom Athanasius wrote, for the reason that Athanasius could ever have approved of so worthless a character. They also distinguish him from the Maximus to whom Basil the Great addressed a letter (Ep. 41, Paris, 1839) in terms of great respect, discussing some points of doctrine, and soliciting a visit from him; but they are not successful in either case. The Maximus Scholasticus. however, to whom Basil also wrote (Ep. 42), was a different person. In A.D. 374, during the reign of the emperor Valens, in the persecution carried on by Lucius, Arian patriarch of Alexandria, Maximus was barbarously scourged and banished to the Oasis, on account of his zeal for orthodoxy, and the alacrity with which he aided those enduring the same persecutions (Gregory Nazianzen, Orat. 25, 100:13, 14).

He was released at the end of four years, probably on the death of Valens; and it was soon after this event that he presented to  the emperor Gratian at Milan his work De Fide, written against the Arians (compare Jerome, De Viris Illustr. 100:127). He wrote also against other heretics, but whether in the same work or in another is not certainly known; and he disputed ably against the heathens. He appears to have returned from Milan and visited Constantinople, where Gregory Nazianzen had just been made patriarch, A.D. 379. Gregory received him with the greatest honor, and pronounced an oration (Orat. 25) in his praise, where his warm panegyrics cause the commendations of Athanasius and Basil to seem exceedingly tame. He welcomed him at his table, treated him with much confidence and regard, but was subsequently grievously disappointed in him. Whether in the succeeding events Maximus was himself ambitious or merely the tool of others, does not appear. Profiting by the sickness of Gregory, and supported by some Egyptian ecclesiastics, sent by Peter, patriarch of Alexandria, under whose guidance they professed to act, Maximus was ordained, during the night, patriarch of Constantinople, in the place of Gregory, whose election had not been perfectly canonical. This bold proceeding greatly excited the indignation of the people, with whom Gregory was popular. The emperor Theodosius, to whom the usurper applied, showing him no favor, the latter withdrew to Alexandria, from whence he was speedily expelled by his patron Peter (see Gregory Nazianzen, Carmen de Vita sua, vss. 750-1029). The resignation of Gregory did not benefit Maximus. His election was declared null and void by the second general council, and the presbyters whom he had ordained were declared not to be presbyters (Concil. Constantinop. Song of Solomon 3, sec. Dionys. Exiguum; Capital 6, sec. Isidor. Mercat; apud Concil. vol. 1, col. 809, 810, ed. Hardouin). He attempted again to assert his claims to the patriarchate; but, though the Italian bishops seemed inclined for a time to second his efforts, he met with no permanent success. The invectives of Gregory Nazianzen against Maximus (Carmina, sec. De Vita sua, l. c.; In Invidos, vs. 16, etc.; In Maximum) were written after their struggle for the patriarchate, and contrast strongly with his former praises in his twenty- fifth Oration, to which some of Gregory's admirers, to conceal the inconsistency, prefixed the name of Heron or Hero (In Laudem Heronis; Jerome, De Viris Illustr. l. c.), which it still bears. The work of Maximus, De Fide, which is well spoken of by Jerome, is lost. (See Athenas, Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, Jerome, l. c.; Sozomen, H. E. 7:9, cum not. Vales; Tillemont, Memoires, 9:443, etc.; Cave, Hist. Litt. ad ann. 380, 1:276, ed. Oxford, 1740-42; Fabricius, Bibl. Graeca, 3:520). — Smith, Dict. Gr. and Rom. Biog. vol. 2, s.v.

## Maximus, Bishop Of Turin[[@Headword:Maximus, Bishop Of Turin]]

             was born towards the close of the 4th century, and early in the 5th was elevated to the episcopate. But little is known of his life. His signature is affixed to a document expressing the approval by the bishops of Northern Italy of pope Leo's letter to Flavian on Eutychianism (Leo, Opp. ed. Quesnel, p. 291). Among the signatures to the acts of a synod held at Rome in A.D. 465, his name appears immediately below that of pope Hilarius, the successor of Leo, a circumstance that marks him as the oldest bishop of the assembly. His writings, chiefly homilies, are rich in descriptions of the life of the Christians, at a time when paganism, although tottering to its fall, was still powerful among the rural population, and  when the empire was trembling before the power of the invading hordes of barbarians. During the irruption of Attila he displayed a lofty faith in God, and succeeded in arousing his people from their despair, which had determined them to forsake their homes and seek safety in flight. The people of Turin obeyed his counsel, and their city was spared. But when the Huns departed from Italy, and the citizens purchased a share of their spoil, including slaves, he did not hesitate to condemn their conduct, and even compared them to wolves following in the track of lions, in order to gorge themselves on their abandoned prey. His homilies often censure the still prevailing idolatry, particularly the cultus Dianae arvorum numinis, the practice of the priests in inflicting wounds on themselves to do honor to their goddess, etc., and also defended the orthodox doctrines of the Church against Eutychians, Nestorians, Pelagians, and Manichaeans. The best edition of his works is that published at Rome in 1784, found in Migne, vol. 57. See also Schonemann, Bibl. Hist. Lit. (Leips. 1794), 2:607 sq.; Acta Sanct. June 25; Biographie, Universelle, vol. 27, s.v.; Herzog, Real- Encyklop. 9:208 sq.; Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lex. 12:782 sq.

## Maximus, Confessor[[@Headword:Maximus, Confessor]]

             a leading champion of orthodoxy in the Monothelite controversy (q.v.), was born at Constantinople in 580. At an early age he became private secretary to the emperor Heraclius, but, deciding for the ecclesiastic state, he resigned this position, and in 630 entered the monastery of Chrysopolis (Scutari), near Constantinople, and in a short time became its abbot. The dangers which threatened the state at the time induced the emperor to attempt a reconciliation between the parties engaged in the Monophysite controversy (q.v.), by means of a compromise, which declared that Christ had accomplished the work of redemption by one manifestation of his will as the God-man, (μιᾶ'/ θεανδρικῇ ἐνεργείᾷ).

The patriarchs Sergius, of Constantinople, and Cyrus, of Alexandria, as heads of the contending parties, agreed in 633 to unite on this formula, and many of the Monophysite faction returned to the Church; but several of the orthodox opposed the compromise strongly, as practically endorsing Monophysite views. With a view to put an end to these troubles, the emperor in 639 published an edict, known as the Ecthesis (q.v.), which prohibited all controversies on the question whether in Christ were one or two operations, but which itself plainly inculcated the doctrine of one will. Maximus, who had in the mean time removed to Africa, now entered the lists in defense of the orthodox view, and unequivocally resisted all attempts to undermine the faith of the Church. His course was favored by Gregorius (or Georgius), the prefect of North Africa, who sought an opportunity to renounce his allegiance to the Byzantine court; and under his protection Maximus exerted himself to the utmost to combat the many heresies which were then rife, manifesting a special zeal against the Monophysite Severians in Egypt and Crete, and against the Monothelites. His discussion with Pyrrhus, the patriarch of Constantinople, who had fled to Gregorius on being charged with complicity in the murder of the emperor Constantine, was held in July, A.D. 645, and resulted in the signal triumph of Maximus. The records of this disputation belong to the most interesting writings of the Monothelite controversy. In the following year the bishops of Africa and the neighboring isles, influenced by Maximus, held a number of synods which condemned Monothelitism, and called on Theodore, bishop of Rome, to support their views with his authority. Maximus now went to Rome, accompanied by Pyrrhus, who formally recanted his late opinions, and was recognized by the pope as the rightful patriarch of Constantinople; and thus a coalition in the interests of  orthodoxy was formed which promised a complete triumph. But Maximus was the only disinterested party to the agreement. Gregorius fell in a battle with the Saracens in A.D. 647; Pyrrhus hastened to take back his recantation, and to make his peace with the emperor; and the pope, disappointed in the hope of seeing his supremacy recognized in the East as well as in the West, anathematized him. Maximus was again compelled to confine his labors to controversial writings.

He was now recognized at the imperial court as the soul of the opposition; and when he resisted the edict of Constans II, promulgated in A.D. 648, and known as the Typus (q.v.), Gregorius, an envoy of the Byzantine court, did not disdain to seek him in his cell, and attempt to shake his firmness. The monk, however, refused to make any concessions, since he regarded that edict as degrading Christ to the level of a being without will or energy, and denied the right of the emperor to interfere in dogmatic questions. On the accession of Martin I, Maximus, more than any others, induced that pope to convene the first synod of the Lateran (in 649); and there can be no doubt that he originated the resolutions there adopted, which condemned Monothelitism and the imperial edict. Thereafter Maximus entered a cloister, and we lose trace of the detailed record of his life. We meet him again when apprehended, under orders from Constantinople, perhaps at the same time as pope Martin I, and brought to trial in 665. The proceedings (of which the records are quite full) show that the aim of the emperor was simply to secure his approval of the τύπος, as a measure in the interests of peace; but the monk remained firm, and declared with tears that the only means of securing peace was the recall of that instrument.

Hence the treatment he received became harsher; and when, after his third trial, he still persisted in maintaining his views, a synod convened by the patriarchs of Constantinople and of Antioch advised the emperor to banish him, and he was taken to the castle of Bizya, in Thrace, later to the monastery of St. Theodore, near Rhegium, and finally to Perberis. His exile was protracted more than a year, during which period frequent attempts were made by bishop Theodosius of Caesarea, and by special agents of the emperor to induce him to recant, but always without success. He was finally condemned to be scourged, and to lose his tongue and his right hand, that he might no longer be able either to speak or write, a and afterwards to be incarcerated in the castle of Shemari, in the country of the Lacians, where he died, Aug. 13, 662. His influence, however, continued to be felt. A few years later the emperor Constans II fell a victim to the hatred he had aroused chiefly by his persecution of this faithful champion of the Church,  and in A.D. 680 the Church gave her sanction to the doctrines so heroically defended by this monk in the first Trullan council (q.v.).

As a writer Maximus is distinguished by a rare combination of dialectic power with mystical profundity. His mind was receptive rather than creative, and in his works Platonic and Aristotelian thought, Chalcedonian orthodoxy, the theology of the Greek fathers, and the ideas of a Christian mysticism, which includes both the subjective ascetism of the Egyptian monks and the hierarchical tendencies of the Areopagite system, all meet and coalesce. The mysticism of the Pseudo-Dionysius exerted the greatest influence over him, and from it he derived his principal thoughts; and it is chiefly because of his authority that the wide-spread influence of this system upon the theology of the Middle Ages was possible. The influence exerted on Scotus Erigena by the writings of Maximus was especially important. Baur asserts that Erigena merely developed the ideas of Maximus, and commented on them; and other writers have shown in detail that the essential features of the system of Erigena are drawn from Maximus, and immediately through him from the Areopagite. This monk thus becomes important as a connecting link between the ideas of the East and West, between the early fathers and the Middle Ages, and as a forerunner of scholasticism; and in his genius, character, piety, learning, literary and ecclesiastical influence, as well as in his eventful life, he appears one of the most remarkable Christian thinkers and martyrs. His works have been largely transcribed and read, but there is no complete edition. Combefis has published a collection in two volumes, folio (Paris, 1675). Catalogues have recorded the titles of fifty-three, his letters being mentioned as one work. Of these, forty-eight have been printed. They may be classed as exegetical, which treat the Scriptures in allegorical style; commentaries on the Church fathers; dogmatico-polemical; moral and ascetic; epistolary; and miscellaneous. He is commemorated in the Latin Church Aug. 13; by the Greek Church Jan. 21. See Herzog, Real- Encyklop. 20:114 sq.; Wetzer und Welte, Kirchen-Lex. 12:783 sq.; Kurtz, Church Hist. 1:205 sq.; Hardwick, Hist. of the Middle Ages, p. 72 sq.; Gieseler, Eccles. Hist. 1:366 sq.; Milman, Hist. of Lat. Christianity, 2:274 sq.; Neander, Hist. of Christian Dogmas, 2:423 sq.; Smith, Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog. and Mythol. s.v.

## Maximus, The Greek[[@Headword:Maximus, The Greek]]

             a celebrated personage in Russian Church history, was born at Arta, in Albania, towards the end of the 15th century. After studying at Paris, Florence, and other cities then distinguished as seats of learning, he took the monastic vows at the cloister of Mount Athos. The grand-duke Vassili Ivanovitch, having requested the patriarch of Constantinople to send two persons to arrange and describe a vast number of Greek manuscripts and books that had recently been discovered in some part of the palace, Maximus was selected, and accordingly set out for Moscow. He was directed by Vassili to examine the books, and to select such as were most deserving of publication; but as he was then wholly ignorant of the Slavonic tongue, he had first to prepare a Latin version, which was afterwards rendered by others into Slavonian. It was thus that the translations of a Psalter with a commentary, and Chrysostom's Homilies on St. John, were produced. Desirous of returning to his convent, it was only at the instances of the Czar, who wished him to revise the earlier translated books of the Greek Church, that he decided to remain, and he then undertook this task, for which he was now qualified by a successful mastery of the Slavonian. The diligence with which he executed it, resulting in many corrections, tended however only to raise up numerous enemies against him, among the rest Daniel the metropolitan. But what more immediately tended to his disgrace was the firmness with which he opposed Vassili's divorce from his first wife, Salome (on account of barrenness), and his marriage with the princess Helena Glinski (comp. Duncan, Hist. of Russia, p. 350). Maximus was condemned by a synod, excommunicated as a heretic, and imprisoned in the Otrotch monastery at Tver in 1525. In this confinement he was for some time treated with-great rigor, though the bishop of Tver interceded for him. At length removed to the Monastery of St. Sergius, he died there in 1556. A great number of works by him are extant, chiefly in manuscript, on a variety of subjects — dogmatical, polemical, philosophical, etc., from which considerable information has been derived with regard to the opinions and prejudices of the clergy and people in that age; nor was he at all timid in reproving the abuses and vices of the times. This alone would account for the persecution which he drew down upon himself; but after his death even those who had been among the more violent against him admitted his innocence, nor was it long before his memory came to be regarded as that of a holy man and a martyr. — English Cyclop. s.v.; Rose, New Gen. Biog. Dict. s.v.

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

             a Scotch prelate, was first minister at Murthlack, and then in the city of Edinburgh in 1620. He was advanced to the see of Ross in 1633; deprived in 1638 and fled to England for protection. He died February 14, 1646. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 203.

## Maxwell, Lady Darcy[[@Headword:Maxwell, Lady Darcy]]

             an eminently pious Methodist, who by birth and rank belonged to the nobility of Scotland, is noted for her great works of philanthropy. She was the youngest daughter of Thomas Brisbane, County of Ayr, and was born about the year 1742. In her own home she received the rudiments of an education, but subsequently completed it in the city of Edinburgh. At the age of sixteen she resided for a time in London with her uncle and aunt, lord and lady Lothian, to enjoy the advantages of being presented at court. In 1759, soon after her return from London, she married Sir Walter Maxwell. This union seemed to open before her a bewildering vista of future joys and happiness; but only for two short years did she realize her bright anticipations; at the end of that period her husband and child were taken from her, and she was left a widow at nineteen. When tidings of her little one's death, within six weeks after that of her husband, were conveyed to her, without any outburst of grief, or even a murmur, she exclaimed, “I see God requires my whole heart, and he shall have it!” “God brought me to himself by affliction,” she frequently said. It was while overwhelmed by these heavy trials that she became acquainted with the Methodists.

The early ministry of John Wesley and George Whitefield was generally respected in Scotland. Many of the higher classes approved their  labors; ministers of the Establishment, members of the university, and persons of rank and title mingled in their audiences. It is supposed that some of the pious nobility, admirers of Wesley and Whitefield, first induced lady Maxwell to hear them. However that may be, it is certain that on June 16, 1764, Mr. Wesley preached to a large congregation in Edinburgh, and from that time corresponded with her ladyship, his influence aiding greatly in regulating her views, and guiding her determinations through life. From the time of her husband's death she had resided in Edinburgh or the vicinity. Her benevolence here was unusually great. Seeking to relieve misery in every form, there was scarcely a public or private charity for the repose of age or the guidance of youth, the relief of the poor, the care of the sick, or the spread of the Gospel, to which she did not contribute. In 1770 she established a school in Edinburgh for the purpose of affording education and Christian instruction to poor children — this school was always the object of her pious solicitude; its entire management and superintenennce remained with herself, and, as the benefits flowing from it became manifest, pecuniary aid was furnished by others. At the time of her death eight hundred children had profited by this praiseworthy charity, and it is still in active operation.

The employment of her time each day was exceedingly exemplary; she usually rose at four o'clock, and attended the Wesleyan chapel at five, morning preaching being then customary; after breakfast she discharged the duties of the head of a family in her own house; from eleven to twelve she spent the time in interceding with God for her friends, the Church, and the world; the remaining hours of the day she devoted to reading, writing, exercise, and acts of benevolence. Her evenings, when alone, were occupied with reading, chiefly divinity; and, after an early supper, and committing her family to the care of the great Father who watches over all, and spending some time in praising God for his mercies, she retired to rest. In this manner, for nearly fifty years, she walked with her God. Her outward religious life had its varieties, but they were the varieties of advance; her inner religious life also had its changes, but they were those of the beautiful morning, which shines brighter and brighter unto the perfect day. In person, lady Maxwell was above the medium height, exceedingly straight and well proportioned; her features quite feminine, but strongly intelligent; her eye quick and penetrating, yet sweet and tender. She died July 2, 1810, passing away as peacefully and joyfully as she had lived: the society to which she belonged losing its oldest member, the world one of its best inhabitants, and the Church universal one  of its brightest ornaments. See Lancaster, Life of Lady Maxwell (N. Y. 1840, 12mo); Coles, Heroines of Methodism, p. 76.

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

             one of the Scottish lords of the regency during the absence of James V in France, deserves a place here for his action in the first Parliament of Mary queen of Scots (1543), where he introduced a bill to allow the reading of the Scriptures in the vulgar tongue, which was passed in spite of the opposition of the lord chancellor, the bishops, and priests. He died in 1546.

## Maxwell, Robert (2)[[@Headword:Maxwell, Robert (2)]]

             a Scotch prelate, was rector of Forbolton in 1521, and soon after provost of the collegiate church in Dumbarton. He was bishop of Orkney till after 1536. He built the stalls in his cathedral, and furnished the steeple with a set of bells. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 223.

## Maxwell, Samuel[[@Headword:Maxwell, Samuel]]

             an American divine and educator, was born in Berkshire County, Mass., about 1805; was educated at Amherst College (class of 1829); subsequently became principal of the preparatory department of Marietta College, Ohio, and later a professor in the collegiate department of the same institution, and remained there until his death, which occurred January 24, 1867. He was also in the employ of the American Missionary Association in his last years.

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

             LL. D. an American educator, celebrated also in the department of jurisprudence, was born at Norfolk, Va., Feb. 27, 1784; was educated at Yale College, 1802; practiced in his native city, and attained great eminence; assumed the editor's chair in the literary department of the N. Y. Journal of Commerce in 1827; resumed the practice of jurisprudence, however, in the following year; was a member of the Virginia House of Delegates in 1830, and of the State Senate from 1831 to 1837, during which time he was made secretary of the Historical Society of Virginia. He next accepted the presidency of the Hampden Sidney College in 1838, which he retained until 1844, and then edited the Virginia Historical Register from 1848 to 1853 (6 vols. in 3, 12mo). He died January 9, 1857, at Richmond, Va. He wrote Memoir of the Rev. John H. Rice, D.D. (Phila. 1835, 12mo). See Drake, Dict. Amer. Biog. s.v.

## May, E. H[[@Headword:May, E. H]]

             a Dutch Reformed minister, was born at Lynn, Norfolk, England, Jan. 28, 1795. He received a good preparatory education, and studied for the ministry at Hoxton College, near London; was ordained in 1815 over the  Independent Church at Bury, Lancashire, and subsequently preached in Rochford, in the south of England, and Croydon, Surrey. In 1834 he came to America, and in 1835 became a member of the Classis of Washington, and pastor of the Reformed Dutch Church in Northumberland; in 1836, pastor of the Church in Schuylerville; in 1839, of the Twenty-first Street Church, New York; in 1848 accepted the appointment of secretary to the Pennsylvania Colonization Society; and in 1849 became secretary of the Pennsylvania Seamen's Friend Society, in which connection he served until near his death, August, 1858. Mr. May was an instructive and evangelical preacher, a man of refined taste and correct judgment, and a frank, open- hearted Christian. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1860, p. 203.

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

             D.D., an Episcopal divine and theological educator, was born in Chester County, Pa., Oct. 1, 1805. He entered Jefferson College, Pa., in 1822; graduated with distinction; commenced the study of law, but finally entered the theological seminary at Alexandria, Va. He was ordained by bishop White in 1827, and first settled in Wilkesbarre, Pa., where he remained two years. In 1836 he became rector of St. Paul's parish, Philadelphia. While there he was engaged with Dr. Clark, then rector of St. Andrew's Church, Dr. Tyng, then rector of the Church of the Epiphany, and with Dr. Suddards, then and still rector of Grace Church, in the editorial management of the Episcopal Recorder. His health failing at this time, he was led to seek restoration in foreign travel. Two years were thus spent abroad. After his return, he accepted the position of professor of pastoral theology and ecclesiastical history in the Alexandria Seminary, his alma mater. The outbreak of the rebellion in 1861 closing the operations of that school, he removed to Philadelphia, and became professor of ecclesiastical history and systematic theology in the divinity school just organized. He remained there until his death. Dec. 18, 1863. But few men have so thoroughly won the affections of those with whom they were associated. Apparently not an impulsive man, he was by no means a person of cold and unimpulsive temper, but full of deep feeling. He has influenced the training of hundreds now in the ministry, who will greatly miss his counsels, and the encouragement his sympathy and personal attainments gave them. He was remarkable for the unvarying symmetry and depth of his Christian character, and seemed like one inspired by Gospel principles, rather than controlled by them, so perfectly natural and habitual was his manifestation of them. See Am. Ch. Rev. 1864, p. 150.

## May, Johann Heinrich (1)[[@Headword:May, Johann Heinrich (1)]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born February 5, 1653. He studied at Wittenberg, was professor of Oriental languages at Giessen, and died September 3, 1719, doctor of theology. He published, De Canone Veteris Test. (Giessen, 1689): — Animadversiones et Supplementa Cocceji Lexicon (Frankfort, 1689, fol.; 3d ed. 1714): — Diss. IV de Sacra Scriptura (ibid. 1690): — Selectiora Vet. Testamenti Oracula Explicanta, etc. (eod.): — Biblia Hebraica (ibid. 1692): — De Lustrationibus et Purificationibus Hebraeorum (ibid. eod.): — De Salis Usu Synbolico (ibid. eod.): — Theologia Davidis (ibid. 1693): — Ebraicae Linguae jusque Accentuationibus Necessitas et Utilitas (ibid. 1696): — Theologia Jeremiana (ibid. 1703): — Theologia Jesaiana (ibid. 1704), etc. See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v. (where 105 titles of his writings are given); Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. Maius; Jicher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. "Majus." (B.P.)

## May, Johann Heinrich (2)[[@Headword:May, Johann Heinrich (2)]]

             a German theologian, son of the foregoing, was born at Durlach, March 11, 1688. He studied at Altdorf and Jena, was professor at Giessen, and died June 13, 1732. He published, De Jure Anni Septimi (Giessen, 1707): — Mainon. Tract. de Jure Anni Septini et Jubilei (1708): — Jura Fimnbriarum (1710): — D. Isaaci Abarbanelis משמיע ישועה(1712): — Observationes Sacrce (1713-15; 1716-27): — Diss. de Schechinah (1723): — De Tiara Pontificis Maximi (1728): — De Aris et Altaribus Veterum  (1732). See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v.; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. "Majus." (B.P.)

## May, Samuel Joseph[[@Headword:May, Samuel Joseph]]

             an eminent Unitarian minister and philanthropist, was born in Boston, Mass., in 1797. He graduated at Harvard College in 1817; and, after preaching several years as a Unitarian minister at Brooklyn, Conn., became general agent of the Massachusetts Anti-slavery Society. Afterwards he assumed a pastorate at South Scituate, Mass.; from 1842 to 1845 was principal of the Lexington Normal school; and finally, in 1845, settled in the Unitarian ministry at Syracuse, New York. There the remainder of his life was passed, and he was identified with every movement for the moral, intellectual, and social improvement of the people, and came to be regarded as the leading spirit in every measure of benevolence. In all matters of education he was very active, and to him, as much as to any man in Syracuse, it is due that its public schools are so successful and maintain so high a character. He resigned the pastorate July 1, 1871. Mr. May devoted his energies especially to the antislavery cause for many years. He was one of the first members of the New England Society in 1832, and a member of the Philadelphia Convention of 1833 which formed the Anti- slavery Society. He was author of Recollections of Amer. Anti-slavery (1869). See Drake, Dict. Amer. Biog. s.v.; New Amer. Cyclop. 1871, p. 495.

## Maya[[@Headword:Maya]]

             (Sanscrit, Illusion) is a term applied by the Hindus, in a philosophical or mystical sense, to that power which caused or created the visible phenomena of the universe. The Hindu, like Berkeley and other European philosophers, assumes that external objects have no absolute existence, but that they are mere impressions on the mind. Maya, in Hindu theology, is, according to some, that mighty goddess the wife or consort of Brahma. See Moor, Hindu Mythology, s.v.; Wilson, Sanscrit Dictionary, s.v.; Thomas, Dict. Biog. and Mythol. s.v.

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

             Mayan is the vernacular of a tribe of Indians inhabiting Yucatan, a peninsula to the east of Mexico, projecting northward between the gulf of Mexico and the Caribbean sea. In 1864 only a part of the gospel of Luke was published by the British and Foreign Bible Society in this dialect. In 1869 the gospel of John was printed in England, the translation having been made by the Reverend R. Fletcher. See Bible of Every Land, page 468. (B.P.)

## Mayence[[@Headword:Mayence]]

             a German town, beautifully situated on a sloping hill on the left bank of the River Rhine, is noted in ecclesiastical annals as the seat of an archiepiscopal see, and as the seat of several important Church councils. SEE MAYENCE, COUNCILS OF.  Mayence as an Archbishopric and Bishopric. — We have no trustworthy information as to the early history of this archbishopric. Attempts have been made to prove that the Christian Church was established there by St. Crescens, based on the passage in 2Ti 4:10, “Crescens (is departed) to Galatia;” and Jerome and other writers also favor the opinion of Gaul having been Christianized by Crescens. Ado, however, in his Martyrologium, written about 860, is the first to refer to the action of Crescens at Vienna. Still we find no documents referring to it until the 10th century, which may, however, be accounted for by the fact that the city was three times destroyed by fire up to that period. According to the ecclesiastical tradition, Crescens, a pupil of the apostle Paul, came to preach there as early as the year 82, became the first bishop of Mayence, and died a martyr in 103.

The list of bishops up to the 6th century is all of later origin; according to it, Crescens was succeeded by Aureus, who was murdered by the Vandals when they took the city in 451. Sidonius, about 546, began the restoration of the town and of the church; Sigbert then became bishop about 589, and is said to have received from king Childebert the onyx bearing a likeness of that prince and of his wife, which is still retained among the jewels of Mayence. In 612 Leonisius (Leutgasius) caused war between Theoderick and Theodebert. We then find in the list Ruthelmus (Rudelin), Landwald, Lupoald (Leowald), Rigbert (Richbert, † 712), Gerold, who died at the hands of the Saxons in 743. He was succeeded by his son Gerwilio or Gewilieb, who in 744 marched with Carloman against the Saxons, and defeated them on the shores of the Weser. In 745 he was deposed, Bonifacius appointed in his place, and the bishopric transformed into an archbishopric, with the sanction of pope Zachary, in 748. In 753 or 754 Bonifacius resigned in favor of his pupil Lullus, who, however, did not receive the pallium before 780; he labored diligently for the interest of the archbishopric, founded several churches and convents, and greatly increased the revenues of the Church by the adoption of the tithing system in 779. He died Oct. 16, 786. His successor was Riculf, who founded the school of the Church of St. Alban at Mayence, and died Aug. 9, 813, the very year in which Constantine called a council at Mayence (see below). Haistulf, † Jan. 28, 827, introduced canonical life in the archbishopric; yet the succeeding archbishops, down to Marculf, were not elected according to canonical rules, but by the king, with the consent of the clergy and people. This was the case with Otgar, 826-47; Rabanus Maurus, 847-56 (who called a council, by order of Louis of Germany, in the year of his accession to the  archiepiscopal chair); Charles, son of king Pepin I of Aquitania, and nephew of Louis the German, 856-63, who was also archchancellor of the empire, a dignity which was retained by his successors; Liutbert, who marched against the Bohemians in 872, and against the Sorbians in 874; defeated the Normans, who had ascended the Rhine, in 883, and died Feb. 17, 889. Sunzo (Sunderhold) fell fighting against the Normans in 891. Hatto I played an important part in the history of Germany during the reign of Louis the Infant and Conrad I, and died Jan. 18, 913. His successor, Heriger, died in 927. Hildebert, who successfully disputed against Cologne and Treves the right to crown the king, and crowned Otto I at Aix-la- Chapelle in 936, died in 937. Friedrich was exiled to Hamburg or Fulda by the emperor Otto I, as a rebel; was recalled in 954, but repeatedly accused of treason, and escaped punishment only by his sudden decease in 954. He was succeeded by Wilhelm, a natural son of Otto, who died in 968. Of Hatto II (968-70), the tradition says that he was devoured by mice. Ruprecht died in 974. Willigis received the pallium from pope Benedict VII, together with the privilege of presiding at all the German councils and of crowning the king.

To remind him always of his low origin (his father was said to have been a wagoner), he caused a wheel to be erected on the walls of his palace, and this is said to be the origin of the wheel on the arms of the archbishops of Mayence. In 978 he laid the foundations of the new cathedral (which, however, was burned down on the day of its consecration in 1009), and died in 1011. Next follow Archimbald (Erkenbold), 1011-21; Aribon, 1021-31; Bardo of Oppershofen, 1031-51, who finished the new cathedral, and consecrated it Nov. 10, 1037. He received on this occasion the pallium from pope John XIX, and the right to act as papal legate whenever no other person appeared invested with that authority in his diocese. The succeeding incumbent was Leopold (Luitpold), count of Bogen, 1051-59. Sigfrid I, count of Eppstein, joined a crusade in 1065; in 1069 he tried, but in vain, to procure a divorce between Henry IV and Bertha, and proclaimed — yet without effect — in 1075 the edict of celibacy of Gregory VII. After 1077 he took the part of the anti- kings, and crowned Rudolf of Suabia and Hermann of Luxemburg. He died in 1084. Wezilo (1084-88) was complained of at the Council of Halberstadt, and put under ban for maintaining that those of the secular clergy who lost their estates were no longer subject to ecclesiastical jurisdiction; he subsequently receded from this position. Under Ruthard (1088-99), in 1097, a persecution broke out against the Jews in Mayence, and the archbishop, fearing the anger of the emperor for having taken an  active part in it, fled to Thuringia, whence he returned only after a lapse of eight years. Adelbert I, count of Saarbruck (1109-37), was elected by Henry V, yet sided against him in 1112 on the question of investiture; he was imprisoned for his opposition, and only released in 1115, when the people of Mayence rose in arms to secure his liberation. Adelbert showed his gratitude by granting the citizens of Mayence the charter (releasing them from the jurisdiction of the church-wardens and from their taxes), which was inscribed on the door of the cathedral in 1135. In 1120 he fled again before the emperor, after whose death, in 1125, he assembled a diet for the election of a king. This is the first instance of the appearance in the history of Germany of the electors, among whom the archbishop of Mayence held the first place.

Adelbert II, brother of the preceding, held the office 1138-41. Marcult; 1141-42, was the first archbishop elected according to canonical rules, with the concurrence of the people. Henry I, 1142-53, was appointed by Conrad III tutor to his son, before his departure for the crusade. He was hated by the clergy for his severity, and they accused him before the pope of squandering the funds of the Church and of immorality. He was deposed in 1153. Under Arnold I, of Seelenhowen (1153-60), the partisans of his predecessors, among them Hermann, count of the Palatinate, invaded the diocese and laid the land waste. Arnold retaliated, and peace was only restored at the emperor's return from Italy in 1155. Arnold having promised the emperor to accompany him in his next journey to Rome, and to employ his influence to settle the difficulty then existing between him and the pope, he sought to levy a tax on the diocese to defray his expenses; but the citizens resisted, and, the emperor refusing to take the part of the citizens, they murdered the archbishop in 1160. The emperor now appointed Conrad I, in spite of the opposition of the chapter; the new archbishop, however, on being requested to recognize the anti-pope, Pascal, fled to Alexander at Rome, and was made archbishop of Salzburg. His place was filled in 1165 by Christian I, count of Buch, chancellor of the emperor Frederic I. He proved true to that prince, and took his part in Italy against the pope; but was arrested there in 1180 by the count of Monte Ferrara, remained a prisoner until 1181, and died in the neighborhood of Rome in 1183.

The title of archchancellor of the empire, which the archbishops of Mayence had often received since the 10th century, became permanent now. After the decease of Christian, Conrad I became again archbishop of Mayence. The late prelate had already set up a claim on the estates of the extinct house of Franconia in Thuringia and Hesse; Conrad brought it forward again in  1184, but was opposed by the landgrave Lewis III, and a lengthy strife ensued. In 1197 Conrad took part in a crusade, and died in 1200. Sigfrid II, the elder, count of Eppstein (1200-30), obtained in 1208 the direction of the bishopric of Worms, and in 1228 the right to crown the kings of Bohemia (which was exercised by his followers until 1343). Sigfrid III, of Eppstein, nephew of the preceding (1230-49), finding the finances in very bad condition, levied, with the assent of the chapter, on all benefices a tax amounting to one twentieth of their income. On the other hand, it was enacted that the archbishop could in future contract no liabilities without the consent of the chapter, and that every future archbishop should be strictly held to submit to that rule. In 1232 Sigfrid obtained from the king the abbey of Lorch, and restored the cathedral, which was consecrated in 1239. He favored the deposition of emperor Frederick II, and supported Henry Raspe, and afterwards William of Holland (this is commemorated by three statues to be seen in the cathedral of Mayence, the center one representing the archbishop, the one on his right Henry Raspe, and the other William of Holland).

After the death of Henry Raspe, Sigfrid attempted to annex his possessions to Thuringia, but was opposed by landgrave Henry and Sophia of Brabant, and the dispute lasted seven years. Sigfrid died in 1249, and was succeeded by Christian II, of Bolanden, who resigned in 1251. Gerhard I (1251-59), was imprisoned in 1256 by duke Albrecht of Brunswick, and liberated in 1257 by king Richard of England, whom he afterwards supported as a candidate to the imperial crown. Under him the cathedral canons of Mayence ceased to lead the communistic life. Werner of Eppstein, nephew of Sigfrid III (1259-84), canceled part of the debts of the archbishopric, and concluded a treaty with the duchess Sophia of Brabant in 1263, by which he obtained Grunberg and Frankenburg; in 1271 he bought Wildenberg, Amorbach, Schneeberg, and Wilbach from Ulrich of Duren, and in 1278 the castle of Bockelnheim from count Henry of Sponhein; he took an active part in the election of Rudolph of Hapsburg as emperor of Germany. After a vacancy of two years, Henry II was appointed archbishop in 1286; he was disliked by the clergy for his strictness, and died in 1288. Gerhard II, of Eppstein (1289-1305), labored to have his cousin Adolph of Nassau elected emperor, but afterwards aided in his deposition and in the election of Albrecht of Austria: he used his influence with both emperors for the aggrandizement of his archbishopric. He was also somewhat distinguished as a legislator; his decrees form the Concordata Gerhardi. An electoral edict of king Albrecht having assigned him the second rank among the electors, he protested, and obtained an  imperial decree, under date of Sept. 23, 1298, placing him and his successors in the first rank; the same decree confirmed them also in the title of archchancellor of Germany.

Peter Aichspalter (1306-20) improved greatly the finances of the diocese by his economy, and was a strict promoter of ecclesiastical discipline. Matthias, count of Bucheck and landgrave of Burgundy (1321-28), first sided with emperor Louis of Bavaria, but afterwards with the pope, and enlarged the estates of the archbishopric. After his death, which occurred in 1328, pope John XXII appointed Henry III, count of Burneburg, but the chapter elected archbishop Balduin of Treves; the latter governed the diocese during the difficulty, and added to it a part of the village of Herzberg, half of Mark Duderstadt, Schurburg, Botzwangen, Esenheim, and Odenheim. On Nov. 12, 1336, Balduin voluntarily surrendered his claim, and Henry was now accepted by the chapter, after promising to take sides with Louis of Bavaria, and to surrender the strong places of the diocese into the hands of the chapter. In 1329 he engaged not to tax the inhabitants of Mayence, or those of the suburbs, without their consent; in 1330 he released them from the ecclesiastical punishments they had incurred for injuring the clergy, and in 1331 absolved them from their promise to repay the Jews sums advanced by them to the city. He obtained jurisdiction over Eichsfeld, Duderstadt, and Giboldhausen; on the other hand, Olmutz and Prague were detached from Mayence, and, in consequence, the archbishops of Mayence lost the right to crown the kings of Hungary. He finally got into difficulties by his fidelity to emperor Lewis, and was deposed by pope Clement VI in 1346, yet continued to exercise his functions until his death in 1353. Gerlach, who had been appointed by the pope in 1346, was now recognized by all as archbishop. The difficulties between him and his predecessor had greatly injured the diocese: the funds had become low, debts had been contracted, the clergy had become much relaxed, and the respect of the people had diminished in consequence; Gerlach, however, added to the diocese the castles of Itter and Allenfelt, Ballenburg; the village of Budensheim, and the half of Geismar. At this time the Golden Bull, in which the high position of the archbishop of Mayence as dean of the electoral college was officially recognized, was given to the public. Gerlach died Feb. 12, 1371. His successor, John I, duke of Luxemburg, died in 1373.

Louis, son of margrave Frederick the Earnest, was now appointed by both the pope and the emperor, while the chapter elected Adolph I, of Nassau, bishop of Spires, who took up his residence at Erfurt; the difficulty lasted until 1380; Adolph remained archbishop of Mayence,  while Louis was made archbishop of Magdeburg, and retained the regalia until his death. Adolph was long at war with landgrave Hermann of Hesse about some possessions in that province; he founded the University of Erfurt, and died in 1390. His successor, Conrad II, of Weinsberg, persecuted the Waldenses, of whom there were a number in his diocese, and entered into a league with the Palatinate, Bavaria, and Spires against the Flagellants. He died Oct. 19,1396. John II, count of Nassau, brother of Adolph I (1396-1419), took part in the deposition of emperor Wenzel, and, in consequence of being suspected of having had a share in the murder of the emperor elect, duke Frederick of Brunswick, as he sheltered the murderer, he became involved in a war with Brunswick and Hesse, which lasted until 1401: he added to his diocese Wetterau and Ardeck, besides several villages. Conrad III, count of Stein, was in 1422 appointed vicar of the empire by emperor Sigismund; but, being opposed by Louis of Heidelberg, he resigned that office in 1423: he added to the diocese the city of Steinheim, and enacted strict regulations for the conduct of the clergy. Under him the citizens of Mayence continued to complain of the exemption from taxes enjoyed by the clergy, and he did not succeed in settling the question. He died in 1434.

His successor, Dietrich I, of Erbach, was more fortunate, and put an end to the troubles in 1435, with the aid of two commissioners of the Council of Basle. His whole time was taken up in quarrels with the pope and emperor; the Pragmatic Sanction of Mayence, of which he was the author, and in which he recognized the Council of Basle, the suppression of the annates, and the general restoration of canonical election, was rejected, while the Concordat of Aschaffenburg, which held the contrary views, was afterwards adopted. Dietrich died May 6, 1459, and was succeeded by Diether (Dietrich II), count of Isenburg- Budingen; the latter, however, found a rival in count Adolph of Nassau, whom Frederick, elector of the Palatinate, supported by force of arms; Diether was besieged in Heidelberg July 4, 1461, and obliged to flee. In 1462 he was deposed by pope Pius II, for refusing to collect the annates (which the pope had arbitrarily raised from 10,000 to 21,000 florins). Adolph II, count of Nassau, was now made archbishop, and a war commenced between Diether, supported by Bavaria and the Palatinate, and Adolph, upheld by Bavaria and Wurtemberg; a treaty was finally concluded, Oct. 25, 1463, Diether renouncing his claims. The city of Mayence, which was stormed by Adolph in 1462, lost all privileges. After the death of Adolph, Sept. 6, 1475, Diether was again appointed archbishop; but now commenced a strife about the city of Mayence: the  cathedral chapter claimed it for its own, while the citizens demanded their liberty, and rebelled against the chapter; they were finally defeated, and the city remained subject to the archbishop, who made it his residence; he built the palace of Martinsburg, and founded the University of Mayence, which was opened in 1477; he also restored to the diocese the estates of Algesheim and Olm, and died May 7,1482. Albert I, duke of Saxony, was son of the elector Ernst (1482-84). His successor, Berthold, count of Henneberg, accompanied emperor Maximilian as archchancellor to court; he took an active part in restoring peace throughout the country, and in the institution of the imperial chamber of justice; he also introduced great improvements in the ecclesiastical and conventual discipline, and laid the grievances of the Germans with regard to ecclesiastical affairs before the court of Rome. He died Dec. 21, 1504. Jacob of Liebenstein (1504-8) added Kostheim and part of Konigsberg to the diocese. Uriel of Genimengen (1508-14) ordered the examination of the clergy, and strictly opposed concubinage among them.

Albrecht of Brandenburg, archbishop of Magdeburg, was made archbishop of Mayence in 1514, he loved grandeur, wasted the funds of the diocese, and abused the sale of indulgences; he took part in the league against the Protestant princes; being attacked by the landgrave of Hesse, he purchased peace at the expense of 40,000 thalers. In 1529 he originated the Edict of Worms against the Protestants; vet he afterwards sought to restore peace among the different religious parties, and was one of the principal promoters of the peace of Nuremberg. He died Sept. 24, 1545, highly respected both by the Roman Catholics and the Lutherans, and even by Luther, with whom he had some correspondence. Sebastian of Heusenstam (1545-55) labored to improve the administration of the diocese, and also to restore the influence of Romanism; he subscribed to the Interim of 1548. During his reign Albrecht Alcibiades of Brandenburg invaded the diocese, and took Mayence; he made the citizens swear allegiance to the king of France, demanded a contribution of 600,000 florins from the archbishop and chapter, and, as they were unable to pay that amount by the time stipulated, he burnt down the archiepiscopal palace and several churches; the archbishop himself fled to Eltfeld, where he died in 1555. His successor, Daniel of Homburg, endeavored to restore the archbishopric to its former splendor; he introduced the Jesuits into Mayence and in Eichsfelde, and surrendered education into their hands; he took part also in the attempts of reconciliation between the Protestants and Romanists, added to his diocese the county of Lahr (Rieneck), the county of Konigstein, and the villages of  Rennshausen and Zornheim. He died March 22,1582. He was succeeded by Wolfgang of Dalberg (1582 to April 5,1601).

John Adam, of Bicken (1601 to Jan. 10, 1604), and John Suicard, of Kronenberg, strictly enforced all the old ecclesiastical rules, and persecuted the Protestants. Under Suicard the diocese began to feel the effects of the Thirty Years' War, which was then raging; it suffered especially from the inroads of Mansfeld and Christian of Brunswick, against whom he called for the assistance of the Spaniards. He died July 6, 1629. Anselm Casimir, of Wambold, was obliged to flee from Mayence when that city was taken by Gustavus Adolphus, Dec. 23,1631; he retired to Cologne, and the diocese was, until the Treaty of Prague, in 1635, occupied by Swedish and French troops, who greatly impoverished the country — not more, however, than the imperial forces. In 1635 the archbishop returned to Mayence; but the diocese becoming again the theater of war in 1643, he fled again before the French armies, and in 1647 made a treaty with Turenne. Mayence remained in the possession of the French, and the archbishop went to reside at Frankfort, where he died, Oct. 9, 1647. His successor, John Philip, of Schonborn, prince bishop of Wurzburg, resigned soon after his election, for the Swedes, after the expiration of the peace of Westphalia, exerted themselves for the secularization of the diocese, and the archbishopric was only maintained through the intervention of Saxony; it lost, however, by exemption, the districts of Verden and Halberstadt. On the occasion of the coronation of Ferdinand IV at Regensburg, John Philip came in conflict with the archbishop of Cologne over their respective prerogatives. He was also in difficulty with the inhabitants of Mayence, and finally took the city by force in 1664. Philip also quarreled with Saxony about the town of Erfurt, which was finally added to his diocese in 1665. He then devoted all his attention to internal improvements; he gave regulations to the court of Mayence in 1659; in 1661 he established a theological seminary; and in 1663 was also made bishop of Worms. He died Feb. 12, 1673.

His successor was Lothar Frederick, of Metternich-Burchied, coadjutor of John Philip since 1670; in 1674 he got into war with the elector of the Palatinate, about the district of Bockelnheim, but died June 3, 1675. Domian Hartard, of Leyen, died Dec. 6, 1678. Charles Henry, duke of Metternich-Winneburg, was elected in 1679, and died on Sept. 27 of the same year. Anselm Franz, of Ingelheim, surrendered Mayence to the French in 1688, and took up his residence at Erfurt; but the marshal of Uxelles having given up Mayence to the duke of Lorraine, Sept. 8,1689, the archbishop returned to it. In 1691 he joined a league against France. By  a treaty concluded Aug. 24, 1692 with Brunswick, he gave up the district of Eichsfeld, with the exception of Duderstadt, Gieboldshausen, and Landau. He died in 1695. Lothar Franz, of Schonborn, nephew of John Philip, took the part of Austria against Spain in the War of Succession. In 1704 the district of Kronenberg was joined to the diocese by succession. In 1714 the strife between the archbishop and the Palatinate was brought to a close by the former giving up his claim to Bockelnheim, and receiving in exchange New Bamberg. He died Jan. 30,1729. Francis Louis, count of Neuburg, bishop of Breslau and Worms, and also archbishop of Treves, died April 19, 1732. Under Philip Charles, of Eltz-Kempenich, Alzenau, together with five villages, was added to the diocese. He died March 21, 1743. John Frederick Charles, count of Ostein, remained neutral in the Austrian War of Succession, and his diocese suffered severely from the French in consequence; in 1745 the grand duke of Tuscany succeeded in driving the French armies out of the country, but during the Seven Years' War the bishopric suffered again on account of its adherence to the queen of Hungary. The archbishop died June 4, 1763: he had added the bishopric of Fulda to Mayence. Emmerich Joseph, baron of Breidbach-Buresheim, was made also bishop of Worms in 1768; in 1769 he joined the two other ecclesiastical electors in trying to emancipate the German episcopacy from the dominion of Rome; by a decree of Dec. 23, 1766, he abolished a number of festivals, and by another of July 30, 1771, he enacted several reforms in the convents; he encouraged industry and agriculture, founded charitable institutions, and established the administration of the diocese on a regular basis; on Jan. 30, 1773, he entered into an agreement with Saxony concerning Trefurt and Mulhouse, by which he surrendered the jurisdiction of Protestant districts to Saxony. He died July 11, 1774.

Frederick Charles Joseph, of Eichthal, who became also bishop of Worms, followed in the footsteps of his predecessor, introducing many reforms in the Church; he endowed the University of Mayence with the convents of Karthaus, Altenmunster, and Reichenklaren in 1781, to which, in 1784, he added seventeen prebends, and also directed that theological studies should no longer be pursued in convents, but only in the University of Mayence. The archbishops had heretofore been partisans of Austria, but he sided with Prussia when Frederick the Great opposed the plans of aggrandizement of the former power towards Bavaria; he opposed, also, the encroachments of the papal nuncios. When the French Revolution broke out, Mayence was betrayed into Custine's hands, Oct. 21, 1792; the archbishop fled to Heiligenstadt, then took up his residence at Erfurt, and died at  Aschaffenburg July 25,1802. He was the last archbishop of Mayence. The archbishopric was secularized Feb. 26, 1803. By treaty France received the portion of the diocese on the left shore of the Rhine, and the remainder was divided between Prussia, Hesse, etc., with the exception of the principalities of Aschaffenburg, Regensburg, the county of Wetzlar, and some other small portions which were given to the coadjutor of the late archbishop, Charles Theodore of Dalberg, as archchancellor, metropolitan, and primate of Germany.

The see was transferred to the cathedral of Regensburg, and received jurisdiction over the whole of the former ecclesiastical provinces of Mayence, Treves, and Cologne, lying on the right shore of the Rhine, with the exception of the part belonging to Prussia, and also over the whole province of Salzburg, in Bavaria. The archbishopric of Mayence became a simple bishopric, subject to the archbishop of Mechlin, and including only the territory of the old archbishopric on the left shore of the Rhine. The first bishop was Joseph Louis Colmar, appointed Oct. 3, 1802, who governed his diocese exclusively under French inspiration. Mayence was taken by the allies May 17, 1814; Colmar died Dec. 15 of the same year. A vicar-general was then appointed. In 1829 the bishopric of Mayence was, by a papal decree, detached from Mechlin and subjected to Freiburg. Joseph Vitus Burg was appointed bishop Jan. 12,1830; he divided the diocese into deaneries, and died May 23, 1833. His successor, the former vicar-general, John Jacob Humann, died Aug. 19, 1834. Peter Leopold Kaiser issued complete diocesan statutes in 1837, and died Dec. 30, 1848. Leopold Schmid, professor of theology and philosophy at the University of Giessen, was appointed bishop of Mayence by pope Pius IX, Feb. 22, 1849, but he was not confirmed (see L. Schmid, Ueb. d. jungste Mainzer Bischofswahl, Giessen, 1850); and William Emanuel von Ketteler was made bishop in his place, March 29, 1850. Since Ketteler's accession, the bishopric of Mayence is noted as the gathering-place of all Jesuit ultramontanists. How this Roman see in Germany will continue its opposition to all order of state rule, now that the Jesuits have been expelled from Germany (1873), remains to be seen. See Theoderich Gresemund, Catalogus episcoporum et archiepiscoporum Mogunt. (Schunk's Beitragen, vol. 2); J. Latomus, Gesch. d. Bischofe v. M. (in Mencke, Scriptores rerum Germ. vol. 3); Servarius, Res Moguntiacae (in Joannis, Res Mogunt. Frankf. 1722, vol. 1); Severus, Memoria pontificum Mogunt. (Mayence, 1765); Wurdtwein, Diaecesis Moguntina in archidiaconatus districta (Manh. 1769-77, 3 vols.); Schepfer, Codex eccles. Mogunt. nov. (Aschaf. 1803); D.  Untergang d. Kurfurst. M. (Frankf. 1839); Werner, Der Dom z. M. (Mayence, 1827, 3 vols.); Pierer, Universal-Lexikon, 10:741 sq.; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 8:697 sq.

## Mayence, Councils At[[@Headword:Mayence, Councils At]]

             Of the numerous councils of the Church of Rome convened here, special notice is due to those of 813, 847-8, 1225, and 1549.

(1.) The first of these, convened June 9, 813, by order of Charlemagne, was composed of thirty bishops and twenty-five abbots; Hildebald, archbishop of Cologne and arch-chaplain, presided. The object of this council was to restore the discipline of the Church. To this end the Gospels, the canons of the Church, and certain of the works of the fathers were read, among others the pastoral of St. Gregory; the abbots and monks also read the letter of St. Benedict. Fifty-six canons were published. 1, 2, and 3 treat of faith, hope, and charity. 4. Orders the administration of holy baptism after the Roman use, and restricts it to Easter and Pentecost, except in cases of necessity. 6. Orders bishops to take care of disinherited orphans. 9. Orders canons to eat in common, and to sleep in the same dormitory. 11. Relates to the life of the monks. 13. To that of nuns. 22. Is directed against vagabond clerks. 23. Gives entire liberty to clerks and monks who have been forced to receive the tonsure. 28. Orders all priests at all times to wear the stole, to mark their sacerdotal character. 32. Defines the difference between the exomologesis and litania; the former it states to be solely for confession of sin, the latter to implore help and mercy. 33. Orders the observance of the great Litany by all Christians, barefooted, with ashes. 35. Confirms the 19th canon of Gangra on fasting. 36 and 37. Relate to holidays and Sundays. 43. Forbids mass to be said by a priest alone; for how can he say Dominus vobiscum, and other like things, when no one is present but himself? 47. Orders godparents to instruct their godchildren. 52. Forbids all interments within the Church except in the case of bishops, abbots, priests, or lay persons distinguished for holiness of life. 54. Forbids marriage within the fourth degree. 55. Forbids parents to stand as sponsors for their own children, and forbids marriages between sponsors and their godchildren, and the parents of their godchildren. 56. Declares that he who has married two sisters, and the woman who has married two brothers, or a father and son, shall be separated, and never be permitted to marry again (Conc. 7:1239).

(2.) The next council convened there about Oct. 1 847, by order of Louis of Germany, under Rabanus, archbishop of Mayence, assisted by twelve bishops, his suffragans, and several abbots, monks, priests, and others of the clergy, including the chorepiscopi. Thirty-one canons were published. The most important are: 2. Warning bishops to be assiduous in preaching the Word of God. 7. Leaving the disposition of Church property to the bishops, and asserting their power over the laity. 11. Forbidding to endow new oratories with the tithes or other property belonging to churches anciently founded, without the bishop's consent. 13. Relating to the life to be observed by clerks and monks; forbids joking, gaming, unsuitable ornaments, delicate living, excess in eating or drinking, unjust weights or measures, unlawful trades, etc. 14. Ordering all monks holding livings to attend the synods and give an account of themselves. 15. Forbidding the clergy to wear long hair, under pain of anathema. 30. Forbidding marriage within the fourth degree (Conc. 8:39).

(3.) The next important council was held at Mayence in 1225, by cardinal Conrad, legate of Honorius III. It is by some called “a synod of Germany.” Fourteen canons were published, which relate to the incontinence of the clergy, and simony. The sixth declares that excommunicated priests who dare to perform any clerical function while under excommunication shall be deposed both from their office and benefices, without hope of being ever restored; shall be treated as infamous, deprived of the power of leaving their property by will, and never again permitted to hold any kind of ecclesiastical benefice (Conc. 11:294).

(4.) Another very large body assembled in council at Mayence in 1549, called together by Sebastian Heusenstein, archbishop of Mayence, with the deputies of the bishops of his province and the principal of his clergy. Forty-seven canons were published concerning the faith, and fifty-seven canons of discipline. Among the first we find an exposition of the mystery of the sacred Trinity, according to the faith of the Church; it is further stated that man was created with righteousness and endued with grace, but that he was possessed of free-will; afterwards the fall of man and his justification are spoken of, and it is declared that this justification proceeds from the grace of God; that it is given before any merit; that this justification is given when man receives the Holy Spirit, with faith, hope, and charity, which gifts it declares to be inherent in him, and not merely imputed, so that man is not only accounted righteous, but is so in reality, yet not through his own merits, but by God's grace and righteousness  communicated to him; that the charity which justifies must be accompanied by good works, of which grace is the source and principle (canons 7 and 8). The council moreover, in the canons of faith, set forth the doctrine of the sacraments, and decided, against the heretics, that they are not bare ceremonies, but effectual signs of grace, which they are, by divine operation, the means of conveying to those who receive them worthily.

With regard to ceremonies, it is decreed that such ought to be retained as incite the people to meditate upon God; among these are reckoned the sacraments, churches, altars, images, holy vestments, banners, etc. As to images, the council decrees that the people should be taught that they are not set up to be worshipped, and that none ought to be set up in churches which are likely to inspire worldly and carnal thoughts rather than piety. Curates are also enjoined to remove the image of any saint to which the people flocked, as if attributing some sort of divinity to the image itself, or as supposing that God or the saints would perform what they prayed for by means of that particular image, and not otherwise. Afterwards the following matters are treated of: devout pilgrimages, worship of saints, prayer for the dead, and the law of fasting.

Among the fifty-six canons of discipline and morality, we find it ruled (by canon 61) that when the lesser festivals fall on a Sunday, they shall be kept on some day following or preceding; that apostate monks, upon their return to their duty, shall be kindly treated; that nuns shall not leave their convent without the bishop's permission; that preaching shall not be allowed, nor the holy sacraments administered, in chapels attached to private houses; that care shall be taken that all school-masters be sound Catholics, etc. Finally, it is declared that the council received the acts of the holy oecumenical councils, and yielded entire submission to the catholic, apostolic, Roman Church in all things (Conc. 14:667; Landon, Manual of Councils, s.v.).

## Mayer, Georg Karl Wilhelm[[@Headword:Mayer, Georg Karl Wilhelm]]

             a Roman Catholic theologian of Germany, was born in 1807 at Aschbach, Franconia. He received holy orders in 1837, was cathedral chaplain at Bamberg in 1838, in 1842 was appointed professor of theology at the lyceum, in 1862 member of the chapter, and died July 22, 1868. He wrote, Geist und Natur im speculativen Systeme Gunther's (Bamberg, 1842): — Der Mensch nach der Glaubenslehre der alten Kirche (1854, 5 volumes): — Commentar uber die Briefe des Johannes (Vienna, 1851): — Aechtheit des Evangeliums nach Johannes (ibid. 1854): — Die patriarchalischen Verheissungen und die messianischen Psalmen (Nordlingen, 1859): — Messianische Prophezeiungen (Vienna, 1863-66, 2 volumes). (B.P.)

## Mayer, Jacob[[@Headword:Mayer, Jacob]]

             an American minister of the German Reformed Church, was born in Lykens Valley, Dauphin Co., Pa., in 1793; was brought up in the Reformed Church, and early instructed in its doctrines. Preparatory to entering the ministry, he was for four years under the special tuition of Rev. Dr. Samuel Heiffenstein, of Philadelphia; was licensed to preach in September, 1822, at the synod held in Harrisburg, Pa.; was soon afterwards ordained, and took charge of the churches in Woodstock, Va., and vicinity. After three years  of labor he removed to the neighborhood of Shrewsbury, York Co., Pa., and there took charge of quite a number of congregations. In this field he labored eight years; then removed to Mercersburg, Franklin Co., Pa., and became pastor of the Church at that place, in connection with those at Greencastle and London in the same county. In 1836 he was appointed special agent of the theological seminary at Mercersburg; the next eight years of his active life were devoted to the work of procuring funds for the use of that institution and of Marshall Coliege, in Mercersburg, in the founding and establishing of both of which he was deeply interested. While engaged in this work his health failed, and he was obliged to relinquish the pastoral work, and attend to some secular pursuit in order to provide for himself and family a proper temporal support. He lived in this way, during different periods, at Chambersburg, Philadelphia, Columbia, and mainly at Lock Haven; in the last-named place he died, Oct. 29, 1872. “He suffered severely, especially during the last four years of his life, from lingering consumption, in the midst of which he manifested much Christian patience, especially during the closing portion of his earthly career.” See Reformed Church Messenger, Nov. 6,1872.

## Mayer, Johann[[@Headword:Mayer, Johann]]

             a German theologian, was born Aug. 2,1697, at Nuremberg; studied at the high-schools of his native place until 1717, when he went to the University of Altdorf to study theology. In 1720 he removed to the University of Halle, and there enjoyed the instruction of the celebrated German savants Wolf and Michaelis. He continued his studies until 1725, when he finally secured the position of catechist, first at an orphan asylum and later at a prison. In 1727 he was made vicar, and in 1728 morning preacher at St. Waldburg. The year following he became pastor at Schwinunbach and Wengen; in 1732 dean of Spitalch, Nuremberg; in 1738 was transferred to the Church of St. Laurence; in 1749 became senior of the chapter. He died Sept. 3, 1760. Mayer's productions are mostly of an ascetic character; at the time of their publication they secured him much popularity, especially his Epistolische Betrachtungen des Todes (Nuremb. 1741, 4to). He also published a number of his sermons. For further details of his works, see Doring, Gelehrte Theologie Deutschlands, vol. 2, s.v.

## Mayer, Johann C[[@Headword:Mayer, Johann C]]

             a Presbyterian minister, a German by birth. was born in Korb, Wurtemburg, May 4, 1835. He was educated at Basle, Switzerland, and attended the seminary at St. Christiana. He left his native land and settled in Texas, where he was licensed by the Lutheran Synod of Texas. On coming to New Orleans he organized a German Presbyterian Church, but died before he had been ordained pastor over it, Aug. 24, 1858. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1860, p. 76.

## Mayer, Johann Friedrich[[@Headword:Mayer, Johann Friedrich]]

             a German Lutheran minister, was born at Leipsic in 1650. He studied in the university of his native city, and became successively superintendent of Leissnig in 1673, of Grimma in 1679, professor of theology at Wittemberg in 1684, pastor of St. Joseph of Hamburg in 1686, professor of the gymnasium of that city in 1687, professor at the University of Kiel in 1688, professor and archchancellor at the University of Greifswald, and general superintendent of Pomerania and Rugen, in 1701. He died at Stettin in 1712. Mayer had taken a leading part in all the controversies of the time. Among his voluminous works we notice Bibliotheca Biblica, which treats of the most celebrated Jewish, Romish, Lutheran, and Calvinistic expositions of Scripture (best edition, Nostock, 1713): — Best Method of Studying Holy Scripture: — History of Martin Luther's German Version of the Bible: — An Account of the Moderns who have written against the Holy Scriptures: — An Exposition of the first two Psalms: — Tractatus de Osculo Redum Pontificis Romani: — De Fide Baronii et Bellarmini ipsis Pontificiis ambigua. See Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 9:209; Pierer, Universal- Lexikon, 11:35; Hook, Biog. Dict. 7:262. (J. N. P.)

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

             D.D., an English divine, flourished in the early part of the 17th century. But few memorials have been discovered to furnish any satisfactory account of his personal history. It appears from his prefaces that he labored under infirm health, which unfitted him for public services as a clergyman for many years. In 1634 he became minister of Reydon, in Suffolk. He published Theological Treatises and Commentaries on the English Catechism (Lond. 1621, 4to): — A Commentary on the Old and New Testaments (rare; 6 vols. fol., and 1 vol. 4to, 1631, ‘47, ‘52, ‘53). See  Allibone, Dict. Brit. and Amer. Authors, vol. 2, s.v.; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. vol. 2, s.v.

## Mayer, Lewis[[@Headword:Mayer, Lewis]]

             D.D., a noted American divine of that branch of the Christian Church denominated the German Reformed, was born at Lancaster, Pa., March 26, 1783. After having received a liberal education in his native place, he removed to Frederick, Md., where he devoted his attention for some time to a secular calling. He was fond of reading and study. Having become conscious of a call to the holy ministry, he pursued his theological studies with great zeal and success, under the direction of the Rev. Mr. Wagner, of Frederick, Md. He was licensed and ordained in 1807, and became pastor of a charge in Shepherdstown, Va., where he labored till 1821. In that year he was called as pastor to York, Pa. In 1825 he resigned his charge, having been called by the Synod of the German Reformed Church to assume the presidency of the theological seminary then established at Carlisle, Pa., and afterwards located at York, Pa. In this position he labored with great zeal till 1835. His health giving way he retired to private life, and lived in York, Pa. He devoted his remaining strength to the preparation of a History of the German Reformed Church, only the first volume of which, however, has been published. This volume is chiefly occupied with an account of the Reformation in Switzerland. His labors were brought down to 1770. Dr. Mayer published also a Treatise on the Sin against the Holy Ghost, and Lectures on Scripture Subjects. While professor of theology he also edited for some years the Magazine and the Messenger of the German Reformed Church. He died Aug. 25, 1849. See biographical sketch by the Rev. E. Heiner, prefaced to Dr. Mayer's History (Phila. 1850, 8vo, pp. 477).

## Mayer, Philip Frederick[[@Headword:Mayer, Philip Frederick]]

             D.D., a distinguished American Lutheran minister, was born April 1, 1781, in the city of New York, where he continued to reside till he reached his majority. His earlier years were spent at the German school attached to the Lutheran Church. His preparation for college was made under the direction of Mr. Campbell. He graduated with the first honors of his class at Columbia College, New York, in 1799, then under the administration of Dr. W. S. Johnson. He spent three years in the prosecution of his theological studies, under the instruction of the Rev. Dr. Kunze, one of the most learned men of his day. He was licensed to preach the Gospel in  1802, and soon after took charge of the Lutheran Church at Lunenburg (now Athens), N. Y. In 1806 he resigned this position, and accepted a call as pastor of St. John's (Lutheran) Church, Philadelphia. This was the first exclusively English Lutheran congregation formed in this country. To the discharge of his arduous duties Dr. Mayer devoted himself with conscientious fidelity and untiring zeal. He was unwearied in his efforts to promote the good of his own flock, as well as faithful and constant in his aims to advance the welfare of the whole community. He never withheld his influence from any object which met his deliberate and cordial approval. In 1808 he was associated with bishop White, Dr. Green, Dr. Rush, and others in the formation of the Pennsylvania Bible Society, the first institution of the kind organized in the United States, of which he continued to be an active and efficient manager, and was at the time of his death the presiding officer. He was also the senior member of the board of trustees of the University of Pennsylvania. He was the president of the board of managers of the Deaf and Dumb Asylum and of the Philadelphia Dispensary, and was actively connected with other eleemosynary institutions. Liberal and enlarged in his views, he was at some time identified, either as a patron or director, with every philanthropic enterprise of a catholic spirit in his adopted city. He retained his pastoral connection with the Church till his death, which occurred April 16,1858. Dr. Mayer was no ordinary man, or he could never have so successfully sustained himself for so long a period among the same people, and enjoyed in so eminent a degree the regard and confidence of the whole community. He was a man of clear intellect and quick perceptions, united with great delicacy of taste and keen discernment. He was a ripe scholar, thoroughly acquainted with the whole range of English literature, and in the department of Biblical Criticism having few superiors. He received his D.D. from Columbia College, New York, and the University of Pennsylvania. (M. L. S.)

## Mayerhoff, Ernst Theodor[[@Headword:Mayerhoff, Ernst Theodor]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Neuruppin, December 5, 1806, and died at Berlin in December, 1837, licentiate and private lecturer in theology. He published, Die Petrinischen Schriften (Hamburg, 1835): — Johann Reuchlin und seine Zeit (Berlin, 1830): — Die Waldenser in unsern Tagen (ibid. 1834): — Ansgarius oder der Anfangspunkt des Christenthums in Schweden (ibid. 1837; transl. from the Swedish of H. Reuterdahl): — Der Brief an die Colosser (published after the author's death by L. Mayerhoff, ibid. 1838). See Winer, Bandbuch der theol. Lit. 1:91, 578, 833; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2:863. (B.P.)

## Mayhew, Experience[[@Headword:Mayhew, Experience]]

             a noted American divine, for years actively engaged in missionary labors among the Indians, was born Jan. 27, 1673. His father, grandfather, and great-grandfather were all most successfully engaged as missionaries to the Indians before him. In March, 1694, about five years after the death of his father, he began to preach to the Indians, taking the oversight of five or six of their assemblies. The Indian language had been familiar to him from infancy, and he was employed by the commissioners of the Society for  Propagating the Gospel in New England to make a new version of the Psalms and John, which work he executed with great accuracy in 1709. He died Nov. 29. 1758, aged eighty-five. He published a sermon entitled All Mankind by Nature equally under Sin (1724): — Indian Converts (1727), in which he gives an account of the lives of thirty Indian ministers, and about eighty Indian men, women, and youth, worthy of remembrance on account of their piety: — Letter on the Lord's Supper (1741): — Grace Defended (1744), in which he contends that the offer of salvation made to sinners in the Gospel contains in it a conditional promise of the grace given in regeneration. In this he says he differs from most Calvinists; yet he supports the doctrines of original sin, of eternal decrees, and of the sovereignty of God in the salvation of man. His son Zechariah succeeded him in the missionary field, making five generations thus engaged. The age attained by the Mayhews is remarkable: the first, Thomas, died aged ninety; Experience, eighty-four; John, grandson of the first John, eighty- nine; his brother Jeremiah, eighty-five; Dr. Matthew, eighty-five; Zechariah, seventy-nine. — Indian Conv., Appendix, p. 306, 307; Chauncy's Remarks on Landaff's Sermon, p. 23; Cyclop. Rel. Knowledge, s.v.

## Mayhew, Jonathan[[@Headword:Mayhew, Jonathan]]

             D.D., a celebrated American divine, was born at Martha's Vinevard Oct. 8, 1720. He was a descendant of Thomas Mayhew, the first English settler of that island. In early childhood Jonathan gave indications of great vigor of mind and a strong will. He was fitted for college by his father, who was a very intelligent man. During his college course at Harvard he was distinguished not only as a fine classical scholar, but also for his skill in dialectics and his attainments in ethical science. He graduated with great honor in 1744. Three years later he received a call from West Church, in Boston, and continued in this station for the remainder of his life. On the day first appointed for his ordination only two clergymen of those invited were in attendance, owing, no doubt, to his extreme rationalism; and even these two refused to act, and a council, consisting of fourteen ministers, had to be convoked, June 17, after which the new candidate was duly installed in office. Mr. Mayhew's liberal opinions were so unpopular in Boston that he was for some time excluded from membership of the Boston Association of Congregational Ministers. In 1750 the degree of doctor of divinity was conferred upon him by the University of Aberdeen. His publications excited great attention not only in this country, but also in  England. In 1755 he published a volume of sermons on the Doctrine of Grace. At the close of one of these sermons there is a note on the doctrine of the Trinity, which was offensive alike to those who did and did not endorse his general views. Subsequently the doctor himself appears to have regretted having written it, and he unsuccessfully endeavored to prevent its being published in the London edition. Dr. Mayhew was at this time scribe of the Massachusetts Convention of Congregational Ministers. In 1763 the Rev. East Arthorp published a pamphlet entitled Considerations on the Institution and Conduct of the Society for Propagating the Gospel, occasioning a violent controversy, in which Dr. Mayhew bore a prominent part. Dr. Mayhew was extensively known throughout Great Britain, and numbered among his correspondents such men as Lardner, Benson, Kippis, Blackburn, and Hollis. He died July 9, 1766. Dr. Mayhew possessed a mind of great acuteness and energy, and in his principles was a determined republican. He had no little influence in producing the American Revolution. Among his best-known publications are the following: Seven Sermons (1749, 8vo): — A Discourse concerning Unlimited Submission and Non-resistance to the Higher Powers (1750, 8vo). See Mr. Bancroft's notice of this sermon, and his eloquent tribute to Mayhew, in his Hist. of the United States, 4:60-62: — Thanksgiving Sermon for the Repeal of the Stamp Act (1766): — Sermons to Young Men (1767, 2 vols. 12mo). See Memoir of the Life and Writings of the Rev. Jonathan Mayhew, by Alden Bradford (1838); Riche, Bibl. Amer. Nova, 1:140, 145, 153; Allibone, Dict. Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Sprague, Annals Amer. Pulpit, 7:22 sq.

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

             a Trinitarian Congregational minister, son of Thomas Mayhew, the governor of Martha's Vineyard, was born in Southampton, England, about 1621; emigrated with his father to New England in 1631; resided for a few years in Watertown, Mass.; and in 1642 assisted his father in establishing a settlement at Edgartown, Martha's Vineyard. Being deeply affected by the intellectual and moral degradation of the Indians, and possessing good natural talents, and a considerable knowledge of the Latin, Greek, and Hebrew languages, he determined to devote himself to preaching to the natives of the island. He soon acquired their language, commenced his pulpit ministrations in 1646, and labored among them so faithfully that in 1650 he had 100 converts, and in 1662, 282, among whom were eight pawams or priests. In 1657 he sailed for England to obtain aid from the  Society for the Propagation of the Gospel; but the ship in which he had taken passage was lost at sea, and never heard of. Cotton Mather says that “he was so affectionately esteemed by the Indians that many years afterwards he was seldom named without tears.” He wrote, in connection with John Eliot, Tears of Repentance, or a Narrative of the Progress of the Gospel among the Indians in New England. — Sprague, Annals American. Pulpit, 1:131; Drake, Dict. American Biography, s.v.

## Mayitri[[@Headword:Mayitri]]

             a future Buddha, who is destined to appear at the end of five thousand years from the death of Gotama Buddha, and will continue for ages to be the teacher of the human race.

## Maymbourg[[@Headword:Maymbourg]]

             SEE MAIMBURG.

## Mayne, James S[[@Headword:Mayne, James S]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Ravallagh, near Coleraine, Antrim County, Ireland, in 1825. He received a careful academic education in his native country, and in 1853 came to America; graduated at Princeton College with honor in 1857; studied divinity at the theological seminary at Princeton, N. J.; was licensed in 1859, and in 1860 commenced his labors at May's Landing, Atlantic City, and Absecon, N. J., where he died. Aug. 30, 1860. Mr. Mayne was a man noted for his consistent and devoted piety. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1862, p. 103.

## Mayne, Jasper[[@Headword:Mayne, Jasper]]

             an English divine and poet, was born in Devonshire in 1604. At the age of nineteen he entered Christ-church College, Oxford, and in 1631 secured the degree of M.A. He took holy orders, became a popular preacher, was presented by his college to two neighboring livings, and continued at the same time his residence in the university. He was made D.D. in 1646. At the time of Cromwell's usurpation, being firmly devoted to the cause of Charles I, he was deprived of his student's place, and soon lost both of his vicarages. His spirit, however, remained unbroken, and in 1652 we hear of his holding a public disputation with a noted Anabaptist preacher. Subsequently he resided, until the Restoration, as chaplain in the family of the earl of Devonshire; in 1660 he was restored again to his living, was made chaplain in ordinary to the king, a canon of Christ Church, and archdeacon of Chichester. He died in Oxford in 1672. Dr. Mayne published in 1662 a translation of a part of Lucian's Dialogues, also several sermons and scattered poems.

## Maynooth College[[@Headword:Maynooth College]]

             In consequence of the English Reformation, the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland lost all its rights and possessions. At the Synod of Dublin, in 1560, seventeen bishops out of nineteen endorsed the Act of Uniformity, and, upon the principle that “ubi episcopus ibi ecclesia,” the English Reformed Church was declared the only legal Church in Ireland. The Roman Catholics were therefore compelled to worship in private, and to get their priests educated abroad. With the assistance of foreign princes they established, during the years 1582-1688, a number of seminaries in Spain, Italy, and the Netherlands (namely, at Salamanca, Alcala, Lisbon, Evora, Dacay, Antwerp, Tournay, Lille, Rome, Prague, Caupranica, Toulouse, Bordeaux, Poitiers, Nantes, Bouley, and Paris). As most of the students were poor and dependent on the aristocracy of Ireland, a great attachment grew up between them and the class by whom they were patronized. But in consequence of the French Revolution intercourse between Ireland and the Continent became more difficult. The Irish colleges of France and Brabant were closed, and the necessity became apparent of establishing a seminary at home. The most opposite political parties agreed in supporting this measure: the aristocracy from fear that the young priests might imbibe democratic ideas abroad, and the democrats from the hope of gaining over to their views the priests, who had heretofore always sided with their patrons. The middle classes especially thought to find in home-bred priests useful auxiliaries to their emancipation.

When therefore the Roman Catholic prelates submitted to the lord lieutenant of Ireland their plan of establishing a college, he immediately gave his approval; the Irish Parliament, composed of Protestants, sanctioned it, voted an appropriation of £8000, and readily obtained the approbation of the Parliament of England in 1795. A board of trustees was organized, consisting of four Protestants, the Irish lord chancellor, three chief justices, six Roman Catholic laymen, and ten bishops. Dr. Hussey, who had been eminently active in organizing the whole affair, was elected president of the college. The whole care and management of the college was vested in this board of managers. The four Protestant members were changed every five years (being replaced by election of the other members), and, together with three Roman Catholics, fulfilled the duties of inspectors, yet without the power of interfering with either the doctrines or the discipline of the college. The most liberal among the Roman Catholics wished the college to be established at Dublin, the seat of the University, and where members of the  different denominations were already studying harmoniously together. But the Roman Catholic bishops opposed this, as they desired their priests to be educated under stricter discipline. The board of managers therefore chose the village of Maynooth, eleven miles from Dublin, and commenced building a seminary for fifty students on, a piece of land purchased from the duke of Leinster.

When the Irish Parliament was incorporated with the English, in 1801, an appropriation was made for the College of Maynooth amounting to some £8000 a year for the next twenty years. In 1808 some £13,000 more was voted for the purpose of enlarging the seminary, as it was inadequate to educating the number of priests required. Indeed in that year there were 478 obliged to study abroad, chiefly in France, while there were only 200 to 250 attending at Maynooth. The seminary continued a long time without attracting much attention; even the report of the board of trustees, presented in 1826 to Parliament, did not throw much light on the real character of the institution; in fact, the true state of things was rather covered up than revealed in that document. But when O'Connell's agitation broke out, it became apparent that its principal champions were priests educated in Maynooth College. It was also found that the alumni of Maynooth took an active part in the Roman Catholic emancipation in 1829 by unfairly influencing the elections.

The seminary, instituted for the purpose of suppressing democratic ideas, seems thus to have become a center of political as well as religious agitation. But the interior workings of the institution remained hidden from the public gaze until a zealous Protestant minister, M'Ghee, procured the theological text-book of Peter Dens, used at Maynooth, which was published to the extent of three thousand copies in 1804; another edition of the same number appeared in 1832. This work, which breathes to the utmost the Roman Catholic spirit of aggression and persecution, and upholds the most offensive doctrines of that Church, was considered there as the highest authority, and gives a striking contradiction to the statement so often made by interested parties that the Roman Catholicism of the 19th century is animated by an entirely different spirit from that of former times. These revelations provoked much opposition to Romanism, and a growing desire to abrogate the privileges of the Romanists. June 28,1835, a great meeting was held at Exeter Hall, which was followed by others in various cities of England and Scotland. It was proved that the Romish Church still displayed the same zeal for the destruction of heretics, still claimed to relieve from oaths, retained auricular confession, with all its attendant evils, and all from unequivocal passages in the aforesaid textbook. Numberless pamphlets were published  on this occasion; Protestant associations were formed in Ireland to defend evangelical freedom, and chief among these were found the Orangemen. The old hatred between the Roman Catholics and the Protestants was thus revived, and trouble with Ireland seemed imminent. On the side of the Romish Church the “liberator of Ireland” gained crowds to his party by his eloquence and his fiery denunciations of the English; his attitude became so threatening that the government was obliged to prosecute him for high- treason.

This repressed the rebellion in its very infancy, but at the same time embittered the feelings of the Roman Catholic population. Previous experience for seven centuries had shown that persecution could indeed weaken, and almost destroy, but never conquer Ireland; and this was still more the case with regard to their Church, which the Roman Catholic Irish clung to the more as it was weaker and more oppressed. There remained nothing but to try whether kindness would succeed where harshness had failed. The occasion was favorable, the insurrection was suppressed, and, if the victors met the vanquished as friends, much might be gained. This Irish question proved almost insolvable to the English government. Cabinet after cabinet were wrecked upon it, without arriving at any result. And this is not to be wondered at, for the civil as well as religious relations in Ireland had for a long time been in so abnormal a state that all attempts at reform seemed either inefficient or dangerous. Every effort to improve the condition of the peasantry was met by the opposition of the landed aristocracy, while every assistance rendered to the weak and oppressed, but de facto national Church of Ireland, exasperated the Protestant element of the population. The passage of any bill concerning Ireland was a most complicated piece of politics. But, said an Irish paper, “Protestantism is not as powerful as landed property, and religion must give way before ground- rents.” Without attributing such views — as was often done — to the British government, for attempts at conciliation were made from religious motives, it would appear that Sir Robert Peel inclined to this theory when, in 1845, he presented the Maynooth Bill to Parliament. Indeed for the last fifty years Parliament had been voting an annual appropriation of over £8000 for the education of Roman Catholic priests, the preceding year the Charitable Bequest Bill had been passed almost unanimously, and the Roman Catholic prelates had assured Peel that the passage of his new bill would be thankfully received by the Roman Catholics as a pledge of reconciliation. But hardly had the bill been presented to the House of Commons when a storm of opposition arose. The Protestants of the various denominations united to denounce it, and to petition against a bill  which would modify the Protestant character of the administration.

A large meeting, chiefly of Dissenters, was held at Exeter Hall, March 18, 1845, and a Central Anti-Maynooth Committee organized to oppose the bill, and to overwhelm the Parliament with petitions. On April 3 Peel presented the bill to the House of Commons. He attempted to prove that there were but three ways of acting: to maintain things as they were, to suppress the usual appropriation, or to increase it. The first he declared impracticable, as so insufficient a sum for the purpose could not gain much gratitude for the donors; the second, he said, was still less advisable, as the withdrawal of assistance to which they had been accustomed for fifty years would not fail to exasperate the Irish; but the third he looked upon as a certain remedy. He therefore proposed to raise the yearly appropriation for Maynooth to £26,000, making it a part of the regular budget, and thus transforming the grant into a dotation; he moreover proposed to incorporate the board of trustees, and to vote a special grant of £30,000 for building purposes. Besides, the existing ex officio inspectors were to be replaced by five inspectors appointed by the crown, who, however, would leave the control of the doctrines and discipline to the three Roman Catholic inspectors. The opposition was headed by Sir R. Inglis. He attacked the bill on religious ground, as opposed to Protestant principles. He did not mean to withdraw the usual appropriation, but wanted Roman Catholics, like Dissenters, to educate their ministers at their own expense. All those opposed to the Established Church sided with him. The bill received 216 votes against 114 at the first reading. This, however, was but the prelude. At the second reading the struggle commenced in earnest, and lasted through six sittings. They first argued about the new principle, which converted a yearly grant into a dotation, for this gave to the previously ignored Roman Catholic Church a legal existence and official recognition. The friends of the bill sought to defend this principle in various ways. Some claimed that it was the duty of the Parliament to care for Maynooth, either because, by uniting with itself the Irish Parliament, it had assumed its charges, or as a sort of restitution for the former possessions of which the Church of Rome had been deprived.

Yet the assumption of the liabilities of the Irish Parliament did not guarantee the continuance of the grant longer than twenty years more, and, on the other hand, calling £26,000 a restitution, when the yearly income from the confiscated Church property amounted to over £600,000, sounded like bitter mockery. Others preferred to take the broader ground of moral obligation, claiming that it was necessary to aid oppressed and impoverished Ireland. Others again, leaving the past to consider only the  future, argued from the political point of view. They hoped that this conciliatory measure, and the better education of the priests, would open a new aera to Ireland. None of these views satisfied Gladstone, who, after criticizing them all, finally arrived at the negative principle that the support granted to Maynooth should only be withdrawn at the last extremity, as it would have the worst consequences on the relation existing between England and Ireland. Some even sought to treat it as a mere educational question. Still the majority could not blind themselves to the fact that it really involved the weighty and difficult question of the relation between the English government and the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland. The opponents of the bill had an easier task. They could readily attack it from an abstract religious stand-point. They divided themselves, however, into two great sections, according to the ground they took. The Churchmen and some of the Dissenters did not oppose the continuation of the former support, but its increase; the Dissenters, as a body, opposed this, like all other government support towards churches. Both parties clamored loudly against the abuses of the Church of Rome, its political as well as religious tendencies, and particularly the Jesuitical spirit inculcated at Maynooth.

Yet Parliament perceived that something must be done to allay the hostile feelings in Ireland, and the bill passed the second reading with 323 votes against 176. After another protracted and severe struggle, it received at the third reading 317 votes against 189. The discussion of the bill in the House of Lords was a repetition of that in the House of Commons. The most eminent jurists decided in favor of the bill. Brougham established a precedent in bringing forward a previous act in which the principle of dotation was clearly expressed. On the bench of bishops, six voted in favor of the bill; among them the archbishop of Armagh and the bishops of Norwich and St. David. The bill finally went through with 181 votes against 50, and received the royal sanction on June 30, 1845. While the bill was under discussion in Parliament, the opposition outside was very active. A large meeting was held on April 13 at Covent Garden, in which both Churchmen and Dissenters took part. Other meetings were also held in the principal cities. The Dissenters were especially active. Churchmen and Dissenters asserted as the ground of their opposition: 1, that by increasing the grant to the seminary, the papacy would be legally recognized in Ireland; 2, that the practice of employing government funds for the support of religion is wrong in principle; 3, that there were special objections to the bill under consideration, namely, the Jesuitical tendencies of Maynooth, the danger of the influence over the masses of a more thoroughly-educated  clergy, the evil of binding the clergy to the support of the government, leading them to oppose the progressive social tendencies of the people; and, finally, the spirit of aggression inherent to the papacy. Some of the Dissenters, however, found this platform too indefinite; they wanted the bill rejected wholly on and-State-Church principles, and on May 2 formed a special committee at Salter's Hall, distinct from the original Central Anti- Maynooth Committee. On May 20 they held a meeting at Crosby Hall, in which 300 ministers and 400 laymen (principally Baptists, Presbyterians, Independents, and Calvinistic and Arminian Methodists of the new Connection) took part.

They urged the Roman Catholics to decline the assistance of the Government to their Church for their own sake and that of their religion. Sir Culling Eardley, president of the Central Committee, spoke in a quite different tone in a letter to O'Connell. He accused the Roman Catholic leader of inconsistency if he accepted the new grant, and threatened to use every means in his power to gain his end. An Anti- Maynooth Committee was also organized at Dublin, and in a meeting held on June 5 an address to the House of Lords was drawn up, which received 3627 signatures, and also a petition to the queen. On the whole there were some 10.000 petitions drawn up against the bill, which received about 1,130,000 signatures. The government, however, remained unmoved, and the excitement gradually subsided. It was thought that now the Roman Catholic party would rest satisfied, and be truly reconciled; yet at one of the very first synods held by them the royal colleges were excommunicated and the national school condemned. The Roman Catholic prelates in Ireland — Cullen, Slatery, and M'Hale — had already attracted considerable attention by their Ultramontane views, but at this last outrage the old opposition spirit kindled again into a flame. Spooner provoked a visitation of Maynooth College by a bill he proposed May 11, 1852. Yet more moderate advice prevailed: it was claimed that the papal aggression in no wise affected Ireland, but rather England, and that the most Ultramontane among the Irish prelates, Cullen, was educated at Rome, not at Maynooth. Spooner finally withdrew his motion. Yet every year, for some time after, the proposition of stopping the appropriation was renewed; and was not dropped until quiet had been fully restored in Ireland, and general harmony re-established.

The agitation of the Irish population in late years, provoked, no doubt, in a great measure in Ireland, as in Poland, by the immaculate emissaries of the pontiff of Rome, has led the government of England to consider the  propriety of granting the three millions of Irish Romanists such liberty in worship and education as should make them as fit subjects as the other twenty millions of the northern isles who enjoy the protection of the British crown, and worthy associates of their English-speaking neighbors. In 1868 Mr. Gladstone, whose very earliest work had been “marked by a plain inclination to elevate the Church above the State,” and who, in the very maiden-days of his political career, had “exhibited an unfailing tenderness for the whims, the complaints, and the growing claims of his friends the papal prelates,” was called to the premiership of Great Britain, to establish, if possible, perfect accord between the English and Irish people. Almost the sole aim of the policy which the new premier inaugurated was the conciliation of the Romanists of Ireland. For this one purpose he has labored uninterruptedly. No sooner had he succeeded Mr. Disraeli than he urged the disestablishment of the Church of England principles as the ecclesiastical principles of Ireland. His success in this attempt is now a matter of history. SEE IRELAND.

Flattered by the easy victory gained in his first effort, Mr. Gladstone followed it by a proposal for the establishment of compulsory education and denominational schools. Herein, also, he succeeded, but only measurably. Encouraged by these repeated successes, he has lately come forward with a scheme which only a few days ago (February, 1873) threatened his ruin, and even now holds him in suspense. His new scheme now on foot is a proposition to dismantle Trinity College, long the eyesore of Romanists, and to found an immense educational establishment, called the Irish University, in which Catholics shall study only their own history and philosophy, Protestants a different series, and which shall be endowed with a vast revenue from the spoliation of Trinity and the wrecks of the Established Church. Both Dissenters and Conformists are alarmed at the step Mr. Gladstone stems determined upon. Even Romanists disfavor the proposal, for of the three or four millions of Catholic Irish it is probable that not one third of suitable age can read and write. The greatest opposition, however, has come from Rome, and suddenly the premier of Great Britain finds himself confronted by those whom he had always had reason to look upon as his chief supporters. Well has it lately been said that “the policy of Rome knows neither friendship nor gratitude; to serve ‘the Church' it strikes indiscriminately at its friends or foes; and the British statesman has shown himself no match for the Italian priests, who have preyed upon his eminent renown, and would now, perhaps, exult over his fall. They throw him aside as the instrument they can no longer use, and demand that Ireland shall be ruled and educated by  Catholics alone. With mediaeval mummeries they have dedicated the island to ‘the sacred heart of Jesus,' and plainly intend nothing less than the total subjugation of its Protestant population to a priestly despotism.” The endowment of Maynooth, and later the establishment of the queen's colleges, and even the open doors of Trinity, cannot and will not pacify Rome. She seeks control of Ireland both in Church and State; and so long as the papacy shall remain tainted by a zest for temporal power, both England and Prussia will find defilement and abasement, aye, not unfrequently rebellion in the ranks of those of her subjects who claim fidelity to the hierarchy. The last days certainly are teaching even the most liberal-minded politicians that the Church of Rome is built upon a foundation which is political as well as ecclesiastical, and that the severe measures, as inaugurated by Bismark, will alone save the Protestant world from ruin and decay.

## Mayo, Daniel[[@Headword:Mayo, Daniel]]

             a Presbyterian divine of some note, was born in London or vicinity in 1672. He was educated first at home, then went abroad and studied for some time in Holland under Witsius. On his return to England he preached successively at Tothill Fields, Westminster, at Kingston-upon-Thames, and at Hackney, and finally settled permanently at Silver Street, London, where he died in 1733. Mr. Mayo was a man of considerable talents, great zeal and activity, combined with prudence. Besides publishing many sermons, he wrote, in continuation of Henry's Exposition, a Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Brown, Cyclop. of Religious Knowledge, s.v.

## Mayotta[[@Headword:Mayotta]]

             one of the Comoro Isles (in the Indian Ocean), since 1843 under the control of the French, is situated in latitude 12° 34'-13° 4' S., and longitude 440 59' 15”-45° 23' E., covering some twenty-one miles from north to south, with an average breadth of six or seven miles; if, however, the dangerous coral reefs which surround the island be included, the whole occupies a space of thirty miles north and south, and twenty-four miles east and west, and contains a population of about 8000, mostly Romanists. The surface of this isle is very uneven, and is studded with volcanic-looking peaks, some of which exceed 2000 feet in height. Its shores are in some places lined with mangrove swamps, which are uncovered at low water,  and are productive of malaria and fever; it is in most parts capable of cultivation, prominently that of sugar, the only article exported. The French themselves live mainly on the island of Gaondzi, inside the chain of reefs on the east side of Mayotta. A governor and colonial officer are residents, and some 100 French soldiers, besides some natives, were stationed there. The Roman Catholic Church alone has a hold here.

## Mayow, Robert Wynell[[@Headword:Mayow, Robert Wynell]]

             an English divine, was born at Saltash, in the latter half of the 17th century (1777); was educated at Exeter College, Oxford; and, after serving several curacies in succession, removed to Ardwick, near Manchester, but there he died, only three months after removal, in 1817. Mr. Mayow is highly spoken of as a pulpit orator. A noted English writer has compared him with Sterne for his great humor and strong feeling, which the two possessed in common. He published Plain Preaching, or Sermons for the Poor and for People of all Ranks (Lond. 1816, 12mo):— Sermons and Miscellaneous Pieces, to which is prefixed a Memoir of his Life (1822, 12mo). — Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth. s.v.

## Mayr, Beda[[@Headword:Mayr, Beda]]

             a Benedictine monk, was born at Duitingen, in Bavaria, in 1742. He entered the cloister at Donauworth in his twentieth year. Finely cultured, and classed with the best talent of his day, he sought relief from the dullness of convent life by teaching mathematics, poetry, rhetoric, philosophy, canon law, and theology. He was charged with being liberal to excess, and was both feared and distrusted by the clergy of the Roman Catholic Church. His principal work, Defence of the Natural, Christian, and Catholic Religion, according to the Necessities of our Time, was published at Augsburg in 1787, and is still mentioned. He died April 28, 1794. A list of his works is given by Doring, Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands, vol. ii, s.v.; see also Wetzer und Welte, Kirchen-Lexikon, 6:953. (G. M.)

## Mayr, Colestin[[@Headword:Mayr, Colestin]]

             a German theologian, was born April 21, 1679, at Donauworth. In 1698 he entered the Benedictine Order at Augsburg; later he became a student at the University of Salzburg, where in 1711 he was appointed professor of philosophy. In 1713 he obtained the professorship of polemical theology,  and the inspection of the Salzburg schools. About this time he was made doctor of divinity. In 1714 he was appointed ecclesiastical counselor of the duke of Salzburg, and at the same time became professor of scholastic theology. In 1716 he was appointed vice-rector of the university, in 1719 pro-chancellor, and in 1728 chief rector. In 1731 he retired from academic life, and thereafter held an official relation to the cloister Linzheim, in Neuburg, where he died, March 19, 1753. Mayr enjoyed great prominence as a writer of theology, but his productions have never been collected in book form. They consist mainly of dissertations and contributions to different journals. For a list of his writings, see Doring, Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands, vol. ii, s.v.

## Mayronius, Francois[[@Headword:Mayronius, Francois]]

             a Franciscan, and doctor of the Sorbonne, styled doctor illuminatus, who died in 1325, is the author of, Commentarii in Genesin: — De Articulis Fidei: — Compendium Librorum S. Augustiniae Civitate Dei: — Comment. in Augustini Librum Confessionum: — Comment. in Dionysium Areopagifam, de Mystica Theologia: —1510 Questiones de Variis Locis Sacre Scripture et Dubiis Theologicis: — Comment. in. Orationemn Doninican, etc. See Gaddius, De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexiaon, s.v. (B.P.).

## Maysart[[@Headword:Maysart]]

             SEE MEYSART.

## Mazarin, Jules[[@Headword:Mazarin, Jules]]

             (properly Guilio Mazzarino), cardinal, the celebrated prime-minister of king Louis XIV of France, the successor of cardinal Richelieu, and inaugurator of a reign noted for attainments in arms, language. fine arts, literature, industry, and a superior degree of splendor, was born of a noble Sicilian family July 14,1602, most probably at Piscina, near the lake of Celano, in Abruzzo Citra, though in the letters of naturalization granted him in France in 1639 it is stated that he was born at Rome. It is certain, however, that he received his education at the Eternal City, and hence, no doubt, the mistake as to his native place. In 1619 Mazarin went to Spain to pursue the study of jurisprudence, probably intending to enter the legal profession, but, returning to Rome in 1622, a little later he entered the military service, and was given a captain's commission in 1625. Soon after this he entered the service of the Church, and was employed as companion of the papal legate to France, and in this mission displayed great political talents. In the difficulties arising out of the contested succession to the duchy of Mantua, in which France supported the pretensions of the count De Nevers, while the emperor of Germany, the king of Spain, and the duke of Savoy supported those of the duke of Guastalla. Mazarin was sent by pope Urban to Turin as the assistant of cardinal Sacchetti. The latter at once perceived his talent, gave him his entire confidence, and in fact devolved upon him the entire management of the negotiation. It was not immediately successful, for in 1629 Louis XIII in person invaded Savoy,  took Suza, and forced the duke of Savoy to abandon his alliance with Spain. Finally Sacchetti returned to Rome, leaving Mazarin, with the title of “internuncio,” to continue the negotiations.

Cardinal Barberini, the pope's nephew, returned in Sacchetti's stead, and Barberini found Mazarin as indispensable as had his predecessor. Mazarin labored unceasingly to restore peace. He visited the contending powers; in 1630 he saw Louis XIII and cardinal Richelieu, who both formed a high opinion of him, and in 1631 he finally succeeded in effecting the treaty of Cherasco, by which peace was restored. Mazarin at this time displayed considerable trickery in favor of France. and by this unfair partiality acquired the hatred of the courts of Spain and Germany, but the thanks of Louis and Richelieu, who recommended “the able negotiator” to the favor of the pope. Shortly after he was to receive at the hands of the French cardinal and prime-minister the reward due for his great services to Louis XIII. In 1634 he was named vice-legate to Avignon, but was sent to Paris as nuncio to intercede with Louis XIII in favor of the duke of Lorraine, whose duchy the king of the French had taken possession of. Mazarin, now unequivocally drawn towards Richelieu, of course failed to accomplish the task assigned him by the holy father. Mazarin returned to Rome in 1636 as the avowed supporter of French interests, and, on the death of Richelieu's celebrated confidant, father Joseph, pope Urban was solicited by Louis XIII and his minister to bestow upon Mazarin the cardinal's hat promised for father Joseph, but, as Urban refused, Mazarin in 1639 quitted Italy for France, and there entered the service of the king as a naturalized Frenchman. In 1640 he was nominated ambassador to Savov, where, after a short war, he was enabled to restore peace, and in 1641 he was at length raised to the rank of cardinal, through the persistent efforts of his friend the cardinal and prime-minister of France. Mazarin, in France, was a faithful and useful assistant to Richelieu, especially during the famous conspiracy headed by Henri de Cinq-Mars, which ended by his execution in September, 1642. This was Richelieu's last triumph. In the following December he died, recommending on his death-bed that Louis should receive Mazarin as his own successor, and Louis, sufficiently predisposed in Mazarin's favor, gladly acceded to the last wish of his faithful friend and counselor.

In 1643 Louis XIII himself died, and Alazarin's position became one of great difficulty amid the intrigues, jealousies, and strifes of the courtiers surrounding Louis XIV in his minority. By the will of the late king he had been declared the sole adviser of the queen-regent, Anne of Austria, but the latter assumed a decidedly hostile attitude towards the cardinal, and it  was some time before he succeeded in acquiring the principal power in the government, as well as the confidence of the queen-regent. He used his power at first with moderation, and courted popularity by gracious and affable manners. He prosecuted the war against Spain which began under his predecessor, and in which Conde and Turenne maintained the honor of the French arms. A dispute which arose between the court and the Parliament of Paris, regarding the registration of edicts of taxation, was fomented by cardinal De Reiz into the revolt of the Parisians called “the Day of the Barricades” (Aug. 27, 1648), and was followed by the civil war of the Fronde.

The court was forced to retire to St. Germain, and Mazarin was outlawed by Parliament; but, by the truce of Ruel, he still remained minister. The feeling against him, however, became still more inflamed when, at his instigation, the queen-regent caused the princes of Conde and Conti and the duke of Longueville to be arrested in January, 1650. Mazarin went in person at the head of the court troops to the insurgent provinces, and, after the victory at Rethel, showed so much insolence that the nobles and the people of the capital made common cause against him. He found it necessary to secure his safety by flight to the Netherlands. The press teemed with violent publications against Mazarin, known as Mazarinades (collected by Morean in the Bibliographie des Mazarinades [Paris, 1850- 51, 3 vols. 8vo]; a selection of them was also published by Moreau under the title Choix des Mazarinades [ibid. 1854, 2 ols. 8vo]). After the rebellion of the prince of Conde he ventured to return to France; but Paris makings his removal a condition of its submission, he retired again from the court, and it was not till Feb. 3, 1653 that he made a triumphant entry into the capital, where he was received with significant silence. Yet after a time the skill, patience, and perseverance of Mazarin triumphed, and he regained his former popularity and acquired his former power. See here article Lorus XIV, p. 526, Colossians 1. After governing France with great ability, and just as Louis XIV was arriving at an age when he felt the capacity and desire to sway the scepter himself; Mazarin died, March 9, 1661. In 1690 some letters, written by Mazarin during the negotiation of the peace of the Pyrenees, were published; additional letters were published in 1693, and in 1745 others were added, and the whole arranged under the title of Lettres du Cardinal Mazarin, ou l'on voit le secret de negotiation de la Pai dedes Pyrenees. “They were written for the information and instruction of the young king, and form useful examples of clearness and precision in diplomatic writings.”

His person was remarkably handsome, and his manners fascinating, and from an opponent he turned Anne of Austria, the  queen-regent during Louis XIV's minority, into his friend, if not secretly affianced companion, as has been asserted with much appearance of truth. “Mazarin,” says Mignet (Memoires relatifs la succession d'Espagne), “had a far-seeing and inventive mind, a character rather supple than feeble. His device was ‘Le Temps et moi.”' Under his administration the influence of France among the nations was increased, and in the internal government of the country those principles of despotism were established on which Louis XIV afterwards acted. The administration of justice, however, became very corrupt, and the commerce and finances of the country sank into deep depression. It is admitted that as a financial administrator he was far inferior to Richelieu. Mazarin was very niggardly and very avaricious, and had acquired in various ways, fair and foul, an immense fortune, amounting to 12,000,000 lives, which he offered to the king shortly before he died; afraid, it is thought, that it might be rudely seized from his heirs. Louis declined the restitution, which was perhaps what the wily minister expected. In his will Mazarin made many and large bequests to students and literary enterprises; indeed, he had always proved himself the friend and patron of learning. The College Mazarin was founded at his wish, to receive students from the provinces acquired by the “peace of the Pyrenees,” and to this same institution he presented his library, of immense value and size. See the Memoir's of Mazarin's contemporaries, Retz, Madame Motteville, La Rochefoucault, Turenne, Grammont, etc.; Mmle. de Longueville, etc., by Victor Cousin; Aubery, Histoire du Cardinal Maszarin (1751); Capefigue, Richelieu, Milazarin, la Froide et la sregne lde Louis XIV (Paris, 1835,8 vols. 8vo); Saint-Aulaire, Histoire de la Fronde; Bazin, Histoire de France sous le Ministere du Cardinal Mazarin (Paris, 1842, 2 vols. 8vo); Voltaire, Siecle de Louis XIV; Gualdo-Priorato. Vita del Cardinal Mazarin (1662); John Calvert, Life of Cardinal Mazarin (1670); Sismondi, Histoire des Fmrsangais; Grammont, Memoires; V. Cousin, La Jeunesse de Mazarin; Hoefer, Nouv. Bio. Generale; Chambers, Cyclop. s.v.; English Cyclop s.v.; Fraser's Magazine, November, 1831, and February, 1832.

## Mazdak (Or Mazdek)[[@Headword:Mazdak (Or Mazdek)]]

             a Persian religious enthusiast, flourished towards the close of the 5th century (he is believed to have been born about A.D. 470). He professed to be a prophet, and, securing many followers, declared for a community of property. Gaining in strength among the people, he found favor finally also in the eyes of his ruler, king Kobhad, and the system of communism was  adopted, effecting great changes in the social order. The revolution, however, lasted only a short time, and gradually the old order of things was restored.

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

             a leader of the French Camisards, was born at Saint-Jean-du-Gard some time about the middle of the 17th century. After the insurrection of the Cevennes in 1702 he was imprisoned, but, escaping from his captors, he determined to bring the people to a more determined stand, and while engaged in this work was killed in a skirmish near Uzes in 1710. See Court, Histoire des Camisards. SEE CAMISARDS.

## Mazitias[[@Headword:Mazitias]]

             (Μαζιτίας v. r. Ζειτίας), given by erroneous Graecism (1Es 9:35) in place of the Hebrew MATTATHIAH (Ezr 10:43).

## Mazolini, Silvestio[[@Headword:Mazolini, Silvestio]]

             an Italian theologian, is usually known by the surname Prierias (after the name of his birthplace, Prierio). SEE PRIERIAS.

## Mazor[[@Headword:Mazor]]

             (Heb. Matsor', מָצוֹר), a name occurring only in the original, and which the traslators of the A. V. (“besieged places,” 2Ki 19:24; Isa 37:25; “fortified cities,” Mic 7:12; “defense,” Isa 19:6) have confounded with a word of the same form signifying a fortress (as in Psa 31:22; Hab 2:1, etc.). Gesenius, however (Thesaur. Heb. p. 815), regards it as a title of Egypt, and apparently Lower Egypt, as, in three out of the four passages where it occurs, it is in the phrase יְאֹרֵי מָצוֹר, the streams or canals of Egypt, i.e. the branches of the Nile (Isa 19:6; Isa 37:25; 2Ki 19:24); and that it comes from the Egpytian word meduro, a kingdom; perhaps the sing. of the dual form Mizriailum, מִצְרִיַםq. d. double Egypt (comp. Josephus, Ant. 1:6, 2). Others (see Bochart, Phaleag, 4:24), as probably the Hebrews themselves, considered Egypt to be so called as being strongly fortified (see Died. Sic. 1:31). SEE EGYPT; SEE FORTRESS.

## Mazzaroth[[@Headword:Mazzaroth]]

             (Heb. Mazzaroth', מִזָּרוֹתa word found only in the plural, and occurring but once, Job 38:32, probably by an interchange of liquids foi מִזָּלוֹת“planets,” 2Ki 23:5), an astronomical term, probably meaning the twelve signs of the Zodiac (see Hirzel, Delitzsch, and Conant, severally, ad loc.). SEE ASTRONOMY. “The Peshito-Syriac renders it by ioallto, the Wain, or Great Bear; and J. D. Michaelis (Suppls. d Lex. Heb. No. 1391) is followed by Ewald in applying it to the stars of the northern crown (Ewald adds the southern), deriving the word from ‘ נֵזֶר, ne-zer, a crown. Furst (Handw. s.v.) understands by Mazzaroth the planet Jupiter, the same as the star of Amo 5:26. But the interpretation given in the margin of our version is supported by the authority of Gesenius (Thes. p. 869). On referring to 2Ki 23:5, we find the word מִזָּלוֹת, mazzacloth (A.V. the planets), differing only from mazzaroth in having the liquid l for r, and rendered in the margin ‘the twelve signs,' as in the Vulgate. The Sept. there also has μαζουρώθ, which points to the same reading in both passages, and is by Suidas explained as the ‘Zodiac,' but by Procopius of Gaza as probably ‘Lucifer, the morning star,' following the Vulgate of Job 38:32. In later Jewish writings mazzaloth are the signs of the Zodiac, and the singular, mazzal, is used to denote the single signs as well as the planets, and also the influence which they were believed to exercise upon human destiny (Selden, De Dis Syr. Synt. 1:c. 1). In consequence of this, Jarchi, and the Hebrew commentators generally, identify mazzaroth and mazzaloth, though their interpretations vary. Aben Ezra understands ‘stars' generally; but R. Levi ben-Gershon, ‘a northern constellation.' Gesenius himself is in favor of regarding mazzaroth as the older form, signifying strictly ‘premonitions,' and in the concrete sense, ‘stars that give warnings or presages,' from the usage of the root נָזִר, nazar, in Arabic. He deciphered, as he believed, the same words on some Cilician coins in the inscription מזרן זן על, which he renders as a prayer, ‘may thy pure star (shine) over (us)' (Mon. Phoen. p. 279, tab. 36).”

## Mazzocchi (Or Mazzoccolo), Alessio Simmmacho[[@Headword:Mazzocchi (Or Mazzoccolo), Alessio Simmmacho]]

             an Italian antiquary and Orientalist, was born at Santa Maria di Capua in 1684, and afterwards flourished as professor of Greek and Hebrew at Naples. He died in 1771. Mazzocchi was celebrated for his learning far beyond the borders of his native land. His many treatises (written in Latin  and Italian) were elaborate and scholarly dissertations upon various subjects. The Paris Academy of Inscriptions recognized his services to the world by making him a member of its body. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Mazzola (or Mazzuola), Girolamo Francesco Malia[[@Headword:Mazzola (or Mazzuola), Girolamo Francesco Malia]]

             an eminent Italian painter, surnamed Il Parmigiano, the Parmesan, was born at Parma in 1503. He visited Rome in 1523, and was employed by Clement VII to execute a number of works in that city. His style, formed on that of Correggio and Kaphael, is characterized by exceeding grace and delicacy of form and softness of coloring. It was said by Mazzola's admirers that “the spirit of Raphael had passed into him.” Mazzola was the first Italian artist who engraved with aqua fortis. He died in 1540. Among his masterpieces are the Madonna a della Rosa, in the gallery of Dresden; an Annunciation, in the principal church of Viadana; the Madonna with St. Margaret, St. Jerome, etc., in the Museum at Bologna; the Madonna dello Lunyo Collo, at Florence; and the Vision of St. Jerome, in the National Gallery, London. See Vasari, Lives of the Painters; Affo, Vita di F. Mazzola (1784); Mrs. Jameson, Memoirs of Early Italian Painters; Bellini, Cenni intorno alla Vita ed alle Opere di I. Mazzola (1844); Mortara, Memoria della Vita di F. Mazzuola (1846).Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, vol. 34, s.v.

## Mazzola, Girolamo Bedolo[[@Headword:Mazzola, Girolamo Bedolo]]

             an Italian painter, pronounced the most distinguished pupil of Parmigiano, was born near Parma in 1503, and died about 1580. He excelled as colorist and in perspective. Among his most valuable productions are those falling within the domain of sacred art. The most worthy of notice are his Madonna with St. Catharine and Miracle of the Multiplication of the Loaves. See Vasari, Lives of the Painters; Hoefer. Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## McAll, Robert Stephens, LL.D[[@Headword:McAll, Robert Stephens, LL.D]]

             an English Congregational minister, was born at Plymouth, August 2, 1792. He was educated at Hoxton Academy and at the University of Edinburgh, studying medicine chiefly. At the age of twenty-one he became pastor at Macclesfield. In January 1827, he accepted the charge of the Mosley Street Church, Manchester, where he died, July 27, 1838. He was a preacher of rare eloquence. See (Lond.) Evang. Magazine, January 1839, page 1.

## McAll, Robert Whitaker, D.D., F.L.S[[@Headword:McAll, Robert Whitaker, D.D., F.L.S]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Macclesfield, Cheshire, England, December 17, 1821. He first studied architecture, but afterwards turned his attention to theology, and became a pastor in 1847, in which relation he continued until 1871, when he went to Paris with his wife for the purpose of viewing the scenes of the Franco-Prussian war. While he was standing on a street corner and distributing tracts to the passers-by, a man stepped from the throng and said "Sir, I perceive you are a clergyman; if any one like you is ready to come over here and teach us a gospel, not of superstition, priestcraft, and bondage, but of simplicity, liberty, and chairity, there are many of us ready to hear; but we have done with priests." Mr. McAll and his wife considered this a divine call and accordingly rented a room in Belleville, and on January 17, 1872, held the first meeting, twenty-eight were present. Mr. McAll could not speak French readily, but he could say; "God loves you," and "I love you” and that won them. The work has grown from this humble beginning until, in 1889; there were 126 stations and 27 missionaries, employed, not only in Paris, but in the provinces. The income of the mission is from private donations and legacies, and has amounted to £17,408 12s. 3d. The mission is administered on a very economical plan, spending for the year £16,480 16s. 10½d. Meetings to the number of 14,083 were held for adults, and 5320 for children. The aggregate attendance of adults was 919,925; of children, 235,927; 26,131 visits were made, and 500,307 Bibles, Testaments, tracts, etc., circulated. There is also a medical mission and two dispensaries. Each station has a small free lending library. Dr. McAll died May 11, 1893. The work is now carried on by his widow. There is an  office of the mission at Room 21, No. 1710 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia. See Bonar, White Fields of France (N.Y. 1879); Missionary Review of the World, August, December 1889; July 1890; (Lond.) Cong. Year-book, 1890, 1894.

## McAuley, "Jerry,"[[@Headword:McAuley, "Jerry,"]]

             an evangelist, was born in Ireland in 1839. His father came to this country to escape arrest. Jerry never received any schooling, and when nineteen years old was committed to Sing Sing state-prison for fifteen years on the charge of robbery. While there he was religiously impressed, but, after his pardon in 1864, he returned to his old pursuits. In 1872 he found friends who stood by him, and in October of that year he opened his "Helping Hand for Men " on Water Street, New York city, which resulted in the conversion of many. In 1876 the old building was replaced by a new one, called "The McAuley Water Street Mission." In 1882, feeling that his work was done in that quarter of the city, he began a new mission in West Thirty-second Street, called the "Cremorne Mission." In June 1883, he began the publication of Jerry McAuley's Newspaper, which is still published every other week. He died September 18, 1884. See Jerry McAuley: His Life and Work, by R.M. Offord (N.Y. 1885),

## McAuley, Catherine[[@Headword:McAuley, Catherine]]

             foundress of the Sisters of Mercy, was born at Stormanstown House, County Dublin, Ireland, September 29, 1787. When of age she formed a regular system for the distribution of food and clothing to the needy, and called in the lame and blind to partake of her bounty. She also erected, in 1824, a large building in a fashionable quarter of Dublin. She made a novitiate in the Presentation Convent in Dublin, professed December 12, 1831, and was appointed by the archbishop superior of her order, the objects of which were, the education of the poor and the protection of good women in distress. When the cholera visited Dublin, in 1832, she and her sisters nursed the hospital patients until they recovered. The women admitted into her houses of refuge were taught various useful employments, and, as soon as possible, provided with good situations. Her  order developed rapidly. Many ladies of distinction joined it. Houses were established in London. Ten houses were founded in Ireland during her lifetime, and two in England, and in the course of forty years there were over two hundred convents of the order in Great Britain, United States, Newfoundland, South America, Australia, and New Zealand, with more than three thousand sisters. She died in Dublin, November 11, 1841. Her life has been written by Mother Austin of New Orleans (New York, 1866). See (N.Y.) Cath. Almanac, 1882, page 73.

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

             a very prominent minister of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland during its early history, who suffered persecution from the Established Church because he boldly advocated the rights of Independency, was a native of Ireland, educated at the University of Glasgow, where he was enrolled in 1666. About 1670 he was ordained by the Presbytery of Tyrone to the pastoral charge of the congregation of Clowe, in the county of Armagh, where he officiated nearly twenty years. In 1694 he succeeded Reverend Patrick Adair as minister of the Belfast congregation, where he labored until his death in 1718. He was a popular preacher, and an able and expert disputant. See Reid, Hist. of the Presb. Church in Ireland.

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

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Philadelphia April 27, 1830; graduated at the University of Pennsylvania in 1851, and studied in the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Presbyterian Church; was licensed in 1855 by the Philadelphia Presbytery, and became a pastor in Mount Vernon, Iowa, where he remained until 1861, when, compelled by impaired health to resign, he returned to Philadelphia. He next became editor and proprietor of The Banner of the Covenant, which he conducted with great acceptance to the Church until his death, May 13, 1863. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1864.

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

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Franklin Mills, Ohio, in May, 1825; graduated with honor at Oberlin College, Ohio; subsequently studied theology in the same institution; and in 1853 was licensed by the Western Reserve Conference, and ordained by Washtenow Presbytery; in 1855 accepted a call to the Church in Howell, Mich., where he labored until his death, Sept. 12, 1860. Mr. McBride was a man of much devotional piety, and labored zealously in building up the Church. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1862, p. 191.

## McCabe, Edward[[@Headword:McCabe, Edward]]

             a Roman Catholic prelate, was born in Dublin in 1816. In 1856 he was appointed parish priest of St. Nicholas, one of the poorest and most populouls localities in Dublin. Archbishop Cullen appointed him one of his vicars-general in 1863, transferring him to the important parish of Kingstown. In 1877 Dr. McCabe, as bishop of Gadara in partibus, was appointed bishop-auxiliary. He was confirmed cardinal by the pope, March 24, 1879, and died February 10, 1885.

## McCabe, James D., D.D[[@Headword:McCabe, James D., D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal clergyman, was rector of a church in Wheeling, Virginia, in 1853, in 1857 he was serving in Baltimore, being rector of St. Stephen's; in 1861 he was rector of St. James's Parish, Tracy's Landing, Md., where he remained until 1867, when he was chosen rector of Zion Church, in Urtbhaa; to this charge was added the pastorate of St. Pieter's, Montgomery County, in 1871. In 1873 he officiated in Baltimore without  regular charge. He died August 1, 1875, aged sixty-seven years. See Prot. Episc. Almanac, 1876, page 149.

## McCabe, John Collins, D.D[[@Headword:McCabe, John Collins, D.D]]

             a Protestant Episieopal clergyman, ordained deacon in 1847, was rector for many years in Hmpton, Virginia, until 1855 or 1856; then he became rector of the Church of the Ascension, Baltimore, Maryland, remaining until 1860, when he accepted the. rectorship of St. James' Church, West River, and remained until 1863. Subsequently he went to Virginia, and, immediately after the civil war in the South, became rector of St. Matthew's Church, Bladensburg; in 1868 was rector of St. Ann's, Middletown, Delaware; in 1873 rector of Trinity, Chambersburg, Pennsylvania. He died February 27, 1875, aged sixty-five-years. See Prot. Episc. Almanac, 1876, page 149.

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

             a Roman Catholic scholar and divine, was born at Emmittsburg, Maryland, September 6, 1806. He was educated at Mount St. Mary's College and Theological Seminary at that place, was ordained deacon in 1831, priest in 1838, and was almost immediately made president of that college, a position which he resigned in 1871. He was twice offered the mitre, but declined. He died at the college, September 25, 1881. See (N.Y.) Cath Annual, 1883, page 64.

## McCall, John A[[@Headword:McCall, John A]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in New Athens, Ohio, Feb. 23, 1834; graduated at Franklin College. New Athens, in 1859; studied theology in the seminary at Xenia, Ohio; was licensed by the Wheeling Presbytery in 1862, and in 1863 was ordained by the Xenia Presbytery, and had just accepted a call to Cedarville, Ohio, when he died. Aug. 25, 1863. Mr. McCall was a man of more than ordinary talents, and remarkable for his sober and studious habits. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1864, p. 351.

## McCall, Joseph Pinckney[[@Headword:McCall, Joseph Pinckney]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born in Mississippi; professed religion while young; joined the Methodist Protestant Church, and was soon after licensed to preach. The war breaking out soon after, he went out as a volunteer in the Southern army. After the war he was received into the Methodist Episcopal Church South, and in due course was recommended to the Quarterly Conference and licensed to preach. In 1866 he was received into the Memphis Annual Conference, and was stationed at Wesley Circuit, with Rev. A. R. Wilson as preacher in charge. In 1867 and 1868 he served at Dresden Station. His last appointment was Hickman Station, in Kentucky, where he labored faithfully until his death, April 8, 1870. Mr. McCall was an able and faithful minister of the Gospel, and the Church greatly mourned her early loss. — Minutes of the M. E. Church South, 1870, s.v.

## McCalla, Daniel[[@Headword:McCalla, Daniel]]

             D.D., a Congregational minister, was born at Neshaminy, Pa., in 1748; graduated at Princeton College, N. J., in 1766; was licensed to preach July 20, 1772; taught an academy in Philadelphia; was ordained pastor of New Providence and Charleston, Pa., in 1774; acted as chaplain in the Revolutionary War; taught afterwards an academy in Hanover County, Va.; and was finally twenty-one years minister at Wappetaw, S. C. He died April 6, 1809. See Hollinghead, Sermons and Essays of 1). MlcCalla (1810, 2 vols.); also Drake, Dict. of Amer. Biog. s.v.

## McCalla, William Latta[[@Headword:McCalla, William Latta]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born near Lexington, Ky., Nov. 25, 1788. He received his preparatory education under the supervision of his parents; graduated with honors at the Transylvania University, Lexington, Ky.; afterwards studied theology privately; was licensed in 1816, and afterwards, ordained pastor of the Presbyterian Church at Augusta, Ky.; in 1823 he went to Philadelphia, and was installed pastor of the Scotch Presbyterian Church, where he continued to labor until 1835, when impaired health prompted him to resign. Subsequently he took charge of the Fourth Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, and under his pulpit ministration the Church became large and influential. In 1839 he resigned this charge, and spent some time as an itinerant missionary in Texas; on his return to Philadelphia, he successively filled the Middletown and Ridley  charges, in the vicinity of Philadelphia, and Union Church, on Thirteenth Street. In 1853 he removed to St. Louis, Mo., and after preaching there some time became connected with the Female Seminary at St. Charles, Mo. In 1859 he assumed the pastorate of a Church in Louisiana, where he labored until his death, Oct. 12, 1859. Mr. McCalla possessed excellent pulpit talents; his expository style was rich and absorbing, his preaching close and pungent. He was the author of many published Sermons and Essays; also Discussions with Alexander Campbell on Baptism; with Kneeland on Universalism; with Barker on Infidelity; a small volume on the Doctorate of Divinity; and Travels in Texas. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1861, p. 99.

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

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Hanover, Washington County, Pennsylvania, September 22, 1817. He graduated from Washington College in 1841, after which he entered upon ,a course of theological training. He was licensed by the Presbytery of Washington in 1845. and ordained an evangelist; served for a time the churches of Wolf Run and Unity as a stated supply, and afterwards at Claysville, where he was installed, December 6, 1852. He died there, April 18, 1881. See Nevin, Presb. Encyclop. s.v. (W.P.S.)

## McCartney, John B[[@Headword:McCartney, John B]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born near Apollo, Armstrong Co., Pa., June 22, 1835; graduated at Jefferson College, Canonsburg, Pa.; and in 1855, at the Western Theological Seminary, Alleghany, Pa.; was licensed in 1857, and in 1858 was ordained and installed pastor of the churches at Mount Washington and Temperanceville, in the vicinity of Pittsburg, Pa. In 1864 he accepted a call from the Twelfth Presbyterian Church, Baltimore, Md., and was installed its pastor May 2,1865, where he labored until he died, May 14, 1865. Mr. McCartney was a man of superior abilities, a close student, and an excellent scholar. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1866, p. 136.

## McCartney, William D[[@Headword:McCartney, William D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Columbia Co., Pa., in 1806; graduated at Washington College, Washington, Pa., in 1832; studied theology at the Western Theological Seminary, Alleghany City, Pa.; was licensed in 1835, and installed pastor of West Liberty Church, Pa.; afterwards labored in the Ridge Church, Madison, and Holmesville churches, Ohio, within the bounds of Steubenville and New Lisbon Presbyteries, and died July 27,1863. Mr. McCartney was gifted with superior intellectual powers, logical and discriminating in his theological views, an excellent scholar, and a successful minister. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1864, p. 175.

## McCintock, John David, D.D[[@Headword:McCintock, John David, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Nicholas County, Kentucky, February 24, 1836. He graduated from Hanover College, Indiana, in 1858, and from Princeton Theological Seminary in 1862; was licensed by Philadelphia  Central Presbytery the same year, and ordained an evangelist, April 11, 1864, by Ebenezer Presbytery, at Augusta, Kentucky. He first supplied the Church of Flemingsburg in 1862; in November 1863, went to Cabell County, Virginia, and supplied the Western (now Huntington) Church, doing evangelistic work until April 1865, when he took charge as stated supply of Catlettsburg Church, Kentucky, in connection with Huntingdon Church; was installed pastor of the latter Church, June 7, 1873, by Greenbrier Presbytery, and released May 15, 1876; installed pastor of Columbus Church, Mississippi, by the Presbytery of Tombeckbee, April 29, 1877, a relation which he held until his death, December 12, 1881. See Necrol. Report of Princeton Theol. Sem. 1882, page 54.

## McClaskey, Joel[[@Headword:McClaskey, Joel]]

             an eminent Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Derry County. Ireland, Jan. 2, 1756. His parents, who were members of the Established Church of England, in 1772 emigrated to New Jersey; here John was converted in 1782, and, feeling that he was called of God to preach the Gospel, took the necessary steps to enter the ministry, and in 1786 became a member of Conference as an itinerant; in 1792 was appointed presiding elder on Philadelphia District; in 1793-94, to Baltimore; in 1795, to Philadelphia: in 1796-98, presiding elder on New Jersey District; in 1799- 1801, to New York City; in 1802, to Philadelphia; in 1812-13, presiding elder on Chesapeake District, and died at Chestertown, Md., Sept. 2, 1814. Mr. McClaskey was a man of deep and earnest piety; versed in the Scriptures; and thousands of souls were converted through his efforts during a long and useful ministry. Conference Minutes, 1:257; Sprague, Annals of the American Pulpit, 7:125.

## McCloskey, John (1), D.D[[@Headword:McCloskey, John (1), D.D]]

             a Roman Catholic prelate, was born at Brooklyn, N.Y., March 20, 1810. He studied at Mount St. Mary's College and Seminary, Emmittsburg, Maryland; was ordained priest, January 9, 1834; studied two years in Rome, and one in France, and on his return became pastor of St. Joseph's Church, New York. In 1841 he became first president of St. John's College, Fordham; in 1842 resumed the rectorship of St. Joseph's Church; In 1843 was coadjutmor of bishop Hughes; in 1847 first bishop of Albany; in 1864 archbishop of New York; in 1875 cardinal-priest, and in 1878 cardinal. He died October 10, 1885. Cardinal McCloskey was a very energetic prelate, establishing religious and charitable houses in his diocese, and actively promoting the interests of his Church.

## McCloskey, John (2), D.D[[@Headword:McCloskey, John (2), D.D]]

             a Roman Catholic divine, was born at Carlow, Ireland, in 1817, soon after which his parents settled in Brooklyn, N.Y. In 1830 he entered Mount St. Mary's College, Emmittsburg, Maryland, where he was ordained, December 13, 1840, and at the solicitation of the college authorities was allowed to remain as professor. He was made vice-president in 1841, and on the retirement of Dr. McCaffrey, in 1871, was chosen president, which position he held for seven years. On the appointment of Dr. Watterson to the bishopric of Columbus, in 1880, he once more resumed the presidency. He was connected with the college for thirty-five years, devoting heart and soul to his work, and never taking a vacation. He was kind to all, over- indulgent, and beloved by all. He died at Emmittsburg, December 24, 1880. See Catholic Annual, 1883, page 61.

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

             a Roman Catholic prelate, was born in Brooklyn, N.Y. March 20, 1810. After completing a seminary course of five years, he was ordained priest in 1834. In 1835-37 he was at Rome and travelling; in 1837-41 was over St. Joseph's Church, New York city; in 1841 was president of St. John's College, Fordham, but the next year: resumed his parish work; in 1844 was consecrated bishop of Axieren in partibus; in 1847 bishop of Albany; in 1864 archbishop of New York; in 1875 was made cardinal, and died October 10, 1885. He completed the cathedral in New York, and founded the Theological Seminary at Troy.

## McClure, Alexander Wilson[[@Headword:McClure, Alexander Wilson]]

             D.D., an American divine, was born in Boston, Mass., May 8, 1808: was educated at Yale and Amherst colleges and Andover Theological Seminary (class of 1830); was settled at Mialden, Mass., 1830-41; then at St. Augustine, Fla., 1841-44; editor of the Christian Observatory from 1844 to 1847; and pastor again at Malden from 1848 to 1852. Leaving the Congregational body, he accepted a call to the First Reformed Church, Jersey City, N. J., and remained there three years (1852-55), when he became corresponding secretary of the Amrerican and Foreign Christian Union, 1855. His health having been impaired, he was sent in 1856 as chaplain of the union at Rome, Italy. In 1858, broken down by bronchial disease, he retired from public service, and lingered a great sufferer until his death, Sept. 20, 1865. The American Chapel in Paris was erected largely by funds which Dr. McClure secured with great zeal and labor. Dr. McClure's contributions to the periodical press were numerous and popular, including valuable articles for the Observatory, the New Brunswick Review, and the Literary and Theological Review. He also published The Life-Boat, an Allegory: — Four Lectures on Ultra Uniresalsises, “a theological classic, unanswered and unanswerable”: — A Series of Letters upon the Bible in the Public Schools,written in controversy with a Romish priest in Jersey City: — Lives of the Chief Fathers of New England (2vols.): — and The Traslators Revived, or Biographical Articles on the History of the Translators of the English Bible (New York, 1853, 12mo). The title is somewhat unfortunate, but the work is invaluable, the materials being drawn from the best sources in Great Britain and America, and with the utmost care for many years, to secure accuracy and fullness. Dr. McClure was a truly learned scholar, a ,genuine wit, a keen dialectician, and a practical controversialist. Ardent and honest as the sunlight, abounding in good feeling, and simple in manners as a child, he was a man of positive convictions, fearless of consequences in the advocacy of truth and in assailing popular errors. Yet, with all his exuberant mirth and knowledge of the world, Dr. McClure was pre-eminently a devout and humble Christian minister. Chastened by many providential trials, his piety grew more serene, and beautiful, and deep with advancing infirmities and years. His prayers and preaching were solemn, tender, and scriptural. Eternal things were seen and felt by him as eternal  realities, and his hearers often were hushed and melted under his reverential appeals. His death was triumphant. See Corwin, Manual; Recollections of Dr. N. Adams; Personal Memories. (W. J. R. T.)

## McClure, Arthur[[@Headword:McClure, Arthur]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in East Tennessee, Feb. 16, 1801 was converted about 1819; entered the Tennessee Conference in 1822, and died Sept. 26, 1825. He was a young man of much promise, excellent in abilities and graces, and an eloquent and successful minister. — Conference Minutes, 1:550.

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

             D.D., a Congregational minister, was born Nov. 18, 1748, in Newport, R. I.; graduated at Yale College in 1769; was ordained missionary to the Indians near Pittsburg, Pa., May 20, 1772. The mission was broken up by the troubles with England, and McClure became pastor in North Hampton, N. H., Nov. 13, 1776; at East Windsor, Conn., June 11, 1786, and died June 25, 1820. He was chosen trustee of Dartmouth College in 1778, and made D.D. by the same in 1800. Dr. McClure published Sermons on the Moral Law (1795, 8vo): — Memoirs of the Rev. Eleazar Wheelock. D.D., in connection with the Rev. Dr. Parish (1810): — and a number of occasional sermons and addresses, and magazine contributions. See Sprague, Annals, 2:7.

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

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Lancaster Valley, Chester County, Pennsylvania, June 17, 1795. He received his early education at the common schools in Washington County, and graduated from Jefferson College in 1822. After leaving: college he was a year and a half a teacher in the academy at Newtown, Bucks County. He next taught for a year at New Hope, when,, at the invitation of the Reverend Dr. Ezra Styles Ely; he went to Philadelphia, and spent a year studying theology under his guidance. In November 1825, he entered Princeton Seminary, and remained a year, when he was licensed by the Presbytery of Philadelphia. After supplying for six months the Church of West Alexander, he accepted a call to become its pastor, and was ordained October 8, 1828. In 1854 he became an agent for the Presbyterian Board of Education; in 1855 assistant pastor of the Church at Neshaminy, Bucks County, and in 1858 pastor elect of the Church at Smyrna, Delaware. He founded there a church school, in 1864: a female school in West Philadelphia, and in 1870 a school in Hightstown, with the special view to the education of the children of missionaries free of charge. In the same year he returned to West Philadelphia, and for four years was associate principal of the Mantua Academy. He spent several years at Wooster, Ohio, from whence he returned to Philadelphia, where he died, March 31, 1880. See Necrol. Report of Princeton Theol. Sem. 1881, page 24. (W.P.S.)

## McCoombs[[@Headword:McCoombs]]

             SEE MCCOMBS.

## McCown, Burr Harrison, D.D[[@Headword:McCown, Burr Harrison, D.D]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born at Bardstown, Kentucky, October 29, 1806. He was educated at St. Joseph's College, in his native place was converted, and joined the Methodists in. early life. Before his majority he entered the Kentucky Conference, and in 1830-31 was stationed at Louisville. In 1834 he was professor of ancient languages in Augusta College, and in 1844 occupied a similar position in Transylvania University. He afterwards taught at Goshen Academy, Forest Academy, and Pine Hill, where he died, August 29, 1881. Dr. McCown was an. interesting preacher, a diligent student, an impressive instructor, and an earnest Christian. See Minutes of the M.E. Church South, 1881, page 285.

## McCracken, John Steele[[@Headword:McCracken, John Steele]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born near Cincinnati, Ohio, April 25,1804. His opportunities in early life for acquiring knowledge were poor. In 1833 he entered the preparatory department of Miami University, Oxford, Ohio, and graduated in 1838; studied theology under the care of the First Presbytery of Ohio of the Associate Reformed Church, and subsequently attended the theological seminary at Alleghany City, Pa., and the seminary at Oxford; was licensed in 1841, and then went out as a missionary among the newly-formed congregations in Illinois and Iowa; in 1843 he accepted a call from the Church at Kenton, Ohio, where he labored until his health gave way. He died April 1, 1863. Mr. McCracken was an able expounder and a sound theologian; his judgment was eminently just and critical; his disposition charitable and liberal. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1864, p. 352. (J. L. S.)

## McCracken, Samuel W[[@Headword:McCracken, Samuel W]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born near Lexington, Ky., Jan. 12, 1800; was educated at Miami University (class of 1831); studied theology at Maryville, Tenn., and was elected professor of mathematics in the college at Maryville; was afterwards chosen professor of mathematics in Miami University; was licensed by Ohio First Presbytery in 1835, and in 1836 was ordained; in 1839 accepted a call to Hopewell Church, Ohio, and resigned his professorship in the university; here he continued to labor until his death, Sept. 10, 1859. Mr. McCracken maintained a high reputation for talent; prudent and far-sighted, his counsels were always worthy of consideration; opposed to all expedients, he made experience the basis of action. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Alm. 1861, p. 209. (J. L. S.)

## McCrary[[@Headword:McCrary]]

             W. H., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Tennessee Jan. 17,1831; was educated at Bethel College, Tenn.; was licensed in 1849, after teaching school for several years; was ordained in 1854. He died Sept. 14, 1858. Mr. McCrary was a good preacher, a successful teacher, and a fine theologian. See Wilson. Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1861, p. 236.

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

             a Lutheran minister, was born in Manchester, England, October 23, 1807. In 1831 he arrived in America. For some time he and his wife were engaged as teachers in Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania. After a course of study in the Gettysburg Theological Seminary, he was inducted, in 1839, into the Lutheran ministry. Having been sent, the same year, as a missionary to Pittsburgh, he organized the first English Lutheran Church in that city. From that time he continued to serve a number of congregations in Pennsylvania, Ohio, New Jersey, New York, and Maryland, the longest period of service having been given to Baltimore, where he spent twenty years. Leaving Baltimore, he became principal of the female seminary at Hagerstown, where he remained two or three years. In 1846 he was a delegate to the World's Evangelical Alliance in London. While residing in Baltimore he cooperated with Drs. Seiss and Passavant in editing the Evangelical Psalmist, a book of tunes adapted to the Lutheran Hymn- book, published in Philadelphia in 1860. He died in Philadelphia, April 26, 1881. See Lutheran Observer, May 6, 1881.

## McCullough, John W., D.D[[@Headword:McCullough, John W., D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal clergyman, was employed as a professor in Nashville, Tennessee, in 1853 and 1854. In 1858 he was teaching in Baltimore, Maryland, and the following year was rector of St. Mary's Hall, in that city, a position which he held. until 1861. While in Tennessee he was a member of the standing committee of the diocese; was a delegate, in 1855, to the General Convention; served on the missionary and education committees of his own diocese, and held various other important positions. In 1861 he removed to Waverley, N.Y. In 1864 he was rector of St. Paul's Church, Alton, Illinois, and remained in that parish until his death, at Waverley, N.Y., October 14, 1867, See Prot. Episc. Almanac, 1868. page 104.

## McDaniel, James, D.D[[@Headword:McDaniel, James, D.D]]

             a Baptist minister, was born near Fayetteville, N.C. in 1803. He united with the Church in 1827, and soon after began to preach. Chiefly through his instrumentality the Church in Fayetteville was formed, and he was called to be its pastor, in which relation he continued for thirty-six years, and then was pastor, for six years, of the First Church in Wilmington, during a part of the time acting as editor of a religious journal. For nineteen years he was  president of the North Carolina Baptist State Convention, organized in 1830. He died in 1870. "Dr. McDaniel possessed in a rare degree the gifts and graces of the orator, and many are the traditions of the pathos and power of his preaching in his younger days." See Cathcart, Baptist Encyclop. s.v. (J.C.S.)

## McDonald, Andrew[[@Headword:McDonald, Andrew]]

             a Scotch minister, was born at Leith in 1757; was educated at the University of Edinburgh; was ordained deacon in 1775; pastor of a congregation at Glasgow in 1777; subsequently removed to London, and devoted himself to the authorship of light literature, and died in the great English metropolis, “a victim to sickness, disappointment, and misfortune,” in 1790. A list of his works is given by Allibone, Dict. Brit. and Amer. Authors, 2:1166.

## McDonald, Daniel[[@Headword:McDonald, Daniel]]

             D.D., an Episcopal minister in America. was born near Bedford, Westchester County, N. Y., about 1787, and was educated at Middlebury College. Having taught for some time, he was ordained in 1810, and became rector of St. Peter's, Auburn, N. Y. He subsequently took charge of the academy in Fairfield, Herkimer Co. where he superintended the preparation of candidates for holy orders. In 1821 he was made D.D. by Columbia College; removed to Geneva, and served for many years as missionary in the village of Waterloo. He became professor in the College of Geneva in 1825, and continued so until his death, March 25, 1830. His  works are A Sermon in the Churchman's Magazine, and A Series of Articles in the Gospel Messenger, signed P. See Sprague, Annals, v. 525.

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

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Brooke County, Va., July 25, 1794; was educated in Ohio University, Athens, Ohio; was licensed and ordained by Athens Presbytery in 1827, and installed pastor of the Church in Burlington, Ohio; subsequently served as missionary in Kentucky; in 1832 labored in Manchester and Huntington churches, Ohio; and from 1836 in the Pleasant Prairie Church, Ill., until his death, Aug. 15, 1866. Mr. McDonald was possessed of rare mental strength and discriminating powers; extensive religious and literary acquirements; sterling piety, and unassuming humility. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1867, p. 184.

## McDonnell, Richard, D.D., LL.D[[@Headword:McDonnell, Richard, D.D., LL.D]]

             an Irish clergyman and collegian, was born at Douglas, County Cork, Ireland, in 1787. He graduated from Trinity College in 1805, and became a fellow in 1808. He studied law at first, was called to the Irish bar, then took holy orders; in 1816 was elected professor of oratory by competitive examination: became senior fellow in 1836; bursar for many years, and in 1852 was appointed provost, which office he held till his death, January 24, 1867. Dr. McDonnell's administration of fifteen years was marked by improvements in the undergraduate course, and by a great advance in the status of the college. See Appleton's Annual Cyclop. 1867, page 589.

## McDowell, Alexander[[@Headword:McDowell, Alexander]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Ireland, and came to this country in 1737; was licensed in 1739; and afterwards itinerated through portions of Maryland and Virginia, until, in 1741, he was ordained as an evangelist to Virginia, and subsequently to itinerate in New Castle Presbytery; in 1743 took charge of White Clay and Elk River churches; in 1752 was appointed principal of the Synod's school, which he afterwards removed to Elktown, Md., and in 1767 to Newark, Del. He continued to labor as a teacher and preacher until his death, Jan. 12, 1782. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1863, p. 48. (J. L. S.)

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

             D.D., a Presbyterian minister (O. S.), was born in Bedminster, Somerset County, N. J., Sept. 10,1780; was educated at Princeton College, where he graduated A.B. in 1801; studied theology with Dr. Woodhull, of Freehold; and was licensed by the Presbytery of New Brunswick in 1804. In December of that year he was installed pastor of the Presbyterian Church of Elizabethtown, where he remained until 1833. During his ministry there 1144 persons were added to the Church. In May, 1833, he became pastor of the Central Church, Philadelphia, which, from small beginnings, grew to be a strong Church under his ministry. In 1846 he accepted a call to the new Spring-garden Street Church, where again his talent for organizing and establishing a society was very successfully employed. He remained in this parish till his death, February, 1863. He published a System of Theology (2 vols.): — Bible Class Manual (2 vols.): — Bible Questions; etc. For nearly fifty years he was a trustee of Princeton College, and was a director of the theological seminary from its foundation. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Alm. 1864, p. 186.

## McDowell, William Anderson[[@Headword:McDowell, William Anderson]]

             D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born May 15,1789, at Lamington, Somerset Co., N. J.; in 1809 graduated at Princeton, where he acted as tutor for several months; completed his theological studies in 1813; was licensed by the Presbytery of New Brunswick, and ordained and installed pastor at Bound Brook. In 1814 he became pastor of the Church of Morristown, N. J.; but after a residence of nine years his health obliged him to resign; in 1823 he was installed by the Charleston Union Presbytery, served for several years, and in 1832 became moderator of the General Assembly, and secretary of the “Board of Domestic Missions of the Presbyterian Church” (Phila.). He subsequently visited the South; and preached occasionally in New Jersey, where he died, Sept. 17, 1851. See Sprague, Annals, 4:495; Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1864.

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

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Lancaster District, N.C., in March 1781. He graduated from Washington College, Virginia; studied theology there under Dr. Baxter; was licensed in 1808 as an evangelist; became pastor at Lexington the same year, and died in that relation, January 2, 1871. See Nevin, Presb. Encyclop. s.v.

## McElhiney, George, D.D[[@Headword:McElhiney, George, D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal clergyman, was born near Londonderry, Ireland, in 1799. He studied first in London, next at Paris, and then under Reverend E.D. Barry, of Baltimore, Maryland; when nineteen years old, he began the study of theology under Reverend Dr. Wyatt, of the same city. In 1820 he was ordained and began his labors in the parish of St. James. Baltimore County. In 1826 he removed to a parish in Charles County, and shortly after visited Europe. On his return home he resumed charge of his first parish, and in September 1829, went to Princess Aisne parish, Somerset County. In October 1834, he became rector of St. Anne's Church, Annapolis, and so continued until his death, May 2, 1841. As an agent in behalf of the convention to obtain funds for the support of the episcopate, he secured more than $50,000. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 5:646.

## McElroy, James, D.D[[@Headword:McElroy, James, D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal clergyman, was a native of Ireland, and was educated in Trinity College, Dublin. He was ordained by bishop Chase in 1829, and officiated successively in Ohio, Virginia, and California. During the five years preceding his death he occupied the St. Paul's Mission in San Francisco. He died in Oakland, California, June 21, 1880. See Whittaker, Almanac and Directory, 1881.

## McElroy, Joseph, D.D[[@Headword:McElroy, Joseph, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born near Nevville, in the Cumberland valley, December 29, 1792. He graduated from Jefferson College in 1812, and studied theology in New York under Dr. John M. Mason. He was licensed in 1815 by the Presbytery of Monongahela; began preaching in Pittsburgh, and established the First Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church there. After laboring successfully for seven years, he was called to succeed Dr. Mason in the Scotch Presbyterian Church, New York. He was among the most eloquent preachers in that city. For the last five years of his life he was emeritus pastor of the Scotch Church. He died in New York, September 16, 1876. See Presbyterian, September 30, 1876. (W.P.S.)

## McEwen, Abel, D.D[[@Headword:McEwen, Abel, D.D]]

             a distinguished Congregational minister, was born at Winchester, Connecticut, February 13, 1780. He graduated at Yale College with honors in 1804, and was settled pastor in New London in 1806, which was his only pastorate, as he retired from the active duties in 1854, but preached occasionally afterwards, and died September 7, 1860. Dr. McEwen originated the New London County Home Missionary Society, was a strong advocate of temperance, Sunday-schools, and education. Over four hundred solid and exhaustive essays delivered by him in the New London County Preacher's Meeting are preserved. He published, Half-century Sermon: — Biographical Sketches of Litchfield County Ministers: — Cotngregatiotnalists in their Relation to Other Religious Sects. See Cong. Quarterly, 1863, page 263.

## McEwen, Robert, D.D[[@Headword:McEwen, Robert, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at New London, Connecticut, June 22, 1808. He graduated from Yale College in 1827, and from Yale Divinity School in 1833; was home missionary for one year at Pontiac, Michigan; pastor at Middletown, Connecticut, from 1835 to 1838; at Enfield, Massachusetts, from 1842 to 1861, and died at New London, August 29, 1883. See Cong. Year-book, 1884, page 30.

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

             D.D., a Congregational minister, was born April 19,1769, at Worcester, Mass.; graduated at Dartmouth College in 1793; was ordained pastor in Concord, N. I., March 7, 1798, and died there Feb. 18, 1827. He was made trustee of Dartmouth College in 1809, and president of the New Hampshire Missionary Society in 1811. His publications were, Oration before the Pi Beta Kappa Society in Dartmouth College (1802): — An Historical View of Heresies and Vindication of the Primitive Faith (1808); and several occasional Sermons. See Sprague, Annals, 2:412.

## McFarland, Francis, D.D[[@Headword:McFarland, Francis, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in County Tyrone, Ireland, January 8, 1788. His parents came to America in 1793. He graduated at Washington  College, Pa., in 1818, and spent over one year thereafter at Princeton Theological Seminary. He was ordained evangelist by the Presbytery of New Brunswick, N.J., August 1, 1822; became pastor at Bethel, Virginia, and died at Staunton, October 10, 1871. He was for six years secretary of the Board of Education of the Old-school Presbyterian Church. See Presbyterian, October 28, 1871; Genesis Cat. of Princeton Theol. Sem. 1881, page 24.

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

             a Presbyterian divine, was born in March, 1800, at Dumbarton, within the present limits of the city of Glasgow, Scotland. He entered the grammar school in Glasgow when seven years old. He next passed to St. Andrew's College, and afterwards to the divinity school of the Established Church, and was licensed to preach the Gospel at the age of twenty-one. During his college course he served as private tutor to an only son of a branch of the great family of Argyle. At the age of twenty-six he became the assistant and successor of the Rev. Dr. Mushett. at Shettleston, a suburb of Glasgow. Soon after he was called to the largest and most numerous congregation in the whole of Scotland at Aberbrotheck, a seaport and manufacturing town between Montrose and Aberdeen, situated on the German Ocean. In the year 1835 Mr. McFarland came to New York, and a little later went to Delaware County, settled by Scotch people, many of whom were the associates and schoolmates of his boyhood. After a few years he removed to Ulster County, and in 1838 was called to be the pastor of the Reformed Dutch Church of Bloominegdale. During his ministry in that place a beautiful church was erected in the neighboring village of Rosendale, principally through his personal efforts. Unusual accessions were made to the membership, and he continued as pastor of the united congregations until the year 1844, when he was called to a large and flourishing congregation at Canajoharie. In 1848 he became the pastor of the Reformed Dutch Church of English Neighborhood, where he remained seven years. After a brief visit to Canada, he returned to Ulster County as pastor of the Reformed Dutch Church of Esopus and St. Remy Chapel. In  1861 he relinquished Esopus and St. Remy, and the next year became minister of a Presbyterian congregation in Galway, Fulton County. From this date until his death his ecclesiastical relations were with the Presbyterian body. In 1866 he left Galway, and became pastor of a congregation at Port Washington, a pleasant summer retreat on the Shrewsbury River, Monmouth County, N. J. He died March 23, 1870. Mr. McFarland was distinguished for his scholarship. He was an excellent linguist. “As a preacher, Mr. McFarland was careful in his preparations, which he delighted in making even to the last. There was the careful use of language, brevity in treatment, and such use and application of the truth as was suited to excite the spirit of devotion, to awaken love and reverence, and to administer satisfying consolation to the penitent and mourner. His positions in the ministry attest popular qualities, his labors evince practical tact, and his success in gathering men and women into the fold attest the blessing of the Good Shepherd upon his ministrations.”

## McFarland, James Hunter[[@Headword:McFarland, James Hunter]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Harrisburg, Pa., March 10, 1809; was converted in 1827, and soon after licensed to preach, and admitted to the Philadelphia Conference in 1830. His ministerial charges were Trenton Circuit, Essex, Bergen Neck Mission, Plainfield, Westchester, Bustleton, Dover, Elkton, Agency for Dickinson College, Newcastle, Columbia, Eighth Street, Philadelphia, presiding eldership of Reading District, Frankford, Bordentown, and Haverstraw, N. J. In 1852, while a member of the New Jersey Conference, his health failed, and he was transferred to the Philadelphia Conference as a supernumerary. In June, 1862, he was appointed chaplain of the United States Hospital in Philadelphia, and in this relation he prosecuted his ministry to the close of his life, March 23,1863. His last words were addressed to his wife: “Mother. I am dying! Lord Jesus, take me!” McFarland was for more than twenty years a corresponding member of the Academy of Natural Sciences in Philadelphia, and was also a member of the Entomological Society. “He was a very faithful and devoted minister of Christ, and did the work of an evangelist successfully. He was warm in his friendship, faithful to the demands of duty, and above everything that looked like a compromise of Christian principle.” — Conference Minutes, 1863, p. 47.

## McFerrin, John Berry, D.D[[@Headword:McFerrin, John Berry, D.D]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Rutherford County, Tennessee, June 15, 1807. In 1825 he was admitted to the Tennessee Conference, and served his Church for eighteen years as editor of the Southern Christian Advocate; seventeen years as book agent; four years as secretary of Domestic Missions, and eight as secretary of  Foreign Missions. He died May 10, 1887. He was the author of Methodism in Tennessee (3 volumes). See Minutes of Annual Conferences of the M.E. Church, South, 1887, page 25.

## McGill, Alexander Taggart, D.D[[@Headword:McGill, Alexander Taggart, D.D]]

             a Presbvterian minister and educator, was born at Cannonsburg, Pennsylvania, February 24, 1807. He graduated from Jefferson College in 1826; was admitted to the bar in Georgia, and appointed by the legislature as state surveyor to trace interstate lines, after having served one year as clerk of the House. In 1831 he turned his attention to theology, and graduated from the Associate Presbyterian Seminary at Cannonsburg in 1835. He was a pastor until 1842, when he became professor of church history in Western Theological Seminary, Allegheny, Pennsylvania; in 1848 he was moderator of the General Assembly; in 1852 he became professor iln the Presbyterian Seminary at Columbia, S.C., but in 1853 returned to his former chair in Allegheny. In 1854 he became professor of ecclesiastical, homiletic, and pastoral theology at Princeton Seminary, and in 1883 was retired as emeritus professor. He died January 13, 1889. See Appletons' Cyclop. of Amer. Biography.

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

             a Roman Catholic prelate, was born in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, November 4, 1809. During his childhood his parents moved to Bardstown, Kentucky, where, at the College of St. Joseph, John was educated. He studied law, was admitted to the bar, and practised his profession there and at New Orleans. He then embraced the sacred calling, studied two years at St. Mary's College, Baltimore, and on his return to Bardstown was ordained priest, June 13, 1830. He subsequently studied at Rome, became missionary in Kentucky, and was the zealous colleague of Dr. Spalding. His Conferences on the dogmas of the Church, at Bardstown, made him distinguished as a controversialist. He was editor of the Catholic Advocate, pastor at Lexington, Kentucky, and on the division of Virginia into two dioceses, and the translation of bishop Whelan to Wheeling, Dr. McGill  was appointed bishop of Richmond, and consecrated, November 10, 1850. His labors were great. As a learned and convincing preacher he was pre- eminent. His controversial sermons were, it is said, unsurpassed. He took an active part in the councils of Baltimore for twenty years, and was an earnest member of the Council of the Vatican. While attending its sessions his health failed him, he returned home, and died at Richmond, Virginia, January 14, 1872. See (N.Y.) Cath. Almanac, 1873, page 42.

## McGinley, Amos A., D.D[[@Headword:McGinley, Amos A., D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born near Fairfield, Pennsylvania, in 1778. He graduated from Dickinson College in 1798, studied theology privately, and was pastor at Upper and Lower Path Valley from 1803 until his death, May 1, 1856. See Nevin, Presbyterian Encyclop. s.v.

## McGuire, Edward C., D.D[[@Headword:McGuire, Edward C., D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal minister, was born in the borough of Winchester, Virginia, in 1793. In 1813 he officiated for one year as layreader in the Church at Fredericksburg, when he was ordained deacon, and after a rectorate of forty-five years at St. George's Church in that city he died there, October 8, 1858. Dr. McGuire was a very successful minister of the gospel. See Amer. Quar. Church Rev. 1859, page 680.

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

             a Roman Catholic prelate, was born in 1791 at Tubber-navine, County Mayo, Ireland. After completing his education, he became lecturer and professor of dogmatic theology at Maynooth, holding the position about eleven years. He was then named coadjutor-bishop of Killala, "cum jure successionis," and consecrated with the title of bishop of Maroma "in partibus infidelium." On the death of Dr. Kelly he was promoted to the archiepiscopal see of Tuam, which he held until his death, November 7, 1881. He published Evidences and Doctrines of the Catholic Church, 1827, which was translated into French and German. He translated sixty of Moore's Irish Melodies into the Irish language, retaining the same metre as the originals. In 1861 he produced a large octavo volume, comprising six books of Homer's Iliad, with an Irish translation in heroic metre. (B.P.)

## McIver, J. W[[@Headword:McIver, J. W]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born Sept. 19, 1835; professed religion in 1858; joined the Memphis Conference in 1861, and filled the Chulahoma and Good Springs circuits. He joined the Confederate army in the late civil war. In 1865 and 1866 he was appointed to the Richland and Cassida circuits; and in 1867 to the Iuka Circuit. He died suddenly, of congestion, while on his way to an appointment, Jan. 17,1868. “Brother McIvor was a very promising young preacher, much beloved by all the people where he preached, and it is with feelings of deepest sadness that we record his early death.” See Conference Minutes of the M. E. Church South. 3:246.

## McJilton, John N., D.D[[@Headword:McJilton, John N., D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal clergyman, was born at Baltimore, Maryland, in 1805. He was ordained deacon in 1841: was for a long time chaplain of the Maryland Hospital, in that city, and subsequently had the rectorship of Mount Zion Church added to his labors; in 1867 he was rector of that Church and of the Church of the Messiah; in the following year he went to New York city, officiating there until 1874, after which he resided, without  special work, in that city until his death, April 13, 1875. See Prot. Episc. Almanac, 1876, page 149.

## McKean, James W[[@Headword:McKean, James W]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Lawrence County, Pa., April 30, 1833; was educated at Richmond College and Jefferson College, Canonsburg, Pa. (class of 1859), and at the Western Theological Seminary; in 1862 was licensed and ordained by the Ohio Presbytery, with a view to labor as a domestic missionary in the Lake Superior region; in 1863 was elected principal of the Synodical School at Hopkinton, Iowa, where he continued to labor until May, 1864, when he enlisted in the service of his country. He died while in camp, July 9, 1854. Mr. McKean was an accurate scholar, a  good teacher, and a model of Christian piety. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1866, p. 137.

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

             D.D., LL.D., a Congregational minister, was born April 19, 1776, in Ipswich, Mass.; graduated at Harvard College in 1794; entered the ministry, and was ordained pastor in Milton, Mass., Nov. 1, 1797; resigned Oct. 3, 1804; was elected professor of mathematics in Harvard College in 1806, but declined, and was chosen Boylston professor of rhetoric in 1809. He remained in this position until his health failed. He died at Havana March 17, 1818. He published a Memoir of the Rev. John Eliot, S.T.D., in the Hist. Coll., and several occasional sermons and addresses. See Sprague, Annals, 2:414.

## McKeen, Silas, D.D[[@Headword:McKeen, Silas, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Corinth, Vermont, March 16, 1791. He received his preparatory studies at Haverhill Academy, and his theological studies were conducted by Reverend Stephen Fuller at Berkshire. He was ordained pastor of the Church in Bradford in 1815, where he continued twelve years; the following year he was reinstalled, remaining there twenty-four years. Subsequently he became acting pastor of the Church at Fairlee, and four years thereafter returned to Bradford, where he died, December 10, 1877. He was moderator of the General Convention of Vermont in 1846. Dr. McKeen published several sermons and addresses. (W.P.S.)

## McKenzie, J.W.P., D.D[[@Headword:McKenzie, J.W.P., D.D]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born in Burke County, N.C., April 26, 1806. He graduated from the University of Georgia in 1824; taught ancient languages for a few years there and at Gainesville; in 1831 went to Tennessee, where he was converted; in 1836 joined the Arkansas Conference, and labored as a missionary among the Choctaws; in 1841 opened a school near Clarksville, Texas; in 1871 became president of Marvin College, resigned the next year, and died June 20, 1881. See Minutes of Annual Conferences of the M.E. Church South, 1881, page 348.

## McKinley, Daniel, D.D[[@Headword:McKinley, Daniel, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Carlisle, Pennsylvania, December 7, 1800. He graduated from Dickinson College in 1824; spent more than a year thereafter in Princeton Theological Seminary; was ordained by the presbytery of Carlisle, October 30, 1827; was pastor at Bedford, 1827-31; Carlisle, 1833-38; agent for the Board of Foreign Missions, 1838-41; pastor at Chambersburg, 1841-47; pastor of Sixth Church, Pittsburgh, 1850-52; agent for the Board of Domestic Missions, 1852-55; and died at Chambersburg, December 7 of the latter year. See Genesis Cat. of Princeton Theol. Sem. 1881, page 50.

## McKinney, Calvin[[@Headword:McKinney, Calvin]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Wallkill, Orange County, N. Y., Jan. 12, 1819. He received a good academic education, afterwards studied theology in the Associate Reformed Seminary at Newburg, N. Y., and was licensed and ordained in 1856. He labored successively. at Millport, Mecklenburg, and West Groton, N. Y. He died June 9, 1864. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1866, p. 220.

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

             D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Mifflin County, Pa., Oct. 22,1795. He was educated at Jefferson College (class of 1821); then studied theology at the school of divinity at Princeton, N. J.; was licensed to preach by the Presbytery of Philadelphia in April, 1824, and ordained  and installed at Erie, Pa., in May, 1825. In 1835 he removed to the bounds of the Presbytery of Huntingdon, and took charge of the churches at Sinking Creek and Spring; in 1841 he was transferred to Hollidaysburg, in the same presbytery. In 1852, having severed his pastoral relations, Dr. McKinney removed to Philadelphia, and there established the Presbyteriann Banner. In 1855 he removed the office of publication to Pittsburg, and there submerged in it the interests of the Presbyterian Advocate. He sold the paper in 1864, to become librarian and treasurer for the Board of Colportage of the Synods of Pittsburg and Alleghany, and this position he filled until the time of his decease. Dr. McKinney was a private partner, and at one time in connection with the editorial staff of the Northwestern Presbyterian Banner. He died May 28, 1873.

## McKinney, Isaac Newton[[@Headword:McKinney, Isaac Newton]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Erie, Pa., Oct. 20,1828; graduated at Jefferson College in 1848, and in 1849 engaged in teaching in Alabama; in 1852 he entered the theological seminary at Princeton, but because of failing health was obliged to relinquish his studies; in 1856 he accepted a license to preach, and in 1857 was ordained and installed pastor of Montour's Church, but soon after accepted an appointment as professor of Latin in his alma mater; in 1862 he was engaged in editing the Presbyterian Banner, and then in originating and conducting the Family Treasure, and died Nov. 20, 1864. Mr. McKinney was a scholar, well versed in language — embracing Latin, Greek, French, and German. As a preacher, he was ardent, direct, and lucid; as a teacher, he had rare capabilities. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1865, p. 103.

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

             a Reformed Presbyterian minister, was born in Cookstown, Tyrone County, Ireland, in 1759. After due preparation he entered Glasgow College, where he distinguished himself by close application to study and a display of unusual talents. His next step was to study medicine, but, called of God to preach the Gospel, he finally entered upon the study of theology, was licensed in due time, and constituted pastor of a congregation at Kirkhills, Antrim County, about 1780. In 1793 he emigrated to this country, and was immediately employed as missionary, Four years later he became the pastor of a Reformed Presbyterian Church at Galway and Duanesburg, N. Y., and there he remained until 1804, when he accepted a  call to a Church at Chester County, S. C. He went south in May, but lived only a few months; he died Sept. 10, 1804. Dr. McMasters thus comments upon McKinney (in Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 9:2): “Of the character of Mr. McKinney as a preacher, and of the power of his eloquence, the very large assemblies that everywhere attended his ministry, and the uniform testimony of all well-informed and serious men, of various denominations. leave no room for doubt... . One feature of his ministerial character may perhaps be inferred from the plan of a work which he proposed to publish, the introductory portion of which only he lived to complete. The proposal was a discussion of the Rights of God, the Rights of Christ as Mediator, the Rights of the Church, and the Rights of Humanity in general. Taking the part he published as a specimen of the whole, the reader will regret the failure of the purpose. The work would have been worthy of the man — not only sound in matter, but deep in thought and impressive in style.” An Irish journal, commenting on the character of James McKinney, says of him: “The character of James McKinney never was exceeded in the boldness of its outline and in the distinctness and prominency of its features. His eloquence was in perfect character. His heart, possessed with the love of the truth as it is in Jesus, was ever set upon its recommendation and enforcement; and it was when descanting upon the grand Gospel theme of a crucified Savior or asserting the Church's rights, or when, with well-sustained pathos, he mourned the wrongs of Zion, that his mind assumed a gigantic attitude, and put forth its wonderful energies. His diction was clear, copious, strong, and full of pertinent and often brilliant figures. He has frequently, in his public discourses, caught a flame from the working of his judgment, imagination, and feelings; and then his conceptions, conveyed in simple, energetic language, or in bright imagery, and in bold and apt allusions, produced an astonishing effect. In America, whose republican institutions he had long loved, the land of enterprise and freedom, was the field which just suited the genius of McKinney; there his powers had full scope for development and exercise.”

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

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Bellefonte, Pa., Aug. 26, 1797; graduated at Jefferson College, Canonsburg, Pa., in 1817; studied theology in the seminary at Princeton, N. J., and was licensed by Philadelphia Presbytery in 1824; was ordained and installed pastor of the Church at Fredericksburg, Ohio, in 1829; subsequently became pastor of the Church  at Alexandria, Pa., and still later a supply at Oswego, Ill. He died in 1867. Mr. McKinney's life was one of real sacrifice and great usefulness; he was mild, affectionate, trustworthy, and eminently righteous. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1868. p. 131.

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

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in 1805. Many years before removing to Texas he resided in Tennessee, where the early part of his ministerial life was spent. He became a member of the Presbytery of Brazos, and a leading minister of the Southern Presbyterian Church. indefatigable in advancing all its interests. He was the first president of Austin College, Texas. He died at Huntsville, November 27, 1879. (W.P.S.)

## McKinnon, J[[@Headword:McKinnon, J]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Esquessing, C. W. His early education was commenced in Oneida Institute, in N. Y., in 1837; in 1838 he placed himself under the tuition of Dr. Rae, in Hamilton, C. W. His collegiate studies were pursued in Queen's College, Kingston, C. W., and Knox College, Toronto. In 1844 he was licensed, and became pastor successively of the St. Thomas, Owen Sound, and Beckwith churches. He died Dec. 24, 1865. Mr. McKinnon was a man of sterling integrity and conscientious fidelity; he possessed a competent knowledge of the languages. but excelled in the logical and mathematical faculties. See Wilson, Piesb. Hist. Almanac, 1867, p. 478.

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

             a Presbyterian minister, was born near Carlisle, Pennsylvania, October 1, 1754. He graduated from Princeton College in 1773, and studied theology privately; was pastor at Lower Marsh Creek, Pennsylvania, from 1775 to  1783; colleague of Dr. Rodgers, in New York, from 1789 to 1809; in 1815 president of Dickinson College, but resigned the next year, and died October 21, 1823. See Nevin, Presbyterian Encyclop. s.v.

## McLain, William, D.D[[@Headword:McLain, William, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Ohio, and served several churches as pastor. His last charge was the First Presbyterian Church of Washington city, D. C., which position he resigned to become financial secretary of the Colonization Society, with which he was identified for many years. He died at Washington, February 15, 1873, aged sixty-six years. See (N.Y.) Presbyterian, March 1, 1873. (W.P.S.)

## McLaren[[@Headword:McLaren]]

             SEE MACLAREN.

## McLean, Alexander[[@Headword:McLean, Alexander]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in the Island of North Uist, Scotland, in March, 1827. His early advantages were poor-his boyhood being a constant battle for existence against the strong arm of Romanism. He graduated at the Edinburgh University, and afterwards studied theology; while thus engaged he was associated with the Rev. Mr. Hall in the Glasgow Home Mission work. In 1855 he came to Canada, and in 1856 was ordained pastor of the East Puslinch congregation, where he remained till his death, May 25, 1864. Mr. McLean was an effective minister, and an ardent laborer in the mission work. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1866, p. 372.

## McLean, Charles G[[@Headword:McLean, Charles G]]

             D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Armagh County, Ireland, March 17,1787; graduated at the University of Pennsylvania in 1808, and studied theology under the Rev. Dr. John M. Mason, of the Associate Reformed Church; was licensed in 1812, and ordained pastor of the Presbyterian Church near Gettysburg, Pa., during which pastorate he became an Independent. In 1844 he accepted a call from the Reformed Dutch Church at Fort Plains, N. Y., and in 1852 emigrated to the West, and, in connection with his son-in-law, established a female seminary at Indianapolis, Ind. He died July 4,1860. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1861, p. 101.

## McLean, Daniel Veach, D.D[[@Headword:McLean, Daniel Veach, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, and member of the Presbytery of Monmouth, N.J., who died at Red Bank, November 23, 1869, was an able preacher, a good scholar, and a friend of temperance, education, the Bible cause, and every Christian and benevolent movement. (W.P.S.)

## McLeod, Alexander[[@Headword:McLeod, Alexander]]

             D.D., a minister of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, was born in the Island of Mull June 12, 1774. His father and grandfather were ministers of the Church of Scotland. In 1792 he came to America and entered Union College, where he graduated in 1798. In 1799 he was licensed by the Reformed Presbytery at Coldenham, and in 1801 was installed pastor of the First Reformed Presbyterian Church. His first publication was Negro Slavery Unjustifiable (N. Y. 1802). In 1803 appeared Messiah governing the Nations; in 1816, Ecclesiatstical Catechism: — The Gospel Ministry: — Lectures on the Prophecies: — Sermons on the War: — Life and Power of True Godliness. He was the chief organizer of the American Colonization Society in 1816, and wrote its constitution. During his pastoral career he received various calls to other churches, to colleges, and to editorships; but he declined them all, and remained in his charge until his  death, Feb. 17, 1833. See Wiley (Sam. B.), Memoir of A. McLeod, D.D. (N. Y. 1855, 8vo); Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1862, p. 261; Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 9:9 sq.

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

             a Protestant Episcopal clergyman, was rector for a number of years at Huntington, Pennsylvania; in 1857 at Clearfield, having charge of St.  Andrew's Church, and subsequently serving, in addition, as missionary at Phillipsburg. In 1864 he was chaplain in the United States Hospital, Wilmington, Delaware, whence he was sent, in 1866, to Fort Delaware, as army chaplain. In 1871 he was removed to Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, serving in the same position. He died at Meadeville, Pennsylvania, February 9, 1877, in his seventy-seventh year. See Prot. Episc. Almanac, 1878, page 169.

## McLeod, Cornelius[[@Headword:McLeod, Cornelius]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born about 1820; joined the Church when but a boy; entered the South Carolina Conference in 1837, and for nearly thirty years labored faithfully and zealously for the cause of the Redeemer. His last appointment was Richland Fork Mission. He died April 9, 1866. “McLeod was a successful laborer, and was much beloved by those for whom he labored. Remarkably amiable, he won without effort the affections of those with whom he was associated; and now, though he has passed away, he lives in the hearts of his people." — Conference Minutes of the M. E. Church South, 3:17.

## McLeod, John Niel, D.D[[@Headword:McLeod, John Niel, D.D]]

             a Reformed Presbyterian minister, was born in New York city, October 11, 1806. He graduated at Columbia College in 1826; studied theology under his father, with whom he was associated as pastor in 1828, and whom he succeeded in 1833. He died in New York, April 27, 1874. He had been for many years stated clerk of the synod of his denomination, and professor in the theological seminary then at Philadelphia.

## McLeod, Norman[[@Headword:McLeod, Norman]]

             D.D., one of the most noted Scotch divines of our day, was born at Campbelltown, Argyleshire, June 3, 1812. He was early destined for the ministry by his father, who was at the time of Norman's birth parish minister of Campbelltown, and Norman was to make the fourth generation of the McLeods in the ministry of the Scotch Kirk. To fit him properly for the responsible position he was to occupy in the near future, his father accepted a parish near Glasgow, and Norman made his preparatory studies for college at Glasgow. His academic education he obtained at Edinburgh, and he then traveled for some time in Germany and the northern countries of Europe. On his return to Scotland he studied theology at Edinburgh, enjoying especially the counsel and instruction of the celebrated Dr. Chalmers. He was licensed to preach in 1838, and “with the Norse tongue in him, and a vigorous Celtic imagination,” he soon found a parish ready to receive him, and was ordained pastor of London, in Ayrshire. Here he labored faithfully until 1843, the year so eventful to the Scotch Kirk. SEE SCOTLAND.

Though Norman McLeod had been a pupil of Dr. Chalmers, and greatly esteemed the doctor, he refused to leave the establishment, and even opposed the Free Church movement. In consequence of this decision to remain a Churchman many offers of promotion came to his door, and he finally accepted the parish of Dalkeith, where he resided until 1851, when he was called to the Barony Church of Glasgow, whither he removed, and “substantially began the real work of his life,” among a membership of  from eleven to twelve hundred adults, who by his guidance not only walked themselves in the path of righteousness, but were the means of promoting Christian holiness and ameliorating the condition of the poor and the forsaken. “Commonly,” says his biographer, Dr. Walter C. Smith (in Good Words, Aug. 1872, p. 513),”' he preached thrice every Sabbath, besides conducting a large class of his own; and his preaching was no mere stringing together of theological commonplaces, but the expression of earnest thought about the highest things, full of practical help and counsel for living men... . Neither did he regard his congregation merely as a company of people to be preached to, but rather as a body of men whom he had to lead unto every good work.” Aside from his parish work, extended as it was far beyond the labor usually performed by three ministers, he edited for ten years the Edinbusrgh Christian Magazine, a periodical of the old religious type, which, while it existed, did much good to the people who read it, but proved a heavy loss both to publisher and editor. In spite of McLeod's connection with this literary venture, Mr. Strahan, the noted British publisher, hesitated not to court the services of Dr. McLeod when in 1860 the publication of Good Words was projected.

The manner in which the doctor replied to the invitation is well worthy of the Christian minister of Glasgow (comp. Contemporary Review, 1872, July, p. 29 sq.). The success of Good Words as a literary venture has been almost unprecedented in the annals of magazine literature. “Wherever the English language is read it has familiarized the people with the great leaders of theological thought; has brought into the cottage specimens of the pencil of the most eminent artists; has diffused sound information on secular truth; and has been the means of introducing to the poor, poets of eminence and writers of wholesome fiction. Its pages, too, were often graced with the kindly productions of the editor's own pen. Many of his works, now published in book form, and of deservedly high popularity, first appeared in Good Words." A recognition of his able services came to Dr. McLeod in his later years from a quarter where, as a member of the Church outside the Anglican establishment, he could hardly have expected so much-we refer to his appointment, upon the death of Dr. Robert Lee, to the chaplaincy to the queen of England, a honor which never before fell to the lot of any Scotch minister except William Carstairs. In the midst of these varied labors, while still in fullest sympathy with the great life that stirred around him, and full of hope for its progress, and doing his full share of the task, death came upon him, June 16, 1872, causing a loss deeply felt not only by his own Church, but by all evangelical  denominations, by the rich and the poor, the high and the low; for it must be borne in mind that his genial, great, noble nature made its influence felt everywhere; and “he considered no work foreign to him if it could be called his Master's business.” “Perhaps no other minister of the Church of Scotland was so generally beloved or exercised so potent an influence for good. His charity was remarkable. He extended the hearty hand of fellowship to men of all sects believing in Jesus Christ and him crucified. In the pulpit his utterances Mere peculiarly fresh and eloquent; and reproof and instruction, conveyed in a spirit of love, came home with striking effect to men's business and bosoms. He had a holy horror of shams in whatever guise they might be presented;” and we do not wonder that the man who is most competent to speak of him is constrained to say that Dr. Norman McLeod was “the most manly man” he ever knew; “the most genial, the most many-sided, and yet the least angular” (John Strahan, publisher of Good Words, in Contemporary Review, July, 1872, p. 291 sq.). “Norman McLeod,” continues Mr. Strahan, “was no mere paper, and pulpit, and platform good man, putting all. his goodness into books, and sermons, and speeches. Where he was best known — known as standing the crucial test of the ‘dreary intercourse of daily life' — there he was most respected and beloved. Glasgow had known him for many a year as a most unpretentious and yet most indefatigable worker for his brethren's weal in this life and beyond this life: and money-making Glasgow struck work in the middle of the week to show that it felt it had lost its best citizen.” It should not be omitted here that Dr. McLeod strove hard to advance the cause of the Indian Mission scheme of the Church of Scotland by not only obtaining for it the contributions of the Church, but by inducing men of high Christian and educational attainments to undertake the work of preaching the Gospel to the people of India. He himself visited India only a short time before his death to inquire into the success of the Mission and to advance its interests more ably. His last speech before the last Assembly he attended was to revive the mission zeal of the Church. (J. H. W.)

## McLeod, Xavier Donald[[@Headword:McLeod, Xavier Donald]]

             a Roman Catholic priest, was born in New York about 1821. and was the son of the celebrated Presbyterian divine, Dr. Alexander McLeod. He was educated at Columbia College; studied theology; took orders in the Episcopal Church in 1845; sailed for Europe in 1850, and while abroad embraced Roman Catholicism. After his return to this country he devoted himself to the publication of several works of a secular nature, besides a  Life of Mary Queen of Scots (1857). About 1860 he became professor of belles-lettres at Mount St. Mary's College, near Cincinnati; subsequently entered the priesthood, and died in August, 1865. — New Amer. Cyclop. 1865, p. 648.

## McMaster, Algernon S. D.D[[@Headword:McMaster, Algernon S. D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Mercer, Pennsylvania, November 17, 1807. He graduated at Union College, and, after completing his theological studies, was ordained pastor of the Presbyterian Church at Galway in 1833, whence he went in 1838 to Pittsburgh, subsequently to Westfield, and finally to Poland, Ohio, where he labored with zeal and success for twenty- four years, until failing health obliged him to resign. He died at Leetonia, October 2, 1882. See (N.Y.) Observer, October 12, 1882. (W.P.S.)

## McMaster, Erasmus D[[@Headword:McMaster, Erasmus D]]

             D.D., a noted Presbyterian divine, was born in Pennsylvansia. Feb. 4, 1806; gralduated at Union College, N.Y., in 1827; was licensed to preach in 1829; was ordained in 1831, and made pastor at Ballston, N. Y.; was president of the South Hanover College, Indiana, from 1838 to 1845, and of Miami University, Ohio, from 1845 to 1849: was professor of systematic theology in the New Alban Theological Seminary from 1849 to 1866; and was then appointed to the same chair in the theological seminary of the Northwest. He died at Chicago, Illinois, Dec. 10, 1866. Possessed of a vigorous and thoroughly cultured mind and a well-balanced judgment, McMaster succeeded in all he attempted. “His expositions of Scripture and his religious addresses and sermons were exceedingly rich and instructive, and held the attention of all his hearers; while his influence over his students was unbounded.” He published several sermons and addresses, and minor theological treatises. See Drake, Dict. Amer. Biog. v. s.; New Amer. Cyclop. 1866, p. 463.

## McMaster, Gilbert[[@Headword:McMaster, Gilbert]]

             D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Ireland, Feb. 13, 1778; came to this country when yet a child, and was educated at Jefferson College, Pa., where he graduated in 1803; was ordained August 8, 1808, and was pastor of Duanesburg Church, N. Y., from 1808 to 1840, and of the Church at Princeton, Ind., from 1840 to 1846. He died at New Albany, Ind., March 15, 1854. His works are: An Essay in Defence of some Fundamental Doctrines of Christianity: — An Analysis of the Shorter Catechism (1815): — An Apology for the Book of Psalms: — The Moral Character of Civil Government considered (1832): — Thoughts on Union in the Church of God (1846). See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1863, p. 368; Sprague, Annals Amer. Pulpit, 9:46 sq.; Drake, Dict. Amer. Biog. s.v.

## McMasters, Sterling Y., D.D., LL.D[[@Headword:McMasters, Sterling Y., D.D., LL.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal clergyman, was born at Guilford Court House, N.C., December 13, 1813. He graduated at the State University, was ordained in 1846, and officiated in 1853 as rector of a church in Alton, Illinois. In 1858 he removed to Palmyra, Missouri, as president of St. Paul's College in that place, and remained in this position until 1861, when he became chaplain of the 27th regiment of Illinois Volunteers, United States army; in the following year he officiated in St. Paul, Minnesota, and soon after became rector of Christ Church, in that place, where he remained until his death. He died November 5, 1875. See Prot. Episc. Almanac, 1876, page 150.

## McMillan, Edward[[@Headword:McMillan, Edward]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Cumberland County, N. C., Sept. 2, 1804; was educated under Rev. Samuel Donnell and Rev. J. R. Bain, Tenn.; was licensed by Shiloh Presbytery in 1827, and ordained in 1828; labored in 1829 in Moulton, Ala.; in 1835, in Bethany, Tenn.; in 1849, in Gallatin, Tenn.; in 1856, in Carlinville, Ill.; and in 1862 became chaplain in the army, in which service he died, Aug. 27, 1864. Mr. McMillan as a preacher was clear and analytical; as a Christian, confiding, prayerful; as a man, naturally kind, noble, and generous. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1866, p. 220.

## McMillan, Gavin[[@Headword:McMillan, Gavin]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Antrim County, Ireland, Feb. 6, 1787, and was brought to Charleston, S.C., in August of the same year. He began his education under Rev. John Kell, and pursued his classical studies under the care successively of John Orr, Rev. Thomas Donnelly, Rev. E. Newton, and Mr. Campbell; in 1817 he graduated with honor at the South Carolina College, S.C.; afterwards studied divinity in the Reformed Presbyterian Seminary in Philadelphia, Pa.; was licensed by the Reformed Philadelphia Presbytery in 1821, and in 1823 was ordained and installed pastor of Beech Woods Church, at Morning Sun, Ohio, where he labored for fifty years. In 1839 and 1861 he was moderator of the Synod. He died Jan. 25, 1867. Mr. McMillan was eminent as a scholar and theologian; clear and instructive as a preacher; wise and trustful as a counselor. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1868, p. 390.

## McMillan, Gavin Riley[[@Headword:McMillan, Gavin Riley]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Fairfield District, S. C., Dec. 24, 1824; was educated in Miami University, Athens, Ohio; graduated at the theological seminary of the Reformed Presbyterian Church in Philadelphia, Pa.; was licensed in 1850, and in 1851 was ordained pastor of the Neshanock and Hermon churches, in Pennsylvania. In 1859 he accepted a call to the First Reformed Presbyterian Church in Brooklyn, but owing to failing health resigned in 1860. Subsequently he settled in the West, and became president of the Union Female Seminary at Xenia, Ohio. He died Jan. 9, 1865. Mr. McMillan was a man of good talents — the judgment predominating over the imaginative, the practical over the speculative; truthfulness, simplicity, and humility were the principal traits of his character. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1867. p. 395.

## McMillan, Hugh[[@Headword:McMillan, Hugh]]

             D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Chester District, S. C., February, 1794; pursued his collegiate studies at the University of Pennsylvania, and graduated with the highest honor; was soon after elected professor of languages in Columbia College; but, determining to consecrate himself to the ministry, he entered the theological seminary of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, Pa., and in 1820 was licensed to preach. In 1821 he was ordained and installed pastor of the Rock Creek Brick Church, Chester District, S. C. His reputation as a profound linguist being now well established, at the public solicitation he founded an academy at the Brick Church for the primary education of young men. In 1828 he accepted a call to become pastor of the united congregations of Xenia and Massie's Creek, Ohio, where also, at the earnest request of his people, he established an academy in 1830. In 1850, his congregation, becoming too numerous, divided into two societies, and he removed to Cedarville, where he died, Oct. 9, 1860. Dr. McMillan was a man of deep- toned piety; zealous, faithful, and indefatigable as a minister; profound and learned as a scholar. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1861, p. 218. (J. L. S.)

## McMillan, John (1), D.D[[@Headword:McMillan, John (1), D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Fagg's Manor, Chester County, Pennsylvania, November 11, 3752. He graduated from Princeton College in 1770, was licensed by the Newcastle Presbytery in 1774, and spent the two following years preaching in various parts of Virginia and North Carolina. In 1776 he joined the Donegal Presbytery, and was stationed at Chambersburg, where he labored earnestly for several years. He died November 16, 1833. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 3:350.

## McMillan, John (2), D.D[[@Headword:McMillan, John (2), D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in South Carolina, but in early life removed to Xenia, Ohio, and afterwards went to Philadelphia, where he received his education. He was ordained pastor of the Scotch Presbyterian Church of Allegheny City, Pennsylvania, which position he held for fifteen years with great usefulness and success. He served during the war as chaplain of a Pittsburgh regiment, and afterwards had charge of a church at Mount Pleasant for ten years. He next became pastor of the Fifteenth Street Church, Philadelphia, where he remained until his death at Nantucket, September 1, 1882. See (N.Y.) Observer, September 7, 1882. (W.P.S.)

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

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Washington County, Pa., March 10, 1829; graduated at Jefferson College, Canonsburg, Pa., in 1850, then taught some months in Darlington, Pa., and afterwards took charge of the  academy in Cross-Creek village, where he labored for three years with great acceptance. Subsequently he studied theology at the Western Theological Seminary in Alleghany City; was licensed in 1856, and in 1857 ordained and installed pastor of the congregations of Warren and Pine Run, Pa., where he labored until his death, Aug. 1, 1864. Mr. McMillan possessed a clear mind, a warm heart, and a most unassuming spirit; his talents were of a high order, cultivated by thorough education; his sermons were of the richest ingredients and finest mould. See Wilson, Priesb. Hist. Almanac, 1865, p. 105.

## McMullen, Robert Burns, D.D[[@Headword:McMullen, Robert Burns, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Abbeville District, S.C., February 9, 1807. He graduated from the University of Alabama in 1833; spent two years in the Princeton Theological Seminary; was ordained by the Presbytery of Tuscaloosa, April 8, 1837; became pastor at Clinton, Alabama, the same year; professor of chemistry in East Tennessee University in 1841; pastor of First Church of Knoxville, Tennessee, the same year; president of Stewart College in 1858, and died at Clarkesville, January 14, 1865. See Genesis Cat. of Princeton Theol. Sem. 1881, page 100.

## McMurdie, Henry, D.D[[@Headword:McMurdie, Henry, D.D]]

             a Roman Catholic divine, was born in London, May 21, 1822, and was brought up a member of the Church of England. He entered a commercial house in Liverpool, and during the Tractarian movement joined the Catholic Church. He accompanied bishop O'Connor of Pittsburgh to  America, and entered Mount St. Mary's Seminary, where he graduated. He was ordained priest at Loretto, Pennsylvania, by bishop O'Connor, August 15, 1854. He returned to Mount St. Mary's, became professor of theology and moral philosophy, afterwards director of the seminary, was vice- president from 1873 to 1875, and was a hard worker to the day of his death, which took place at the seminary, Emmittsburg, Maryland, January 20, 1880. Dr. McMurdie had a mind which saw through the most abstract questions. He had a marvellous command of English, and was a fine preacher. See (N.Y.) Catholic Annual, 1883, page 63.

## McNeill, Angus Currie[[@Headword:McNeill, Angus Currie]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Robeson County, N. C., May 4,1812. He early exhibited an intense fondness for learning, and, though he had to struggle against adverse influences, managed to secure a good primary education; his final preparation for college was received in the Donaldson Academy in Fayetteville, N. C., where he discharged the twofold duties of teacher and pupil until 1835, when he entered the University of North Carolina, where he graduated with the first honor. He studied theology in the Union Seminary at Prince Edward, Va., was licensed in 1845, and ordained and installed pastor of Carthage, Union, and Cypress churches in North Carolina. In 1852 he accepted a call to the pastorate of Centre Ridge Church, Ala., which relation existed until his death, Oct. 14,1860. Mr. McNeill was an able minister, an eloquent orator, and a fine scholar. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1862, p. 110.

## McNeill, James H[[@Headword:McNeill, James H]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Fayetteville, N. C., May 23 1825; entered North Carolina University at Chapel Hill, N. C.; after one year went to Yale College, New Haven, and subsequently graduated at Delaware College, Newark, Del., in 1844; studied divinity in the Union Theological Seminary, New York, for two years, and afterwards graduated  at Princeton, N. J.; was licensed in 1848, and in 1849 ordained and installed pastor of the Church at Pittsborough, in Chatham County, N. C.; was made one of the corresponding secretaries of the American Bible Society at New York in 1853; in 1861 was elected associate editor of the North Carolina Presbyterian, which position he held until 1862, when he entered the Confederate army. He was killed in battle, March 31,1865. Mr. McNeill was a man of strong will, and great independence of thought and action; his distinct individuality was indicative of the highest executive ability; his earnestness and vigor made him effective in every sphere. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1866, p. 356.

## McParland, Francis Patrick, D.D[[@Headword:McParland, Francis Patrick, D.D]]

             a Roman Catholic prelate, was born at Franklin, Pennsylvania, April 6, 1819. He studied at a private academy in his native town, and then at Mount St. Mary's Seminary, Emmittsburg, Maryland. He was ordained priest in St. Patrick's Cathedral, New York, by archbishop Hughes, May 18, 1845, and was for one year thereafter professor at St. John's College, Fordham. Thence he went to St. Joseph's Church, New York city, where he remained three months, when he was transferred to the pastorate of the church at Watertown, N.Y. In 1851 he was appointed pastor of St. John's Church, Utica, and remained there until his election to the episcopacy of Hartford, March 14, 1858. This diocese then included Connecticut and Rhode Island, and Providence was the seat; but in 1872 Hendricken was appointed to the see of Providence, and McFarland removed to Hartford, where he died, October 12, 1874. Bishop McFarland was modest, dignified in office, zealous, and studious. See (N.Y.) Cath. Almanac, 1875, page 105.

## McPheeters, Samuel Brown, D.D[[@Headword:McPheeters, Samuel Brown, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Raleigh, N.C., September 18, 1819. He graduated from the University of North Carolina in 1841; studied law; graduated from Princeton Theological Seminary in 1843; was ordained evangelist in 1848; became pastor of the Pine Street Church, St. Louis, Missouri, in 1851, and in 1861 of Mulberry Presbyterian Church, Shelby County, Kentucky, where he died, March 9, 1870. See Genesis Cat. of Princeton Theol. Sem. 1881, page 141.

## McPherson, John Erskine[[@Headword:McPherson, John Erskine]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Iredell County, N. C., Aug. 17, 1806; was educated at the academy at Beattie's Ford, N. C.; spent one year in the Union Theological Seminary, Virginia, and finished his studies privately under the Rev. R. H. Morrison, of Davidson College, N. C.; was licensed in 1838, and for several months labored as a missionary in North Carolina. In 1842 he was ordained, but for ten years more continued to labor in the mission work; in 1852 he was called to Prospect Church, in Rowan County, N. C.; in 1855 removed to Cherokee County, and labored in that missionary region until 1859. He died April 9,1860. Mr. McPherson was characterized by a patient perseverance and devotion to duty. indicative of the highest, grade of spiritual life. See Wilson. Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1861, p. 102.

## McPherson, Joseph A[[@Headword:McPherson, Joseph A]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South. was born in West Feliciana Parish, La.. Dec. 19. 1835; was educated at the Centenary College, Jackson, La. (class of 1853): spent several years in teaching; entered the Mississippi Conference in 1859, and was appointed to Bolivar Circuit; in 1860 he was transferred to Fort Adams Circuit, and died June 18,1861. He was a faithful and able minister of the Gospel, and the Church greatly lamented his early loss. — Conference Minutes of the M. E. Ch. South, 2:317.

## McQueen, Donald, D.D[[@Headword:McQueen, Donald, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Chesterfield District, S.C,, June 21, 1810, of a Scotch-Irish family. He graduated from South Carolina College in 1832, and from the theological seminary at Columbia in 1836. His sole pastorate was at Sumter, to which was for a time added that of the adjoining town of Concord; he died at the former place, January 22, 1880. See Nevin, Presb. Encyclop. s.v.

## McRee, James, D.D[[@Headword:McRee, James, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Iredell County, N.C., May 10, 1752, of parents who had emigrated from Ireland in 1730. He was educated in New Jersey College, studied theology privately, was licensed to preach by the Presbytery of Orange in April 1778, and became pastor in Mecklenburg County, N.C., where he remained twenty years. He died March 28, 1840. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 3:322.

## McSparran, James, D.D[[@Headword:McSparran, James, D.D]]

             an English clergyman, graduated M.A. at the University of Glasgow, Scotland, in 1709, and was selected by the Society for the Propagation of  the Gospel in Foreign Parts as a missionary over the Narragansett Parish, R.I. He was ordained August 21, 1720, as deacon, by the bishop of London, and September 25 following, as presbyter, by the archbishop of Canterbury. Besides officiating in Narragansett, he was required to preach at Bristol, Freetown, Swanlsey, and at Little Compton. In 1725 he assisted in establishing a Church in New London, Connecticut. In 1736 he visited England, and again in 1754. He died at South Kingstown, R.I., December 1, 1757. He published a work entitled America Dissected, etc. (Dublin, 1753). See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 5:44.

## McTyeire, Holland Nimmons, D.D[[@Headword:McTyeire, Holland Nimmons, D.D]]

             a bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Barnwell County, S.C., July 28, 1824; graduated from Randolph-Maconi College, Virginia in 1844; joined the Virginia Conference in 1845; in 1851 became editor of the New Orleans Christian Advocate, and in 1858 of the Nashville Christian Advocate; in 1866 was elected bishop; in 1873 was made president of the board of Vanderbilt University, and died February 15, 1889. He was the author of Duties of Christian Masters (1851): — Catechism of Church Government (1869): — Catechism on Bible History (eod.): — Manual of Discipline (1870): — History of Methodism (1884).

## McVickar, William Augustus, D.D[[@Headword:McVickar, William Augustus, D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal clergyman, was born in the city of New York, April 24, 1827. He graduated from Columbia College in 1846, and from the General Theological Seminary in 1849; became successively rector at Morristown, N.J., and at Dobbs Ferry and Irvington, N.Y.; then of the American Chapel at Nice, France, and for nine years previous to his death was rector of Christ Church, New York city. He died September 24, 1877. See Prot. Episc. Almanac, 1878. page 169.

## McWhir, William, D.D[[@Headword:McWhir, William, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Ireland, September 9, 1759. He was prepared for college at Belfast, and at nineteen years of age entered the University of Glasgow. He was licensed by the Presbytery of Killyleagh in 1782. In 1783 he sailed for America, and in 1792 settled near Savannah, and took charge of an academy, in connection with his pastoral duties. He died January 31, 1851. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 3:439.

## McWhorter, Alexander[[@Headword:McWhorter, Alexander]]

             SEE MACWHORTER.

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

             a ruling elder in the Presbyterian Church, was born April 10, 1777, near Ballymena, Ireland. Being an ardent friend of liberty, the oppressive measures of the British government led him to take an active part in the efforts made to obtain freedom in Ireland; in consequence of which he incurred the suspicion of the officers of the law, and being in danger of  losing his life by a summary trial, in 1797 he left his native land for America. He was subsequently engaged in teaching in Philadelphia; was for a considerable time at the head of the mathematical and English school connected with the University of Pennsylvania; was ordained a ruling elder in 1801, and for many years treasurer of the Board of Missions of the General Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church. He died Nov. 16, 1844. Mr. McAdam was a man of noble and generous impulses, dignified in manners, intelligent, and truthful. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1860, p. 176.

## Mcarthur, James P.[[@Headword:Mcarthur, James P.]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Jackson, N. Y., October 22, 1827; graduated at Union College, Schenectady, N.Y.; studied theology, first in the Associate Seminary, Canonsburg, Pa., and afterwards in the seminary at Xenia, Ohio; was licensed by the Presbytery of Miami, and connected with the Presbytery of Cambridge when he died, April 15, 1859. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1860, p. 159.

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

             an Associate Reformed Presbyterian minister, was born in the north of Ireland about 1765. His early education was thorouogh, as he was intended for some literary profession, and when about fifteen years old he was entered as student at the University of Glasgow, where he gained high distinctions. Both students and professors regarded him as a youth of singular promise. Upon graduation he at once entered upon the study of theology, under the well-known and venerable John Brown of Haddington, the professor of theology to the Associate Burgher Synod of Scotland, and was one of the last class of students taught by that great and good man. William McAuley was licensed to preach in 1789 by the Associate Presbytery of Armagh, and was ordained by that body in 1790, as minister of the Associate congregation of Tulliallan, and there he labored acceptably until 1794, when he emigrated to the United States. Here he was received by the Presbytery of Washington (Synod of New York), and was installed in charge of the united congregations of Kortright, Harpersfield, and Stamford, Delaware County, N. Y. As the country developed, his churches grew in power, and divisions becoming necessary, he was finally confined in his labors to Kortright alone. He held his post for over half a century, and died in the harness March 24, 1851. Mr. McAuley deserves to be  remembered as one of the pioneers of American Protestantism. His task was one requiring energy and perseverance, and both these qualities he possessed in an eminent degree. Though frequently left to struggle against poverty and sickness in the care of a large family, he never faltered, and unhesitatingly pressed forward to advance the interests of his Master's cause. Says Dr. John Forsyth (in Sprague's Annals of the American Pulpit, 9:78): “That he was not an ordinary man, all, I think, will admit, who consider the single fact that his ‘natural force' as a preacher was considered as ‘unabated' by the grandchildren and great-grandchildren of those who seventy years ago or more settled in a wilderness, which, through their instrumentality, has been made to blossom as the rose... . In the central portions of Delaware County there are thousands who, though they never saw him, yet, from what their fathers have told them, will cherish with affectionate veneration the name of William McAuley.”

## Mcbryde, Thomas Livingston, D.D[[@Headword:Mcbryde, Thomas Livingston, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Abbeville District, S. C.. Feb. 25, 1817; pursued his literary course in Franklin College, Athens, Ga., graduating in 1837; entered the theological seminary in Columbia, S. C.; and in 1839 was licensed to preach by Harmony Presbytery; was appointed missionary to China in 1839, and sailed for. Singapore in March, 1840; in 1843 returned to this country on account of failing health; and afterwards became pastor successively of Providence and Rocky River churches in Abbeville District, S. C., and Hopewell Church, Pendleton, S. C., in which latter place he labored till he died, April 15, 1863. He received the degree of D.D. from Erskine College, S. C. Dr. McBryde was an able minister, a sound divine, and a wise counselor. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1866, p. 355. (J. L. S.)

## Mccaine, Alexander[[@Headword:Mccaine, Alexander]]

             an American divine of note, was born in Tipperary, Ireland, in the year 1768. He was educated in England, and was intended for the ministry of the Church of England; but, emigrating to the United States in 1791, he joined the Methodist Episcopal Church, and in 1797 entered the itinerant ministry, and filled several important pulpits until 1821, when he located. He now became one of the agitators of the movement which so lately has been successfully carried — lay representation. In relply to the adverse decision of the General Conference of 1824, he published the somewhat elaborate History and Mystery of Methodist Episcopacy (1829), a work displaring rare ability. When the Methodist Protestant Church was started, he became one of its zealous promoters, and was regarded as one of the most able andl influential ministers of that body. He died June 1, 1856. He was particularly ready with the pen, and distinguished for his rare talents in the pulpit.

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

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Rockbridge County, Va., April 9, 1781; graduated at Washington College, Lexington, Va.; subsequently studied theology with Isaac Anderson, D.D., at Maryville, Tenn.; was licensed in 1805, ordained by the Union Presbytery in 1807, and preached successively to the Strawberry Plains, Hopewell, and New Market churches, within the bounds of French Broad Presbytery. He died Sept. 28, 1859. Dr. McCampbell was a faithful minister, a good preacher, and an earnest pastor. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1861, p. 191.

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

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Newlin, Pa., August 12, 1800. In 1829 he entered the itinerant ministry in the Philadelphia Conference, and in 1835 the New Jersey Conference. He labored as an effective minister for thirty-one years. He was three times appointed presiding elder, and was a member of the General Conference of 1852. A thorough student, an eloquent preacher, a faithful pastor, a gentle ruler, he was greatly beloved and esteemed in all his appointments. He died in East Newark, N. J., May 9, 1860.

## Mccarron, Michael, D.D.[[@Headword:Mccarron, Michael, D.D.]]

             a Roman Catholic theologian of note, was born in the County of Monaghan, Ireland, in the year 1804. He received his early education in his native place, after the completion of which he entered Maynooth College to pursue his theological studies, and on graduation was ordained to the ministry. Soon after this he came to the United States. He was placed at St.  James's Church (now the cathedral), in Brooklyn. Subsequently he was transferred to St. James's Church, New York, but very soon afterwards was appointed pastor of St. Joseph's Church, Sixth Avenue, where he remained several years. About the year 1857 the late archbishop Hughes conferred on him the pastorate of the large congregation of St. Mary's Church, corner of Grand and Ridge Streets, New York, which he retained until his decease, Feb. 23, 1867. At the time when father McCarron arrived in this country archbishop Hughes had been actively engaged in the work of education, and had succeeded in exciting a deep interest among the Catholics on the subject. Father McCarron, then in the vigor and prime of life, entered upon this work with the greatest zeal, and the results of his efforts in that noble cause were soon apparent, and are felt at the present time. Father McCarron received evidences of the respect and esteem of his associates by his advancement to the archdeaconship of the archdiocese of New York. The date of this appointment is not known to us.

## Mccartee, Robert. D.D[[@Headword:Mccartee, Robert. D.D]]

             an American Presbvterian minister, was born in New York City Sept. 30, 1791, and was educated at Columbia College. He chose the legal profession, and was engaged in his studies of jurisprudence when he was impressed with the duty of devoting himself to the sacred ministry. He therefore entered the Theological Seminary of the Associate Reformed Church at New York, and pursued a theological course of study, and was licensed to preach in 1816. He was immediately called to Philadelphia, where he remained several years; then returned to New York to take charge of the Orange Street Church, which had at that time but thirty members. While he was the pastor of this Church it was removed to Canal Street. When his connection ceased, in 1836, it numbered eight hundred members. In 1836 he accepted a call to the Church at Port Carbon, Pa., and remained there four years. In 1840 he became the pastor of the Presbyterian Church at Goshen, N. Y.; in 1849 of the Union Church at Newburg, and in 1856 of the Westminster Church in Twenty-second Street (with which the Twenty-fifth Street Church was united), New York City. This was his last pastoral charge. In 1862 his health, which for some time had been enfeebled, failing still more, he resigned his charge. He died at Yonkers, N.Y., March 12, 1865. “All who have known Dr. McCartee will remember him as one possessed of a genial nature, whose warm-hearted friendship was ever finding the most fitting expression in words and acts; as a simple-minded, fervent Christian, whose love for the Savior and his  blessed Gospel was never concealed; and as an able minister of the New Testament, whose fervid eloquence when proclaiming the glad tidings of salvation, and in urging them upon the acceptance of perishing men, was seldom equaled. We have often listened with wrapt attention to his solemn appeals, while the tears which were flowing down his cheeks, and his tender words, were answered by the tears of his hearers. But his voice is now silent; his work is done; he has entered into rest” (The Observer, N. Y. March, 1865). The degree of D.D. was bestowed on Mr. McCartee by Columbia College in 1831. See New Amer. Cyclop. 1865, p. 536; Wilson. Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1866, p. 132.

## Mccaul, Alexander[[@Headword:Mccaul, Alexander]]

             an eminent Anglican divine, was born about the opening of this century, and was educated at King's College, London, where he afterwards became professor of divinity. He was also prebend of St. Paul's, London, since  1845. He is noted, however, not so much on account of the high positions he filled as an ecclesiastic, as for his missionary labors among the Jews, a task for which his great erudition and uncommon familiarity with the Hebrew language and literature peculiarly fitted him. He died in 1863. Dr. McCaul left, besides Sketches of Judaism and the Jews (Lond. 1838, 8vo), The Old Paths, or a Comparison of Mod. Judaisnm wiih the Rel. of Moses and the Prophets (2d ed. 1868, 12mo); a lot of minor theological works, and a host of sermomns; for a list of which see Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. 2:1902.

## Mccaulle, Thomas Harris, D.D[[@Headword:Mccaulle, Thomas Harris, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born about the middle of last century; graduated at Princeton College, N. J., in 1774; was ordained minister in the western counties of North Carolina; was several years president of a college at Waynesborough, S. C.; and died in Savannah, Ga., about 1800.

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

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Lewiston, Pa., Feb. 17, 1816; was educated at Jefferson College (class of 1838) ; studied theology in the Princeton Theological Seminary; was licensed by Huntingdon Presbytery in 1841; and in 1842 was ordained, and installed pastor of the united churches of Bethesda, Concord, and Callensburg, Pa., where he continued to labor for more than twenty years. In 1861 he accepted the chaplaincy of the 103d Regiment of Pennsylvania Volunteers, in which position he labored until his death, June 4, 1862. Mr. McCay possessed an intellect of high order, clear, comprehensive, and eminently practical; his attainments in science and literature were varied and exact; his piety deep, constant, and heartfelt. See Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1863, p. 191.

## Mccheyne, Robert Murray[[@Headword:Mccheyne, Robert Murray]]

             a celebrated Scotch preacher and evangelist, was born in Edinburgh, Scotland, May 21, 1813. At five years of age he was quite proficient in English. When eight years old he entered the high-school, where for six years he maintained high rank in his classes. In November, 1827, he entered Edinburgh University, and during his college course gained prizes in various departments of study. He studied modern languages privately; was proficient in gymnastic exercises, and in music and drawing. This last acquisition was advantageous to him afterwards in sketching scenes in the  Holy Land. The death of his eldest brother, David, led to his conversion, or was the beginning of the great change in his life, and brought him to study for the ministry. In 1831 he entered upon his studies in theology and Church history in Divinity Hall, under Dr. Chalmers and Dr. Welsh. In 1835 he removed to the Presbytery of Annan, and was licensed to preach July 1. November 7 he began his labors at Larbert, a parish containing six thousand people, to whom he was a devoted pastor. He was also an intense student of the Bible, reading it in both the Hebrew and the Greek. In 1836 he was called to St. Peter's Church, Dundee, and was ordained there Nov. 24. This charge was large, and his labors were so constant that his health failed, and he was obliged to retire for a season of rest. During this vacation he went, with three other ministers, to Palestine, on a “mission of inquiry to the Jews.” His health improved by his travels, and on his return he resumed his work at St. Peter's, where he remained until 1842, when his health again failed. He now undertook a preaching tour, with other ministers, through the north of England, preaching in the open air and in churches of different denominations. Returning from England, he was obliged by failing health to have an assistant in his labors at Dundee. In February, 1843, he went on his last tour as an evangelist; on his return from which he was attacked by a fever, and died March 25. 1843. His death was a loss not to his own congregation or denomination only, but to the whole Christian world. Mr. McCheyne was one of the most beautiful examples of the true Gospel minister. Whether among his own congregation, or in Palestine, or traveling as an evangelist, he was always preaching by his words and holy life. He was pre-eminent as a preacher, as a pastor, and as a Christian. and did a great work not merely by the great number of conversions which took place directly or indirectly through his instrumentality, but by the zealous spirit which he infused into every department of Christian work. He had also fine talents for literary and scholastic pursuits. He wrote a number of pieces showing a taste for poetry, one of which — Greece, but living Greece no more — was written at the age of fourteen. His letters from Palestine, his lectures, sermons, and letters, show an ability for composition rarely surpassed; but he consecrated all his talents and powers to the service of Christ, and lived only for the salvation of men. His name will long be fragrant in the Church as a model preacher of the Gospel. See Life and Remains of Letters, Lectures, and Poems of the Rev. Robert Murray McCheyne, by Rev. Andrew A. Bonar (New York, 1857). (H. A. B.)

## Mcclanahan, Alexander W.[[@Headword:Mcclanahan, Alexander W.]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born near West Union, Adams County, Ohio, Nov. 28, 1821; graduated with honor at Miami University, Oxford, Ohio, in 1844; studied theology in the theological seminary at Oxford; was licensed in 1847 by the Chilicothe Presbytery; and in 1848 ordained. His first and only charge was at Decatur, Ohio. He died Oct. 29, 1862. Mr. MIcClanahan was noted for his kindness of heart and spirit of self-sacrifice; he had a massive intellect, capable of broad and comprehensive views, and, when aroused to high mental activity, he wrote and spoke with rare power. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanacs, 1863, p. 359.

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

             a noted (Dutch) Reformed minister and educator, was born at Schenectady, N. Y., in 1794; graduated at Union College in 1809; studied theology with Rev. John Anderson, D.D., in Western Pennsylvania, and afterwards with Rev. John M. Mason, D.D.; was licensed by the Associate Reformed Presbytery, New York, in 1815; and, when nineteen years only, was elected pastor of Rutgers Street Presbyterian Church, New York, as successor of Dr. Milledoler. Here he remained seven years, and established his great reputation as a pulpit orator among the foremost men of his day. In 1822 he became professor of rhetoric, logic, and metaphysics in Dickinson College, Pa.; removed in 1829 to New Brunswick, N. J., as  professor of languages in Rutgers College; and in 1832 was elected professor of Oriental literature and Biblical criticism in the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church. He continued, however, to give instruction in rhetoric and belles-lettres in the college for several years. He resigned his place in the theological seminary in 1857; and, after a tour in Europe, returned to New Brunswick, where he lived in retirement until his death, Dec. 19, 1864. This published works consist of a few occasional sermons and pamphlets, and a volume on the Canon and Interpretation of Scripture (New York, 1860, pp. 329, 12mo). Dr. McClelland was in almost every respect a man sui generis. He was original in thought, in style of expression, in oratory, and in the professor's chair. He was humorous and witty, keen and strong, robust in mind, thorough in scholarship, impatient of dullness and idleness, and exacting to the last degree as a teacher. Inspiring his pupils with his own enthusiasm, he taught them to study and to think accurately for themselves.

He gave very short lessons in Hebrew and in Greek; but the grammar and dictionary were always in use, and he required critical accuracy in recitations. His written lectures on the Epistles to the Romans and Hebrews, and his oral criticisms on Isaiah and the Psalms; his condensed Hebrew Grammar, and his lectures on the Canon and interpretation of Scripture, were admirable specimens of his skill as an instructor. His rare pulpit eloquence was quite equaled at times by outbursts of his genius and power in the professorial chair. Naturally impulsive and irritable, he was often sarcastic and severe; and these tendencies were aggravated by protracted and distressing disease. Yet his best students overlooked all this in their admiration of his ability as a teacher. In the pulpit he was clear and forcible, brilliant and impassioned, versatile and learned, simple and profound, electric, and frequently eccentric. Among his published sermons are a few of his memorable discourses; but some that were perhaps even more characteristic of his remarkable oratory were left out of the collection. No printed page can reproduce the effects of his mellifluous voice, his significant gestures, and the earnestness of his impassioned power. His peculiarities of temperament and manner interfered considerably with his general usefulness, and his independence of thought sometimes led him into questionable statements of truth; and in 1834 he was arraigned before the General Synod for heresy, on the subject of spiritual renovation; but, having made satisfactory explanations, he retained his professorship and ecclesiastical status. His latter years were spent in retirement among his books, and in the quiet pursuit of favorite studies, until he was disabled by a long and incurable  disease; and then, with simple trust in Jesus, entered into rest. Quite detailed sketches of Dr. McClelland's life and works, from the pen of Dr. Chalmers, of New York City, were published in the Christian Intelligencer (New York, 1872, Oct., Nov.). (W. J. R. T.)

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

             one of the projectors and editors of this Cyclopaedia, was born in the city of Philadelphia, Oct. 27, 1814. His parents were devoted members of the Methodist Episcopal Church in that city. In the year 1832 he entered the freshman class of the University of Pennsylvania, and by strenuous exertions completed the whole collegiae course in the space of three years. Before his graduation, in the year 1835, he had commenced preaching, in the New Jersey Annual Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church. In the year 1836 he accepted a call to the chair of mathematics in Dickinson College, which had been reopened in 1834 under Methodist auspices. In this institution he spent twelve most fruitful years. In the year 1840 he exchanged the mathematical chair for that of the Latin and Greek languages, succeeding his friend, the Rev. Robert Emory. As a teacher Dr. McClintock was most successful. Rapid and brilliant, and at the same time thorough and accurate, he was the beau ideal of a college instructor. In 1846 he commenced, in connection with the writer of this article, a series of Latin and Greek text-books, designed to apply to these languages the method of “imitation and repetition” which had been successfully introduced into the teaching of modern tongues. The series was well received, and its method has since been extensively followed. In the year 1848 Dr. McClintock was elected by the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church the editor of its Quarterly Review. In this office he spent eight years. His fine taste, his critical acumen, and his interest in all departments of human knowledge, were amply illustrated in his conduct of the Review. Under his care it rose rapidly to the highest rank among periodicals of its kind. In 1856 he was, in association with bishop Simpson, appointed a delegate from the Methodist Episcopal Church to the Wesleyan Methodist Conference of England. He was at various times elected president of several colleges, but he never assumed the active duties of such a position.

In 1857 he became pastor of St. Paul's Methodist Church, in the city of New York. He adapted himself readily to the duties of the pastoral office. and speedily became known as one of the most eloquent preachers of the metropolis. A fine presence, a rich voice, and a graceful delivery gave effect to the utterances of a well-stored mind. His  charge of this Church expiring by limitation in 1860, he accepted the appointment of pastor of the American chapel in Paris, then and now under the care of the American and Foreign Christian Union. While holding this position the great American civil war broke out, and Dr. McClintock was not a man to be idle in the time of his country's peril. Appreciating the value to the national cause of the friendly opinion of Europe, he exerted himself to the utmost in diffusing a right knowledge of the merits of the controversy in which the American Union was involved. In these labors he availed himself of the aid of the count De Gasparin and the Rev. Mr. Austin of England. During the entire war his pen was never idle, and from the platform, whenever it was practicable, he made eloquent pleas for the national cause. During the period of his residence abroad, he was also corresponding editor of the Methodist, a paper established in 1860 in the city of New York. His letters kept the American public well advised of the fluctuations of European opinion in relation to the war. Upon his return home, in 1864, he was for a second time appointed to the pastorate of St. Paul's Church, but, finding his health unequal to the discharge of the duties of the office, he resigned it at the end of a year. In 1866 he was made chairman of the Central Centenary Committee of the Methodist Episcopal Church, to which was given the work of organizing the commemoration of the introduction, in 1766, of Methodism into the United States. Mr. Daniel Drew, of New York, having signified his intention of founding, in connection with this centenary commemoration, a Biblical and Theological School, Dr. McClintock was chosen its first president. The school was opened in the year 1867, at Madison, New Jersey, under the most flattering auspices, and has been from the beginning an entire success. Dr. McClintock's health had, prior to his election to the presidency of Drew, shown symptoms of decline. Since 1848 he had been frequently prostrated by attacks of illness. From 1867 to 1870 a great decay of vitality was perceptible, and on March 4 of the latter year the “wheels of life stood still at last.”

To the preparation of this Cyclopaedia, Dr. McClintock had, in company with his co-editor, Dr. Strong, devoted many laborious years. To theology and its kindred studies his attention had through life been chiefly directed. He lived to see three volumes completed, and the fourth in a state of forwardness. In the year 1847 he translated, with Prof. C. E. Blumenthal, Neander's Life of Christ, published by Harper and Brothers. In 1851 he prepared an essay on the Temporal Power of the Pope, which was at that  time a political question of some importance in the United States. The Theological Institutes, by Watson, Dr. McClintock supplied with an analysis, which is considered a model work of its kind. He was also a frequent contributor to the Methodlist Quarterly Review, and an occasional one to several other periodicals. Since his death a volume of his sermons has been collected and published under the title Livinq Words (N.Y. 1871,12mo). Dr. McClintock's versatility of talent is apparent even from this slight sketch. He was truly a many-sided man. Yet his attainments were solid; an imperfect understanding of any subject he could not tolerate. In facility of acquiring knowledge he was very remarkable. He could track a subject, never losing the clew, through a labyrinth of books, until he came into full possession of it, both as a whole and in its details. The critical faculty was dominant in him. To systematize knowledge, to reduce it to form and completeness, was instinctive with him; yet he had at the same time the fervor which makes the orator. His eloquence was of the highest order; in power to sway an audience he had few if any superiors. He was probably the most complete scholar that his Church has produced in the United States. His style as a writer was remarkable for clearness, precision, directness, and condensation. His personal qualities endeared him to hosts of friends; his death, in the midst of his years, has been deplored as a great loss to the cause of religion and learning in our country. (G. R. C.)

## Mcclung, John Alexander, D.D.[[@Headword:Mcclung, John Alexander, D.D.]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Washington, Ky., Sept. 25, 1804. His education was received at a private school at Brick Pond, Woodford County, Ky., his instructors being Messrs. Thompson and Daly, from the University of Dublin, Ireland. In 1823 he entered Princeton Thelogical Seminary, and in 1828 was licensed to preach. Subsequently, his mind becoming unsettled concerning the authenticity of some of the books of the Old Testament and one or two of the Epistles, he gave up preaching and entered upon the study of law. During this stage of his life he wrote Sketches of Western Adventures, and otherwise contributed to the press of the day. He was admitted to the bar in 1835, and became a regular practitioner until 1849, when, his religious principles being revived, he was again, in 1851, licensed and ordained, and was called to the First Presbyterian Church, Indianapolis, Ind.; during his pastorate there he was elected president of Hanover College, Ind. In 1857 he accepted a call to Maysville, Ky., wvhere he labored until the summer of 1859, when he was drowned. Dr. McClung was a man of brilliant intellect and rare eloquence;  he was a polished schlar, a generous friend, and an humble Christian. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. A1manac, 1861, p. 100.

## Mccombs (Or Mccoombs), Lawrence[[@Headword:Mccombs (Or Mccoombs), Lawrence]]

             an early Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Kent Coulty, in the State of Delaware, on the 11th of March, 1769. Little is known of his early education, but it is to be presumed, from the easy circumstances of his father, who was a man of wealth, and the high character of the schools and academies of the district in which he lived, that he early attained to a good degree of intellectual culture. In 1792 he was admitted to the Philadelphia Conference on probation, and his first appointment was to the Newburg Circuit, in the State of New York; two years later he was appointed to Long Island; in 1795, to New London; in 1796, to Middletown; in 1797 and 1798, to Polland; in 1799, to New London; in 1800, to Philadelphia; in 1801, to Baltimore City; in 1802, to Baltimore City and Fell's Point; in 1804, to the Baltimore Circuit. In 1806 he asked and obtained a location, and selected a residence on the eastern shore of Maryland, near the head of  the Chesapeake Bay. In this location he is said to have labored with unabated industry and devotion.

In 1815 he re-entered the itinerancy, and took his place in the Philadelphia Conference; in that and in the following year he was appointed to Smyrna; in 1817, to Queen Anne's; and in 1818, to Kent. From 1819 to 1822 he was presiding elder of the Jersey District; in 1823 he was appointed to Essex and Staten Island; in 1824 and 1825, to St. John's Church, Philadelphia; and in 1826, to Wilmington. In 1827 and 1828 he was presiding elder of the East Jersey District; from 1829 to 1832, of the Chesapeake Bay; and in 1833, of the South Philadelphia District. In 1834 he was appointed to St. Paul's Church, Philadelphia; in this year, however, he was constrained, by his rapidly-failing health, to relinquish his active position and become a super-numerary. In 1835 he took his place among the retired and infirm, after having performed an unprecedented amount of labor, and left the impress of his energetic character wherever he went.

He closed his useful and eventful life June 11, 1836. An intimate friend, also a minister, the Rev. J. Kennaday, has left this beautiful tribute to his memory: “In his religious character Mr. McCombs blended great zeal and fidelity with a very unusual kindliness of spirit. No hostility could intimidate him in the course of duty, nor could any provocation betray him into petulance or resentment. Meek in spirit, intrepid in purpose, gentle and social in manner, he was greatly respected in the pulpit, and ever welcome to the hospitalities of the numerous circles which he adorned as the man of God. He was strong in faith, much in prayer, and a great reader of the Bible. His intellectual character was developed more in the uniform strength of his faculties than in the marked prominence of any one or more of them. His perceptions were quick and clear, and his judgment sober and impartial. He had a fine imagination, which, being restrained and regulated by his admirable taste, gave beauty and warmth, as the artists say, to all his pictures. In unison with these traits, there were some physical qualities that contributed largely to his power and success. His personal appearance was very imposing. In stature he was full six feet in height, with a finely- developed form; though not corpulent, the breadth of his chest indicated the prodigious strength which enabled him to perform his almost gigantic labors. The general expression of his countenance betokened intelligence, gentleness, and energy, while his full, frank face was illumined by his ever- lindling eye. His voice was full, clear, and of great flexibility, sweeping from the lowest to the highest tone, and modulated in the most delicate manner, in beautiful harmony with his subject. In preaching in the field, which was his favorite arena, I used to think he was quite an approach to  Whitefield. Such was his known power at camp-meetings that the announcement that he was to be present on such an occasion would draw a multitude of people from great distances.... I have thought that in some respects there was a striking resemblance between him and the late distinguished Dr. John M. Mason, of New York, whom I often heard in my boyhood.” See Sprague, Annals Amer. Pulpit, 7:210 sq.; Conf. Min. 2:492.

## Mcconaughy, David, D.D., LL.D.[[@Headword:Mcconaughy, David, D.D., LL.D.]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Menallen township, York County, Pa., Sept. 29, 1775, and graduated at Dickinson College, Carlisle, in 1795; studied theology for two years; was licensed in 1797, and preached frequently as a missionary in Philadelphia and New York; accepted a call from the United Christians of Upper Marsh Creek and Conewago in 1800, and remained pastor till 1832. During this connection he visited Baltimore, Philadelphia, and New York in behalf of the Gettysburg Church, and as a minister and a teacher rendered important services. At an early period he interested himself much in the cause of temperance by appointing meetings, preaching, and forming a society, of which he himself was president. He removed to Washington in 1832 to the presidency of the college, which he resigned in 1849. He died Jan. 29, 1852. Dr. McConaughy published A Brief Summary and Outline of Moral Science (1838): — Discourses, chiefly Biographical, of Persons eminent in Sacred History (1850, 8vo): — Two Tracts on the Doctrine of the Trinity and on Infant Baptism Sermons and Addresses. See Sprague, Annals, 4:199.

## Mcconnell, William L.[[@Headword:Mcconnell, William L.]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born near Canonsburg, Pa., Sept. 19, 1829; graduated at Jefferson College, Canonsburg, Pa.; studied theology in the Associate Reformed Seminary, Alleghany, Pa.; and was licensed and ordained by Alleghany Reformed Presbytery in 1857. He accepted a call to Hanover Church, and subsequently to West Newton, Pa., where he labored until failing health compelled him to desist. He died July 18, 1866. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1867, p. 363.

## Mccook, Robert J[[@Headword:Mccook, Robert J]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born in Wilkinson County, Ga., Jan. 5, 1817; professed religion and joined the  Church when in his fourteenth year, and was impressed with a call to preach the Gospel. Resisting this impression, he lost his religious peace, and finally made shipwreck of his faith. At about twenty-two he again connected himself with the Church, but still shrunk from obeying his call to the ministry until 1853, when he was licensed to preach, and was admitted into the Florida Convention in 1854. From that time (except during the year 1866, when he was superannuated), he labored with devoted zeal and encouraging success, filling various important charges with great usefulness until his death at Key West, Nov. 22, 1870. “He was a godly man. ‘Holiness to the Lord' was his theme in the pulpit, and was illustrated in his daily life. His end was peace, and his works do follow him." — Conference Minutes M. E. Church South, 1871, s.v.

## Mccorkle, Samuel Eusebius, D.D[[@Headword:Mccorkle, Samuel Eusebius, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born near Harris Ferry, Lancaster County, Pa., Aug. 23, 1746, and graduated at New Jersey College in 1772; was licensed in 1774, and, after laboring for two years in Virginia, accepted a call from the congregation of Thyatira in 1777. About 1785 he opened a classical school named Zion Parnassus. which he continued ten or twelve years. He died Jan. 21, 1811. Dr. McCorkle published Four Discourses on the great First Principles of Deism and Revelation contrasted (1797): — Three Discourses on the Terms of Christian Communion: — Occasional Sermons. See Sprague, Annals, 3:346.

## Mccoy, Isaac[[@Headword:Mccoy, Isaac]]

             a Baptist minister, was born in Fayette County, Pa., June 13, 1784; was licensed to preach in 1805, and began work as a missionary. Oct. 13, 1810, he was ordained pastor of the Church at Maria Creek, in Clark County, Ind.. where he remained some eight years, making occasional missionary tours in the surrounding country. In 1818 he was appointed a missionary to the Indians, and in May, 1820, removed to Fort Wayne, where he established a Church; in the fall of the same year he removed to Carey, on the St. Joseph River, and from thence, in 1829, to the Indian country, now Kansas. In 1842 he became the first corresponding secretary and general agent of the American Indian Mission Association, at Louisville, Ky. He  died June 21, 1846. He published a History of Baptist Indian Missions, embracing remarks on the former, present condition, and future prospects of the aboriginal tribes (1840, 8vo). See Sprague, Annals, 6:541.

## Mccready, Jonathan Sharp[[@Headword:Mccready, Jonathan Sharp]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born near New Galilee, Pa., April 15,1828; enjoyed in early life the advantage of religious instruction, discipline, and example; graduated at Franklin College in 1852; studied theology in the Associate Seminary at Canonsburg (class of 1855); was licensed by the Associate Presbytery of Ohio in October of the same year; in 1856 was ordained and installed pastor of the Associate congregation of Cadiz, and there continued to labor until 1862, when he volunteered in the service of the government. While in the army he continued to preach, and perform every other ministerial duty as occasion offered, until he was killed, Sept. 7, 1864. Mr. McCready was endowed with a clear and penetrating intellect; his education was comprehensive, his style logical and energetic, his manner positive and emphatic. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1866, p. 265.

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

             a noted Scotch divine, celebrated as a write on ecclesiastical history and polemics, was born at Dunse, in Berwickshire, in November, 1772. “Dr. McCrie's parents,” says his biographer, “being connected with that branch of the secession usually termed Anti-Burghers, he was brought up under... the primitive strictness of that communion... and received that thoroughly religious education, of the importance of which he was ever afterwards so strenuous an advocate, and of the success of which he was himself a striking example.” After securing the rudiments of education at the parish school of his native place, he entered, in 1788, the University of Edinburgh, and in 1791 commenced his theological studies. In 1795 he was licensed to preach by the Associate Presbytery of Kelso, and he was immediately afterwards chosen pastor of a congregation of the same body in Edinburgh, where he served the following ten years, applying himself with great assiduity to the discharge of his professional duties, and occasionally publishing able pamphlets on some of the gravest and most difficult subjects of theological inquiry. The differences of opinion, and the appearance of New-Lights with peculiar doctrines quite unknown to the primitive belief of the “Secession Church,” caused McCrie in 1806, with five friends, among them the celebrated Bruce, to separate from the “General Associated Synod,” and to form “the Constitutional Associate Presbytery,” avowing “strict adherence to the principles of the original secession.” (Here compare Hist. Sketch of the Origin of the Secession  Church, by the Rev.

A. Thomson, and the History of the Rise of the Relief Church, by the Rev. Gavin Struthers [Edinburgh, 1858, 12mo]). During the controversy which this change provoked he gave himself largely to the study of the Reformers, and came to admire so much his great countryman, John Knox, that he zealously applied himself to the composition of a Life of John Knox (Edinb. 1812, 8vo, and often), a masterly work, that combines the highest excellences of which biography is capable, and was by his contemporaries regarded as “a literary phenomenon.” “It placed the character of the Scottish Reformer,” says Jamieson (Cyclop. Rel. Biog. s.v.), “in an entirely new light, and showed him to be so widely different from the rude and illiterate demagogue he had been hitherto represented, that its appearance was hailed with patriotic pride and gratitude. It placed the name of McCrie at once in the foremost ranks of living historians. The highest literary honors were conferred on him” (compare Hetherington, Hist. Ch. of Scotland, 2:369). He received from the University of Edinburgh the honorary title of D.D., being the first Dissenter to whom that distinction was awarded; and his book, besides passing through several editions in Scotland, was translated into most of the languages of Europe. Encouraged by the success of his first literary effort, Dr. McCrie published, as the fruits of his researches regarding a later period of Scottish ecclesiastical history, the Biography of Andrew Melville, a celebrated champion of Presbyterianism in the reign of James VI of Scotland. This work, composed on the same principle of combining the memoirs of an individual with a narrative of public events (it illustrates the formation of the Kirk of Scotland, and the peculiarities of the Presbyterian establishment), evinces a vast amount of erudition and research. Critics of Anglican tendency have always been inclined to accuse McCrie of great partisan zeal and unfairness to his opponents: thus Mr. Hallam designated his writings as the products of “Presbyterian Hildebrandism.”

But these censures are unjust and unmerited. His impartiality and candor, and his unaffected desire to investigate the truth, to whatever conclusion it might lead, have been clearly conceded even by liberal opponents, and unmistakably impress themselves on every thoughtful reader. A writer, commenting on a later production from Dr. McCrie, in the Westminster Review (Jan. 1857), aptly says: “McCrie belongs to the higher class of writers to whose earnesestess, thoroughness, and genuine research we turn for relief from the superficial second-hand showiness of books written from a transient impulse, in order to supply only a transient need.” After McCrie's formation of the “Constitutional Associate Presbytery,” difficulty  arose among his people respecting their Church property. The result finally was the building of a new place of worship in West Nicholson Street, and there he ministered for nearly thirty years. In 1821 he made a tour to the Continent, mainly with a view to study the Continental Reformation, and, after continuing his investigations until 1827, published the Hist. of the Ref. in Italy, and in 1829 the Hist. of the Ref. in Spain, both of which had the honor of being prominently placed in the list of the Roman Index of forbidden books, and are spoken of as “the very best accounts we possess of the protest made against Romish corruption by the races of the South — a protest not less ardent, but unhappily less persistent than that of the phlegmatic North.” At the time of his death, Aug. 5, 1835, the doctor was engaged on a “Life of Calvin,” which unfortunately he left uncompleted. All his completed works were published under the title of Works of the late Thomas McCrie, D.D., by his son Thomas, in 4 vols. 8vo (Edinb. 185557). They contain, besides the works already mentioned, Discourses on the Unity of the Church (1821): — Memoirs of William Veitch and George Bryson (1825): — Lectures on the Book of Esther (1838):— Vindications of Christian Faith and his Sermons (1836). See Life and Times of Thomias McCrie, D.D., by his son Thomas (Edinb. 1840, 8vo); Blackwood's Magazine, 38:429; Gentl. Magazine, 1835, pt. ii, p. 434; The Annual Biogr. and Obit. (Lond. 1836, 8vo), 20:442; Allibone, Dict. Brit. and Amer. Authors, vol. ii, s.v.; Cunningham, Hist. Studies, 1:411. (J. H. W.)

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

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Ireland. He received a classical education in the College of Belfast, Ireland; subsequently emigrated to this country, and studied theology in Princeton Theological Seminary. In 1848 he was licensed, and ordained pastor of Mount Grove and Hopewell churches, Ohio, where he remained until 1856, when he went to California. On his return he became connected with the New Lisbon Presbytery, in which connection he remained until his death in 1859, See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1860, p. 76.

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

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born in Elbert County, Ga., July 10, 1800; in 1825 he professed religion, and joined the Methodist Episcopal Church; in 1830 was licensed to preach, and in 1843 was admitted into the Tennessee Annual Conference. From that time till his  death he labored faithfully on various circuits and missions. Much of his time was devoted to missionary work among the colored people. In this field he was very successful. For the last several years of his life his health was feeble, and he was on the supernumerary and superannuated lists. He died in Williamson County, Tenn., Aug. 17, 1870. Mr. McCurdy “was a man of sound judgment, good common-sense, and deep and uniform piety. He lived above reproach, and died honored by all who knew him." — Conference Minutes M. E. Ch. South, 1870, s.v.

## Mccutchen, James B[[@Headword:Mccutchen, James B]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born near Murfreesboro, Tenn., Aug. 26, 1829; professed religion in his fourteenth year, and joined the Methodist Church; was licensed to preach, and joined the Memphis Annual Conference in 1852; was appointed to Camden Circuit in 1853; Mount Pinson in 1854; Tishomingo in 1855; Clinton Circuit in 1857; Paducah Circuit in 1858; Murray Circuit in 1860; and Tishomingo Circuit in 1861. During this year he was elected chaplain of the 7th Kentucky Regiment C. S. A. In this service he continued till the close of the war, when he resumed his place as, traveling preacher, and was appointed in 1866 to Cageville Circuit; in 1868 to Trenton Circuit, and again to Cageville Circuit in 1869. He died Aug. 28, 1870. “Brother McCutchen was a self-made man, having received but a limited education in his youth, but by industry and hard study he had acquired a very good English education, and no mean acquaintance with the Latin and Greek languages. His preaching was of a plain, practical character, exhibiting a large acquaintance with the sacred Scriptures, and with the standard literature of the Church. He was not of a polemical turn of mind, but when our doctrines were attacked, he always showed himself a fearless champion and a trustworthy debater. But few men in our ranks are better prepared to defend our doctrines than he was, and yet he cherished a noble catholicity of sentiment and feeling that did credit at once to his head and heart. He was not merely acceptable, but popular and useful, making many friends wherever he went." — Conference Minutes of. E. Church South, 1870, s.v.

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

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Amelia County, Va., April 1, 1799; was educated in what were known as the Old Fields Schools of Virginia; was early made a ruling elder in the Church, and at once identified himself  with the cause of temperance. He was licensed by West Hanover Presbvtery in 1834, and in 1838 ordained and installed pastor over Hoe Creek and Morris churches, in Campbell County, Va. He died Sept. 15, 1867. Mr. McDearmon was a good and useful man, and an earnest apostle of temperance in his region. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1868, p. 347.

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

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Monmouth County, N. J., in 1791; was educated in the Lawrenceville High School, N. J.; studied divinity in the theological seminary at Princeton (class of 1832), and was licensed and ordained by New Brunswick Presbytery, as pastor of the Church at Stillwater, N. J.: in 1838, removed to Ohio as pastor of Hubbard and Unity churches; in 1844 accepted a call to Clarkson Church; and in 1846 resigned to become pastor of Chippewa Church, where he remained until compelled to resign because of failing health. He died June 6, 1861. Mr. McDermott was a devoted preacher; earnest in his work, and industrious in his efforts. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1862, p. 109.

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

             an American philanthropist, a merchant of New Orleans, was born at Baltimore in 1778, and in 1800 removed to the Southern city, where, after having by hard labor and strict economy amassed an immense fortune, he delighted to serve the cause of humanity. He founded free schools and asylums for orphans, and also aided greatly the cause of the “American Colonization Society.” He established himself a colony in Africa, and sent thither many of his own negroes, after having previously provided them with a thorough education and a trade. He died Oct. 26. 1850. See Drake, Dict. Amer. Biog. s.v.

## Mcelhany, William G[[@Headword:Mcelhany, William G]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Huntington, Pa.; graduated at Jefferson College, Pa., in 1847; studied theology in the Associate Reformed Seminary at Canonsburg, Pa.; and in 1850 was licensed by Chartier Presbytery; in 1855 was ordained and installed pastor of the Church in Hoboken, N. J., which relation existed until his death, May 28,  1860. Mr. McElhany was a sound evangelical preacher. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Alm. 1861, p. 209.

## Mcfarlane, Jessie[[@Headword:Mcfarlane, Jessie]]

             a female preacher of the Society of Friends, was born about the year 1842; commenced preaching at seventeen, at first to girls and women, but later also to men. After eight years of this service, she became the wife of Dr. Brodie, of Edinburgh, and spent the remainder of her life in more private activity for the cause of her Master. She died about 1869. Her preaching was impressive, her life one of uncommon purity and devotion, her death triumphant. She wrote a paper on the scriptural authority for the preaching of women, which is inserted in a memoir of her life, entitled In Memoriam. Jessie McFarlane, by J. G. (Lond. 1872,12mo). See Friends' Review (Phila.), Oct. 12.1872.

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

             a distinguished minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Washington County, Va., March 25, 1784. His ancestors emigrated from Ireland to this country about the year 1740. His father was a Presbyterian, a farmer, a strict observer of the Lord's day, and esteemed for his sobriety, good judgment, and intelligence. Mr. McFerrin's educational advantages were very limited, the years of his minority being passed on his father's farm, where, however, he acquired habits of industry, sobriety, and enterprise. On his twentieth birthday he was married to Jane Campbell Berry; shortly after which event he removed from Virginia to Rutherford County, Tenn. The country was new, the settlements exposed to depredations by the Indians; hardships and dangers were consequently inseparable from such a condition of things. Mr. McFerrin gave great attention to military tactics, in which he became thoroughly skilled, and, on the breaking out of the war with Great Britain in 1812, he was called into service, and, as captain of a company of volunteers, was engaged in a campaign against the Creek Indians under that renowned man, general Jackson. On account of his brave conduct at the battle in which the Indians were defeated, Mr. McFerrin was elected colonel. In his thirty-sixth year his whole course of life was changed, the result of which was that he thenceforth devoted himself to the work of the ministry. In 1823 he became a member of the Tennessee Annual Conference, and was appointed to the Jackson Circuit, in the northern part of Alabama. He had charge of this circuit two years. The two subsequent years (1826 and 1827) he traveled the Limestone Circuit, and at the close of this period removed to the vicinity of Courtland, Ala., where he purchased a farm, and remained  for several years. This was in the Franklin Circuit, which he traveled in the years 1828 and 1829. During this period he attended the General Conference held in Pittsburg in 1828. He was also a delegate to the General Conference of 1832, held in Philadelphia. At the close of his labors on the Franklin Circuit he was made presiding elder of the Richland District, which he traveled four years. In the year 1834, having determined to remove to Western Tennessee, he deemed it proper to locate for one year, till he should be settled in his new home. In 1835 he was re-admitted into Conference, and appointed to the Wesley Circuit, which he traveled two years. His next appointment was to Randolph and Harmony, for one year; and to the Wesley Circuit for one year (1839), which proved to be the last of his itinerant life. Among his papers is the following record, made in 1839: “Since I joined Conference, Nov. 25, 1823, I have preached 2088 times, baptized 573 adults and 813 infants, and have taken into society 3965 members.” Mr. McFerrin died Sept. 4, 1840.

## Mcgaughey, William G.[[@Headword:Mcgaughey, William G.]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born in Davidson County, Tenn., Jan. 12, 1812; was converted in 1833; was licensed to exhort at Holly Springs, Miss., about 1843; and shortly after received license to preach, and accomplished much good for the Church in this capacity. He was also for several years agent for the American Bible Society. In 1847 he was ordained deacon by bishop Soule; elder by bishop Andrew in 1852; in 1855 was admitted into Louisiana Conference, and appointed to Swan Lake and Pecan Grove; to Lake Providence in 1.858 Carroll Circuit in 1859; Tensas and Elizabeth Chapel in 1861; Tensas Mission in 1863; Wesley, Tensas, and Jordan Chapel in 1864; Tensas District in 1865; Lake Providence District in 1867; Carroll Circuit in 1870; and in 1871 Lake Providence. He died Jan. 26, 1872. Mr. McGaughey was a devoted Christian and an able minister, much esteemed by all who knew him. — Conference Minutes of the M. C. Church South, 1872, s.v.

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

             a celebrated Scotch layman and writer, was born in the parish of Auchinleck, Ayrshire, Aug. 12,1773. His parents were in very moderate circumstances, and young McGavin therefore enjoyed but slender educational advantages. While yet a boy he was apprenticed to a bookseller and printer, but soon made himself a host of friends by the great literary  talent he displayed in frequent contributions to the local newspapers. He was entrusted with the care of an elementary school, which he conducted with skill, though he hated the drudgery of teaching. He took an early opportunity to quit the rostrum, and to seek a livelihood in the counting- house. He became the agent of the British Linen Company's banking establishment in Glasgow. Although this business connection gave him great care and responsibility, McGavin's fondness of writing would not allow him to withdraw altogether from literary labors, and, by habits of unwearied industry, he was enabled to command leisure for the publication of many valuable religious tracts. An ardent opponent of Romanism, he attacked it in a series of papers entitled the “Protestant” (1818-21), which Dr. Robert Hall (Review of Birt's Popery) pronounced “the fullest delineation of the popish system, and the most powerful confutation of its principles, in a popular style.” McGavin also edited John Howie's Scotch Worthies, and John Knox's Hist. of the Reformation, and frequently preached to the poor and the humble in the suburbs of Glasgow. He died in 1832. See Chambers's and Thomson's Biog. Dict. of Eminent Scotsmen (1865), vol. 3, s.v.; Jamieson, Dict. of Reli. Biog. s.v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, vol. ii, s.v.

## Mcgee, William C[[@Headword:Mcgee, William C]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Paterson, N. J., Aug. 15, 1816, and was educated at New Jersey College, N. J. (class of 1836), and at the theological seminary, Princeton, N. J. In 1841 he was licensed and ordained pastor of Hardwick and Marksborough churches, where he remained until his death, May 25, 1867. Mr. McGee, as a preacher, was earnest, lucid, and practical; as a pastor, constant and zealous; as a citizen, intelligent and public-spirited. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1868, p. 127.

## Mcgilvary, Archibald B[[@Headword:Mcgilvary, Archibald B]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born in the Isle of Skye, coast of Scotland, towards the close of the last century. He came to this country in 1806, joined the South Carolina Conference in 1832, and died at Greenville, S. C., June 9, 1863. “Brother McGilvary was a modest, cheerful, and agreeable man, a faithful friend, and good citizen. As a minister of Christ, he was holy, laborious, and useful." — Conference Minutes of the M. E. Church South, 2:449.

## Mcglashan, Alexander[[@Headword:Mcglashan, Alexander]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Queenston, Canada, Feb. 23, 1812; pursued his preparatory studies in the academy in Geneva, N.Y.; graduated at Hobart College, Geneva, N.Y., and in 1840 at the theological seminary in Auburn, N.Y. He was licensed and ordained as all evangelist in 1843. and afterwards commissioned by the American Tract Society as a general agent to the Southern States. While in this employ he built a mariner's church in Mobile, Ala.; subsequently his services were transferred from the tract and colportage efforts to the cause of the Seaman's Friend Society. In 1859 he again removed to the North, and in 1863 commenced work for the cause of the sailor in New York City, where he established a new church, called the Church of the Sea and Land. In 1866 he removed to St. Catharine's, Canada, where he remained until his death, Sept. 9,1867. Mr. McGlashan was a man of extraordinary Christian zeal, peculiar talents, and marked success. See Wilson, Presb. list. Almanac, 1868, p. 128.

## Mcgorrisk, Bernard[[@Headword:Mcgorrisk, Bernard]]

             a Roman Catholic priest, was born in Ireland in 1818; went to Paris to pursue an academical course, and there also studied theology; emigrated to this country early in 1842; was engaged for several months as professor of French at St. John's College (Fordham, N. Y.); afterwards went as missionary priest to the West, where he labored for nearly eighteen years, building fifteen or sixteen churches. About 1860 he removed to Brooklyn, where he built the present church of St. Vincent de Paul. He died Oct. 29, 1865. — New Amer. Cyclop. 1865, p. 654.

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

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Ireland in 1711, and from 1736 until his death (May 30,1777) was pastor of Londonderry Church, New Hampshire. He received the degree of A.M. from New Jersey College. He published Sermons sand Theological Treatises (1741-74). See Drake, Dict. of Amer. Biog. s.v.

## Mchal[[@Headword:Mchal]]

             (Heb. Mikal', מַיכִל, rivulet, as in 2Sa 17:20; Sept. Μεχόλ v.r. Μελχόλ; Josephus, Μιχάλα, Ant. 6:11, 4), the younger of king Saul's two daughters (1Sa 14:49), doubtless by his wife Ahinoam (1Sa 14:50). In the following statement of the Biblical history, we chiefly dwell upon those points that relate to his successor. SEE DAVID.

The king had proposed to bestow on David his eldest daughter Merab; but before the marriage could be arranged an unexpected turn was given to the matter by the behavior of Michal, who fell violently in love with the young hero. The marriage with her elder sister was at once put aside. Saul eagerly caught at the opportunity which the change offered him of exposing his rival to the risk of death. The price fixed on Michal's hand was no less than the slaughter of a hundred Philistines. For these the usual “dowry” by which, according to the custom of the East, from the time of Jacob down to the present day, the father is paid for his daughter, was relinquished. David by a brilliant feat doubled the tale of victims, and Michal became his wife (1Sa 18:20-28). What her age was we do not know — her husband cannot have been more than twenty. B.C. cir. 1063.

It was not long before the strength of her affection was put to the proof. They seem to have been living at Gibeah, then the head-quarters of the king and the army. After one of Saul's attacks of frenzy, in which David had barely escaped being transfixed by the king's great spear, Michal learned that the house was watched by the myrmidons of Saul, and that it was intended on the next morning to attack her husband as he left his door (1Sa 19:11). That the intention was real was evident from the behavior of the king's soldiers, who paraded around and around the town, and “returning” to the house “in the evening,” with loud cries, more like the yells of the savage dogs of the East than the utterances of human beings, “belched out” curses and lies against the young warrior who had so lately shamed them all (Psa 59:3; Psa 59:6-7; Psa 59:12). Michal seems to have known too well the vacillating and ferocious disposition of her father when in these demoniacal moods. The attack was ordered for the morning; but before the morning arrives the king will probably have changed his mind and hastened his stroke. So, like a true soldier's wife, she meets stratagem  by stratagem. She first provided for David's safety by lowering him out of the window; to gain time for him to reach the residence of Samuel, she next dressed up the bed as if still occupied by him; one of her teraphim; or household gods, was laid in the bed; its head enveloped, like that of a sleeper, in the usual net (so Ewald, Gesch. 3:101, renders כְּבַיר, rather perhaps a quilt or mattress, A.V. “‘pillow” [q.v.]) of goat's hair for protection from gnats, the rest of the figure covered with the wide beged or plaid. It happened as she had feared; Saul could. not delay his vengeance till David appeared out of doors, but sent his people into the house. The reply of Michal is that her husband is ill and cannot be disturbed. At last Saul will be baulked no longer: his messengers force their way into the inmost apartment, and there discover the deception which has been played off upon them with such success. Saul's rage may be imagined: his fury was such that Michal was obliged to fabricate a story of David's having attempted to kill her (1Sa 19:12-17). B.C. cir. 1062.

This was the last time she saw her husband for many years; and when the rupture between Saul and David had become open and incurable, Michal was married to another man, Phalti, or Phaltiel, of Gallim (1Sa 25:44; 2Sa 3:15), a village apparently not far from Gibeah. Her father probably did not believe her story concerning David's escape; but he had taken advantage of it by canceling her former marriage. David, however, as the divorce had been without his consent, felt that the law (Deu 24:4) against a husband taking back a divorced wife could not apply in this case; he therefore formally reclaimed her of Ish- bosheth, who employed no less a personage than Abner to take her from Phaltiel, and conduct her with all honor to David. It was under cover of this mission that Abner sounded the elders of Israel respecting their acceptance of David for king, and conferred with David himself on the same subject at Hebron (2Sa 3:12-21). As this demand was not made by David until Abner had contrived to intimate his design, it has been supposed by some that it was managed between them solely to afford Abner an ostensible errand in going to Hebron; but it is more pleasant to suppose that, although the matter happened to be so timed as to give a color to this suspicion, the demand really arose from David's revived affection for his first wife and earliest love. After the death of her father and brothers at Glib, Michal and her new husband appear to have betaken themselves, with the rest of the family of Saul, to the eastern side of the Jordan. If the old Jewish tradition inserted by the Targum in 2 Samuel 21  may be followed, she was occupied in bringing up the sons of her sister Merab and Adriel of Meholah.

At any rate, it is on the road leading up from the .Jordan valley to the Mount of Olives that we first encounter her with her husband — Michal under the joint escort of David's messengers and Abner's twenty men, en route to David at Hebron, the submissive Phaltiel behind, bewailing the wife thus torn from him. It was at least fourteen years since David and she had parted at Gibeah, since she had watched him disappear down the cord into the darkness, and had perilled her own life for his against the rage of her insane father. That David's love for his absent wife had undergone no change in the interval seems certain from the eagerness with which he reclaims her as soon as the opportunity is afforded him. Important as it was to him to make an alliance with Ishbosheth and the great tribe of Benjamin, and much as he respected Abner, he will not listen for a moment to any overtures till his wife is restored. Every circumstance is fresh in his memory. “I will not see thy face except thou first bring Saul's daughter... my wife Michal whom I espoused to me for a hundred foreskins of the Philistines” (2Sa 3:13-14). The meeting took place at Hebron. B.C. cir. 1047. How Michal comported herself in the altered circumstances of David's household, how she received or was received by Abigail and Ahinoam we are not told; but it is plain from the subsequent occurrences that something had happened to alter the relations of herself and David. They were no longer what they had been to each other. The alienation was probably mutual. On her side must have been the recollection of the long contests which had taken place in the interval between her father and David; the strong anti-Saulite and anti- Benjamite feeling prevalent in the camp at Hebron, where every word she heard must have contained some distasteful allusion, and where at every turn she must have encountered men like Abiathar the priest or Ismaiah the Gibeonite (1Ch 12:4; comp. 2Sa 21:2), who had lost the whole or the greater part of their relatives in some sudden burst of her father's fury. Add to this the connection between her husband and the Philistines who had killed her father and brothers; and, more than all perhaps, the inevitable difference between the boy-husband of her recollections and the matured and occupied warrior who now received her. The whole must have come upon her as a strong contrast to the affectionate husband whose tears had followed her along the road over Olivet, and to the home over which we cannot doubt she ruled supreme. On the side of David it is natural to put her advanced years, in a climate where women are old at thirty, and probably a petulant and jealous temper  inherited from her father, one outburst of which certainly produced the rupture between them which closes our knowledge of Michal.

It was the day of David's greatest triumph, when he brought the Ark of Jehovah from its temporary restingplace to its home in the newly-acquired city. It was a triumph in every respect peculiarly his own. The procession consisted of priests, Levites, the captains of the host, the elders of the nation; and conspicuous in front, “in the midst of the damsels playing on the timbrels” (comp. Psa 68:25), was the king dancing and leaping. Michal watched this procession approach from the window of her apartments in the royal harem; the motions of her husband, clothed only in a thin linen ephod (1Ch 15:27), shocked her as undignified and indecent — “she despised him in her heart.” B.C. cir. 1043. It would have been well if her contempt had rested there; but it was not in her nature to conceal it, and when, after the exertions of the long day were over — the last burnt-offering and the last peace-offering offered, the last portion distributed to the crowd of worshippers — the king entered his house to bless his family, he was received by his wife, not with the congratulations which he had a right to expect, and which would have been so grateful to him, but with a bitter taunt, which showed how incapable she was of appreciating either her husband's temper or the service in which he had been engaged. David's retort was a tremendous one, conveyed in words which once spoken could never be recalled. It gathered up all the differences between them which made sympathy no longer possible, and we do not need the assurance of the sacred writer, that “Michal had no child unto the day of her death,” to feel quite certain that all intercourse between her and David must have ceased from that date. Josephus (Ant. 7:4, 3) intimates that she returned to Phaltiel, but of this there is no mention in the records of the Bible; and it would be difficult to reconcile such a thing with the known ideas of the Jews as to women who had once shared the king's bed. SEE ABISHAG; SEE ADONIJAH.

The fanciful Jewish tradition, preserved in the Targum on Rth 3:3, states that Phaltiel had from the first acted in accordance with the idea alluded to in the text. He is placed in the same rank with Joseph, and is commemorated as “Phaltiel, son of Laish, the pious (חֲסַידָא, Assidaean, the word used for the Puritans of the New Testament times), who placed a sword between himself and Michal, Saul's daughter, lest he should go in unto her.” It was thus, perhaps, as Abarbanel remarks, ordered by Providence that the race of Saul and David  should not be mixed, and that no one deriving any apparent right from Saul should succeed to the throne.

Her name appears but once again (2Sa 21:8), as the bringer-up, or more accurately the mother, of five of the grandchildren of Saul who were sacrificed to Jehovah by the Gibeonites on the hill of Gibeah. But it is probably more correct to substitute Merab for Michal in this place (see Hitzig, Begr. der Krit. page 145 sq.; Flieschmann, De filiis Michal, Altorf, 1716). SEE ADRIEL.

## Mchenry, Barnabas[[@Headword:Mchenry, Barnabas]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in one of the eastern counties of Virginia Dec. 10,1767; was converted when only fifteen years of age, and shortly after joined the Church. Called to preach  the Gospel, he entered the itinerancy in May, 1787, and was appointed to Yadkin Circuit. Thereafter he successively served the cause of his Master in the following appointments: in 1788 at Cumberland Circuit: in 1789 at Danville; in 1790 at Madison; in 1791 at Cumberland; was placed in charge of the district in 1792, and in 1793 of an enlarged number of circuits; in 1.794 he was sent to Salt River Circuit; in 1795 was located on account of impaired health; in 1819 was readmitted, and appointed presiding elder of Salt River District, Tennessee Conference, but his health again failed him, and he was finally obliged to retire from active work, and take the place of a super-annuate. He died at Mount Pleasant, near Springfield, Ky. June 16, 1833. “Barnabas McHenry,” is the testimony of one, “was a man of strong mind and able in argument. He stood upon the walls of our Zion and defended her bulwarks when she was assailed by an enemy.” Bishop Bascom says, “Of the early years of his ministry but little is known, except vague yet cherished traditions of the beauty, unction, and eloquence of his preaching, together with the dangers and hardships to which he was exposed as a pioneer missionary in the wilderness of the West from 1788 to 1795.... Even a century in a single community produces few such men as Barnabas McHenry and Valentine Cook. They were men by themselves, and their memory would adorn the history of any Church or age.” See Sprague, Annals of the American Pulpit, 7:143 sq.; Finley, Sketches of the M. E. Church South; Minutes of Conferences, 1834.

## Mcilvaine (Or Macllvaine), Charles Petit, D.D.[[@Headword:Mcilvaine (Or Macllvaine), Charles Petit, D.D.]]

             an eminent divine of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born in Burlington, New Jersey, June 18, 1799. His father, Joseph McIlvaine, was a leading lawyer and United States senator from New Jersey at the time of his death, in 1826. Charles graduated in 1816 at Princeton; was admitted to deacon's orders July 4, 1820, by bishop White, and, having labored in Christ Church, Georgetown, Md., he received two years later priest's orders from bishop Kemp, of Maryland. In 1825 he became professor of ethics and chaplain in the United States Military Academy at West Point. In 1827 he became rector of St. Ann's Church, Brooklyn, N.Y., where he remained until 1832, when he was consecrated bishop of Ohio. While rector at Brooklyn, he also held the professorship of evidences of revealed religion and sacred antiquities in the University of the City of New York. In the episcopacy, Dr. McIlvaine quickly made a name for himself as a man of learning, and of unusual kindliness of disposition, not only in his own Church, but among all Christians, both in this country and in Europe. For  the last ten years or more he was looked upon as the representative of the Low Churchmen of the Protestant Episcopal Church. In his death (which occurred at Florence, Italy, while on a journey for recreation, March 14, 1873), irenical theology has lost one of its ablest advocates, and the Evangelical Association one of its most active promoters.

Bishop McIllvaine was a large contributor to theological literature. His Lectures on the Evidences of Christianity (9th ed. 1857, 12mo, reprinted in England and Scotland), delivered in New York University in 1831, were published by request of the Council, and have gone through many editions. During the early part of the controversy arising out of the Oxford tracts, appeared his Oxford Divinity compared with that of the Romnish and Anglican Churches (Phila. 1841, 8vo ; Lond. 1841, 8vo), which the Edinburgh Review recommended as one of the best “confutations of the Oxford school.” In 1854 he published a volume of sermons entitled The Truth and the Life. He also compiled two volumes of Select Family and Parish Sermons (Columbus, Ohio, 1839, 2 vols. 8vo). His other works of a minor character are, The Sinner's Justification before God (N.Y. 18mo; Lond. 1851, sq.): — The Holy Catholic Church (Phila. 18mo; Lond. 1844, 16mo): — No Priest, no Altar, no Sacrifice, but Christ (N. Y. 12mo; Lond. 12mo): — Valedictory Offering; Five Sermons (1853, 12mo): — A Word in Season to Candidates for Confirnation: — The Doctrines of the Prot. Epis. Church as to Confirmation: — Chief Danger of the Church: — The Truth and the Life; a Series of Twenty-two Discourses (N. Y. 1865, 8vo; Lond. 1855, 8vo; this volume was published at the request of the Convention of the Diocese of Ohio, together with A Memoir of the Rev. Chas. Simeon, both published in New York); and contributed articles to the N. Y. (quarterly) Review, the Episcopal (monthly) Observer, the London (monthly) Christian Observer, the Protestant Churchman (New York), the Episcopal Recorder (Phila.), and the Western Episcopalian (Gambier, Ohio). In 1853 the degree of D.C.L. was conferred upon him by the University of Oxford, and in 1858 that of LL.D. by the University of Cambridge. He was distinguished for the soundness and clearness of his evangelical views, and for the expository character of his preaching. “That for which as a preacher he is most eminent is his power of illustrating Scripture by Scripture; and his mode of doing this shows at once the fullness and the accuracy of his knowledge of Scripture and the transparent simplicity of his conception... . in all his preaching he aims to lay broad and deep the foundations of the Christian character, in strong, clear views of man's sinfulness and need, and Christ's fullness and freeness as a Savior.”  See Fish, Pulpit Eloquence of the Nineteenth Century (N.Y. 1857, 442, q.v.) for a notice of this excellent prelate, and a sermon of his on the resurrection of Christ. See, also, Western Memorabilia; Knickerbocker, 35:42; Darling, Cyclop. Bibl. 1:1911; Allibone, Dict. Brit. and Amer. Authors, vol. ii, s.v. (J. H. W.)

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

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Columbiana County, Ohio, July 7, 1825; pursued his academic course at Jefferson College, Canonsburg, Pa.; studied theology at the Western Theological Seminary, Alleghany City, Pa.; was licensed by the Presbytery of New Lisbon, and immediately took temporary charge of the Church at Yellow Creek; but, owing to ill health and other causes, had to give up his labors. He died Jan. 19, 1863. Mr. McKay possessed an extensive knowledge of the Scriptures, and was well versed in theology. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1864, p. 187.

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

             a Baptist minister, was born in Rawdon, Ireland, Aug. 22, 1804, and emigrated with his parents, while yet a youth, to the British possessions this side the Atlantic, and finally settled at Rowdon, N. F. Richard was reared in the Episcopal Church, but in 1820 was converted under the preaching of elder James Munro, a Baptist evangelist, and in 1821 finally joined the Baptists; he began preaching in 1826, and March 10, 1828, became the pastor of a congregation at Rowdon In May, 1829, he was called upon to assume the pastors ate of a Baptist congregation at Windsor also, and he thereafter preached both at Rowdon and Windsor until about 1836, when ill health compelled him to withdraw from the ministry. Deprived of the advantages of academic training, he had prepared for college while in the ministry, and in 1839 matriculated at King's College, and there graduated in due course of time, and took his degree of B.A. In 1842, his health still too feeble to reenter the ministry, he removed to Dartmouth, and established himself in business. He died Aug. 17,1860, acknowledged by all who knew him to have been “a conspicuous example of unbending Christian integrity, and earnest, steadfast devotion to the cause of Christ.” “As a preacher,” says one of his contemporaries and associates, “Mr. McKearn commanded the full attention of his auditory. His manner was earnest and energetic; his subjects practical, and treated with clearness and precision. Their application to the heart and conscience was with great power. His language was free and copious, his voice excellent, and capable of great modulation. As his subject required, he was  earnestly winning and persuasive, or denounced with fearful energy the courses of the ungodly.” See The Christian Messenger (Halifax), Oct. 17, 1860.

## Mckeen, Joseph, D.D.[[@Headword:Mckeen, Joseph, D.D.]]

             a Congregational minister, noted as an educator, was born Oct. 15, 1757, in Londonderry, N. H.; graduated at Dartmouth in 1774; served under general Sullivan in the Revolution; was licensed to preach, and ordained pastor in Beverly in May, 1785. In 1802 he was chosen first president of Bowdoin College, and was inaugurated Sept. 2. He died July 15, 1807. “Dr. McKeen possessed a strong and discriminating mind; his manners were conciliating though dignified, and his spirit mild though firm and decided. He was indefatigable in his exertions to promote the interests of science and religion. He was respectable for his learning and exemplary for his Christian virtues, being pious without ostentation, and adhering to evangelical truth without bigotry or superstition.” He published his Inaugural Address and a few occasional Sermons. — Sprague, Annals, 2:216.

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

             a bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in King William County, Va., July 6,1757. He was the subject of frequent religious impressions in youth, but he failed to find peace. He was an adjutant and commissary in Washington's army for several years, and was present at the surrender of Cornwallis at Yorktown in 1781; in 1787 he was converted, during the great revival that occurred under the labors of the Rev. John Easter; and entered the itinerancy June 17, 1788. In 1796 he was made presiding elder; in 1801 was sent by the bishops to preside over Kentucky District, and to have general superintendence of the Western Conference, then embracing Ohio, Kentucky, Tennessee, Western Virginia, and part of Illinois; and in 1806 was presiding elder on Cumberland District, with the same supervision of the Conference. At the General Conference in Baltimore, May, 1810, McKendree was finally promoted to the highest office in the gift of the Church — the episcopacy. He died March 5, 1835, at his brother's, near Nashville, Tenn., having preached faithfully almost fifty years, been twelve years a presiding elder, and nearly twenty-seven years a bishop in the Church. Bishop McKendree was one of the most eminent of all the preachers and pastors of his age. From the time of his  first efforts he was marked as a man of the most vigorous genius, the most genuine modesty, and the most devoted piety. Although not classically educated, his broad and grasping mind went oil acquiring and growing until it had digested and could wield at will a vast and varied knowledge. His imagination was grand and fervid, but always healthy; and could give to his knowledge the freshness of romance, or to his judgment the spell of prophecy. His utterance was copious and forcible, and his voice rich, deep, and flexible. These elements of mind and means, employed by a strong and pathetic heart baptized with the Holy Ghost, made him not only the most truly eloquent bishop that his Church has ever possessed, but one of the best preachers of any Church or age. As a pastor, his administrative abilities were unrivalled. He found the economical methods of the Church crude and indefinite, and imparted to them a systematic vigor; and he was a distinguished promoter of her benevolent institutions. As a man and a Christian he was honored by every class of society. His labors were mighty in laying the deep foundations of evangelical religion in the Mississippi Valley, and his genius and devotion are still a power in the churches, and his memory is blessed. See Minutes of Conferences, 2:402; Life, by B. St. J. Fry, in the M. E. S. S. Library; and that by Bp. Paine, of the M. E. Church South (Nashville, 1869, 2 vols. 12mo); Summers, Biog. Sketches, p. 43; Wakely, Heroes of Methodism, p. 93; Bennett (W. B.), Memorials of Methodism in Virginia (Richm. 1871, 12mo), p. 260 sq.; McFerrin, Hist. Meth. in Tennessee, 1:366; Redford, Hist. Meth. in Kentucky, 2:28. (G. L. T.)

## Mckennan, James Wilson, D.D[[@Headword:Mckennan, James Wilson, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Washington, Pa., Sept. 2, 1804; graduated at Washington College, Pa., in 1822, and then studied and practiced law at Millersburg, Ohio; subsequently commenced the study of theology with Dr. John Anderson, of Upper Buffalo Church, Pa.; was licensed by Washington Presbytery in 1828, and in 1829 was ordained and installed pastor of the United churches of Lower Buffalo and West Liberty, Pa. In 1835 he accepted a call to Indianapolis, but owing to infirm health he had to resign. He was afterwards engaged in teaching in Wheeling, and at Moundsville, Va., and also as rector in the preparatory department, and adjunct professor of languages ins Washington College. He died July 19, 1861. Dr. McKennan's character was truly remarkable in candor, benevolence, and meekness; in simplicity and directness of purpose; in  strength of faith and zeal. His sermons were characterized by plainness and directness of style. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1862, p. 109.

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

             a minister of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, was born in Philadelphia, Pa., July 18, 1815. He was educated at the University of Pennsylvania, which institution he entered when not quite fourteen years old, and there he graduated with the first honor of his class in 1833. From his very childhood the ministry had been looked to as the profession of his life, and he therefore, immediately upon the commotion of his college course, entered upon the study of theology at the theological seminary of his Church, then under the care of Dr. Samuel B. Wylie. In 1835 Mr. McKinley was licensed to preach by the Presbytery of Philadelphia. After filling various minor appointments, he was in 1838 called to the pastorate of the Reformed Presbyterian Church at Milton, Pa. Here he labored acceptably and successfully until 1841, when failing health compelled him to withdraw from active work. His precautions had been taken too late, for he failed rapidly, and died Oct. 5 of the same year. “All who knew him recognized in his death the extinction of one of the bright lights of the Church.” His only publication is a series of articles on the Slave Trade, which appeared in a weekly periodical at Milton, Pa. “He was a man of cultivated intellect, of sound and discriminating judgment, of generous sympathies and noble impulses, and fervent piety.” See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 9:87 sq.

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

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Glasgow, Scotland, in 1797; was educated in the Glasgow University, and studied divinity in the theological seminary of the Old Burgher section of the Secession Church; was licensed in 1827, and ordained as a missionary to Southern Africa, under the patronage of the London Missionary Society, but after two years' residence at the Cape of Good Hope he was compelled by ill-health to return. In 1830 he was made chaplain of the Seamen's Chapel in the city of Glasgow; but, becoming dissatisfied with his ecclesiastical connection, he joined the Reformed Presbyterian Church, and in 1834 was sent by the Scottish Synod of the Church to Canada West as their missionary. Subsequently he accepted a call from the congregation at Lisbon, N. Y., where he continued till his death, Nov. 19, 1864. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1866, p. 292.

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

             a Presbyterian minister, was born near Bloomingsburg, Ohio, April 2, 1824; was educated at the South Salem Academy, Ohio, and studied theology with Dr. Carothers and Rev. H. S. Fullerton, and for a short time at the Western Theological Seminary Alleghany City, Pa.; was licensed in 1852, and ordained in 1853, as pastor of Harmony Church. During the last  few years of his life he was connected with the Western Reserve Presbytery, and was a commissioner from that presbytery to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, which met at Columbus, Ohio, in 1862. He died June 24, 1862. Mr. McLain was a man of indomitable energy, great zeal, and geniality of spirit. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1863, p. 193.

## Mclane, James Woods, D.D[[@Headword:Mclane, James Woods, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian divine, was born in Charlotte, N. C., May 22, 1801; received his preparatory training in Phillips' Academy, Andover, Mass.; graduated with high honor at Yale College in 1828, and in 1834 at Andover Theological Seminary; was licensed by the Andover Congregational Association in 1835; was shortly after ordained pastor of the Madison Street Presbyterian Church in New York, and labored there until 1856, when he became pastor of the Presbyterian Church at Williamsburg, L. I. There he labored with untiring zeal until 1863, when he resigned on account of failing health. During his ministry Dr. McLane contributed frequently to the religious press; was for many years director of the American Bible Society, and prepared for this society an improved standard edition of the Bible. He was also for many years recorder of the Union Theological Seminary, and secretary of the Church Erection Fund. He died at Brooklyn, N. Y., Feb. 26, 1864. Dr. McLane was a man of fine talents and scholarship; as a preacher, earnest and practical; as a writer, bold and uncompromising. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1865, p. 168; Appleton, New Amer. Cyclop. 1864, p. 595.

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

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Perthshire, Scotland, in 1796; graduated at Edinburgh; studied theology in Glasgow; and in 1824 was licensed and ordained by a presbytery of the Church of Scotland. In 1840 he emigrated to the United States, became pastor successively of the Plainfield and Paw Paw churches, within the bounds of Kalamazoo Presbytery, Mich., and subsequently preached at Birmingham and Fentonville, Mich. He died May 11, 1860. Mr. McLaurin was an able and learned minister. See Wilson. Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1861, p. 161.

## Mclnnis, Richmond, D.D[[@Headword:Mclnnis, Richmond, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Greene County, Mississippi, March 17, 1817. He graduated from the literary department of Oakland College in 1839, and studied theology there likewise; became pastor at Yazoo City in 1840, in 1841 at Jackson, and editor of the True Witness, which, in 1857, he removed to New Orleans; afterwards preached as an evangelist, and died January 13, 1881. See Nevin, Presbyterian Encyclop. s.v.

## Mcloughlin, F. T[[@Headword:Mcloughlin, F. T]]

             a Roman Catholic priest, was born in the parish of Aglia, Upper Canada, in 1836; was educated at the College of St. Michael, Toronto; studied for the priesthood in the Seminary of St. Mary's, Baltimore, Md.; was ordained priest in Brooklyn for that diocese; died in New York Aug. 3, 1863. “He won by his attention to the best interests of his people, the sincere admiration of all.” — New Amer. Cyclop. 1865, p. 645.

## Mclure, Daniel Milton[[@Headword:Mclure, Daniel Milton]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born near Flat Rock, S. C., Dec. 1835; pursued his studies at Davidson College, N. C., and subsequently at Oglethorpe University, Ga. (class of 1858); studied divinity in the theological seminary at Columbia, S. C.; and in 1861 was licensed to preach, and supplied a Church in Alabama. In 1864 he was regularly ordained and installed pastor of Williamsburg Church, and died Oct. 25, 1865. Mr. McLure's mind was of more than ordinary strength; independence and clearness characterized his thoughts, deliberation and study formed his opinions. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1867, p. 44- 7.

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

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born in Dumfries, Prince William County, Va., about 1785; was converted at a camp-meeting held near Oldtown, Md.; was appointed class-leader by Peter Cartwright, and afterwards licensed to exhort by the Rev. James Quinn, and soon after to preach, and was received into the traveling connection in 1811. His first appointment was Silver Creek, in the territory of Indiana; in 1812 he was sent to Kentucky, where he remained four years, and traveled the Lexington, Shelby, Jefferson, and Fleming circuits. Under this four years' ministry thousands were awakened and converted. In 1816 he was transferred to the Mississippi Conference to take charge of a district. He started on his journey with bishop Roberts, but was taken sick at Nashville, and there transferred by bishop McKendree to the Tennessee Conference,  and was appointed to Nashville Circuit. After that time he became one of the leading minds of the Tennessee and Memphis Conferences. His health having failed, he located, and removed from North Alabama to De Soto County, Miss., in December, 1835; was readmitted into the traveling connection at the second session of the Memphis Conference, held in the fall of 1841, and was appointed to Holly Springs District, where he remained four years. He continued in the regular work, preaching with a power and success such as but few men ever had, until his health gave way. For several years before his death he sustained either a supernumerary or a superannuated relation. He died about 1867 or 1868. “Few men, during the present century, have exerted a greater influence upon Methodism in the South. For fifty years he held up the cross and preached the doctrines of Christianity in Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, and Mississippi, leaving holy foot-prints, and winning votaries to Christ. He was in many respects a most remarkable man. No one ever had the reputation that he had in North Alabama and Mississippi.” — Conference Minutes of the M. E. Church South, 1870, s.v.; McFerrin, Methodism in Tennessee, 2:426; Redford, Hist. Meth. in Kentucky, 2:252.

## Mcmullen, James Porter[[@Headword:Mcmullen, James Porter]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Abbeville District, S.C., July 21, 1811; graduated at Franklin College, Athens, Georgia: in 1838; studied theology privately, under the direction of his brother, Rev. Dr. McMullen, and in 1841 was licensed and ordained pastor of the united churches of Matthew Zion, Concord, and Carthage, Ala., and afterwards took charge of Pleasant Ridge and Bethsaida churches, in Greene and Pickens counties, Ala. In 1864 he was appointed by the Executive Committee of Domestic Missions of the General Assembly of the Church South to labor in the Army of Tennessee, in which service he was killed in battle, May 16, 1864. Mr. McMullen was a man of excellent mind and great force of character. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1868, p. 348.

## Mcmurray, William, D.D[[@Headword:Mcmurray, William, D.D]]

             a (Dutch) Reformed minister, was born in Salem, N. Y. in 1784; graduated at Union College in 1804; was tutor in same in 1806-7; was licensed to preach by the Associate Reformed Church in 1808; settled at Lansingburg, N.Y., in 1808-11; entered the Reformed Church as pastor at Rhinebeck Flats, N. Y., in 1812-20; then removed to Market Street Reformed Dutch Church, New York, and died in 1835. His character was distinguished for its beautiful balance and harmony of excellent and gentle qualities. His ministry was remarkable for its fervor, diligence. and uniform success. His Church in New York grew from very small and humble beginnings, and chiefly among a poor people in the then suburbs, to a membership of between five and six hundred communicants. Besides frequent contributions to the periodical press, Dr. McMurray published several valuable occasional discourses (1825,1833). — Sprague, Annals, vol. 9: Corwin, Manual (Dutch) Reformed Church, s.v. (W. J. R. T.)

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

             a Presbyterian divine, was born near Newton, Pa., May 28,1806. He was reared with an earnest regard to his spiritual welfare, and at an early age made a profession of religion. He was educated at Newton Academy, then at Jefferson College, Canonsburg, Pa., graduating in 1828; studied theology at Princeton Seminary, N. J.; was licensed in 1831, and ordained in 1833. He labored for several years as a missionary in Pennsylvania, Indiana, and New Jersey; but subsequently he was called to Lancaster, Pa., where he continued to labor for eleven years. During the rebellion he entered the army as chaplain, and when the war was over returned and took charge of the Church in Strasburg, Pa. He died Jan. 27, 1867. Dr. McNair was retiring in his manner and deportment, possessing, however, a firmness and integrity of purpose which made itself felt in his expressed opinions. His sermons evinced a high order of talent, being eloquent, yet plain and easily comprehended. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1868, p. 132.

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

             a minister of the (Dutch) Reformed Church, was born in Scotland in 1820; came to this country while yet a youth; graduated at Rutgers College in 1841, and at the New Brunswick Theological Seminary in 1844. He consecrated himself to the work of domestic missions, for which he was peculiarly fitted by his constitutional vigor and enthusiasm, by his unusual gifts as a public speaker, and by the depth and activity of his piety. He combined the “ingenium perfervidum Scotorum” with a truly American practicality, and with a consuming zeal which dared all difficulties and endured all trials “for Jesus's sake.” Few preachers could be more intensely earnest and solemn in dealing with the higher themes of the Gospel, and in appeals to the consciences and the hearts of his hearers. One of his sermons on the last judgment seemed to the writer of this notice as if it were almost inspired. Its realizing power was awful and sublime. But he was equally at home in appealing to the tenderest sensibilities of the soul. Like a master musician, he could sweep all the chords of his mighty harp at will. His devotion to his missionary work in Michigan and Indiana, where all of his ministry was spent, was self-consuming. He lived for the Church of God until his earthly career closed in 1854. His great thought and last uttered wish was in full accordance with his high theological belief and experience. “Oh, that I may be made perfectly holy!” He was settled successively at Centreville and Constantine, Mich. (1844-49); at South Bend, Ind. (1849- 52); and again at Constantine (1852-54). But his influence was powerful in all the Reformed churches of the Western States, among which he was a pioneer and a master builder. (W. J. R. T.)

## Mcnelly, George[[@Headword:Mcnelly, George]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born Feb. 15, 1793, on Drake's Creek, Davidson (now Sumner) County, then territory south of Ohio, now State of Tennessee; was licensed to preach in August, 1814; entered the traveling connection in the autumn of the same year; was ordained deacon in 1816, and elder in 1818, by bishop McKendree. His ministerial life was spent in Tennessee, Ohio, and Kentucky. His educational opportunities were limited, but by hard study, pursued in the midst of the abundant labors of a Methodist itinerant, he obtained a good knowledge of Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, and also of the sciences. He stood quite high, not only as a preacher, but also as a theologian. See McFerrin, Methodism in Tennessee, 2:334.

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

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Killala, Ireland, in June, 1829; was educated at Belfast, Ireland, and, after reaching the United States, in the Associate Reformed Seminary at Newburg, N. Y., Union Seminary, New York City, and the theological seminary at Princeton, N. J. In 1853 he was licensed, and in 1854 was ordained and installed pastor of the Church at Richland City, Wis.; in 1856 accepted a call from the Church of Caledonia in De Korra, Wis., where he labored zealously until he died, May 15, 1861. Mr. McNulty was a devoted and zealous worker in the cause of Christ. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1862, p. 111.

## Mcpheeters, William. D.D[[@Headword:Mcpheeters, William. D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Augusta County, Va., Sept. 28, 1778; was educated at Liberty Hall, Lexington, and licensed in 1802. Soon after he preaclled in various parts of Kentucky, extended his labors to Ohio and took charge of the Church at Danville, Ky., and of a male school. In 1804 he visited the counties of Greenbriar and Monroe. Subsequently he served at New Lebanon and Windy Cove, and acted as a stated supply in 1805 at Bethel Church. He was ordained in 1806, and took charge of the academy and congregation in Raleigh, N. C., where he remained several years. In 1836 he was principal of a school in Fayetteville, and was afterwards agent of the Board of Domestic Missions of the General Assembly. He died Nov. 7, 1842. — Sprague, Annals, 4:304.

## Mcqueen, George, Jr[[@Headword:Mcqueen, George, Jr]]

             a Presbyterian missionary, was born in Schenectady, N. Y., in 1826; graduated at Union College, N. Y., in 1849; studied divinity in the seminary at Princeton, N.J.; was licensed and ordained by the presbytery of Albany in 1852, and soon after sailed for Africa, as a member of the Corisco Mission. where he labored until he died, March 25, 1859. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1860, p. 76.

## Mcreynolds, Robert Young[[@Headword:Mcreynolds, Robert Young]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born in Alien County, Kentucky, in 1818; was converted in his sixteenth year; was licensed to preach in his nineteenth year, and joined the Kentucky Conference in 1829. In 1840 he was transferred to the Rock River  Conference, and was stationed at Galena; in 1841 was transferred back to the Kentucky Conference, and continued in the regular work until 1845, when he located until 1867. He was next readmitted to the Louisville Conference, and appointed to Portland; in 1868 to Shepherdsville Circuit, and in 1869 to Litchfield Circuit. He died August 23, 1870. Mr. McReynolds was “a benevolent man, a cheerful, happy Christian, very zealous and useful in the ministry." — Conference Minutes of the M. E. Church South, 1870, s.v.

## Mcswain, William Adney[[@Headword:Mcswain, William Adney]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born in Montgomery (now Stanley) County, N. C., Nov. 5, 1814; was converted and joined the Church in 1831; was licensed to preach in 1836, and entered the South Carolina Conference in 1838. He served on the following circuits: Pleasant Grove in 1843; Rutherford in 1844-45; Union in 1846- 47, and again in 1854; Neuberry in 1848. and again in 1855-56; Black Swamp in 1849-50. In 185152 he was pastor of Trinity Church, Charleston; in 1853 of Spartansburg station; in 1857 tract agent of his Conference; from 1859-62 presiding elder on the Cokesbury District; in 1863-64 pastor of Ninety-six, and in 1865 of Laurens Circuit. He died Jan. 7, 1866. Besides the trustworthiness indicated in his appointments, he served as a delegate to the last two sessions of the Southern General Conference, and was elected to that which was to meet in 1862. and was at the time of his death president of the Sunday-school Society of the South Carolina Conference. “Few men, with similar disadvantages, ever attained that measure of ability, degree of eminence, and width of popularity which constituted that honor which was so cheerfully and universally awarded by the Church and world to this self-made man. Possessed of great versatility of genius, gifted with rare social qualities and conversational powers, and blessed with a singular descriptive faculty, he was well qualified, from his vast fund of general information, to give life, interest, and information to the fireside or social circle. His appearance in the pulpit, his engaging address, flow of language, and tone of voice, and ease and naturalness of manner, his own interest in the subject, with the general persuasiveness of his style, gave to his sermons, which evinced much thought and research, an effectiveness which was only equaled by the great popularity of the preacher himself. He was a favorite divine with all sects of Christians and all classes of people.” See Conference Minutes of the M. E. Church South, 3:17.

## Mcvean, Daniel Creighton[[@Headword:Mcvean, Daniel Creighton]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Caledonia, Livingston County. N. Y., Oct. 10, 1818; graduated at Union College in 1844; pursued his theological studies in the Seminary of the Associate Reformed Synod of New York at Newburg, and in 1847 was licensed to preach. He traveled for two or three years as a probationer, and in 1850 was ordained and installed pastor of the Associate Reformed Church of Lyndon, where he labored for sixteen years. He died Sept. 7, 1868. Mr. McVean was a faithful pastor, a useful minister, and an eminently pious man. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1868, p. 274.

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

             an eminent clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born at New York in 1787, and was educated at Columbia College (class of 1804), and at Cambridge University, England. He entered the ministry in 1811 as rector at Hyde Park, N. Y., and remained there until 1817, when he was appointed professor of moral philosophy, rhetoric, and belles-lettres in Columbia College. The duties of this position he discharged until 1857, when ill-health obliged him to retire from active duties. In recognition of his services he was created Emeritus professor. He also acted as chaplain on Governor's Island. He died at Bloomingdale, N. Y., Oct. 29, 1868. Dr. McVickar was the author of several valuable works; among them the following deserve our notice: Early Years of Bishop Hobart (1834): — The Professional Years of Bishop Hobart (1836): — A Memoir of the Rev. Edmund D. Griffins, appended to the “Remains of the Rev. E. D. Griffins” (1831. 2 vols. 8vo). See Life of the Rev. John McVickar, D.D., by W. A. McVickar (N.Y. 1871); New Amer. Cyclop, 1868; Drake, Dict. Amer. Biog. s.v.; Allibone, Dict. Brit, and Amer. Authors, 2:1198.

## Me-Jarkon[[@Headword:Me-Jarkon]]

             (Hebrews Mey-Hay-yarkon' מֵי הִיִּרְקוֹן, waters of yellowness, or clear water; Sept. θάλασα ῾Ιαρακών, Vulg. Mejarcon), a town in the tribe of Dan, mentioned between Gath-rimmon and Rakkon (Jos 19:46); probably so called from a spring in its vicinity. Schwarz (Palest. p. 141) regards the name as equivalent to river of disease (lit. of paleness), and states that there is a “ Wady Udshi which descends from the mountains of- Lod” (probably referring to the ravine in the south rear of Ludd), a nearly synonymous epithet, according to him, on the strength of which he is disposed to identify the locality. “It is difficult not to suspect that the name following that of Me-hajjarkon, har-Rakon (A. V. Rakkon), is a mere corrupt repetition thereof, as the two bear a very close similarity to each other, and occur nowhere else”.

## Mead Zechariah[[@Headword:Mead Zechariah]]

             a clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born at Greenwich, Conn., some time in the first half of our century (perhaps 1802), and was educated at Yale College (class of 1825). He was ordained priest at Norfolk, Va., May 22, 1831; became rector of Grace Church, Boston, Mass.; from 1837-1840 was editor of the Southern Churchman, published at Richmond, Va.; and died Nov. 27, 1840. See General Catal. of the Divinity School of Yale College, p. 7.

## Mead, Edward N., D.D[[@Headword:Mead, Edward N., D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal clergyman, graduated from the General Theological. Seminary, and resided for some time, without regular charge, first in New York city, and then in Tarrytown, being secretary, in 1859, of the board of trustees of the General Theological Seminary, an office which he held for eighteen years. In 1864 he ministered at St. Mary's Church, Beechwood, N.Y. He died at Sing Sing, October 19, 1877. See Prot. Episc. Almanac, 1878, page 169.

## Mead, Hiram, D.D[[@Headword:Mead, Hiram, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Cornwall, Vermont, May 10, 1827. He studied at Burr Seminary, Manchester, and graduated from Middlebury College in 1850. The next two years he was engaged in teaching at Flushing, N.Y. From 1852 to 1854 he was a tutor in Middlebury College. In 1857 he graduated from Andover Theological Seminary. He was ordained pastor of the Church in South Hadley, Massachusetts, September 29, 1858, from which he was dismissed, November 19, 1867. From December 17, following, to September 22, 1869, he was pastor at Nashua, N.H. From 1870 until his death he was professor of sacred rhetoric and pastoral theology in Oberlin College. He died in Oberlin, Ohio, May 18, 1881. Among his publications is the Manual of Praise, for Sunday and Social Worship (1880). See Cong. Year-book, 1882, page 34.

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

             an English divine, was born in Buckinghamshire in 1629. Of his early history we know but little. He first came prominently into public notice during the Cromwellian movement. Mead identified himself with the cause of the Independents, and was appointed by the Protector to the living of Shadwell in 1658. Four years later he was ejected for nonconformity, and removed to Holland, in common with .many other ministers of that age. He became acquainted with the duke of Orange, and was greatly favored by him and the States. Afterwards he returned to England, and gathered about. him one of the largest congregations in London. He settled at Stepney as pastor of a dissenting congregation in 1674, and the community betokened their love and esteem for him by presenting him with building material for a new chapel. He died in 1699. Matthew Mead, whom his friend and associate, Howe (Funeral Sermon for Mead), describes as “that very reverend and most laborious servant of Chris,” was as indefatigable in Christian work as he was. amiable in spirit, and, in consequence of his mild temperament and the moderation of his opinions, formed the strongest personal link between the Presbyterians and Independents of England in the second half of the 17th century. Among his publications are, The Almost Christian, or seven sermons on Act 26:28 (Loud. 1666, 8vo):-- The Almost Christian Discovered (1684, 4to; Glasgow, 1755, 12mo; with Essay by Dr. Young of Perth, Lond. 1825; 1849, 12mo):-Life and Death of Nathaniel Mather (1689, 8vo):-Vision of the Wheels sermon on Eze 10:13 (1689, 4to). See Calamy, Nonconformists; Skeats, Hist. of the Free Churches of England, p. 167 Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth. 2:1257.

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

             a distinguished English physician, who was born at Stepney in 1673, and after studying at the most eminent medical schools on the Continent, returned and settled in England, and became one of the most celebrated practitioners of his time, wrote a treatise on the diseases mentioned in Scripture, entitled Medicina Sacra, seu de morbis insignioribus qui in Biblis memorantur (Lond. 1749, 8vo; republished at Amsterdam, 1749, 8vo). A translation of this work was made by Dr. T. Stark, and was published with a memoir of the author (Lond. 1755, 8vo). Dr. Mead died in 1754. See Alliboue, Dict. Brit. and Amer. Biog. s.v.

## Mead, Stith[[@Headword:Mead, Stith]]

             an early Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Bedford County, Va., Sept. 25, 1767; was converted in 1789, and feeling called of God to preach the Gospel, entered the itinerancy in 1793; was located in 1816; readmitted superannuate in 1827, and died in 1835. Mr. Mead was eminently useful as a preacher, and particularly conspicuous in the great revivals of his time, yet remembered in the Southern States. See Minutes of Conferences, 2:347.

## Mead, William Cooper, D.D., LL.D[[@Headword:Mead, William Cooper, D.D., LL.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal clergyman, was born at Greenwich, Connecticut, and ordained deacon in 1824 by bishop Croes. Previous to 1836 he was rector of Christ Church, Reading, Pennsylvania, and of Trinity Church, Philadelphia, and from that date of St. Paul's Church, Norwalk, Connecticut, until his death, July 17, 1879, at the age of eighty years. For more than forty years he served on the standing committee, and in the general convention. See Prot. Episc. Almanac, page 171.

## Meade, William, D.D[[@Headword:Meade, William, D.D]]

             a noted prelate of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born at Millwood, Clarke County, Nov. 11, 1789, his father being Colossians Richard K. Meade, aide-de-camp to Genesis Washington, and was connected both by birth and marriage with some of the oldest and best families in Virginia. His great-grandfather was an Irish Romanist, who came to this country, married a Quakeress in Flushing, L. I., and removed to Virginia. His grandmother was a descendant of Richard Kidder, bishop of Bath and Wells. William was educated at Princeton College, N. J. (class of 1808); was ordained deacon by bishop Madison, Feb. 24,1811, in Williamsburg, Va.; and priest by bishop Claggett, in St. Paul's Church, Alexandria. He commenced his ministry in his own native parish, Frederick (now Clarke) Comity, as assistant to the Revelation Alexander Balmaine; in the fall of 1811 he took charge of Christ Church, Alexandria. where he remained two years, when he returned to Millwood, and, on the death of Mr. Balmaine, became rector of that Church. In 1826 he was a candidate as assistant bishop in Pennsylvania, but failed by one vote of nomination by the clergy; and in the following year the Revelation H. U. Onderdonk, D.D., was elected. In 1823 he was elected assistant bishop to bishop Moore, and was consecrated Aug. 19, 1829, in St. James's Church, Philadelphia, by bishops  White, Hobart, Griswold, Moore, Croes, Brownell, and H. U. Onderdonk. On the death of bishop Moore, Nov. 11, 1841, he became bishop of the diocese of Virginia. In this capacity he labored unceasingly, up to the hour of his death, March 14, 1862, for the good of evangelical Christianity. He advanced the interests of his Master's cause not only in the pulpit, but in many and various ways he labored for the good of humanity.

Several educational and missionary societies owe their origin to him, and the Theological School of Virginia, lately at Alexandria, was largely indebted to him for its existence (though the plan of a theological seminary in Virginia was not original with him). He gave to, this school of the prophets his personal care and labors, nearly to the close of his life. During the exciting days of 1861 bishop Meade made many fervent though futile efforts to save Virginia from the troubles of the impending civil war. He steadfastly opposed secession to the very last. Taken altogether, but few men in the nation have enjoyed the confidence of the people to a greater degree than did this honest ecclesiastic, who sought in more ways than one to serve his day and generation as a truly Christian man. For years before his death bishop Meade was the recognized head of the evangelical branch of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States. On bishop Meade's ecclesiastical position, the Church Review (July, 1862) thus comments: “The gross worldliness, and even the .open immorality of many of the early clergy of Virginia; the moral-essay style of preaching which characterized many of the missionaries; the French infidelity introduced during the Revolution, and the absence of that bitter opposition to Church principles which was, and even now is waged in the Northern States, led the bishop to regard as not only mainly, but only important, the development of the subjective in religion. His ‘extraordinary will,' as the Episcopal Recorder calls it, and his Calvinistic doctrines, led him to separate evangelical truth from apostolic order, and to make him, we doubt not an honest, but a most determined. opponent to any earnest presentation of the positive institutions of Christianity.” Bishop Meade was buried from St. Paul's Church, Richmond, March 17. His principal published works. are, Family Prayer (1834):-Lectures on the Pastoral Office, and Lectures to Students (1849): -Old Churches and Families in Virginia (Philad. 1856, 2 vols. 8vo):-The Bible and the Classics (1861, 12mo). Besides these, he also published Memorials of [his] ‘Two Beloved Wives, which the Church Review informs us was suppressed. His controversial writings are numerous. See Life, by bishop Johns (Baltimore, 1868). (J.H.W.)

## Meadow[[@Headword:Meadow]]

             a term used in the A. V. as the translation of two Hebrews words, neither of which seems to have this meaning, although terms otherwise rendered doubtless have. SEE ABEL.

1. Gen 41:2; Gen 41:18. Here the word in the original is הָאָחוּ(with the definite article), ha-Achu. It appears to be an Egyptian term, literally transferred into the Hebrew text, as it is also into that of the Alexandrian translators, who give it as' τῷ ῎Αχει. (This is the reading- of Codex A. Codex B, if we may accept the edition of Mai, has ἕλος; so also the rendering of Aquila and Symmachus, and of Josephus [Ant. 2:5, 5]. Another version, quoted in the fragments of the Hexapla, attempts to reconcile sound and sense by ὄχθη. The Veneto-Greek has λειμών.) The same form is retained. by the Coptic version. Its use in Job 8:11(A.V. “flag”)-where it occurs as a parallel to gome (A.V. “rush”), a word used in Exo 2:3 for the “bulrushes” of which Moses's ark was composed- seems to show that it is not a “ meadow,” but some kind of reed or water plant. This the Sept. supports, both by rendering in. the latter passage βούτομον, and also by introducing ῎Αχι as the equivalent of the word rendered “paper reeds” in Isa 19:7. Jerome, in his commentary on the passage, also confirms this meaning. He states that he was informed by learned Egyptians that the word achi denoted in their tongue any green thing that grew in a marsh-omne quod in palude virens nascitur. But, as during high inundations of the Nile-such inundation's as are the cause of fruitful years-the whole of the land on either side is a marsh, and as the cultivation extends up to the very lip of the river, is it not possible that Achu may denote the herbage of the growing crops? The fact that the cows of Pharaoh's vision were feeding there would seem to be as strong a figure as could be presented to an Egyptian of the extreme fruitfulness of the season: so luxuriant was the growth on either side of the stream, that the very cows fed among it unmolested. The lean kine on the other hand, merely stand on the dry brink. SEE NILE, No one appears yet to -have attempted to discover on the spot what the Signification of the term is. SEE REED.

2. Jdg 20:33 only: “the meadows of Gibeah.” Here the word is מִעֲרֶה, Maareh', which occurs nowhere else with the same vowels attached to it. The sense is thus doubly uncertain. “Meadows” around Gibeah can certainly never have existed: the nearest approach to that sense  would be to take maareh as meaning an open plain. This is the dictum of Gesenius (Thesaur. p. 1069), on the authority of the Targum. It is also adopted by De Wette (“ Die Plane von G.”). But, if an open plain, where could the ambush have concealed itself? SEE PLAIN.

The Sept., according to the Alex. MS. (the Vatican Codex transfers the word literally- Μαρααγαβέ), read a different Hebrew word— מִעֲרָב— ”from the west of Gibeah.” Tremellius, taking the root of the word in a figurative sense, reads “ after Gibeah had been left open,” i.e. by the quitting of its inhabitants-post denudationem Gibhoe. This is adopted by Bertheau (Kurzgef. Handb. ad loc.). But the most plausible interpretation is that of the Peshito-Syriac, which by a slight difference in the vowel- points makes the word מְעָרָת, “ the cave;” a suggestion quite in keeping with the locality, which is very suitable for caves, and also with the requirements of the ambush. The only thing that can be said against this is that the liers-in-wait were “set round about” Gibeah, as if not in one spot, but several. SEE GIBEAH.

## Meah[[@Headword:Meah]]

             (Hebrews Meah מֵאָה, a hundred, as often; Sept. ἑκατόν, Μεά; Vulg. cenztum, Emnath), a tower in Jerusalem, situated on the eastern wall (Neh 3:1; Neh 12:39), probably at the north-eastern angle of the Temple enclosure (Strong's Harmony and Expos. of the Gospels, Append. ii, p. 19; but it is not likely that the outer wall was different from that of the Temple, as supposed by Dr. Barclay, City of the Great King, p. 152). SEE JERUSALEM.

## Meal[[@Headword:Meal]]

             (קֶמִח, ke'mach, in pause ק מִח, prob. fat, i.e.. marrow; hence the fatness of wheat or barley, i.e.. its ground substance, Gen 18:6; Num 5:15; 1Ki 4:22; 1Ki 17:12; 1Ki 17:14-16; 2Ki 4:41; 1Ch 12:40; Isa 47:2; Hos 8:7; “flour,” as elsewhere rendered, 1Sa 1:24; 1Sa 28:24; 2Sa 17:28; Gr. ἃλευρον, Mat 13:33; Luk 13:21; also סֹלֶת, so'leth, stripped of its bran, the finest portion of the ground grain, Gen 18:6 [where it stands after the preceding term, in apposition]; elsewhere “flour” or “fine flour,” Sept. σεμίδαλις), the ground produce of any species of grain. SEE  GRITS. This is usually prepared in the East by females in hand-mills. SEE FLOUR.

## Meal-Time[[@Headword:Meal-Time]]

             (עֵת אֹכֶל, eth o'kel, the season of eating, Rth 2:14). That the Hebrews took their principal meal (coena, supper) in the latter part of the afternoon or towards evening, follows as well from the circumstance that banquets and convivial entertainments generally (perhaps always) occurred near the close of the day (sometimes being continued far into the night, Josephus, Life, 44), as from the custom still prevalent in the East (Wellsted, Trav. 1:113; the Persians sup about six or seven o'clock), a usage to which the Essenes were an exception (Josephus, War, 2:8, 5). SEE FEAST.

The agricultural and laboring portion of the community, however, probably took their principal meal at noon (1Ki 20:16). SEE DINE.

In the forenoon a slight repast was partaken (breakfast, ἄριστον, comp. Luk 14:12; Joh 21:22). Among the later Jews, it was usual for the deeply religious not to taste anything before the hour of morning prayer (comp. Act 2:15; see Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. ad loc.; the passage in Berach. fol. 27:2, quoted by Kuinol, refers to the blessing before eating, see Gemar. Bab. 6:1,1); on the Sabbath, the synagogue worship led to the rule of not eating before the sixth hour, or noon. Before each meal, persons were accustomed, especially in later times, carefully to wash (Mat 15:2; Luk 11:38; Mar 6:2; sec the younger Buxtorf s Dissert. philol. theol. p. 397 sq.), like the ancient Greeks (Hiad, 10:577; Odyss. 1:136 sq.; 4:216 sq.; Aristoph. Vesp. 1216) and the modern Orientals (Niebuhr, Beschr. p. 54; Shaw, Trav. p. 202), and also to “say grace”. (בֵּרָכָה, the blessing, εὐλογία, εὐχαριστία; Mat 14:19; Mat 15:36; Mat 26:26; Luk 9:16 Joh 6:11; comp. 1Ti 4:3; see the Gemara, Berach. p. 278; and the rabbinical tract, Berachoth, p. 6-18; also KuinoL De precum ante et post cibum ap. Jud. et Christian. antiquitate, Lips. 1764). While eating the Hebrews originally sat (Gen 27:19; Hengstenberg, Mos. p. 36, incorrectly infers their recumbency at table from Gen 18:4; comp. Jdg 19:6; 1Sa 20:5; 1Sa 20:24; 1Ki 13:20), like the Greeks in the heroic period (Hiad, 10:578; Odyss. 1:144; 15:134; Athen. 8:363; 11:459), and the  Romans anciently (Serv. ad AEn. 7:176; Varro, Ling. Lat. 1, p. 236: Bip.; see Becker, Charikl. 1:425), and in this posture are the early Egyptians represented on the monuments (Wilkinson, 2:201). In later times the practice of reclining (ἀνακεῖσθαι, κατακεῖσθαι, κατακλίνεσθαι, see the Mishna, Berach. 6:6) on cushions or divans (מַטוֹת; κλῖναι, Xen. Cyrop. 8:8, 16; κατακλίματα, Josephus. Ant. 15:9, 3; comp. A. Baccins, De conviv. antiq. ii, sq., in Gronov. Thesaur. ix), at first only in special entertainments (Amo 6:4 comp. 2:8; Mat 9:10; Mat 26:7; Mar 6:22; Mar 14:3; Luk 5:29; Luk 7:37; Luk 14:10; Joh 12:2; Joh 13:23, etc.), but eventually in common life (Luk 17:7), without any particular invitation to that effect (Terent. Heautont. 1:1, 72;' Plant. Trucul. 2:14, 16; Martial; 3:50, 3; comp. Plat. Conviv. p. 213), and universally (see H.Mercurialis, Diss. de accubitu triclinio, in his Ars gymnast. p. 75 sq.). SEE ACCUBATION.

Every such divan or dinner-bed accommodated (according to Roman fashion) three persons (triclinium [Plin. 37:6], a prevalent form of luxury [Plin. 33:52;-Josephus, Ant. 15:9, 3; Philo, 2:478], introduced from the Babylonians, who used a carpet or tapestry over it [Plin. 8:74], whence: the terms descriptive of spreading it [sternere, Cic. Mur. 36; Macrob. Sat. 2:9; στρωννύειν, Xen. Cyrop. 8:3, 6; which explains the ἀνάγαιον ἐστρωμένον of Mar 14:15; see generally Ciacon. De triclinio, Amst. 1699]), sometimes as many as five, who leaned upon the left arm, the feet being stretched out behind. Each one on the right touched with the back of his head the breast of his left neighbor, whence the phrase “ to lie in one's bosom” (ἀνακεῖσθαι ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ, Joh 13:23; Joh 21:20), as being the place of the spouse (among the Jews, however, wives ate sitting, which the Romans generally held to be the most becoming attitude, Isidor. Orig. 20:11; comp. Sueton. Claud. 32; Val. Max. 2:1, 2; the “sitting at the feet” in Luk 10:39, was not an act of participation in the meal), a friend, or a favorite (Plin. Eph 4:22; see Kype, Observ. 1:402; comp. Talm. Babyl. Berach. 7:2, 5); the place of honor being in the middle of the three (Talm. Hieros. Taanith, Ixviii, i; comp. Potter, Archceol. 2:661). The tables (comp. 1Sa 20:29; 2Sa 9:7-11; 1Ki 10:5; Eze 39:20; Luk 22:21; Act 16:34, etc.) were probably, as still in the East (Mariti, Trav. p. 283; Shaw, Trav. p. 202; Mayr, Schicksale, 1:51; Robinson, Researches, 2:726), low (among modern Orientals consisting of a round skin [sufra] or reed-mat, Rtippel, Abyssin. 2:85, spread on the floor in the middle of the room, Arvieux, Voyage, iii 237; Pococke, East, 1:292; Harmar, Observ. 2:453, or on ‘a stool, and furnished with rings on the edge, so that after the meal it may be  folded together, and hung up like a bag, the food being laid on mats, or upon cloths covering it, comp. Niebuhr, Trav. 1:372; Paulus, Samml. 3:101), as appears likewise from the pattern of the table of show-bread. SEE TABLE.

Meat and vegetables, the first cut into small pieces (the loins and shoulders affording what were regarded as choice morsels, Eze 24:4), were set on the table in large platters, out of which each guest took his share with his fingers upon the flat pieces of bread, and ate without either knife or fork (comp. Zorn, in the Miscell. Duisburg. 2:437'sq.; Mariti, Trav. p.284); or was sometimes helped by the host (1Sa 1:4; comp. Joh 13:26; Xen. Cyrop. 1:3, 7). The pieces of bread were dipped into the sauce (Mat 26:23; Aristoph. Eg. 1176), and the vegetables were conveyed from the dish by means of the hand or fingers to the mouth (comp. Pro 19:24; Pro 26:15; Rth 2:14 is not in point), a custom which still prevails in the East even at the royal table (Tavernier, Trav. 1:282; Arvieux, Voyage, iii, 238.; Pococke, 2:63; Niebuhir Besch. p. 53; Shaw, Trav. p. 203; Burckhardt, Wahaby, p.51; Rosenmiller, Morgenl. 4:138; Robinson, 2:726; 3:201). Whether they drank wine during the meal (like the Romans) or after it (like the Egyptians, Herod. 2:278, and Persians, Herod. v. 18, and as is still the practice of most Arabians and Persians, Chardin, 4:44, 52; Arvieux, 3:277; Burckhardt, Sprachen, p. 137; comp. Josephus, Ant. 15:1, 2), is not positively stated, although the Talmud (Babylon. Berach. p. 251) seems to imply that the Jews did both, the draught following the meal, however, being the principal one (Berach. 8:4,7; comp. Robinson, 2:726). SEE EATING. (See generally M. Geier, in the Biblioth. Lubec. v. 1 sq.) SEE ENTERTAINMENT.

## Meal-Tub Plot[[@Headword:Meal-Tub Plot]]

             is the name of a plot concocted on the part of Romanists, but intended to be fathered on a number of eminent persons engaged in the interests of the Protestants during the reign of Charles II, in the year 1679. A conspiracy on the part of the Jesuits to dethrone or make away with Charles, and place the duke of York (who was in favor of the papal rule) on the throne, having come to light, the papists, exasperated, determined to set on foot a sham plot, and brand the Presbyterians as the originators. The dastardly attempt was timely discovered, and heaped infamy upon the already spotted character of the Jesuits. For a full account, see Neale, Hist. of the Puritans, 2:290; Stoughton, Eccl. Hist. of Engl. (Ch. of the Restoration), 2:21 sq.

## Meals[[@Headword:Meals]]

             SEE DINE; SEE REPAST; SEE SUP; and the article following.

## Meani[[@Headword:Meani]]

             (Μεαᾷι v. r. Μαᾷι and Μααᾷι), a less correct form (1Es 5:31) for the SEE MEHUNIM (q.v.) of the Hebrews text (Ezr 2:50).

## Means Of Grace[[@Headword:Means Of Grace]]

             a convenient but unscientific and unscriptural phrase for those exercises or agencies which become the channel or occasion of spiritual influences to the Christian. The doctrine concerning the means of grace is based on that of grace itself. It has only received its adequate form through the Reformation, which, in opposition to the Roman Church, who considers that grace is imparted by the visible Church, particularly by the priest, asserts as the only regular means of grace the Word of God and the sacraments instituted by Christ. In popular language, however, the term “means of grace” is extended so as to include those duties which we perform for the purpose of improving our minds, affecting our hearts, and of obtaining spiritual blessings; such as hearing the Gospel, reading the Scriptures, self-examination, meditation, prayer, praise, Christian conversation, etc. The means are to be used without any reference to merit, solely with a dependence on the divine Being; nor can we ever expect happiness in ourselves, nor be good exemplars to others, while we live in the neglect of them. It is in vain to argue that the divine willingness to bestow grace supersedes the necessity of them, since God has as certainly appointed the means as the end. Besides, he himself generally works by them, and the more means he thinks proper to use, the more he displays his glorious perfections. Jesus Christ, when on earth, used means; he prayed, he exhorted, and did good, by going from place to place. Indeed, the systems of nature, providence, and grace are all carried on by means. The Scriptures abound with exhortations to them (Matthew 5; Romans 12), and none but enthusiasts or immoral characters ever refuse to use them. In the following article we use the term in its more restricted sense, as related to the sacramental controversy between Roman Catholics and Protestants, condensing the statements in Herzog's Real Encyklop. v. 200 sq.

The starting-point of the Protestant doctrine on this subject is contained in the fifth article of the Confession of Augsburg. Grace itself is presupposed, such as exists in the form of justification by faith. The hearing of the Word and the partaking of the sacraments are methods of arriving at this faith: “Nam per verbum et sacramenta, tamquam per instrumenta donatur  Spiritus Sanctus, qmii fidem afficit, ubi et quando visum est Deo in iis, qui audiunt Evangelium,” etc. To this. statement is joined the declaration, “Damnant Anabaptistas et alios, qui sentiunt, Spiritum Sanctum. contingere sine verbo externo hominibus per ipsorum praeparationes ad opera.” The Heidelberg Catechism enounces the same doctrine, and at the same time states still more emphatically the connection between the sacraments and the Word of God in quest. 65: “Whence comes saving grace? It is the effect of the Holy Spirit in our heart by means of the preaching of the holy Gospel, and confirmed by the use of the holy sacraments.” (The most important passages of symbols on this point are Apoleg. 4:153; Artic. Smalc. pars 2:2,:8; Catechism. maj. Praeceptum iii, p. 426; .Symbol. apost. p. 502; Formul. conc. Epitome: “De lib. arbitr.” Negativa vi; Solid. decl. p. 655, 669, 828; Conf. Helv. ii, c. 1; Conf Gall. art. 25, 35; Conf; Belg. art. 24.) The means of grace are called instrumenta gratice, media, adminicula gratice. In the Lutheran Church the union between the Word and the sacraments is made much closer than in the Reformed. The Helvetic Confession treats of the Word of God in the first-chapter, and of the sacraments in the nineteenth.

The reason of this separation is that the Bible, as the Word of God, is the foundation of the whole system. Yet their connection. and union are not lost sight of: “Praedicationi verbi sui adjunxit Deus imox ab initio in ecclesia sua sacramenta, velsigna sacramentalia.” The idea of the unity of the means of grace is not considered by the evangelical Church as only a formal, human, or theological connection between the Word of God, baptism, and the Lord's Supper, but as the consequence of a divine act, the institution of the Church and of the ecclesiastical office. The means of grace are not mere possessions of the Church, but its foundation itself. The Church is called into existence by the Word of God, while by baptism and communion it is manifested as a religious community (see Conf. Aug. art. vii). Schleiermacher himself recognised in them the essential and unchangeable foundations of the Church (ii, § 127). ‘Thus he contradicts himself when further on, treating of ,the connection between baptism and the Lord's Supper, he refuses to consider it as an actual dogmatic point (p. -A16). The unity of the means of grace may be briefly said to consist in their constituting the Church as the organ of transmission of grace.

The inner ground of their unity is grace itself, of which they are the channels; the outer aspect is the ministerium, the office appointed by Christ, which has to administer both forms of the means of grace.  This brings us to the significance and necessity of these means of grace, or to the views of the Protestant Church as opposed to the Roman Catholic Church on these points. ‘The first point of difference lies in the conception of the ecclesiastical office. Both, indeed, consider it as a divine institution, but the Protestants look upon it as a ministerium, which can be considered as a continuous Christian working of the Church in the Word and sacraments, while the Roman Catholics retain the idea of a sacerdotium forming the real fundamental means of grace, and creating itself the distinct means of grace after the manner of the apostles (see Dieringer. Lehrbuch d. Kath. Dogmatik, p. 512), “The substitution of the Son of man by the apostleship.” If its sacerdotal character is susceptible of being. defended by Scripture and tradition, it yet is certain that it is only through tradition that it obtained this superior .,importance, as capable of creating the other means of grace., The practical results of this superior importance became manifest in the prohibition to read the Bible, the refusal of the chalice in communion, etc., thus diminishing the other means of grace, while they were increased on the other hand by the promulgation of the commandments of the Church, and the institution of additional sacraments; and also modified in the doctrine of the sacrificial character of the Eucharist, etc. Thus the Protestant doctrine of the means of grace differs at once from the Roman Catholic, by its conception of a ministerium in the place of a sacerdotium. They next differ in the relative position they assign to the means of grace. ‘Protestants maintain that this grace is first communicated through the Word of God, and confirmed by the sacraments; Roman Catholics, on the contrary, consider the sacraments as the chief means of grace, and the Word of God as accessory. Then, as regards the Word of God, Protestants consider it as consisting essentially in Scripture, together with explanations, while by it Roman Catholics understand only the praedicatio verbi. The latter also increase the number off sacraments, and recognise other means of grace. On these points, SEE WORD OF GOD and SEE SACRAMENTS.

Another distinction is the difference in which the means of grace themselves are apprehended in their connection with grace and forgiveness. According to the Concil. Trident., sess. 7, the sacraments work ex opere operato, a doctrine which the Conf. Aug. art. xiii, rejects. We must, of course, refer to Roman Catholic theologians to find the sense which that Church attaches to the opus operatum (Bellarmine, De sacr. 2:1). According to them, infant baptism is efficient in itself to regenerate them, without any resistance being for a moment to be thought of. The opposition of adults to baptism,' confession,  and the mass could only consist in an obstacle (ponere obicem), a deceitful hiding of a mortal sin, and the persistence in it, for absolution presupposes a full and candid confession. But a passive faith as saving faith, in the Protestant sense, is not required to give efficiency to the sacraments. We might then suppose that the Word would here, as a means of grace, be placed before the sacrament, and produce conversion, which would insure the effect of the sacrament. But we must remember that, for the most part, Roman Catholics are such from being born of Roman Catholic parents. Of converts themselves nothing further is demanded than that they should have enough fides. implicita in the word-announced to them to .submit to the authority of the Church; History teaches us how even the word itself may become the opus operatum.

In opposition to the Roman Catholic Church, Protestants generally draw a distinction between grace and the means of grace, although they recognise their relation. We must, however, distinguish between such as reject altogether the necessity and ordinance of the means of grace, and those who recognise as such the Word of God but not the sacraments. Among the former we find in the time of the Reformation the Anabaptists, in later times the Quakers. They maintain that the Holy Spirit, without the aid of the Word, illuminates each man immediately by an inner light at a certain time, and that by it only is-man able to understand the Word of God (see Barclay, Apol.). Still it would be unjust to say that they altogether reject the notion of means, of grace, for the Quakers are especially distinguished for diligent searching of the Scriptures.” But they ‘deny the' existence of divinely-ordained,' special means of grace of the Church. The Socinians and Mennonites, on the other hand, consider, in a certain sense, the Word of God as an objective means of grace; the former considering the sacraments purely as symbols of the Christian faith (cerimoniae), while the Mennonites consider them also as objective signs of the action of grace (Riz, Conf. art. 30). Here also we miss the objective character of the means of grace, but we find it again among the Arminians. ‘Necessarily as the sphere of action of the sacraments is restricted as means of grace, that of grace itself, as immediately active, becomes enlarged; this we see exemplified in the doctrine of restoration of the Anabaptiste, in the Quaker doctrine of the action of the revealing Spirit (“Deus spiritus revel latione se ipsum semper filiis hominum patefecit,” Barclay, Apol. thes. ii), and in the Socinian notion of an extraordinary and special action of the divine Spirit aside from its general action through the Gospel (Osterodt, Unferricht. K.  p. 34). The Protestant Church, in its doctrine of grati praeveniens, recognises, with some, restriction, the truth of these views, but still maintains the necessity of the sacraments.

According to Scripture, the sphere of the gratia praeveniens extends beyond that of the theocratic revelation. The Spirit dwells where it chooses, the Logos shines in all human souls, and the gratia praeveniens is active in all receptive hearts. Yet the prepared soul only arrives to an experimental knowledge of salvation within the sphere of revelation, and to a certainty of it by the ordained means of grace. On this point of the necessity of the means of grace, the difference, such as it is, which exists between the Lutheran and the Reformed Church on that doctrine, cannot but appear. The possibility of the spiritual enlightenment of individual members of the Church, sine externo ministerio, is clearly recognised by the Conf Helv. ii, cap. i. Still the article considers it as divinely ordained that it is imparted by the usitata ratio instituendi homines. It insists still more strongly on the necessity of the praedicatio dei verbi, to which, of course, is joined the interna Spiritus illuminatio. But this necessity is defined as a necessitas precaepti, non absoluta, i.e.. God, in the work of redemption, is not confined to these means, as is proved by the prophets and by revelation, but, in consideration of the weakness of our nature, has appointed these means (see Schweizer, Glaubenslehre d. ec . ref. Kirche, 2:561). Luther, on the contrary, refers even the inspiration of the prophets to the verbum vocale (Art. Smal. p. 333). Another difference consists in the close connection existing in the Lutheran Church between the sacrament and the Word, while in the Reformed theology the Word takes the prominent position as the causa instrumentalis fidei (see Ebrard, Christliche Dogmatik, p. 578). The Lutheran Church teaches an organic joint action of grace and the means of grace, without, however, making them identical.

The Reformed Lutherans understand only an; economic joint action, which, however, does not exclude irregularities or rather exceptions. As regards the Word of God, the Lutheran theologians strongly uphold its effcacia, and Calovius and Quenstedt speak of a unio mystica gratice sive virtutis divince cum verbo (see Hahn, Lehrbuch, p. 549). At this point orthodoxy approaches the idea of the opus operatum (see Lange, Dogmatik, p. 1119). According to Reformed theology, the connection of the Spirit with the Word is conditioned by the number of the elect among the number of hearers, while the Heidelberg Catechism, holds that the Spirit awakens faith in our heart through the preaching of the holy Gospel. According to Nitzsch, the point of union of the two confessions on this doctrine lies in the conception of  the pignus. We further notice that the Reformed Church does not insist as strongly on the necessity of baptism as the Lutheran. The Confessio Scotica (p. 127) emphatically rejects the Roman Catholic doctrine of the damnation of children dying without baptism; so does also Calvin, in his Instit. 4:16, 26. As regards the connection between baptism and regeneration, the twenty-seventh article of the Conf. Anglic. takes a middle course, saying that baptism is a signum regenerationis per quod recte baptismum suscipientes ecclesiis inseruntur. By this is meant that the ecclesiastic, social regeneration is accomplished, the individual, social regeneration made thereby perceptible to the senses, and sacramentally promised. SEE REGENERATION.

With regard to the action and the necessity of the means of grace, the differences of the different confessions come again into play. While the evangelical churches teach that the sacraments are agents of sanctification for those who receive them with faith, strengthening and increasing that faith, the Roman Catholic holds that they are the agents of faith, requiring none to be worthily participated in beyond faith in the authority of the Church, and that mortal sin alone can render them ineffectual, and the Baptists and Socinians look upon the participation in the sacraments only as outward acts, professions of the Christian faith,

In dogmatics, the means of grace represent the eternal presence of Christ in the spiritual Church, and through her in the world. In his institutions, Christ, by the Holy Spirit, identifies himself with them, and in his eternal presence draws the world to his salvation. The Word and the sacraments are inseparably connected with each other the Word receives its fulfillment and seal in the sacrament, while the sacrament receives light and spiritual life from the creative power of the Word. The Word, without the seal of the sacrament, is only a scholastic knowledge; the sacrament, without the vivifying influence of the Word, is a piece of priestly magic. But though the means of grace, in their connection with the Holy Spirit, set at work the saving power of the life of Christ, as a participation in his salvation, still they must be preceded by faith, since Christ required faith when personally present on earth. Yet he no more requires a perfect faith than he compels to believe. Those who ask shall receive. SEE SACRAMENT.

See Fletcher, Works; Wesley, Works; Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctrines; Winer, Symbol. p. 113; Kurtz, Ch. Hist. vol. i; Niedner, Philos. p. 441.

## Means, Alexander, D.D., LL.D[[@Headword:Means, Alexander, D.D., LL.D]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born at Statesville, N.C., February 6, 1801. He studied four years at the academy in his native place; taught school one year at Mocksville; studied medicine, and practiced it six years at Covington, Georgia; became a local preacher in 1829; and from 1833 devoted himself to the cause of education, as principal of the Georgia Conference Manual Labor School (1834), professor in Emory College (1838), in the Medical College of Georgia (1840), president of Masonic Female College (1853), analytical chemist of Georgia (1869). He entered the Georgia Conference in 1839, and died in 1883. See Minutes of Annual Conferences of the M.E. Church South, 1883, page 78.

## Means, John Oliver, D.D[[@Headword:Means, John Oliver, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Augusta, Maine, August 1, 1822. He graduated from Bowdoin College in 1843, and from Andover Theological Seminary in 1849, having meanwhile served four years as purser in the navy. He was ordained December 3, 1851, pastor at East Medway, Massachusetts, a position which he held for four years, and in 1857 became pastor of the Vine Street Congregational Church, at Roxbury, where he remained for eighteen years. In 1875 he resigned his position to become secretary of the Massachusetts Sunday-school Publication Society, but was soon called into a wider sphere of usefulness, the secretaryship of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, which he held at the time of his death, December 8, 1883. Dr. Means also served on the Boston School Board. He was president of the Roxbury Athenaeum, and held other trusts. He was also a member of the  Royal Geographical Society of England. He visited Europe in the interest of the missionary society, and was highly esteemed by all denominations.

## Mearah[[@Headword:Mearah]]

             (Hebrews Mearah', מְעָרָה, a cave, as often; Sept. ἀπὸ Γάζης, apparently reading מֵעִזָּה from Gaza; Vulg. Maara), a place mentioned in Jos 13:4 as situated in the northern edge of Palestine: “From the south, all the land of the Canaanites, and Mearah that is beside the Sidonians, unto Aphek.” Some find it in the town Marathos (Strabo, 16:753; Pliny, v. 17; Ptolemy, v. 15, 16). Most interpreters, following the Chaldee and Syriac (see the Critici Biblici, s.v.), are of the opinion that the term should rather be rendered as an appellative-the cave (Keil's Comment. ad loc.); but if a mere cave were intended, and not a place called Mearah, the name would surely have been preceded by the definite article, and would have stood as הִמְּעָרָה, “the cave.” Besides, the scope of the passage shows that some place-either a city or district-must be meant. “Reland (Palaest. p. 896) suggests that Mearah may be the same with Meroth, a village named by Josephus (Ant. 3:3,1) as forming the limit of Galilee on the west (see also Ant. 2:20, 6), and which again may possibly have been connected with the waters of Merom. A village called el-Mughar is found in the mountains of Naphtali, some ten miles west of the northern extremity of the Sea of Galilee (Robinson, 3:79, 30; Van de Velde's Map), which may possibly represent an ancient Mearah.” “About half-way between Tyre and Sidon. close to the shore, are the ruins of an ancient town; and in the neighboring cliffs are large numbers of caves and grottos hewn in the rock, and formerly used as tombs. Dr. Robinson suggested that this may be ‘Mearah of the Sidonians (ii. 474). The ruins are now called ‘Adlan, but perhaps take that name from the village on the mountain-side.” Ritter (Erdk. 17:10; also 16:8, 9), on the other hand, identifies Mearah, under the name Mughara, with the remarkable cavern (Rosenmiller, Alterth. II, 1:39 sq., 66) which the Crusaders fortified, and Which is described by William of Tyre (Histor. Hieros. 19:2, 11) as “a certain fortress of ours in the Sidonian territory, namely, an impregnable grotto, commonly called the Cave of Tyre (Cavea de Tyron).” It was afterwards the last retreat of the emir Fakhr ed-Din. The place is now also known as Shukif Tairun (Abulfeda, Table). Schultz is the first traveller who mentions it in modern days. .It is situated in the high cliff east of Sidon, between Jezim and Michmurhy (Van de Velde, Memoir, s.v.). SEE CAVE.

## Mears, John William, D.D[[@Headword:Mears, John William, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister and educator, was born at Reading, Pennsylvania, August 10, 1825. He graduated from Delaware College at the head of his class in 1844, and from Yale Divinity School in 1851. He was ordained, in 1852, pastor at Camden, N.J.: in 1854 became pastor at Elkton, Maryland; in 1857 at Milford, Delaware; in 1860 became joint editor of the American Presbyterian, at Philadelphia, and later sole editor and proprietor until 1870, when that paper was merged in the Evangelist. In 1871 he was, elected professor of metaphysics in Hamilton College, a position which he retained until his death, November 10, 1881. Dr. Mears took great interest in the questions of the day, and in 1878 he organized the movement against the Oneida community which gained such force that they were compelled to abolish the objectionable system of complex marriage. He was prominent as a prohibitionist, and was the candidate of that party for governor in one campaign. He was the author of several well-known religious works, among them The Bible in. the Workshop, and The Martyrs of France.

## Mears, Thomas, M.A[[@Headword:Mears, Thomas, M.A]]

             an English divine of note, flourished near the opening of the present century. He was at one time rector of St. Lawrence and vicar of St. Michael's in Southampton, and chaplain to the corporation of that town. He died about 1810. Mr. Mears was a prolific writer, and a pulpit orator of no mean ability. He contributed many articles to the Orthodox Churchman's Magazine, and published several of his sermons, among which the following deserve special mention: England expects every Man to do his Duty (1805, 8vo):--Religious Example (1807, 8vo):-On the Lord's Supper (1807j 8vo).

## Measure[[@Headword:Measure]]

             is the rendering in the Auth. Vers. of a number of Hebrew and Greek terms, some of which are descriptive of dimension or extent generally, while others denote a specific length or capacity, Again, there are other words in the original denoting a particular quantity or space, which are still differently rendered in the Auth. Vers. It is our purpose in the present article to present merely a general view of the various renderings, leaving the determination of the modern equivalents to the special head of METROLOGY SEE METROLOGY (q.v.). The following are the words rendered “measure” in the A.V.:

1. Those that are of indefinite Import.

(1) חֹק, chok (Isa 5:14; a statute, as elsewhere usually rendered);

(2) מִד, mad (Job 11:9; Jer 13:25; reduplicated plur. Job 38:5; elsewhere a garment, as usually rendered);

(3).properly מַדָּה, middah', the usual word thus rendered (Exo 26:2; Exo 26:8; Jos 3:4; 1Ki 6:25; 1Ki 7:9; 1Ki 7:11; 1Ki 7:37; 2Ch 3:3; Job 28:25; Psa 39:4 [5]; Jeremiah 21:39; Eze 40:3; Eze 40:5; Eze 40:10; Eze 40:21-22; Eze 40:24; Eze 40:28-29; Eze 40:32-33; Eze 40:35; Eze 41:17; Eze 42:15-19; Eze 43:13; Eze 45:3; Eze 46:22; Eze 48:16; Eze 48:30; Eze 48:33; Zec 2:1 [5]; elsewhere “‘piece,” etc.);

(4) מְשֹוּרָה, mesurah' (Lev 19:35; 1 Chronicles 23:39; Eze 4:11; Eze 4:16);

(5) מַשְׁפָּט, mishpat' (Jer 30:2; Jer 46:28; judgment, as elsewhere usually rendered);

(6) מַתְכֹּנֶת, mithko'neth. (Eze 45:11; “tale,” Exo 5:8; “composition,” Exo 30:32; Exo 30:37; “‘ state,” 2Ch 24:13);

(7) תֹּכֶtִo'ken (Eze 45:11; “tale,” Exo 5:18);

(8) μέτρον, the usual and proper Greek word (Mat 7:2; Mat 23:32; Mar 4:24; Luk 6:38; Joh 3:34; Rom 12:3; 2Co 10:13; Eph 4:7; Eph 4:13; Eph 4:16; Rev 21:17).

2. Such as represent a definite Value.

(1) אֵיפָה, eyphah' (Deu 25:14-15; Pro 20:10; Mic 6:10; elsewhere “ephah” [q.v.]);

(2) אִמָּה, ammah' (Jer 51:13; “post,” Isa 6:4; elsewhere “cubit” [q.v.]);

(3) כֹּרkor (1Ki 4:22 [1Ki 5:2]; 1Ki 11:22]; 2Ch 2:10 [9]; 2Ch 27:5; Chald. plur. Ezr 7:22; elsewhere “cor” [q.v.]), Gr.- κόρος (Luk 16:7);

(4) סְאָה, seah' (Gen 18:6; 1Sa 25:18; 1Ki 18:32; 2Ki 7:16; 2Ki 7:18; a seah [q.v.]), the Gr. σάτον (Mat 13:33; Luk 13:21), and the reduplicated form סִאסְּאָה, sasseah (Isa 27:8; used indeterminately);

(5) שָׁלַישׁ, shalish' (Isa 40:12; “great measure,” Psa 80:5; lit. a third, i.e.. prob. of the ephah, but used indefinitely;

(6) βάτος (Luk 16:6; the Hebrew bath [q.v.]); (7) χοῖνιξ (Rev 6:6; the Greek choenix [q.v.]).

## Meat[[@Headword:Meat]]

             I. It does not appear that the word “meat”‘is used in any one instance in the Authorized Version of either the O. or N. Testament in the sense which it now almost exclusively bears of animal food. The latter is denoted uniformly by “flesh.”

1. The only possible exceptions to this assertion in the. O.T. are:

(a) Gen 27:4, etc., “savory meat ;” Gen 45:23,” corn and bread and meat.” Here the Hebrew word, מִטְעִמַּיםmatammim', which in this form appears in this chapter only, is derived from a root .which has exactly the force of our word “taste,” and is employed in reference to the manna. In the passages in ,question the word “dainties” would be perhaps more appropriate.

(b) In Genesis the original word is one of almost equal rarity, מָזוֹן, mazon'; and if the Lexicons did not show that this had only the general force of food in all the other Oriental tongues, that would be established in regard to Hebrew by its other occurrences, viz. 2Ch 11:23, where it is rendered “victual;” and Dan 9:12; Dan 9:21, where the meat spoken of is that to be furnished by a tree.

2. The only real and inconvenient ambiguity caused by ‘the change' which has taken place in' the. meaning' of the word is in the case of the “meat- offering,” the second of the three great divisions into which the sacrifices of the. Law were divided-the burnt-offering, the meat-offering, and the peace-offering (Lev 2:1, etc.)and which consisted solely of flour, or corn, and oil, sacrifices of flesh being confined to the other two. The word thus translated is מַנְחָה, minchah', elsewhere rendered “present” and “oblation,” and derived from a root which has the force of “sending” or “offering” to a person. It is very desirable that some English term should be proposed which would avoid this ambiguity. “Food offering” is hardly admissible, though it is perhaps preferable to “ unbloody or bloodless sacrifice.” SEE MEAT OFFERING.

3. There are several other words, which, though entirely distinct in the original, are all translated in the A.V. by “meat ;” but none of them present any special interest except טֶרֶ, te'reph. This word, from a ‘root signifying “ to tear,” would be perhaps more accurately rendered “prey” or “booty.” Its use in Psa 111:5, especially when taken in connection with the word rendered “good understanding” in Psa 111:10, which should rather be, as in the margin, “good. success,” throws a new and-unexpected light over the familiar phrases of that beautiful Psalm. It seems to show how inextinguishable was the warlike, predatory spirit in the mind of the writer, good Israelite and devout worshipper of Jehovah as he was. Late as he lived in the history of his nation, he cannot forget the “power” of Jehovah's “ works” by which his forefathers acquired the “heritage of the  heathen;” and to him, as to his ancestors when conquering the country, it is still a firm article of belief that those who fear Jehovah shall obtain most of the spoil of his enemies-those who obey his commandments shall have the best success in the field.

4. In the N.T. the variety of the Greek: words thus rendered is equally great; but dismissing such terms as ἀνακεῖσθαι or ἀναπίπτειν, which are rendered by “sit at meat”'-φαγεῖν, for which we occasionally find “meat” - τράεζα (Act 16:34), the same- εἰδωλοθύτα, “meat offered to idols”- κλάσματα, generally “fragments,” but twice “broken meat”- dismissing these, we have left τροφή and βρῶμα (with its kindred words, βρῶσις, etc.), both words bearing the widest possible signification, and meaning everything that can be eaten or can nourish the frame. The former is most used in the Gospels and Acts. The latter is found in John and in the Epistles of Paul. It is the word employed in the famous sentences, “for meat destroy not the work of God,” if meat make my brother to offend,” etc. SEE ALISGEMA.

II. Meat, however, in the proper modern sense (בָּשָׂר, basar', flesh, as it is rendered in the Auth.Vers.), i.e.. of clean beasts (Leviticus 11.), namely, lambs (Isa 53:7; Amo 6:4), calves (1Sa 28:24; Gen 18:7; Amo 6:4; Luk 15:23; comp. Russell, Aleppo, 1:145), oxen (Isa 22:13; Pro 15:17; 1Ki 4:23; Mat 22:4), kids (1Sa 16:20; Jdg 6:19), also venison (1Ki 4:23), and poultry (1Ki 4:23; see Gesenius, Thes. Hebrews p. 715; Michaelis, Mos-Recht. 4:198), was a favorite dish among the Hebrews, either roasted entire, or cooked with choice vegetables and eaten with bread (2Sa 6:19; 1Ki 17:6); yet only royal personages partook of it daily (1Ki 4:23; Neh 5:18), the less wealthy merely on festive occasions (Luk 15:23; comp. Niebuhr, Besch. p. 52), especially at the great sacrificial festivals; and we find that the modern Arabs, namely, the Bedouin, as a general rule. but seldom eat flesh (Shaw, Trav. p. 169; comp. Burckhardt, Trav. 2:1003; Wellsted, 1:248; those of the peninsula of Sinai live mostly on sour milk, dried dates, and unleavened bread, Rtippel, p. 203; but among the ancient Egyptians flesh was very commonly eaten, Exo 16:3; comp. Rosellini, Monum. cir. 1:151). The shoulder was the -most esteemed piece of the animal (1Sa 9:24; comp. Harmar, 1:311). Flesh which contained the blood, was forbidden (Lev 3:17; Lev 7:26; Lev 17:10; Deu 12:16; Deu 12:27),  because the life was regarded as residing in the blood (Gen 9:4; comp. Oedmann, 6:89 sq.). SEE BLOOD. The pieces of flesh were taken by each guest from the common dish with his fingers. SEE EAT; 4. The Jews were very careful to avoid the flesh of heathen victims (Aboda Sara, 2:3). SEE CLEAN; SEE OFFERING.

III. As above noted, in the English version the word “meat” means food in general; or when confined to one species of food, it always signifies meal, flour, or grain, but never flesh, which is now the ‘usual acceptation of the word. SEE FLESH.

A “ meat-offering” in the Scriptures is always a vegetable, and never an animal offering; and it might now be rendered a bread-offering, or a meal-offering, instead of a meat-offering. It does not appear that the ancient Hebrews were very nice about the dressing of their food. We find among them roast meat, boiled meat, and ragouts. SEE COOK.

Their manner of living would be much like that of the ancient Egyptians, among whom they had long resided. Wilkinson says, “No tray was used on the Egyptian table, nor was it covered by any linen; like that of the Greeks, it was probably wiped with a sponge or napkin after the dishes were removed, and polished by the servants when the company had retired. The dishes consisted of fish; meat, boiled, roasted, and dressed in various ways; game, poultry, and a profusion of vegetables and fruit, particularly figs and grapes during the season; and a soup or pottage of lentils. Of figs and grapes they were particularly fond. Fresh dates during the season, and in a dried state at other periods of the year, were also brought to table.” SEE FOOD.

Among the Hebrews meats that were offered were boiled in a pot (1Sa 2:14-15). They were forbidden to seethe a kid in the milk of its dam (Exo 23:19; Exo 34:26). They might not kill a cow and its calf on the same day; nor a sheep or goat and its young one at the same time. They might not cut off a part of a living animal to eat it, either raw or dressed. If any lawful beast or bird should die of itself or be strangled, and the blood not drain away, they were not allowed to taste of it. He that by inadvertence should eat of any animal that died of itself, or that was killed by any beast, was to be unclean till the evening, and was not purified till he had washed his clothes. They ate of nothing dressed by any other than a Hebrew, nor did they ever dress their victuals with-the kitchen implements of any but one of their own nation.

The prohibition of eating blood, or animals that are strangled, has been always rigidly observed by the Jews. In the council of the apostles held at Jerusalem. it was declared that converts from paganism should not be  subject to the legal ceremonies, but that they should refrain from idolatry, - from fornication, from eating blood, and from such animals as were strangled, and their blood thereby retained in their bodies; which decree was observed for many ages by the Church (Act 15:20-29).

In reference to “meats offered to idols,” it may be observed that at the first settling of the Church there were many disputes concerning the use of meats offered to idols (1Co 8:7; 1Co 8:10). Some newly-converted Christians, convinced that an idol was nothing, and that the distinction of clean and unclean creatures was abolished by our Saviour, ate indifferently of whatever was served up to them, even among pagans, without inquiring whether the meats had been offered to idols. They took the same liberty in buying meat sold in the market, not regarding whether it were pure or impure, according to the Jews; or whether it had been offered to idols or not. But other Christians, weaker or less instructed, were offended at this liberty, and thought that eating of meat which had been offered to idols was a kind of partaking in that wicked and sacrilegious offering. This diversity of opinion produced some scandal, for which Paul thought that it behooved him to provide a remedy (Rom 14:20-21; Tit 1:15). He determined, therefore, that all things were clean to such as were clean, and that an idol was nothing at all; that a man might safely eat of whatever was sold in the shambles, and need not scrupulously inquire whence it came; and that if an unbeliever should invite a believer to eat with him, the believer might eat of whatever was set before him (1Co 10:25, etc.). But at the same time he enjoins that the laws of charity and prudence should be observed; that believers should be cautious of scandalizing or offending weak minds; for though all things might be lawful,” yet all things were not always expedient. SEE SACRIFICE.

## Meat-Offering[[@Headword:Meat-Offering]]

             (מַנְחָה, minchah'; sometimes more fully קָרְבִּן מַנְחָה, to mark its sacrificial character; Sept. fully δῶρον θυσία, but generally simply δῶρον or θυσία, sometimes προσφορά ; Vulg. oblatio sacrificii. or simply sacrificium). The word minchah (from the obsolete root מָנִח, “to distribute” or “ to give”) signifies originally a gift of any kind, and appears to be used generally of a gift from an inferior to a superior, whether God or man (Lat.fertum). Thus in Gen 32:13 it is used of the present from Jacob to Esau, in Gen 43:11 of the present sent to Joseph in Egypt, in 2Sa 8:2; 2Sa 8:6 of the tribute from Moab and Syria to David, etc.;  and in Gen 4:3-5 it is applied to the sacrifices to God offered by Cain and Abel, although Abel's was a whole burnt-offering. Afterwards this general sense became attached to the word corban (קָרְבָּן), and the word minchah restricted to an “ unbloody offering,” as opposed to זֶבִח, a “bloody” sacrifice. It is constantly spoken of in connection with the drink- offering (נֶסֶךְ, Sept. σπονδή, Vulg. libamen), which generally accompanied it, and which had the same meaning. SEE DRINK- OFFERING.

The law or ceremonial of the meat-offering is described in Leviticus 2 and Lev 6:14-23. It was to be composed of fine flour, seasoned with salt, and mixed with oil and frankincense, but without leaven; and it was generally accompanied by a drink-offering of wine. A portion of it, including all the frankincense, was to be burnt on the altar as “a memorial;” the rest belonged to the priest; but the meat-offerings offered by the priests themselves were to be wholly burnt.

Its meaning (which is analogous to that of the offering of the tithes, the first-fruits, and the showbread) appears to be exactly expressed in the words of David (1Ch 29:10-14), “All that is in the heaven and in the earth is thine. All things come of thee, and of thine own have we given thee.” It recognised the sovereignty of the Lord, and his bounty in' giving us all earthly blessings, by dedicating to him the best of his gifts: the flour, as the main support of life; oil, as the symbol of richness; and wine, as the symbol of vigor and refreshment (see Psa 104:15). All these were un-. leavened and seasoned with salt, in order to show their purity, and hallowed by the frankincense for God's special service. This recognition, implied in all cases, is expressed clearly in the form of offering the-first-fruits prescribed in Deu 26:5-11.

It will be seen that this meaning involves neither of the main ideas of sacrifice-the atonement for sin and the self-dedication to God. It takes them for granted, and is based on them. Accordingly, the meat-offering, properly so called, seems always to have been a subsidiary offering, needing to be introduced by the sin-offering, which represented the one idea, and forming an appendage to the burnt-offering which represented the. other. Thus, in the case of public sacrifices, a “meat-offering” was enjoined as a part of

(1) the daily morning and evening sacrifice (Exo 29:40-41);

(2) the Sabbath-offering (Num 28:9-10);

(3) the offering at the new moon (Num 28:11-14):

(4) the offerings at the great festivals (Num 28:20; Num 28:28; Num 29:3-4; Num 29:14-15, etc.);

(5) the offerings on the great day of atonement.

(Num 29:9-10). The same was the case with private sacrifices, as at

(1) the consecration of priests (Exo 29:1-2; Lev 6:20; Lev 8:2) and of Levites (Num 8:8);

(2) the cleansing of the leper (Lev 14:20);

(3) the termination of the Nazaritish vow (Num 6:15).

The unbloody offerings offered alone did not properly belong to the regular meat-offering. They were usually substitutes for other offerings. Thus, for example, in Lev 5:11 a tenth of an ephah of flour is allowed to be substituted by a poor man for the lamb or kid of a trespass-offering: in Num 5:15 the same offering is ordained as the “offering of jealousy” for a suspected wife. The unusual character of the offering is marked in both cases by the absence of the oil, frankincense, and wine. We find also at certain times libations of water poured out before God; as by Samuel's command at Mizpeh during the fast (1Sa 7:6), and by David at Bethlehem (2Sa 23:16), and a libation of oil poured by Jacob on the pillar at Bethel. (Gen 35:14). But these have clearly especial meanings, and are not to be included in the ordinary drink- offerings. The same observation will apply to the remarkable libation of water customary at the Feast of Tabernacles, but not mentioned in Scripture. SEE TABERNACLES, FEAST OF.

From the above statements it appears that the “meat-offering” (or, rather, food-offering) was in general such eatable but bloodless articles (of vegetable growth) as. were to be presented to Jehovah as devout gifts (comp. the early instance, Gen 4:3 sq.), and in a special sense only gifts of meal, raw or baked, which were brought to the altar of burnt- offerings, Exo 40:29; comp. 30:9), and either wholly or partially burnt to the honor of Jehovah (commonly with incense) by the hand of the priest. The portion of such “meat-offering” that was to be consumed is called אִזְכָּרָה, in contradistinction from that part which fell to the priest (Lev 2:2; Lev 2:9; Lev 2:16; Num 6:26; comp. Lev 24:7, where the incense of the showbread is so called, which was also consumed). This word certainly has not the signification of odoramentum  (Saadias), or in general offering (as Michaelis thinks), but is a verbal noun from , הַזְכַּיר (to cause to remember), and the Sept. translates μνημόσυνον accordingly (see Gesen. Thesaur. p. 417).

The Mishnic tract Menachoth- (v. 2; comp. Otho, Lex. Rabb. p. 649) treats of the “ meat- offering” in the above broad sense as an important part of the sacred ritual. The Bible itself specifies, of the not burned “meat-offerings,” only the Pentecostal bread expressly by the name of a minchah (Lev 23:18; comp. Lev 23:17), while the Passover sheaf and the showbread belong by their own nature to the same category. The proper “meat-offerings,” as above particularized, were either independent gifts (Talm. הבאות בפני עצמן), or simply additions to other principal offerings (הבאות עם הזבח). For example, no burnt-offering' could be presented without a meat or drink offering (see Lev 7:8 sq.); and drink-offerings were associated likewise with thank-offerings (Lev 7:12 sq.), and in a certain case with a sin-offering (Lev 14:10; Lev 14:20). This appears to have been on the principle that men do not eat flesh without bread and wine; a signification which also lay at the bottom of the Greek οὐλαί (coarse ground barley grains) and the Roman mola salsa, with which the victim was strewn. Bahr (Symbol. 1:216), however, regards the supplementary unbloody offering as a sort of compensation for the life taken from the sacrifice. Such additional meat-offerings, at all events, appear regularly in connection with the principal offerings, whether (a) free-will (Num 16:4 sq.; comp. Jdg 6:19) or (b) enjoined.

The latter, again, were sometimes offered publicly in the name of the whole people (מנחת צבור), as those in connection with the daily morning and evening oblation (Exo 29:40; Exo 28:6; Num 4:16), or with the sabbatical (Num 28:9) and feast offerings (Num 28:11 sq.; Leviticus 23); at other times they were private (מנחת יחיד), as that of the purification of the leper (Lev 14:20 sq.), the Nazarite who had fulfilled his vow (Num 6:16-17), and the consecration. of Levites (Num 8:8 sq.), and perhaps of priests (Exo 29:2, Lev 8:2). In these cases the essential part of the meat-offering was fine wheat flour (סֹלֶת; Josephus, ἄλευρον καθαρώματυν, Ant. 3:9 4), mixed with olive. oil (these were both to be the best procurable in Pales. tine; see the Mishna, Menach. 8:1), and it was all consumed upon the altar. The proportions were: for a lamb, 1/10 ephah of flour and 1/4 hin of oil; for a ram, 2/10 ephah of flour and'1/3 bin of oil; finally, for a bullock, 3/10 ephah of flour and 1/2 hin of oil (Num 15:4 sq.; Num 28:5; Num 28:9; Num 28:12 sq., Num 28:28  sq.; Num 29:3 sq.,Num 29:8 sq., Num 29:13 sq.; Lev 14:21). For the lamb offered with the Passover sheaf, 3/10 ephah of fine flour was prescribed (Lev 23:13). In the case of the Nazarite still different regulations are made (Num 6:16 sq.). SEE NAZARITE.

From the fact that in connection with (free-will) burnt offerings a handful of the meal only as a meat- offering was to be sprinkled upon the altar to be consumed with the incense, while the remainder fell to the priest's lot (Lev 7:14 sq.), we see that priestly festivities were associated with the thank-offerings.

It likewise appears from the foregoing. account that the independent “meat-offerings” were sometimes freewill (Leviticus 2), and sometimes obligatory. To the latter belonged the casts specified above: (a) that of a poor man, who had made himself liable in the manner stated in Lev 2:1 sq. (comp. Lev 2:11); and (b) the “jealousy offering” of a wife charged with adultery (Num 5:15; Num 5:26); to which is to be added (c) the consecration-offering of a priest (high-priest) on entering upon his office (Lev 6:20 [13] sq.). The Talmud (see Menach. 4:5; 11:3) applies this law exclusively to the oblation of the high-priest, and makes the meat- offering to be a daily one (מַנְחָה תָמַיד), with which Josephus agrees (Ant. 3:10, 7). In both the first cases the meat-offering consisted of 1/10 ephah of meal (without oil or in, cense), of which, as above noted, only a handful was burned, and the rest, as usual, went to the priest; whereas in the third case, the whole meat-offering was to be consumed (if so we may understand the somewhat dark passage of Lev 6:22). The meal in cases (a) and (c) was to be of wheat, but in the case (b) of barley. The free- will offering might be brought in either of three conditions, namely, as raw flour, upon which oil was poured and incense laid (strewed) (Leviticus ii, l sq.); or as roasted and pounded (firstling) grains, likewise with oil and incense (Lev 2:14 sq.); or, lastly, as baked dough. The dough, moreover, might be baked either ill the oven, and in that case the oil must be spread under the loaves, or sprinkled ‘upon them (Lev 2:14); or in a pan (מִחֲבִת), when the dough must be mixed with the oil. and in the presentation the loaves were broken in pieces and oil poured on them (Lev 2:5 sq.); or, finally, in the מִרְחֶשֶׁת, i.e.., according to the Jews, a deep stewpan, so that the loaves swam in oil-(Lev 2:7). SEE CAKE.

The priest always burned of these free-will offerings a handful of meal with oil (or a batch), with all the incense, on the altar (Lev 2:2); the remainder fell sometimes to him, sometimes to the other priests (Lev 7:9 sq.), and must be consumed in the sanctuary  (Lev 2:3; Lev 10:10; Lev 10:12 sq.; comp. Josephus, Ant. 3:9, 4). Leaven or honey must not be mixed with the meat-offering (Lev 2:11; a rule which, with one exception [Lev 7:13], applied to all such offerings; see Exo 29:2; Lev 7:12; Lev 8:26; Lev 10:12; Mishna, Menach. v. 1), but they must be salted (Lev 2:13). Even in eating the meat-offering the priests were not allowed to use ferment (see Lev 6:16 [9]; 10:12). See generally Reland, Antiq. Sacr. 3:7; Iken, Antig. Heb 1:14; Carpzov, Appar. p. 708 (brief); Bauer, Gottesd. Verd. 1:187 sq. (incomplete and inexact). See Vollborth, De sacrificio farreo Hebraeorum (Gottingen, 1780). SEE OFFERING.

Mebane, William N.

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Guilford County, N.C. March 10,1809. His preparatory education was received in Greensborough, N. C., under the Revelation Drs. Pressly and Carothers. He graduated at the University of North Carolina in 1833, and at Princeton Theological Seminary in 1837; in 1838 and 1839 labored as a missionary in the bounds of the states of Louisiana and Texas; in 1840 was ordained and installed pastor of Spring Garden Church, N. C.; in 1852 took charge of Madison Church. He died in May, 1859. Mr. Mebane possessed fine conversational powers, together with a striking independence of thought; as a pastor he was very successful, as he was gifted with the happy faculty of introducing the subject of personal religion. See Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1861, p.97.

## Mebunnai[[@Headword:Mebunnai]]

             (Hebrews Mebunnay', מְבֻנִּי, constructive, if genuine; Sept. ἐκ τῶν υἱῶν [apparently pointing מַבְּנִי], but v. r; Σαβουχαϊv; Vulg. Mebounai), a person named as one of David's body-guard (2Sa 23:27), but elsewhere more correctly SIBBECHAI (2Sa 21:18; 1Ch 20:4) or SIBBECAI (1Ch 11:29; 1Ch 27:11). See DAVID.

## Mecaskey, John W., A.M[[@Headword:Mecaskey, John W., A.M]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, born in 1821, was the son of pious parents, and inherited an honored name, a fine physical form, a vigorous intellect, and anamiable disposition. On the death of his devoted mother in his twelfth year, he was placed by his remaining parent in the academy of the Revelation Mr. Andrews, of Doylestown, Pa., and there  completed his academical course. His inclinations were for the legal profession, and he consequently fitted himself for admission to the bar, with fair promises of a bright future. Suddenly brought to acknowledge his need of religion, he gave himself to Christianity, and, believing himself to be called to preach the Gospel, at once prepared for the great work. After rendering good service in the Sunday-school, and as a class-leader and exhorter, he was; licensed to preach; and being further proved by one year's travel on the Newtown Circuit, he was recommended to the Philadelphia Conference, by which he was received in 1844, and sent to Radnor Circuit. His subsequent fields of labor were Grove Circuit, Mauch Chunk, Stroudsburg, Bustleton, St. John's, the Tract Agency, and West Philadelphia. After this he was stationed in Columbia, Reading, Norristown, and Pottsville. In 1862 he was again brought to Philadelphia, and stationed in Asbury, West Philadelphia, and here he worked for the Master's cause until death, Oct. 16,1863. “He was instant in season and out of season, an able minister of the New Testament, and a faithful steward of the mysteries of God. Purity, dignity, and earnestness, culminating in deep, constant devotion to God and his work, marked and illuminated his whole course.” See Minutes of Conferences, 1864,' p. 26.

## Mecca[[@Headword:Mecca]]

             (Om A -Kora, Mother of Cities), the birthplace of Mohammed, and therefore the central and most sacredly guarded and honored city of Arabia, is one of its oldest towns, the capital of the province of Hejaz. It is situated in 21° 30' N. lat., and 40° 8' E. long., 245 miles south of Medina (q.v.), and about 65 miles east of Jiddah, the well-known port on the Red Sea, in a narrow, barren valley, surrounded by bare hills and sandy plains, and watered by the brook Wady Al-Tarafeyn. The city is about 1500 paces long, and about 650 broad, and is divided into the Upper and Lower City, with twenty-five chief quarters. The streets are broad and rather regular, but unpaved; excessively dusty in summer, and muddy in the rainy season. The houses, three or four stories high, are built of brick or stone, ornamented with paintings, and their windows open on the streets. The rooms are much more handsomely furnished, and altogether in a better state than is usual in the East, the inhabitants of Mecca making their living chiefly by letting them to the pilgrims who flock hither to visit the Beit Allah (House of God), or chief mosque, containing the Kaaba (q.v.). This mosque, capable of holding about 35,000 persons, is surrounded by nineteen gates surmounted by seven minarets, and contains several rows of  pillars, about twenty feet high, and about eighteen inches. in diameter, of marble, granite, porphyry, and common sandstone, which at certain distances are surmounted by small domes. A great number of people are attached to the mosque in some kind of ecclesiastical capacity, as katibs, muftis, mueddins, etc. Pilgrimages have very much decreased of late years, and in consequence the inhabitants of this city, at one time containing 100,000, now scarcely counts 40,000 regular residents. The age of the city of Mecca is not exactly known. We find that it was in quite a flourishing condition in the days of Ptolemy, under. the name of Macoraba. ‘ Mohammed, who had been obliged to quit it quite precipitately in AD. 622, returned to it in 627, forcing his entrance as conqueror. At first it belonged to the tribe of the Kosaites, later to the Koreish (q.v.). Within the course of the present century (1803) Mecca was taken by the Wahabies (q.v.), but given up again to the pacha of Egypt, Mehemet Ali (1833), whose son Ibrahim was made sheik El-Haram -” of the Sacred Place.” At present, however, Mecca is directly dependent on the sultan of Turkey. A certain balm, the “Balm of Mecca,” is made from a plant called Besem, which grows in abundance in the neighborhood of the city. Another chief article of manufacture, and a great source of income to the residents of Mecca, are the chaplets for pious pilgrims. See Chambers, Cyclop. s.v.; Der Christliche Apologete; 1872, Nov. 12.

## Mechanic[[@Headword:Mechanic]]

             The Hebrews appear to have learned in Egypt the elements at least of all the forms of handicraft practiced in that highly-civilized country, and later their neighbors the Phoenicians, famous in early times for their progress in the industrial arts, doubtless exerted a further influence upon them; nevertheless, down at least to the close of the period of the judges, the skill of the Hebrews in manufactures was quite inconsiderable (1Sa 13:20). Many of the handicrafts were practiced by the proprietor of the house (landowner) himself (comp. Homer, Odyss. v,243), chiefly the coarser kinds of work (i.e. in wood), while other sorts fell to the female head of the family, such as baking (2Sa 13:8), weaving and embroidering (Exo 35:28; Pro 31:24), and the making up of garments, including those of the men (Pro 31:21; 1Sa 2:19; Act 9:39). SEE WOMAN, and comp. the Mishna, Kethuboth, v. 5. But all the varied forms of manufacture, which, being generally executed by dint of actual manipulation, required a good degree of personal dexterity, were carried on among the Hebrews by the owners themselves,  who were not slaves. So in the Homeric poems several kinds of mechanic arts appear (Hiad, 4:110, 485; 18:601; Odyss. 3:425, 432; see Wachsmuth, Hellen. Alterth. II, 1:47 sq.).

Accordingly we find mention of the gold and silver smith ( צוֹרֵor מְצָרֵ, Jdg 17:4; Isa 40:19; Jer 10:14, etc.), who especially fabricated idols, or plated and ornamented them; the apothecary ( רֹקֵחor רִקִּח, Exo 30:35; comp. μυρεψός, Sir 38:7); the artificer (חָרָשׁ, Exo 35:35; Deu 27:15; 1Sa 13:19), a term inclusive of blacksmiths (חָרָשֵׁי בִּרְזֶל, Isa 44:12; 2Ki 24:14; 1Sa 13:19; Tam. נִפָּחַין, Mishna, Chel. 14:3) and braziers ( ח נְחשֶׁת 1Ki 7:14; comp. χαλκεύς)C, 2Ti 4:14), as well as carpenters (ח עֵוֹ. 2Sa 5:11; Isa 44:13; comp. τέκτων, Matthew 3:55; Mar 6:3; also cabinet-makers, Mishna, Baba Kamma, 9:3) and masolis (קַיר חָרָשֵׁי, 1Ch 14:1); the stone- squarers ( חֹצְבֵי אֶבֶן, 2Ki 12:12), which was distinct from the last named, but whether the plasterers .(תָפֵל טָחֵי, Eze 13:11) were a separate trade from the masons is not clear; the potter ( יֹצֵרIsa 29:16, etc.; κερμεύς, Mat 27:7; Mat 27:10; comp. Gesenius, Monum. Phoen. p. 161); the locksmith (מִסְגֵּר, Jer 29:2); the fuller ( בֹּבֵסor מְכִבֵּסi 2Ki 18:17; γναφεύς, Mar 9:3; comp. Gesen. ut sup. p. 181); the weaver (אֹרֵג) early (Exo 28:32) formed a separate branch of industry (especially in fabrics of byssus, 1Ch 4:21), and in large cities the baker (אֹפֶה, Hos 7:4; Jer 37:21; see Josephus, Ant. 15:9, 2; but Luk 11:2, does not: rove the absence of such a trade); later also the barber (גִּלִּב, Eze 5:1) is named (סִפָּר, according to the Targum of Jonath. at Lev 13:45; Mishna, Shabb. 1:2). See each in its place. ‘Nevertheless, that the Hebrews took no very high rank in the fine styles of work, especially those in which labor passes over into an art, appears from the fact that a single individual often carried on several trades at once (Exo 31:3 sq.; 2Ch 2:14); while David and Solomon are recorded as having imported for their  structures Phoenician (Sidonian) artificers (1Ki 5:6; 1Ch 14:1; 2Ch 2:7; 2Ch 2:14, etc.). SEE PHOENICIA.

After the exile handicrafts and arts in general stood in greater esteem among the Jews, so that experts were found among them, and their productions acquired considerable reputation (see Rosenmuller, Morgenland, 6:42). It passed for a sign of a bad bringing up when a father failed to teach his son a trade (Mishna, Kiddush. 4:14; Lightfoot, p 616; comp. Pirke Aboth, 2:2; Wagenseil, Sota, p. 597; Otho, Lex. Rabb. p.491). In the Apocrypha of the Old Test. there are mentioned the κεραμεύς , as a moulder of figures of clay (Wis 15:8), the χρυσουρνός, ἀργυροχόος, and χαλκοπλάστης among metal-workers (Wis 15:19), chiefly as tributary to idol image-makers.; in the New Test. the tanner (βυρσεύς, Act 9:43; Act 10:6; Act 10:32; Talm. מורסיין or עבדנין, Chel. 15:1), the tentmaker (σκηνοποιός, Act 18:3); in Josephus occur the cheese- makers (τυροποιοί, War, v. 4, 1), the barbers (κουριεῖς, Ant. xvi, 5; War, 1:27, 5), who were of service to princes; in the Talmud, among others, the tailor (הייט, Shabb. 1:3), the shoemaker (רצען, Pesach, 4:6), the plasterer ( סייד, Chel. 29:3), the glazier (גזז, Chel. 8:9), the goldsmith (זהר, Chel. 29:6), the dyer (צבע, comp. Thilo, Apocr. p. 111). Some of these occupations were of so low repute that those who followed them could not attain the office of high-priest (Kiddush. lxxxii. 1); viz. those of the weaver, the barber, the fuller, the apothecary, the bloodletter, the bath- keeper, the tanner, which avocations, especially the barber's and the tanner's, were very odious (Kiddush. 4:14; Megilla, 3:2; comp. Otho, Lex. Rabb. p. 155; Wetstein, Nov. Test. 2:516). The workshops or place of business of the artisans appear (in the larger cities) to have been in certain streets or squares (bazaars, Tournefort, Trav. 2:322), where they were collected (Jeremiah 39:21); as in the Talmud, for instance, there is mention (Surenhusius, Mischna, v. 169, 225) of a meat-market (אטלס אישלין), and in Josephus (War, v. 4, 1) of a cheese-maker's valley (the Tyropceon), as likewise of forges and dealers in wool and garments (War,v. 8, i). On occasions of public mourning such places were closed (Philo, 2:525). See generally, Iken, Antiq. Hebr. 2:578 sq.; Bellermann, Handb. 1:221 sq. SEE HANDICRAFT.

Mecherah.

SEE MECHERATHITE.

## Mecherathite[[@Headword:Mecherathite]]

             (Hebrews Mekerathi', מְכֵרָתַי, gentile from מְכֵרָה, Mekerah', a sword, as in. Gen 49:5; Sept. Μεχουραθί v. r. Μεχωραθρί, Vulg. Mecherathites), an epithet applied to Hepher, one of David's famous warriors, probably as being a native of MECHERAH, a place otherwise unknown (1Ch 11:36); but from ‘the parallel passage (2Sa 23:34) it would appear to be a corruption for MAACHATHITE. SEE UR.

## Mechitar[[@Headword:Mechitar]]

             (or Mekhitar), DA PETRO, the founder of the Order of Mechitarists (q.v.), was born at Sebaste, a town of Armenia Minor, Feb. 7, 1676. His father's name was Peter Mauukean (i.e. son of Manug), but he exchanged his family name (Manug) for that of Mechitar, or “ Consoler,” on entering into ecclesiastical orders. His early education had been intrusted to monastics; they, no doubt, influenced him to devote himself to the service of the Church. At the age of fifteen he became an inmate of the Convent of the Holy Cross, near Sebaste; and a few years after, being made secretary of the archbishop Michael, who took him to Erzerum, he became acquainted with a fellow-countryman who had travelled in Europe, and wholenthim an Armenian work by Galanus, an Italian missionary, On the Reconciliation of the Armenian Church with that of Rome (published at Rome in 1650). Though Mechitar still continued professedly a member of the Armenian priesthood, he appears from this time to have become in secret a proselyte to the Church of Rome but the exact date of his passing over seems to have been unknown to all his biographers. He was anxious to make himself acquainted with the civilization of the West, it is urged by some; others believe that Mechitar had fallen into the hands of Romish priests, and was induced, as early as 1693, to accept the Romish interpretation of the sacred writings, and, consequently, of the doctrines and faith of the hierarchy, and that he determined on a visit to Rome to enjoy an interview with the holy father and the great dignitaries of the Latin Church. There is some reason also for the belief that Mechitar was at once, after his entry into the Latin Church, made a member of the Society of Jesus, and that he secretly worked for the good of the order. On his way to Rome he was attacked by severe illness in the island of Cyprus, and compelled to return, begging his way as he went. In 1696 he reentered the convent, determined to become a worker for higher religious and literary culture among his countrymen, and  to further this undertaking effectually he sought to gather about him young men desiring to work as missionaries. In 1699 he was made DD., and shortly after he removed to the Byzantine capital. In 1700, when he was a preacher at Constantinople, some dissensions between the partisans of two rival patriarchs divided the Armenian community into two hostile parties. Mechitar at first advised reconciliation, and afterwards, to their surprise, preached submission to the Church of Rome, and this roused such a storm against him that he was obliged to claim the protection of the French ambassador, which was readily afforded.

Thenceforth Mechitar appeared openly as a Roman Catholic. To escape from the animosity of his country. men he still found it necessary to remove in disguise to Smyrna, and finally he settled at Modon, in theMorea under the protection of the Venetian government, to whom it then belonged. As early as Sept. 8, 1701, he had founded at Constantinople a new religious community, in which ten other persons joined with him; at Modon, on Sept. 8, 1703, he took possession of an estate given him by the Venetians, to build a convent of the new order, which was called after his own name. The war between the Turks and the Venetians drove Mechitar in 1715 ‘to Venice, where he remained until after the conquest of the Morea by the Mussulman. His petition for a place instead of Modon found a willing ear at the Venetian Senate in 1717, and he was presented with the little island of San Lazaro, near the Lido, and there Mechitar built the convent which still attracts the attention of every visitor to Venice. It was opened on the day of the Virgin Mary's birth, Sept. 8. Thenceforth Mechitar labored assiduously for the good of the Church of Rome and the elevation of his countrymen. He is acknowledged even by his opponents of the Armenian Church to have revived the high literary attainments of his country in former days. He not only contributed to this by his own efforts as a voluminous writer, but in a still more important degree by establishing printing presses. He died April 27, 1749. His own productions are, besides many hymns, which are still sung in the Armenian churches, because they were written before his apostasy, a translation of Thomas B Kempis's Imitation of Christ, and of Thomas Aquinas's Theology, and many philological works of value. The fullest account of Mechitar, of his work, and of his followers, in English, is to be found in Brief Account of the Mechitaristican Society,:by Alexander Gorde (Venice, 1835). SEE MECHITARISTS.

## Mechitarists[[@Headword:Mechitarists]]

             a congregation of Armenian Christians, who reside on the island of San Lazaro at Venice, but who have also obtained a footing in France and Austria. They derive their name from MECHITAR DA PETRO SEE MECHITAR DA PETRO (q.v.), Who in the year 1701 founded this religious society for the purpose of diffusing a knowledge of the old Armenian language and literature. The Mechitarists, like their founder and instructor, acknowledge the supremacy of the Roman pontiff, and seek to spread the faith and practices of the Church of Rome in the East. The rules of the Mechitarists are modelled after those of the Benedictines, but every member must be of the Armenian nation, and promise an active devotion to the cultivation of the Armenian language and literature. The result, as we have said above, has been the formation not only of a convent but of an academy; and, in fact, the best schools for the study of Armenian are in the houses of the order. A division was provoked in 1773, and some of the Mechitarists settled at Trieste, and there founded an institution like that at San Lazaro. In 1810 these seceders removed to Vienna, the Austrian capital, and there they still remain, busy mainly in the publication of Armenian classical productions and instructing young Armenians. A third society has recently been founded at Paris, and efforts are making for the establishment of a fourth at Constantinople. Several hundred volumes have already been published by the Mechitarists. Of these the theological portion has a Roman Catholic circulation only, but the others have been welcomed by the Armenians generally. They publish a periodical like the English Penny Magazine. See Boze, De Convent de St. Lazare a Venise on Histoire succincte de l'Ordre des Mechitaristes Armeniens (Paris, 1837).

Mechthildis, ST.

a younger sister of St. Gertrude (q.v.), of the ancient and renowned family of Hackeborn, was born at Eisleben in the early part of the 13th century. She early manifested a decided taste for religious exercises, and at the age of seven, having gone one day with her mother to visit the Convent of Rodersdorf, occupied by Benedictine nuns, she was so much delighted with it that she insisted one remaining in it. She was allowed to become a novice, and fulfilled all the duties imposed upon her in that position with great zeal, showing herself particularly serviceable in taking care of the poor' and the afflicted. At the end of her noviciate she took the veil, and remained in the convent until 1258, when, together with the other nuns.  she removed to that of Helpede, where she died shortly after. Inclining from youth to mysticism, she, like her sister Gertrude, claimed to have had visions, but she steadfastly declined writing them down; this was, however, done against her will, by one of her friends, under the title Revelationes selectae S. Mathildis, together with a short biographical notice. These mystic pieces are not only full of elevated thoughts and aspirations, but give evidence of a thorough acquaintance with Scripture. The best edition is that published, together with a German translation, in the Bibliotheca mystica et ascetica (Cologne, 1854, pt. x).

Another Mechthildis, also honored as a saint in the Roman Catholic Church, flourished near the middle of the 12th century. She was a descendant of the counts of Andechs. In early youth she commenced to manifest signs of piety, and when she attained the requisite age she became a nun in the Convent of Diessen, in Bavaria. Here she acquired such reputation for piety and zeal that she was elected abbess ins 1153. Some years afterwards she was obliged, at the command of the bishop, to go as abbess to the Convent of Edelstetten, which she was to renovate. She labored there with her usual zeal, and proved very successful, yet she always regretted leaving her former convent, and during her last illness. was removed to it. She died May 31, 1160. She is commemorated April 10. See Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 9:223; Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lex. 12:788.

## Mecklenburg[[@Headword:Mecklenburg]]

             a North German territory, now part of the German empire, consists of two grand-duchies, the larger one called Mecklenburg-Schwerin, and the smaller one called Mecklenburg-Strelitz.

(1.) Mecklenburg-Schwerin, bounded on the north by the Baltic, on the east by Pomerania, on the south by Brandenburg, and on the west by Laienburg, covers an area of about 5126 square miles, and has a population of 560,618 (in 1867), of which 556,290 are Lutherans (200 Reformed), 1195 communicants of the Church of Rome, and 3064 adherents to the Jewish faith. The Mecklenburgers are for, the most part of Slavonic origin, hut amalgamation with their Saxon neighbors has largely Germanized the original race. The predominating form of religion is the Lutheran, the religion of the reigning prince. The grand-duke, whose powers are limited by a mixed feudal and constitutional form of government, has the title of royal highness, and is styled prince of the Wends, and of Schwerin and  Ratzeburg, count of Schwerin, and lord of Rostock, Stargard, etc. The state Church divides the territory into 331 rectories, with 475 churches, which are controlled by six superintendents and thirty-seven prpepositors. Much has been done of late years in extending the educational organization of Mecklenburg, although the lower classes do not yet enjoy as many advantages as in some other districts of Germany. Besides the university at Rostock (q.v.), there are five gymnasia, and numerous burgher, parochial, and other schools. The principal towns are the capital Schwerin, Ludwigslust, Rostock, Gistrow, and Wismar.

(2.) Mecklenburg-Strelitz, the other grand-duchy, is composed of two distinct portions of territory, viz. Stargard (by far the larger division, lying to the east of Mecklenburg-Schwerin) and the principality of Ratzeburg (between Mecklenburg-Schwerin and Lauenburg), and comprises an area of rather more than 1000 square miles, with a population of 98,770 (in 1867), of which 97,937 are Lutherans (1000 Reformed), 169 Roman Catholics, and 466 Jews. Like the other Mecklenburg duchy, the, country is in the hands of the Lutherans. It is divided into sixty-two rectories, and is governed by seven diocesan superintendents (propste).

The two Mecklenburg duchies have provincial estates in common, which meet once a year, alternately at Malchin and Sternberg. This united chamber consists of noble landowners and the representatives of forty- seven provincial boroughs, each of which has, however its separate municipal government.

History.-The Mecklenburg territory, anciently occupied by Germanic and afterwards by Slavonic tribes, was in the 12th century conquered by Henry the Lion, duke of Saxony, who, after thoroughly devastating the country, and compelling the small number of inhabitants remaining after the war to adopt Christianity, restored the greater part of the territory to Burewin, the heir of the slain Slavonic prince, Niklot, and gave him his daughter in marriage. The country at that period received its present designation from its principal settlement, Mikilinborg, now a village between Wismar and Brul. Christianity was, however, known to the inhabitants of this country long before the inroads of Henry the Lion. Missionaries of the Cross are said to have been there in the days of Charlemagne; but true Christian principles and faithful adherents to the Christian cause were not made there until the first half of the 10th century. After Henry I had vanquished the natives in the battle at Leuzen (931), bishop Adalward, of Verden, in that  very year baptized one of their rulers, and by the close of that century many converts had been gathered. But Christianity was still unpopular, and its confessors suffered much persecution, especially near the middle of the 11th century (comp., Jaffe, Lothar, p. 147, 232; Conrad III, p. 16). Not until the successful incursions of Henry the Lion can Christianity be really said to have found a hold in Mecklenburg territory, and hence he is generally looked upon not only as the author of the consolidation of the territory as Mecklenburg, but also as the founder of Christianity within its bounds. Shortly after the middle of the 12th century convents were built, and several monastic establishments founded. We find one Vicelin (t 1154), bishop of Lubeck, and his successor Geroldj especially active as missionaries.

But Christianity did not attain to a really prosperous condition during the Middle Ages in this part of the-Teutonic domains, although it was elevated into a duchy in 1349 by the emperor Charles. The Protestant doctrines were first introduced here in 1550 by duke Johann Albrecht, and his grandsons, Wolf-Friedrich and Johann Albrecht, who founded the lines of Mecklenburg-Schwerin and Mecklenburg-Giistrow. They were, however, deprived of the ducal title in 1627, in consequence of their adhesion to the Protestant cause, and the imperial general Wallenstein was proclaimed duke of all Mecklenburg. In 1632 Gustavus Adolphus of Sweden restored his kinsmen, the deposed dukes, to their domains. Kotzer, alias Schluter (q.v.), who was poisoned in 1532 was particularly prominent in the cause of the Reformers.

The fruit of his labors was seen in 1534 in the decree against the reading of the mass, and in the final official adoption of the Protestant cause in 1550. The secular affairs of Mecklenburg continued to undergo changes. After various subdivisions of the ducal line into the branches of Schwerin, Strelitz, and others, and the successive extinction of several of these collateral houses, the Imperial Commission, which met at Hamburg in 1701, brought about the settlement of a family compact, by which it was arranged that Schwerin and Giistrow should form one duchy, and Strelitz, with Ratzeburg and Stargard, Mirow and Nemerow, another independent sovereignty. After this, very few events of importance occurred till the accession in Schwerin, in 1785, of Friedrich Franz, who obtained the title of grandduke in 1815, and died in 1837, after a long reign, which he had made highly conducive to the internal welfare and external reputation of his hereditary dominions. The reign of Friedrich Franz II, who succeeded his father, Paul Friedrich, in 1842, was disturbed by a context between the nobles and the burgher and equestrian landowners, the former arrogating to themselves the exclusive right of  electing members into the equestrian order, nominating to benefices, and monopolizing other prerogatives of the ancient feudal nobility. The revolutionary excitement of 1848 gave a fresh stimulus to the popular ferment, and the disturbances could only be quelled by the intervention of Prussian troops. In 1866 the duchies were incorporated in the North German Confederation, and since the establishment of the new German empire they form part of the latter. Religious toleration and freedom of speech, which were comparatively unknown in the duchies of Mecklenburg, have since. 1866 gained quite a footing there, and promise much aid in the extinction of a very lukewarm profession of Christianity, and the establishment of vital Christianity in its stead. See Adam. Bremens. Hist. Eccles. in Pertz, Mon. Script. vol. iii; Ernst Boll, Geschichte Mecklenburg's mit besonderer. Berucksichtigung der Culturgesch. (Neubrandenburg, 1855-5.);:Herzog, Real-encyklopadie, s.v.; Deutsch- Amerik. Conv. Lexikon, s.v., (J. H. W.)

## Medaba[[@Headword:Medaba]]

             (Μηδαβά 2 Macc. 9:36). SEE MEDEBA.

## Medad[[@Headword:Medad]]

             (Hebrews Meydad', מֵידָד, low; Sept. Μωδάδ), a person mentioned in connection with Eidad, as two of the seventy elders who were nominated to assist Moses in the government of the people, but who remained in the camp, probably as modestly deeming themselves unfit for the office, when the others presented themselves at the tabernacle. The divine Spirit, however, rested on them even there, “and they prophesied in the camp” (Num 11:24-29). The Targum of Jonathan alleges that these two men were brothers of Moses and Aaron by the mother's side, being sons of Jochebed and Elizaphan. BC. 1657. SEE ELDAD.

## Medan[[@Headword:Medan]]

             (Hebrews Medan', מְדָן, contention, as in Pro 6:14; Pro 6:19; Sept. Μαδάν v. r. in Chron. Μαδιάμ; Vulg. Madan), the third son of Abraham by Keturah (Gen 25:2). BC. post 2024. He and his brother Midian are believed to have peopled the country of Midian, east of the Dead Sea. “It has been supposed, from the similarity of the name, that the tribe descended from Medan was more closely allied to Midian than by mere blood-relation, and that it was the same as, or a portion of the latter. There  is, however, no ground for this theory beyond its plausibility. The traditional city Medyen of the Arab geographers (the classical Modiana), situate in Arabia on the eastern shore of the Gulf of Eyleh, must be held to have been Midianitish, not Medanitish (but Bunsen, Bibelwerk, suggests the latter identification). It has been elsewhere remarked, SEE KETURAH, that many of the Keturahite tribes seem to have merged in early times into the Ishmaelite tribes. The mention of ‘Ishmaelite' as a convertible term with ‘Midianite,' in Gen 37:28; Gen 37:36, is. remarkable; but the Midianite of the AV. in Gen 37:28 is Medanite in the Hebrew (by the Sept. rendered Μαδιηναῖοι, and in the Vulg. Isimaelitae and: Madianitae), and we may have here a trace of the subject of this article, though Midianite appears on the whole to be more likely the correct reading in the passages referred to. SEE MIDIAN. .

## Medard, ST[[@Headword:Medard, ST]]

             bishop of Noyon, in France, was born about 456, in the village of Sallency, near Noyon. Through his father, Nectardus, he belonged to a noble Frank family; his mother, Protagia, a Gallo-Roman, also claimed high connections. He was educated in the school of his native city, and early manifested that zeal and charity for which he afterwards became distinguished. He entered the Church under the guidance of the bishop of Vermand, and on the death of the latter, in 530, was appointed his successor. In consequence, however, of the frequent invasions which desolated that district, he exchanged this see for Noyon, a strongly- fortified town. When St. Eleutherus, bishop of Tournay, died, in 532, Medard was invited to join this see to that of Noyon; he refused at first, but was finally induced to accept by king Clotaire himself, and the two dioceses continued to be administered by the same bishop until 1146, when they were again divided. St. Medard was one of the most influential and most universally-respected bishops of his time. King Clotaire came to visit him shortly before his death, which occurred about 545, and afterwards caused his remains to be buried in the royal estate of Crouy, near Soissons. The renowned cathedral of St. Medard is erected over his grave. He is commemorated on June 8. He is highly praised by Gregory of Tours (lib. 4:c. 19), who, like his biographers Venantius, Fortunatus, and Radbodus, attributes to him a great number of miracles. The best biography of St. Medard is contained in the Acta Sanctorum for July 8. See Perz Monun. Hist. Germ. vol. i and ii; Gregorius Turon. Hist. Franc. lib. iv, c. 19; same,  De Gloria Confess. c. 95; Radbodus, Vita S. Medardi, Noviomn. episc. apud Suriun, 8 Junii; Gallia Christ. vol. ix, col. 979. (J. N. P.)

Medatha.

SEE HAMMEDATHA.

## Mede[[@Headword:Mede]]

             (Hebrews Maday', מָדִי, a word of Indian origin, meaning, according to Gesenius, Thes. Hebrews p. 768, the middle country, from its position, as in Polybius, v. 44; Auth. Vers. “Medes,” “Media,” “Madai,” Gen 10:2; 2Ki 17:6; 2Ki 18:11; 1Ch 1:5; Est 1:3; Est 1:14; Est 1:18-19; Est 10:2; Isa 13:17; Isa 21:2; Jer 25:25; Jer 51:11; Jer 51:28; Dan 8:20; Dan 9:1; also Madi', מָדַי, “Mede,” Dan 11:1; Chald. Maday', מָדִי“Mede,” “Medes,” Ezr 6:2; Dan 5:28; Dan 6:8; Dan 6:12; Dan 6:15; and Madaah', מָדָאָה“Me, “Median,” or Madaa', מָדָיֹא, Dan 5:31; Gr. Μῆδος), the ethnographic title of a Median, or inhabitant of Media; the same of that of MADAI SEE MADAI [q.v.]. The Hebrew form, “which occurs in Gen 10:2, among the list of the sons of Japhet, has been commonly regarded as a personal appellation; and most commentators call Madai the third son of Japhet, and the progenitor of the Medes. But it is extremely doubtful whether, in the mind of the writer of Genesis 10, the term Madai was regarded as representing a person. That the genealogies in the chapter are to some extent ethnic is universally allowed, and may be seen even in our Authorized Version (Gen 10:16-18). As Gomer, Magog, Javan, Tubal, ‘and Meshech, which are conjoined in Gen 10:2 with Madai, are elsewhere in Scripture always ethnic and not personal appellatives (Eze 27:13; Eze 38:6; Eze 39:6; Dan 8:21; Joe 3:6; Psa 120:5; Isa 66:19, etc.), so it is probable that they stand for nations rather than persons here. In. that case no one would regard Madai as a person; and we must remember that it is the exact word used elsewhere throughout Scripture for the well-known nation of the Medes. Probably, therefore, all that the writer intends to assert in Gen 10:2 is that the Medes, as well as the Gomerites, Greeks, Tibareni, Moschi, etc., descended from Japhet. Modern science has found that, both in physical type and in language, the Medes belong to that family of the human race which embraces the Cymry and the GrecoRomnans” (see Prichard's Phys. Hist. of Mankind, 4:650; chap. x, § 2-4; and comp. the article on MEDIA). For “ Darius the Mede,” SEE DARIUS.'

## Mede, Joseph, BD[[@Headword:Mede, Joseph, BD]]

             a learned English divine, was descended from a respectable family at Berden, in Essex, and was born in 1586. When but a boy ten years old he lost his father, but his education was provided for by friends. He became a commoner of Christ Church, Cambridge, in 1602, where hd took the degree of master of arts in 1610, having made such progress in all kinds of learning that. he was universally esteemed an accomplished scholar. He was appointed Greek lecturer on Sir Walter Mildmay's foundation, and particularly employed himself in studying the history of the Chaldaeans and Egyptians. He appears to have had many offers of preferment, but unhesitatingly declined them ‘all in favor of this position, which afforded him leisure for favorite studies. He died in 1638. “Mr. Mede,” says his biographer, “ was an acute logician, an accurate philosopher, a skilful mathematician, an excellent anatomist, a great philologist,. a- master of many ‘languages, and a good proficient in history and chronology.” His principal production, worthy the labors of a lifetime, he sent ‘forth in 1627, under the title Clavis Apocalyptica (Cambridge, 1627, 4to); to which he added in 1632, In Sancti Joannis Apocalypsin Commentarius, ad amussim Clavis Apocalypticce. An English translation of this celebrated work was published in London in l1650, entitled The Key of Revelation searched and demonstrated out of the natural and proper Characters of the Visions, etc.; to which is added a Conjecture concerning Gog and Magog. This work has been honored with high commendation from the learned Dr. Hurd, in his' Introduction to the Study of the Prophecies (ii. 122, etc.), where Mede is spoken of as “a sublime genius, without vanity, interest, or spleen, but with a single, unmixed love of truth, dedicating his great talents to the study of the prophetic Scriptures, and unfolding the mysterious prophecies of the Revelation.” A collection of the whole of Mede's writings was published in 1672, in 2 vols. folio, by Dr. Worthington, who added to them a life of the author. He was a pious and profoundly learned man; and in every part of his works the talents of a sound and learned divine are eminently conspicuous. He was- distinguished for his meekness, modesty, and prudence, and for unbounded liberality towards the needy. A very full account of Mede is given in Allibone's Dict. Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v. See also English Cyclop. s.v.; Genesis Biog. Dict. s.v.; Darling, Cyclop, Bibliog. 1:2028; Horne, Bibl. Bibl. 1839, p. 331; Orme, Biblioth. Biblia, s.v.; Hunt, Hist. of Religious Thought in England, 1:167.

## Medeba[[@Headword:Medeba]]

             (Hebrews Meydeba', מֵידְבָא, water of quiet; Sept. Μηδαβά in Chron., Μαιδαβά in Josh., Μωάβ in Numb., and Μωαβῖτις v. r. Μηδαβά, Μηδαμά, Μιδαβά in Isa.; Vulg. Medaba; Joseph. Μηδάβα and Μεδάβη ), a town east of the Jordan, in a plain of the sapne name in the southern border of the tribe of Reuben (Jos 13:9; Jos 13:16), before which was fought the great battle where Joab defeated the Ammonites and their allies (1Ch 19:7; comp. with 2Sa 10:8; 2Sa 10:14, etc.). In the time of Ahaz, Medeba was a sanctuary of Moab (Isa 15:2); but in the denunciation of Jeremiah (48), often parallel with that of Isaiah, it is not mentioned. It originally belonged to the Moabites (Num 21:30), from whom it was conquered by Sihon the Amoritish king (Josephus, Ant. 13:1, 2, and 4); but upon the captivity of the tribes beyond the Jordan, the Moabites again took possession of it (Isa 15:2), and retained it after the return from exile (1Ma 9:36). SEE JAMBRI.

It was the scene of the capture and possibly the death of John Maccabseus, and also of the revenge subsequently taken by Jonathan and Simon (Josephus, Ant. 13:1,4; the name is omitted in Maccabees on the second occasion, see v. 38). About BC. 110 it was, taken, after a long siege, by John Hyrcanus ,(Ant. 13:9, 1; War, 1:2, 4), and then appears to have remained in the possession of the Jews for at least thirty years, till the time of Alexander Jannseus (13:15, 4); and it is mentioned as one of the twelve cities by the promise of which Aretas, the king of Arabia, was induced to assist Hyrcanus II to recover Jerusalem ‘from his brother, Aristobulus (Ant. 14:1,4). Ptolemy calls it Medaua (Μήδανα), ,in Arabia Petraea, in long. 68° 30', lat. 300 45' (v. 17, 6). Stephen of Byzantium (p. 566) assigns it to Nabatene. The Onomasticon places it near Heshbon; and it was once the seat of one of the thirty-five bishoprics of Arabia (Reland, Palaestina, p. 217, 223, 226). The place, ‘although in ruins, still retains the name Madeba, and is ‘situated upon a round hill seven miles south of Heshbron. The ruins are about a mile and a half in circuit, but not a single edifice remains perfect, although the remains of the walls of private houses are traceable, and an immense tank (Irby and Mangles, p. 471) is visible (Seetzen, in Zach's Monat. Corresp. 18:431; Burckhardt, Trav. in Syria, p. 365 sq.). The foundations of an-ancient temple observed by these travellers on the west of the town are perhaps those of the Christian church which it once contained (ἡ πόλις Μηδάβων, Le Quien, Oriens Christianus, 769-772). A large tank, columns, and other marks of former structures are still to be seen; the  remains of a Roman road exist near the town, which seems formerly to have connected it with Heshbon. “Taken as a Hebrew word, Me-deba means ‘waters' of quiet; but, except the above tank, what waters can there ever have been on that high plain ? The Arabic name, though similar in sound, has a different signification.”

The plain (מַישׁוֹר) from Medeba to Dibon, given in Jos 13:9 as the southern portion of the territory of the Amorites, is the modern Belka, a fertile tract thus described by Raumer (Palastina, p. 70): “ Southwards from Rabbath Ammon as far as the Arnon the country is mostly table-land, in some places for a considerable distance without a tree, but covered with the ruins of cities that have been destroyed. Towards the east it stretches away into the desert of Arabia, and on the west it slopes away to the Jordan.” The part of this plateau here referred to is elsewhere (Num 21:20) called, after its former inhabitants, “the field of Moab,” or (Num 23:14) “ the field of the watchmen” (comp. Hengstenberg, Bileam, p. 241, 243). SEE MISHOR.

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

             The ruins of this site are extensively described by Tristram (Land of Moab, page 321 sq.) and Merrill (East of the Jordan, page 252). They consist especially of two columns, still standing, with their architrave, the remains of a temple, and a stone reservoir, one hundred and twenty yards square, still perfect, with the usual signs of an ancient town.

## Medhurst, Walter Henry, DD[[@Headword:Medhurst, Walter Henry, DD]]

             an English missionary and Chinese scholar, was born in London in 1796. He first entered the missionary field of labor in 1816, when he was sent to China by the London Missionary Society to ascertain if the country was open to the Gospel, and, if so, to furnish this people with a correct version of the Scriptures in Chinese. After having labored successfully in India, on the island of Malacca, and other Asiatic countries, he was again sent to China in 1835, with the Revelation Edwin Stevens; but he did not commence active missionary work in that country until 1845, when he was joined by Lockhart, and settled at Shanghai. He had charge of the printing establishment which was owned by this society, and had up. to this time been operated at Batavia; he now removed it to Shanghai, and began the publication of sermons and tracts. In spite of the opposition of the numerous Romanists, the mission grew so rapidly that in the year 1847 34,000 copies of different works were printed, and 500 tracts were weekly distributed. This same year delegates from several stations convened in Shanghai for the revision of the New Testament in Chinese. Medhurst was engaged in this important labor until 1850, when he withdrew, and gave his whole time to the reh vision of the Old Testament. He died Jan. 24,1857, a few days after his return- to England, closing a life of valuable service spent in the interests of Christian missions. ‘Medhurst founded several  orphan asylums, and did much good among the Asiatics in various ways. His works of special: interest are, China, its State and Prospects, with especial Reference to the Diffusion of the Gospel (Lond. 1838, 8vo):- Dissertation on the Theology of the Chinese (8vo):-The Chinese Version of the Scriptures ‘(1851, 8vo):-also a Chinese Dictionary (1838, 4to), and a Japanese and English Vocabulary. See Vapereau, Dictionnaire des Conteniporains, s.v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, vol. ii, s.v.

## Media[[@Headword:Media]]

             (מָדִי). The same Hebrew word is used in the O.T. as the name of a son of Japhet, of the nation which he founded, and of their country. Hence we find it rendered in four different -ways in our AV. In most cases these renderings are arbitrary, and tend to confuse rather than explain

(1.) Madai, the proper rendering (Gen 10:2; Μαδοί; Alex. Μαδαί Madai; 1Ch 1:5, Μαδαϊvμ);

(2.) Medes (Μήδοι. 2Ki 17:6; 2Ki 18:11; Est 1:19; Isa 13:17; Jer 25:25; Dan 9:1; Dan 5:28; Μήδεια, Ezr 6:22; Medo;

(3.) Media (Μήδοι, Medoi, Est 1:3; Est 10:2; Isa 21:2; Dan 8:20);

(4.) Mede, only in Dan 11:1. In the following account we chiefly refer of course to ancient territorial distributions and descriptions.

I. Geography. The general situation of the country is abundantly clear, though its limits may not be capable of being precisely determined. Media lay northwest of Persia Proper, south and south-west of the Caspian, east of Armenia and Assyrian west and north-west of the great salt desert of Iran. Its greatest length was from north to south, and in this direction it extended from the 32d to the 40th parallel, a distance of 550 miles. In width it reached from about long. 450 to 53°; but its ,average breadth was not more than from 250 to 300 miles. Its area may be reckoned at about 150,000 square miles, or three fourths of that of modern France. The natural boundary of Media on the north was the river Aras; on the west Zagros, and the mountain-chain which connects Zagros with Ararat; on the south Media was probably separated from Persia by the desert which now  forms the boundary between Farsistan and Irak Ajemi; on the east its natural limit was the desert and the Caspian Gates. West of the gates it was bounded, not (as is commonly said) by the Caspian Sea, but by the mountain range south of that sea, which is the natural boundary btween the high and the low country. It thus comprised the modern provinces of Irak Ajemi, Persian Kurdistai., part of Luristan, Azerbijan, perhaps Talish and Ghila a, but not Mazanderan or Asterabad.

The division of Media commonly recognised by the Greeks and Romans was that into Media Magna and Media Atropatene (Strabo, 11:13, § 1; comp. Polyb. v. 44; Pliny, H. N. 6:13; Ptolem. 6:2, etc.).

1. Media Atropatene, so named from the satrap Atropates, who became independent monarch of the province on the destruction of the Persian empire by Alexander (Arrian, Exped. Alex. iii,8; 6:29; Diod. Sic. 18:3), corresponded nearly to the modern Azerbijan, being the tract situated between the Caspian and the mountains which run north from Zagros, and consisting mainly of the rich and fertile basin of Lake Urumiyeh, with the valleys of the Aras ,and the Sefid Rud. This is chiefly a high tract, varied between mountains and plains, and lying mostly three or four thousand feet above the sea level. The basin of Lake Urumiyeh (the Spanta of Strabh ) has a still greater elevation, the surface of the lake itself, into which all the rivers run, being as much as 4200 feet above the ocean. The country is fairly fertile, ell-watered in most places, and favorable to agriculture its climate is temperate, though occasionally severe in winter; it produces rice, corn of all kinds, wine, silk, white wax, and all mariner of delicious fruits. Tabriz, is modern capital, forms the summer residence of the Persian kings, and is a beautiful place, situated in a forest. of orchards. The ancient Atropatene may have included also the countries of Ghilan and Talish, together with the plain of Moghan, at the mouth of the combined Kur and Aras rivers. These tracts are low and flat; that of Moghan is sandy and sterile; Talish is more productive; while Ghilan (like Mazanderan) is rich and fertile in the highest degree. The climate of Ghilan, however, is unhealthy, and at times pestilential; the streams perpetually overflow their banks; and the waters which escape stagnate in marshes, whose exhalations spread disease and death among the inhabitants.

2. Media Magna lay south and east of Atropatene. Its northern boundary was the range of Elburz from the Caspian Gates to the Rudbar pass, through which the Sefid Rud reaches the low country of Ghilan. It then  adjoined upon Atropatene, from which it may be regarded as separated by a line running about south-west by west from the bridge of Menjil to Zagros. Here it touched Assyria, from which it was probably divided by the last line of hills towards the west, before the mountains sink down upon the plain . On the south it was bounded by Susiana and Persia Proper, the former of which it met in the modern Luristan, probably about lat. 33° 30', while it struck the latter on the eastern side of the Zangros range, in lat. 32° or 32° 30'. Towards the east it was closed in by the great salt desert, which Herodotus reckons to Sagartia, and later writers to Parthia and Carmania. Media Magna thus contained a great part of Kurdistan and Luristan, with all Ardelan and Irak Ajemi. The character of this tract is very varied. Towards the west, in Ardelan, Kurdistan, and Luristan, it is highly mountainous, but at the same time wellwatered and richly wooded, fertile and lovely; on the north, along the flank of Elburz, it is less. charming, but still pleasant and tolerably productive; while towards the east and south-east it is bare, arid, rocky, and sandy supporting with difficulty a spare and wretched population. The present productions of Zagros are cotton, tobacco, hemp, Indian corn, rice, wheat, wine, and fruits of every variety; every valley is a garden; and besides valleys, extensive plains are often found, furnishing the most excellent pasturage. Here were nurtured the valuable breed of horses called Nisaean, which the Persians cultivated with such especial care, and from which the horses of the monarch were always chosen. The pasture grounds of Khawah and Alishtar, between Behistun and Khorram-abad, probably represent the “ Nisean plain” of the ancients, which seems to have taken its name from a town Nisaea (Nisaya), mentioned in the cuneiform inscriptions.

Although the division of Media into these two provinces can only be distinctly proved to have existed from the time of Alexander the Great, yet there is reason to believe that it was more ancient, dating from the settlement of the Medes in the country, which did not take place all at once, but was first in the more northern and afterwards in the southern country. It is indicative of the division, that there were two Ecbatanas-one, the northern, at Takht-i-Suleiman; the other, the southern at Hamadan, on the flanks of Mount Orontes (Elwand) -respectively the capitals of the two districts. SEE ECBATANA.

Next to the two Ecbatanas, the chief town in Media was undoubtedly Rhages-the Raga of the inscriptions. Hither the rebel Phraortes fled on his defeat by Darius Hystaspis, and hither. too, came Darius Codomannus after  the battle of Arbela, on his way to the eastern provinces (Arrian, Exped. Alex. 3:20). The only other place of much note was Bagistana, the modern Behistun, which guarded the chief pass connecting Media with the Mesopotamian plain.

No doubt both parts of Media were further subdivided into provinces, but no trustworthy account of these minor. divisions has come down to us. The tract about Rhages was certainly called Rhagiana, and the mountain tract adjoining Persia seems to have been known' as Paraetacene; or the country of the Parsetacae. Ptolemy gives as Median'districts Elymais, Choromithrene, Sigrina, Daritis, and Syromedia; but these names are little known to other writers, and suspicions attach to some of them. On the whole, it would seem that we do not possess materials for a minute account of the ancient geography of the country, which is very imperfectly described by Strabo, and almost omitted by Pliny.

In Great Media lay the metropolis of the country, the Ecbatana of that district (Pliny, Hist. Nat. 6:17), as well as the province of Rhagiana and the city Rhagae, with the above Nissean plain, celebrated in the time off the Persian empire for its horses and horse-races (Herod. 3:106; Arrian, 7:13; Heeren, Ideen, 1:1. 305). This plain was near the city Nisaea, around which were fine pasture lands producing excellent clover (Herba Medica). The horses were entirely white, and of extraordinary height and beauty, as well as speed. They constituted a part of the luxury of the great, and a tribute in kind was paid from them to the monarch, who, like all Eastern sovereigns, used to delight in equestrian display. Some idea of the opulence of the country may be had when it is known that, independently of imposts rendered in money, Media paid a yearly tribute of not less than 3000 horses, 4000 mules, and nearly 100,000 sheep. The breeds, once celebrated through the world, appear to exist no more; but Ker Porter saw the shah ride on festival occasions a splendid horse of pure white. Cattle abounded, as did the richest fruits, as pines, citrons, oranges, all of peculiar excellence, growing as in their native land. Here also was found the silphium (probably assafoetida), which formed a considerable article in the commerce of the ancients, and was accounted worth its weight in. gold.

II. History. —

1. Its Early Stages. In Gen 10:2 we are told that Madai was the third son of Japhet (comp. 1Ch 1:5). The names in that invaluable ethnological summary were not merely those of individuals but  of the nations which descended from them; for the historian says, “By these Were the isles of the Gentiles divided in their lands, every one after his tongue, after their families, in their nations” (1Ch 1:5). For a period of fifteen centuries the Medes are not again mentioned in Scripture. Then Isaiah, in pronouncing the prophetic doom of Babylon, says, “I will stir up the Medes against them” (Isa 13:17). This prophecy was uttered about BC. 720. There is no direct evidence connecting Madai, the son of Japhet, and the nation he founded, with the Medes (Madai) of whom Isaiah speaks; but the names are identical in Hebrew; and the genealogical tables of Genesis appear to have been intended to show the origin of those nations which afterwards bore an important part in the history of God's people.

Berosus, the Babylonian priest and historian, states that at a very remote period (BC. cir. 2000) the Medes ruled in Babylon (Eusebius, Chron. 1:4). Though we may not be able to rely upon either his dates or his facts, yet we may infer from his words and references that the Medes were one of the great primeval races which established themselves in Central Asia. Herodotus gives a very graphic and circumstantial account of the early history of the Medes, and the establishment of the empire: “The Medes were called anciently by all people Arians; but when Medda, the Colchian, came to them from Athens, they changed their name. Such is the ‘account which they themselves give” (vii. 62). This is opposed to what appears to be the opinion of the sacred writers; but there can be no doubt that during the time of ascendency of Greek arms, literature, and -art, Eastern nations were all anxious to claim some sort of connection with Greece, and this may account for Herodotus's story (comp. Rawlinson's Herod. 4:61, 1st ed.).

The Medes appear, however, to have been a branch of the Arian family, who probably had their primitive seat on the east bank of the Indus, and thence sent their colonies eastward into India, and westward to Media, Persia, Greece, etc. (Muller, Science of Language). There are independent grounds for thinking that an Arian element existed in the population of the Mesopotamian valley, side by side with the Cushite and Shemitic elements, at a very early date. It is therefore not at all impossible that the Medes may have been the predominant race there for a time, as Berosus states, and may afterwards have been overpowered and driven to the mountains, whence they may have spread themselves eastward, northward, and westward, so as to occupy a vast number of localities from the banks of the  Indus to those of the middle Danube. The term Arians, which was by the universal consent of their neighbors applied to the Medes in the time of Herodotus (Herod. 7:62), connects them with the early Yedic settlers in Western Hindustan; the Matieni of Mount Zagros. the Sauro Matae of the steppe-country between the Caspian and the Euxine, and the Maetae or Maeotae of the Sea of Azov, mark their progress towards the north; while the Maedi or Medi of Thrace seem to indicate their spread westward into Europe, which was directly attested by the native traditions of the Sigynnae (Herod. v. 9). It has been supposed by some that there was a Scythic tribe of Madai who conquered and held Babylonia long previous to the irruption of the Arian family, and that it is to them Berosus alludes. There are no good grounds for this belief; and it is worthy of note as tending to disprove the theory that the name “Mede” does not appear upon the Assyrian monuments before the year BC. 880 (Rawlinson's Commentary on A ssyrian Inscriptions). To that date is assigned the inscription. on the famous black obelisk, discovered by Layard at Nimrud, which contains a record of the victories of Temen-bar, the Assyrian monarch. In the twenty- fourth year of his reign he invaded the territory of the Medes (Vaux, Nineveh and Persepolis, p. 263, where a translation of the inscription is given). At that time the Medes were independent, occupying an extensive country with many cities, and divided, like the Persians, into a number of tribes having each a chief. This remarkable monument thus fixes the date of the first conquest of the Medes by the Assyrians; but it does not determine the' date of the settlement of the former in Media. Sir H. Rawlinson thinks that the way in which the nations are grouped in that inscription seems to indicate that the Medes when attacked were in the act of migrating (Commentary). This, however, is very uncertain.

The invasion of Temen-bar was probably more like an Arab raid than a military conquest. His successors on the Assyrian throne were almost incessantly engaged in hostilities with the Medes (Rawlinson's Herodot. 1. 404); and Sargon appears to have been the first who attempted to occupy the country with regular garrisons. He built cities in Media, and reduced the people to tribute (Rawlinson's Herod. 1. c.; and Comment.). Sargon was that king of Assyria “who took Samaria, and carried Israel captive,” and placed some of them “in the cities of the Medes” (2Ki 17:6; comp. 18:17; Isa 20:1). The truth of Scripture history is here strongly confirmed by monuments recently disentombed from the ruins of Sargon's palace at Khorsabad. On its walls are inscribed the records of his  conquests, in which both Media and Judaea are mentioned-the former as on the eastern, and the latter on the western limits of his vast empire (Rawlinson's Comment. p. 61; Rawlinson's Herodot. 1:405). SEE SARGON.

Media was not yet a kingdom. It was occupied by a number of petty chiefs, each ruling his own tribe. From these chiefs the Assyrian monarchs exacted tribute. The tribes increased in numbers, influence, and power. They held a country naturally strong. The Assyrian yoke was galling to their free spirits, and probably this first induced them to unite their forces, elect a common leader, and assert their independence. The exact date of this revolution cannot now be fixed, but the fact of it is certain. Herodotus's account of it is as follows: “The Assyrians had held the empire of Upper Asia for a space of 520 years, when the Medes set the example of revolt. They took arms for the recovery of their freedom, and fought a battle with the Assyrians, in which they behaved with such gallantry as to shake off the yoke of servitude” (i. 95). He then tells how the empire was formed by a certain Deioces, who, in consequence of his wisdom and justice, was elected monarch by the six tribes composing the nation (i. 96-101). Deioces built the great city of Ecbatana; and, after a prosperous reign of fifty-three years, left the throne to his son Phraortes. Phraortes conquered Persia, vastly enlarged the Median empire, and reigned twenty-two years. He was succeeded by his son Cyaxares. During his reign, while engaged in a war against Nineveh, Media was overrun by a horde of Scythians, who held a great part of Western Asia for twenty-eight years. The Scythian leaders were at length treacherously murdered by Cyaxares, and the Median monarchy re-established. He ruled forty years, and then left the kingdom to his son Astyages, whose daughter Mandane was married to a Persian noble, and became the mother of the great Cyrus. According to this narrative, the Median monarchy was established about BC. 708 (Rawlinson's Herodot. 1:407). There is good reason to believe, however, that the early portion of the narrative is apocryphal,,and that Cvaxares was the real founder of the Median empire. He is so represented by most ancient historians (Diodoi's Sic. 2:32; }AEschylus, Persae, 761; see Grote's History of Greece, vol. iii). The Assyrian monumental annals are almost complete down to the reign of the son of Esarhaddon (BC. 640), and they contain no mention of any Median irruptions; on the contrary, they represent the Median chiefs as giving tribute to Esarhaddon (Rawlinson's Herodot. 1:405, 408).

Ctesias, as quoted by Diodorus Siculus (ii. 32), assigns to the Median monarchy a still older date than Herodotus. He gives a list of eight kings who ruled before Astyages, for an aggregate period of 282 years, which would fix the, establishment of the monarchy about BC. 875. The names of the kings are different from those of Herodotus; and it is vain to attempt to reconcile the narratives (see, however, Hales's Analysis of Chronology, 3:84; Heeren, Manual of Ancient Hist.). Rawlinson has clearly shown that Ctesias's narrative is fabulous (Herodot. 1:406).

2. The Median Empire.

(1.) Its Establishment.-From the foregoing notices we may conclude that the Medes migrated from beyond the Indus to the country on the southern shores of the Caspian Sea not later than the 9th century BC.; that they settled there as a number of distinct tribes (probably six, as Herodotus states, l. c.), and so remained during a period of three or four centuries; that some Scythian tribes either occupied the country with them or invaded it at a later date; and that (about BC. 633) Cyaxares rose suddenly to power, united the Medes under his sway, drove out the Scythians, and established She monarchy. Before this time the Medes are only once mentioned in Scripture, and then, as has been seen their country was subject to Assyria (2Ki 17:6.

A few years after the establishment of his empire Cyaxares made a league with the Babylonian monarch, and invaded Assyria. Nineveh was captured and destroyed, BC. 625. The incidents of the siege and capture, as related by Diodorus Siculus (ii. 27, 28), contain a remarkable fulfilment of the prophecies uttered by Nahum (Nah 1:8; Nah 2:5-6; Nah 3:13-14) nearly a century previously; and recent excavations' by Layard illustrate both (Nineveh and Babylon, p. 71, 103, etc.). SEE NINEVEH. The Assyrian monarchy was then overthrown (Rawlinson, Ancient Monarchies, 2:521).

Abydenus (probably following Berosus) informs us that iln his Assyrian war Cyaxares was assisted by the Babylonians under Nabopolassar, between whom and Cyaxares an intimate alliance was formed, cemented by a union of their children; and that a result of their success was the establishment of Nabopolassar as independent king on the throne of Babylon, an event which we know to belong to the above-mentioned year. It was undoubtedly after this that Cyaxares endeavored tc conquer Lydia.  His conquest of Assyria had made him master of the whole country lying between Mount Zagros and the river Halys,to which he now hoped to add the tract between the Halys and the AEgaean Sea. It is surprising that he failed, more especially as he seems to have been accompanied by the forces of the Babylonians, who were perhaps commanded by Nebuchadnezzar on the occasion. SEE NEBUCHADNEZZAR. After a war which lasted six years he desisted from his attempt, and concluded the treaty with the Lydian monarch of which we have already spoken. The three great Oriental monarchies- Media, Lydia, and Babylon-were now united by mutual engagements and intermarriages, and continued at peace with one another during the remainder of the reign of Cyaxares, and during that of Astyages, his son and successor.

(2.) Extent of the Empire.-The conquest of Assyria produced a great change in the Median empire, and on the whole of Western Asia. Babylon then regained its independence, and formed a close alliance with Media. The Israelites, who had been led captive by the Assyrians, were placed under new rulers. Cyaxares led his victorious armies into Syria and Asia Minor (Herod. 1:103). When Pharaoh-necho marched to the banks of the Euphrates against Babylon, the Babylonians were aided by the Medes (Joseph. Ant. 10:5, 1). It was in attempting to oppose this expedition of the Egyptian monarch that king Josiah was slain at Megiddo (Jer 46:2; 2Ch 35:20; 2Ki 23:29). We also learn that Nebuchadnezzar was aided by the Medes in the conquest of the Jews and capture of Jerusalem (Eusebius, Pr. Evang.; comp. 2Ki 24:1; 2Ch 36:5). Media was now the most powerful monarchy in Western Asia.

The limits of the Median empire cannot be definitely fixed, but it is not difficult to give a general idea of its size and position. From north to south its extent was in no place great, since it was certainly confined between the Persian Gulf and the Euphrates on the one side, and the Black and Caspian seas on the other. From east to west it had, however, a wide expansion, since it reached from the Halys at least as far as the Caspian Gates, and possibly farther. It comprised Persia, Media Magna, Northern Media, Matiene or Media Mattiana, Assyria, Armenia, Cappadocia, the tract between Armenia and the Caucasus, the low tract along the south-west and south of the Caspian, and possibly some portion of Hyrcania,.Parthia, and Sagartia. It was separated from Babylonia either by the Tigris, or more probably by a line running about half-way between that river and the  Euphrates, and thus did not include Syria, Phoenicia, or Judaea, which fell to Babylon on the. destruction of the Assyrian empire. Its greatest length may be reckoned at 1500 miles from north-west to south-east, and its average breadth at 400 or 450 miles. Its area would thus be about 600,000 square miles, or somewhat greater than that of modern Persia.

(3.) Its Character.-With regard to the nature of the government established by the Medes over the conquered nations, we possess but little trustworthy evidence. Herodotus in one place compares, somewhat vaguely, the Median with the Persian system (i. 134), and Ctesias appears to have asserted the positive introduction of the satrapial organization into the empire at its first foundation by his Arbaces (Diod. Sic. 2:28); but, on the whole, it is perhaps most probable that the Assyrian organization was continued by the Medes, the subject nations retaining their native monarchs, and merely acknowledging subjection by the payment of an annual tribute. This seems certainly to have been the case in Persia, where Cyrus and his father Cambyses were monarchs, holding their crown of the Median king before the revolt of the former and there is no reason to suppose that the remainder of the empire was organized in a different manner. The satrapial organization was apparently a Persian invention, begun by Cyrus, continued by Cambyses, his son, but first adopted as the regular governmental system by Darius Hystaspis.

(4.) Its Duration.-Of all the ancient Oriental monarchies the Median was the shortest in duration. It commenced, as we have seen, after the middle of the 7th century BC., and it terminated BC. 558. The period of three quarters of a century, which Herodotus assigns to the reigns of Cyaxares and Astyages, may be taken as fairly indicating its probable length, though we cannot feel sure that the years are correctly apportioned between the monarchs. Its rise was rapid, and appears to have been chiefly owing to the genius of one manCyaxares. The power of Media was short-lived. With Cyaxares it rose, and with him it passed away. At his death he left his throne to Astyages, of whom little is known except the stories told by Herodotus (i. 110-129) and Nicolaus of Damascus (Frag. Hist. Gr. 3:404- 6), who probably borrowed from Ctesias; and on these little reliance can be placed. They are founded on fact, and we may infer from them that during the reign of Astyages a war broke out between the Medes and Persians. in which the latter were victorious, and Cyrus, the Persian king, who was himself closely related to Astyages, united the' two nations under one  sceptre (BC. 558). The life of Astyages was spared, and even the title of king continued with him.

This is as far as the authorities we have followed carry us. But Xenophon, in his Cyclopaedia, gives us a very different account of the relationship of Cyrus to the Median king, at the time of the capture of Babylon by their allied arms. SEE DARIUS THE MEDE.

(5.) Coalescence with the Persian Empire.-It is universally allowed that the Median king who succeeded Cyaxares was his son Astyages; but of the character of this king and the events and duration of his reign there exists an absolute contradiction. In so far as Scripture is concerned, the accounts are chiefly of importance from their relation to Cyrus and Darius, the only personages mentioned in Scripture as connected with this period of Median history. But having already been considered under the two names in question, it becomes unnecessary to relate the circumstances afresh here. From chronological considerations we have leaned to the authority of Xenophon in those previous articles, but it is impossible to arrive at certainty. We simply state that whichever account be preferred of the birth and relations of Cyrus, the notices in Daniel oblige us to hold that at the time of the capture of Babylon there was a superior in rank, though not in power, to Cyrus; and this can only have been either Astyages or Cyaxares II. If it were the latter, the description given us by Xenophon of his vain, capricious, and fickle disposition perfectly accords with the idea suggested respecting him by the narrative in Daniel 6.

Whether we suppose Cyrus himself to have been king of Persia at the period of the conquest of Babylon, or Cambyses his father to have still reigned there, the Darius of Daniel would properly be head only of the Median kingdom; and it was not until Cyrus came to the throne that the great empire was united under one head. Cyrus was consequently the first king of the Medo-Persian dominions, without any discredit to Daniel's statement that Darius, the head of the older kingdom of Media, and the uncle and father-in-law. according to Xenophon, of Cyrus, received during his brief reign the rank that gratified his excessive vanity. In regard to the position and character of Cyrus, this is not the place for any detailed account. He was the real founder of the vast empire which ruled Asia and threatened Europe until the time of Alexander. He is the hero whom the poets and historians of Persia delighted to celebrate, and whose real character doubtless was of the grand aid heroic cast. The praises of  Xenophon had been anticipated in that sublime address in which Jehovah, nearly 200 years before, calls upon Cyrus his shepherd to advance on his career of conquest (Isa 45:1-6). The statement of Xenophon that the Medes voluntarily submitted to Cyrus (Cyrop. 1:1) seems much more agreeable to the scriptural accounts of things after the conquest of Babylon, and to the manner in which foreign nations regarded the newly- risen empire, than is the narrative of Herodotus, who relates that Media was conquered by Cyrus, and held in subjection by force (Herodotus, 1:125, 130).

The accession of Darius the Mede (Dan 5:31) seems inconsistent with' this latter view. Throughout his reign we always find the Medes mentioned first in rank, which they would scarcely be if they were a conquered people (Dan 5:28; Dan 6:8; Dan 6:12; Dan 6:15). At a subsequent period, when the Persian line of kings had succeeded to the throne, while we find the Medes ever ranked side by ‘side with the Persians, we find, as was natural, that the language of the court placed Persia, the country of the reigning king, first in rank (Est 1:3; Est 1:18-19. etc.). We have, however, in the conclusion of this book an indication that while the language of the court gave the preference to Persia, the state chronicles still ran under their ancient title, “the chronicles of the kings of Media and Persia”-pointing plainly to the original superiority of rank of Media over Persia, quite inconsistent with the idea of a conquered race (Est 10:2). With this view of Scripture the notions entertained by foreign nations of the new empire agree. So far from looking on the Medes as a conquered dependency of Persia, both the Greeks of Europe and the barbarians of Asia look on the Median as the preponderant element, quite obscuring the more recent power of Persia. The queen of the Massagetse addresses Cyrus as the “sovereign of the Medes,” ignoring the Persian nation (Herodotus, 1:206). Thucydides, who ranks in the foremost place of Grecian history, invariably styles the barbarous power that had nearly conquered Greece Median, and never calls it Persian (bk. i). All this points to the original superiority of the Median kingdom-a superiority which still belonged to it in foreign eyes, but which could not well have attached to it if Media had been violently subdued to the rule of Persia. Scripture, which in its early silence as to the very existence of Persia was true to the political obscurity of this latter power, is also the first to recognise the superiority to which it rose under Cyrus.

Before the allied armies had marched through the empty bed of the Euphrates into the heart of Babylon, prophecy described the rising empire as a ram with two horns, one of which was higher than the other, and the higher came up last (Dan 8:3).  Scripture history, penetrating the veil of tradition, and looking through the thin disguise which the assumption of Median dress and manners by the Persians had cast over reality, was the first to recognise that Persia, not Media, had become the ruler of Asia. It is Persia that is spoken of throughout the book of Ezra, the Jewish scribe being better acquainted with the facts of history than Thucydides was. Nor are the subsequent revolts of the Medes against Persian rule any argument that at the first rise of the empire they were not one of two great nations united together on friendly and equal terms. So long as Cyrus and Cambyses his son, descended from the Median as from the Persian dynasty, sat on the throne, Media made no attempt at revolt. Nor did they do so under the foreign the pseudo Smerdis, who was supposed to be the son of Cyrus. It was not until the discovery of the imposture practiced by Smerdis,and the elevation of a purely Persian family in the person of Darius Hystaspis to the throne, that Media sought for a separate existence. Her ancient line of kings no longer ruled over the mountains of Media, and hence probably she sought to return to that independence which had been her pride during the centuries when Assyria vainly sought to rule over Median land.

According to some writers (as Herodotus and Xenophon) there wasa close relationship between Cyrus and the last Median monarch, who was therefore naturally treated with more than common tenderness. The fact of the relationship is, however, denied by Ctesias; and whether it existed or no, at any rate the peculiar position of the Medes under Persia was not really owing to this accident. The two nations were closely akin; they had the same Arian or Iranic origin, the same early traditions, the same language (Strabo, 15:2,8), nearly the same religion, and ultimately the same manners and customs, dress, and general mode of life. It is not surprising therefore that they were drawn together, and that, though never actually coalescing, they still formed to some extent a single privileged people. Medes were advanced to stations of high honor and importance under Cyrus and his successors, an advantage shared by no other conquered people. The Median capital was at first the chief royal residence, and always remained one of the places at which the court spent a portion of the year; while among the provinces Media claimed and enjoyed a precedency, which appears equally in the Greek writers and' in the native records. Still it would seem that the nation, so lately sovereign, was not altogether content with its secondary position. On' the first convenient opportunity Media rebelled, elevating to the throne a certain Phraortes (Frawartish),  who called himself. Xatlhrites, and claimed to be a descendant from Cvaxares. Darius Hystaspis, in whose reign this rebellion took place, had great difficulty in suppressing it. After vainly endeavoring to put it down by his generals, he was compelled to take the field himself. He defeated Phraortes in a pitched battle, pursued and captured him near Rhages, mutilated him, kept him for a time “ chained at his door,” and finally crucified him at Ecbatana, executing at the same time. his chief followers (see the Behistun Inscription, in Rawlinson's Herodotus, 2:601, 602). The Medes thereupon submitted, and quietly bore the yoke for another century, when they made a second attempt to free themselves, which was suppressed by Darius Nothus (Xenophon, Hell. 1:2, 19). Thenceforth they patiently acquiesced in their subordinate position, and followed through its various shifts and changes the fortune of Persia.

Media, with the rest of the Persian empire, fell under the sway of Alexander the Great. At his death the northern province was erected by the satrap Atropates into an independent state, and called Atropatene. The southern province, Media Magna, was attached with Babylon to the kingdom of the Seleucide. The whole country eventually passed over to the Parthian monarchy (Strabo, 16:745). It is now included in the dominions of the shah of Persia.

III. Antiquities.-

1. Internal Divisions.-According to Herodotus the Median nation was divided into six tribes (ἔθνη), called the Busse, the Paretaceni, the Struchates, the Arizanti, the Budii, and the Magi. It is doubtful, however, in what sense these are to be considered as ethnic divisions. The Paretaceni appear to represent a geographical district, while the Magi were certainly a priest caste; of the rest we know little or nothing. The Arizanti, whose name would signify “ of noble descent,” or “of Arian descent,” must (one would think) have been the leading tribe, corresponding to the Pasargadse in Persia; but it is remarkable that they have only the fourth place in the list of Herodotus. The Budii are fairly identified with the eastern Phut-the Putiya of the Persian inscriptions-whom Scripture joins with Persia in two, places (Eze 27:10; Eze 38:5). Of the Buse and the Struchates nothing is known beyond the statement of Herodotus. We may perhaps assume, from the order of. Herodotus's list, that the Buse, Paretaceni, Struchates, and Arizanti were true Medes, of genuine Arian descent, while the Budii and Magi were foreigners admitted into the nation.  2. Character, Manners, and Customs.- The ancient Medes were a warlike people, particularly celebrated, as Herodotus (vii. 61) and Strabo (xi. 525) inform us, for their skill in archery. Xenophon says their bows were three ells long. This illustrates the language of Isaiah describing the attack of the Medes on Babylon: “Their bows also shall dash the young men to pieces” (xiii. 18). Their cavalry was also excellent, their horses being fleet ‘and strong, and their men skilful riders. It is doubtless in reference to this fact that Jeremiah, speaking of the overthrow of Babylon, says, “They (the enemies) shall hold the bow and the lance... and they shall ride upon horses” (1, 42). Strabo states that the province of Atropatene alone was able to bring into the field an army of 10,000 horse (11. 523). Xenophon affirms that the Medes did not fight for plunder. Military glory was their great ambition, and they would never permit gold or silver to turn them aside from their object. How striking do the words of Isaiah thus appear “Behold I will stir up the Medes against them, which shall not regard silver, and as for gold, they shall not delight in it” (13. 18). The wealth of Babylon could not save it, for the Medes could not be bought off (Rosenmuller, Bib. Geog. 1:176). The conquests of the Medes, and their intercourse with other nations, produced a marked change upon their character. They became fond of dress and display; those settled in cities engaged in commerce, and lost their hardy habits and bravery. The splendor of the Median robes became proverbial, and their princes and nobles ruled the fashion in the East. They were imitated by the Persian court (Herodot. 6:112; Xenoph. Cyrop. 1:3, 2; Strabo, xi, p. 525). It was this dress, that is, of the highest class, which seems to have gained a sort of classical authority, and to have been at a later period worn at the Persian court, probably in part from its antiquity. This dress the Persian monarchs used to-present to those whom they wished to honor, and no others were permitted to wear it. It consisted of a long white loose robe or gown, flowing down to the feet, and enclosing the entire body, specimens of which, as now used in those countries, may be seen in plates given in Perkin's Residence in Persia (NY. 1843). The nature and the celebrity of this dress combine with the natural richness of the country to assure us that the ancient Medians had made no mean progress in the. arts; indeed, the colors of the Persian textures are known to have been accounted second only to those of India. If these regal dresses were of silk, then was there an early commerce between Media and India; if not, weaving, as well as dyeing, must have been practiced and carried to a high degree of perfection in the former country (Ammian. Marcell. 24:6, p. 353, ed. Bip.; Athen. xii,  p. 512, 514 sq.; Heeren, Ideen, 1:205, 307; Herod. 6:112; Dan 3:21). The Medes thus gave way to luxury and its consequent vices, and they; soon became an easy prey to their more warlike neighbors. The northern mountaineers retained their primitive habits, and consequently their independence, for a much longer period.

3. Religion.-The ancient religion of the Medes must undoubtedly have been that simple creed which is placed before us in the earlier portions of the Zendavesta. Its peculiar characteristic was Dualism, the belief in the existence of two opposite principles of good and evil, nearly if not quite on a par with one another. Ormazd and Ahriman were both self-caused and self-existent, both indestructible, both potent to work their will their warfare had been from all eternity, and would continue to all eternity, though on the whole the struggle was to the disadvantage of the Prince of Darkness. Ormazd was the God of the Arians, the object of their worship and trust; Ahriman was their enemy, an object of fear and abhorrence, but not of any religious rite. Besides Ormazd, the Arians worshipped the sun and moon, under the names of Mithra and Homa; and they ‘believed in the existence of numerous spirits or genii, some good, some bad, the subjects and ministers respectively of the two powers of Good and Evil. Their cult was simple, consisting in processions, religious chants and hymns, and a few plain offerings, expressions of devotion and thankfulness. Such was the worship and such the belief which the whole Arian race brought with them from the remote east when they migrated westward. Their migration brought them into contact with the fire-worshippers of Armenia and Mount Zagros, among whom Magism had been established from a remote antiquity. The result was either a combination of the two religions, or in some cases an actual conversion of the conquerors to the faith and worship of the conquered. So far as can be gathered from the scanty materials in our possession, the latter was the case with the Medes. While in Persia the true Arian creed maintained itself, at least to the time of Darius Hystaspis, intolerable purity, in the neighboring kingdom of Media, it was early swallowed up in Magism, which was probably established by Cyaxares or his successor as the religion of the state. The essence of Magism was the worship of the elements, fire, water, air, and earth with a special preference of fire to the remainder. Temples were not allowed, but fire-altars were maintained on various sacred sites, generally mountain-tops, where sacrifices were continually offered, and the flame was never suffered to go  out. A hierarchy naturally' followed, to perform these constant rites, and the magi became recognised as a sacred caste entitled to the veneration of the faithful. They claimed in many cases a power of divining the future, and practiced largely those occult arts which are still called by their name in most of the languages of modern Europe. The fear of polluting the elements gaverise to a number of curious superstitions among the professors of the Magian religion (Herod. 1:138); among the rest to the strange practice of neither burying nor burning their dead, but exposing them to be devoured by beasts or birds of prey (Herod. 1:140; Strabo, 15:3, § 20). This custom is still observed by their representatives, the modern Parsees. See Rhode, Heil. Sage der Baktr. Meder und' Perser, p. 820; Abbildungen aus der Mythol. der Alten Welt; Pers. Med. plate 10,11.

4. The language of the ancient Medes was not connected with the Shemitic, but with the Indian, and divided itself into two chief branches, the Zend, spoken in North Media, and the Pehlvi, spoken in Lower Media and Parthia, which last was the dominant tongue among the Parthians (Adelung, Mithridates, 1:256 sq.; Eichhorn, Gesch. der Lit. v. 1,294 sq.).

5. References to the Medes in Scripture.-The references to the Medes in the canonical Scriptures are not very numerous, but they are striking. ‘We first hear of certain “cities of the Medes,” in which the captive Israelites were placed by “the king of Assyria” on the destruction of Samaria, BC. 721 (2Ki 17:6; 2Ki 18:11). This implies the subjection of Media to Assyria at the time of Shalmaneser, or of Sargon, his successor, and accords (as we have shown) very closely with the account given by the latter of certain military colonies which he planted in the Median country. Soon afterwards Isaiah prophesies the part which the Medes should take in the destruction of Babylon (Isa 13:17; Isa 21:2), and this is again still more distinctly declared by Jeremiah (Jer 51:1; Jer 51:23) who sufficiently indicates the independence of Media in his day (Jer 25:25). Daniel relates, as a historian, the fact of the Medo-Persic conquest (Dan 5:28; Dan 5:31), giving an account of the reign of Darius the Mede who appears to have been made viceroy by Cyrus (6:1-28). In Ezra we have a, mention of Achmetha (Ecbatana), “the palace in the province of the Medes,” where the decree of Cyrus was found (6:2-5) a notice which accords with the known facts that the Median capital was the seat of government under Cyrus; but a royal residence only and not the seat of government under Darius Hystaspis. Finally, in Esther, the high rank of  Media under the Persian kings is marked by the frequent combination of the two names in phrases of honor.

In the apocryphal Scriptures the Medes occupy a more prominent place. The chief scene of one whole book (Tobit) is Media, and in another (Judith) a very striking portion of the narrative belongs to the same country. But the historical character of both these books is with reason doubted, and from neither can we derive any authentic or satisfactory information concerning the people. From the story of Tobias little could be gathered, even if we accepted it as true, while the history of Arphaxad (which seems to be rierely a distorted account of the struggle between the rebel Phraortes and Darius Hystaspis) adds nothing to our knowledge of that contest. The mention of Rhages in both narratives as a Median town and region of importance is geographically correct, and it is historically true that Phraortes suffered his overthrow in the Rhagian district. But beyond these facts the narratives in question contain little that even illustrates the true history of the Median nation.

IV. Literature.-The ancient authorities for the history and geography of Media and the Medes are Herodotus, especially when read with the learned and valuable notes of Rawlinson; Strabo, Xenophon, Ptolemy, Diodorus Siculus, Arrian, and Josephus. The monuments and inscriptions discovered, and in part deciphered, within the last few years, add vastly to our stores of information. The various works and articles of Sir H. Rawlinson referred to in the body of this article serve to set forth: and illustrate their contents. Among modern writers the student may consult Bochart, Cellarius, Ritter; Grote's History of Greece, 3:301-312; Prof. Rawlinison's Ancient Monarchies; Bosanquet's Chronology of the Medes, read before the Royal Asiatic Society, June 5, 1858; Brandis, Rerum Assyriarum tempora emendata, p. 1-14; and Hupfeld's Exercitationum Herodotearum Specimina duo, p. 56 sq. For the present state of the country, see Sir K. Porter's Travels; Kinnier's Persian Empire; Layard's Nineveh and Babylon; Chesney's Euphrates Expedition; Sir H. Rawlinson's articles in the Journal of R. G. S. vols. ix and x; and the valuable dissertations in Rawlinson's Herodotus, vol. i.

## Median[[@Headword:Median]]

             (Chald. Mladaya', מָדָיא, marg. מָדָאָה; Sept. ὁ Μῆδος, Vulg. Medus), a patrial epithet of Darius, “the son of Ahasueras, of the seed of the Medes”  (Dan 9:1), or “ the Mede” (Dan 11:1), as described in Dan 11:31. SEE MEDE.

## Mediation[[@Headword:Mediation]]

             in the Christian sense, is the intervention of Jesus Christ between God and sinners. It implies a condition of alienation and hostility on the part of man towards God, and a corresponding state of disfavor and condemnation in the divine mind with respect to man. Such a mutual relation of dissatisfaction lies at the basis of the whole remedial scheme of salvation, originating in the fall (q.v.), and provided. for in the atonement (q.v.). It is presumed in every form of religion and worship, whether heathen, Jewish, or any other; and has its natural exponents in sacrifice (q v.), the priesthood (q.v.), and ritual (q.v.). In addition to the considerations adduced under the head Mediator (q.v.), there remain certain fundamental aspects of this question which we propose here briefly to discuss. SEE EXPIATION.

1. Man's Enmity towards God.-This is a fact too apparent to require detailed proof. Its historical origin is given: in the Bible in the account of Eden, its record is engraven in the whole course of human conduct, and its conclusive attestation is found in the deepest consciousness of man's nature. The sense of guilt and condemnation, to which it inevitably and legitimately gives rise in the human conscience, is a testimony so universal, so profound, and so overwhelming as to call for little if any external corroboration.

2. God's Displeasure towards Man.-This is a doctrine ‘which of necessity results from the preceding one. If God be holy, as the Scriptures represent him, and as the purest forms of faith depict him, he cannot but regard all sin with the utmost abhorrence, and he cannot be supposed to entertain amicable emotions towards those who commit and delight in sin. This feeling in the divine mind, however, must not be regarded as one of vindictiveness or personal hatred. A pure and unselfish being, raised above the petty jealousies and hazards of earth, cannot be conceived as entertaining sentiments of malice. Such a view of the divine nature is inconsistent with the emphatic statements of Scripture (such as that “God is love,” etc.),.with the interest he still Cakes in fallen humanity (“ God so loved the world that he gave his only-begotten Son,” etc.), and even with the benevolent provision which he makes in nature for the continuation and  comfort of the race. In like manner Christians are forbidden to indulge any malevolence towards their own personal enemies, much more towards their fellow-creatures at large. That view of the Almighty which represents or imagines him as taking any delight in human suffering is characteristic of heathenism, not of Bible truth. SEE LOVE.

Nevertheless the purest ethics, as well as the soundest theology, demands a place in the divine mind for that sense of indignation with moral evil, and that call for its punishment, which are instinctive in ‘the human breast. In this light. are to be interpreted the many and pointed declarations of the Bible respecting God's anger against sin, and his inexorable determination to inflict vengeance upon its perpetrators. Justice, no less than mercy, is one of the indispensable attributes of a holy deity. The ultimate grounds of this doctrine are not to be sought so much in any considerations of administrative policy or governmental consistency-mere views of expediency and safety-as in the essential contradiction of the divine nature itself to all that is inconsistent with its own character.

3. These premises being settled as the actual relations between the parties, the grand problem arises, How can this mutual disagreement be removed? That the change, if any, must take place in man, is obvious, not only because God is immutable, but because he certainly has not been at fault. The offender alone must make the amends. The Being offended against may indeed propose advances towards reconciliation, as. it belongs to him to lay down the terms of satisfaction, but these cannot involve any concession nor imply any retraction. The standard of righteousness must not be lowered, nor wrong exculpated. The case presents a difficulty in two aspects, neither of which can be overlooked in any scheme proposing its settlement. They relate respectively to the past and the future. Two questions therefore arise: 1. How can the sinful acts already committed be properly forgiven? 2. How can their recurrence be most effectively prevented in time to come? These two subordinate problems must be wrought out together, as the omission to solve the latter would render the solution of the former nugatory. The mediation of Jesus Christ exactly meets all the conditions of both these problems. It is spontaneous on the part of God, voluntary on the part of the Mediator, and does not infringe on the freedom of man. It cancels the past debt, takes away the sense of present guilt, and removes the disposition to transgress thereafter. It releases, reconciles, and renews at once. Pardon, peace, purity are its harmonious results. Justification, regeneration, sanctification are its  immunities. The first frees from the judicial sentence, the second restores to the heavenly family, and the, third fits for life here and forever. All this is due to the vicarious principle of the atonement. It remains to show more particularly how the substitution of Christ as a victim for man in undergoing the penalty accomplishes these ends successfully and satisfactorily. The transfer of the punishment due to human crimes, as effected in the life and death of our Saviour, is not a mere forensic device, nor simply a diplomatic artifice; it is no stratagem invented to elude justice, nor a pretence set up to screen impunity. If, with regard to its individual objects, it was unconditional and absolute, as Universalism generally on the one hand represents it by extension, and strict Predestinarianism on the other by limitation, it would justly be liable to this charge. But inasmuch as it secures the permanent reformation of the culprit in the very process of amnesty, it is not purely penal, but also prophylactic; it changes the relations of the sinner by converting him into a saint.

(1.) The chief, if not the only difficulty in our conceptions of the method of Christian redemption relates to the justice of substituting an innocent for a guilty person in the expiation of crime. This is, to be sure, an abstract question, but it is a fundamental one. Its determination. however, rests with the Being to be placated, and with the individual submitting to become the victim, rather than with ourselves, the beneficiaries of the arrangement, or with any other intelligences who may be merely spectators. As the compact, in pursuance of which this mediation is effected, was confined to the bosom of the Godhead, we might fairly be excused from attempting its vindication; especially as the Father and the Son, regarded as the contracting parties, are so identified in nature and action that any moral discrepancy or personal disagreement, such as this question implies, is necessarily excluded. Indeed, if they two freely consent, as the plan presupposes, it is hard to see who can have a right to raise a doubt or utter complaint on the subject. Still, to obviate all cavil, it may not be amiss to pursue this point as far as we may without presumption or arrogance.

Instances of a similar but far less extensive vicarious suffering have occurred in human history, and are often pointed to as rare but striking illustrations of this principle. These were applauded at the time of their occurrence, and have been commended ever since by the common voice of mankind without incurring the imputation of unfairness or compromise. If we look into the design of judicial exactions, so far as human legislation and administration enable us to discern it, we find it to be fourfold:

1, the appeasement of the wrath of the injured party;

2, the moral cure of the offending party;

3, the allaying of the sense of wrong in the convictions of the community; and,

4, the deterring of others from similar crimes.

Most laws for earthly retribution have chiefly in view the pecuniary reparation of the wrong, and the protection of society against its recurrence; and in these respects Christ's atonement is as parallel as possible. In cases of capital punishment, with which the present is most analogous, the first two ends of penal infliction are necessarily excluded, by the death of the murdered and the execution of the murderer; so that there remain only the moral influence and the preventive effect upon others as the essential objects to be attained. SEE PUNISHMENT. But, in the case in hand, these external and disinterested observers can consist only of the angels and inhabitants of other worlds, inasmuch as our own race is wholly included in the culprit himself. Of the moral constitution or even existence of the latter of these two classes of presumed spectators we have absolutely no knowledge, nor any reason to suppose that they could become informed of the transaction. Of the former we know but little more, and that little leads us to the belief that they have already passed their probation, and are therefore incapable of being influenced by example, while the interest which they take in the scene is that of intense satisfaction at its progress and consummation. All objectors are thus removed, and the substitution is ratified by common consent.

We have assumed that man's demurral to this procedure is silenced by the fact of his being himself the convict. Yet a prisoner may be imagined to have a right to protest against another's taking his place as accused or condemned. This, however, he can only be allowed in court to do when he confesses his crime, and demands to bear its penalty in person. Both these privileges, if such they can be called, are reserved to him by the scheme under consideration. Nay, he is required to make confession before he can avail himself of the benefits of Christ's mediation, and that with a sincerity and fulness which admit of no retraction; and he is at last compelled to undergo the penalty himself unless he voluntarily and actively apply for the exemption offered him. These provisions are the saving clauses of the bill of amnesty, and by virtue of them the vicarious redemption receives its final approval.

(2.) Nevertheless the sinner realizes a partial effect of the atonement unconditionally, in the respite from punishment till the close of his earthly career. But for this the whole race had been cut off in embryo at the first transgression. Hence there is an opportunity for the exercise of the remedial or curative as well as preventive influence of that penal retribution, which is temporarily suspended and may be -wholly averted from himself. The only problem here arising is, How can impunity be allowed without encouraging vice? or rather, to state it more radically, How can the criminal go scot-free and yet be reformed? It has of late years only been discovered in families, schools, armies, and diplomacy that pardon is often the best discipline; but God knew long ago the true philosophy of the prevention of crime. The spectacle of another suffering the penalty due to ourselves has been found to be the most effectual softener of the rebel heartland the condition of genuine contrition is the best. safeguard against the abuse of clemency. In this light the scheme of Christian mediation is most abundantly sanctioned by actual experiment, and the Cross becomes the glory of the redeemed. SEE REDEMPTION.

(3.) It is not to be imagined, however, that in this vicarious atonement Jesus Christ actually experienced the aggregate amount of suffering due for the sins of every human being. In the first place, this was unnecessary. The object to be attained was not a given amount of penal infliction, whether to placate the Almighty, to reform the offender, or to vindicate the statutes infracted. This is obvious from the foregoing discussion. Had these ends rigidly required an exact balance-sheet of debit and credit on this basis, no substitution or vicarious satisfaction had been admissible at all. The strict terms of the law are,” The soul that sinneth, it shall die.” The mediation under consideration, was an equivalent, such as met the moral design of the penalty. Nor is it correct to argue that as man incurred infinite guilt by sinning against infinite holiness, so Christ offered an infinite satisfaction by reason of his divine and perfect nature. Neither part of this proposition is tenable. No finite creature is capable of infinite guilt, of even the sum total of all humanity, for it is limited both in its numbers and nature, and so is likewise the sum of its sins. Christ therefore did not need to make an infinite atonement, but only an adequate or commensurate one.

His expiation was sufficient, not because it was made by his divine nature-for that was by hypothesis incapable and incompetent-but because it contained such a degree of merit, in view of its completeness and the exalted character of the offerer, that the divine Being could consistently accept it in  lieu of the actual obedience of the race represented, and thus remit the penalty due them. In the next place, an absolute equality or identity of retribution was impossible in the remedial scheme. The supposition that Jesus endured-whether during his whole lifetime, or in the brief agonies of the garden and the cross-the sum total of the torments that will be and that would have been' experienced by the eternally damned, is simply preposterous. Not only had he no opportunity for this, but he was not capable of it, either physically or spiritually. His bodily pain was such, indeed, as to take his life, but other men have known as great, if not greater. His mental anguish, especially the hiding of his Father's face, was so intense as to literally break his heart; but it cannot have been the same, either in character; extent, or continuance, as the everlasting pangs of conscious guilt. All that was practicable, in him as a substitute forman, was to undergo an ordeal as similar in kind and degree as his pure human nature would admit. In this sense he drank the bitter cup of atonement to its very dregs, but it was not the identical draught intended for mankind. Finally, such an absolute vicariousness would have been useless, and that in two most vital respects it would so fully have exhausted the penalty for all possible or foreseen human transgression as to render the personal punishment of any offender thereafter impossible, because unjust; and it would have been no gain or saving of suffering on the whole, but a mere shifting of a specific load from the shoulders of one being to those of another. No larger average of happiness could have resulted; nor any greater glory redounded to God. Such an atonement would have defeated instead of furthering the main design of its merciful Projector. It would have been fatal to all the advantages seen above to be secured by Christ's mediation. SEE VICARIOUS SUFFERING.

## Mediator[[@Headword:Mediator]]

             a person who intervenes between two parties at variance, in order to reconcile them. The term does not occur in the Old Test., but the idea is contained in that' remarkable passage (Job 9:33) which is rendered in the AuthVers. “Neither is there any daysman betwixt us, that might lay his hand upon' us both.” The Hebrew words are, לאֹ יֵשׁאּבֵּינֵינוּ מוֹכַיחִ יָשֵׁת יָדוֹ עִלאּשְׁנֵינוּ; literally, “ There is not between us a reprover he shall place his hand upon us both.” This the Sept. translates, or rather paraphrases, εἴθε ἡν ὁ μεσίτης ἡμῶν, καὶ ἐλέγχων, καὶ διακούων ἀναμέσον ἀμφοτέρων. SEE DAYSMAN. In the New Test. it is the invariable  rendering of μεσίτης, a word which is rather rare in classical Greek- Polybius and Lucian being, it would appear, nearly the only classical authors who employ it (see Robinson, N.T. Lex. s.v.). Its meaning, however, is not difficult to determine. This seems evidently to be, qui medio inter duo stat — he who takes a middle position between two parties, and principally with the view of removing their differences. Thus Suidas paraphrases the word by μεσέγγος. and also by ἐγγυητής, μέσος δύο μερῶν. In the Sept. the word appears to occur only once, namely, in the above passage of Job.

1. It is used, in an accommodated sense, by many of the ancient fathers, to denote one who intervenes between two dispensations. Hence it is applied by them to John the Baptist, because he came, as it were, between the Mosaic and Christian dispensations. Thus Greg. Nazianzen (Orat. xxxix, p. 633) calls him ὁ παλαιᾶς καὶ νέας μεσίτης. Theophylact, commenting on Matthew iii, gives him the same denomination.

2. Again, it signifies, in its more proper sense, an internuncius, or ambassador, one who stands as the channel of communication between two contracting parties. Thus most commentators think that the apostle Paul, in Gal 3:19, calls Moses mediator, because he conveyed the expression of God's will to the people, and reported to God their wants, wishes, and determinations. In reference to this passage of Scripture, Basil (De -Spiritu Sancto, cap. xiv), says, “Mosen figuram representasse quando inter Deum et populum intermedius extiterit.” Many ancient and modern divines, however, are of opinion that Christ himself, and not Moses, is here meant by the apostle, and this view would seem to be confirmed by comparing Deu 33:2 with Act 7:38-52. Christ it was who, surrounded by angelic spirits, communicated with Moses on Mount Sinai. On this point, the words of the learned and pious Chrysostom, on Galatians 3, are very express: “Here,” says he, “ Paul calls Christ Mediator, declaring thereby that he existed before the law, and that by' him the law was revealed.” This application of the passage will be the more evident if we consider the scope of the apostle's argument, which evidently is to point out the dignity of the law. How could he present a clearer demonstration of this than by showing that it was the second person of the ever blessed Trinity who stood forth on the mount to communicate between God the Father and his creature man! Moreover, to contradistinguish Christ's mediation from that of Moses, the former is emphatically styled μεσίτης κρείττονος διαθήκης (Heb 8:6). This, however, implies that  Moses was the mediator of the former covenant, and Eadie, in his Commentary on Galatians (ad loc.), shows at length that this is the meaning of the passage, in opposition to all other views. Moses is likewise often styled סִרְסוּר, or mediator, in the rabbinical writings (see Schottgen and Wetstein, ad loc.). But bethis as it may, far more emphatically and officially

3. CHRIST is called Mediator (1Ti 2:5; Heb 8:6; Heb 9:15; Heb 12:24) by virtue of the reconciliation he has effected between a justly- offended God and his rebellious creature man (see Grotius, De Satifactione Christi, cap. viii). In this sense of the term Moses was, on many occasions, an eminent type of Christ. The latter, however, was not. Mediator merely by reason of his coming between God and his creatures, as certain heretics would affirm (see Cyril. Alex. Dial, I de Sancta Trinitate, p. 410), but because he appeased his wrath, and made reconciliation for iniquity. “Christ is the Mediator,” observes Theophylact, commenting on Galatians 3, “of two, be of God and man. He exercises this office between both by making peace, and putting a stop to that spiritual war which man wages against God. To accomplish this he assumed our nature, joining in a marvellous, manner the human, by reason of sin unfriendly, to the divine nature.” “Hence,” he adds, “he made reconciliation.” OEcumenius expresses similar sentiments on the same passage of Scripture. Again, Cyril, in his work before quoted, remarks: “He is esteemed Mediator because the divine and human nature being disjointed by sin, he has shown them united in his own person; and in this manner he reunites us to God the Father.” If, in addition to the above general remarks, confirmed by many of the most ancient and orthodox fathers of the Church, we consider the three great offices which holy Scripture assigns to Christ as Saviour of the world, viz. those of prophet, priest, and king, a further and more ample illustration will be afforded of his Mediatorship.

(1.) One of the first and most palpable predictions which we have of the prophetic character of Christ is that of Moses (Deu 18:15): “The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him ye shall hearken.” That this refers to Christ we are assured by the inspired apostle Peter (Act 3:22). Again, in Isa 61:1; Isa 61:3, Christ's consecration to the prophetic office, together with its sacred and gracious functions, is emphatically set forth (see Luk 4:16-21, where Christ applies this passage to himself). In order, then, to sustain this part of his mediatorial office, and thus work  out the redemption of the world, we may see the necessity there was that Messiah should be both God and man. It belongs to a prophet to expound the law, declare the will of God, and foretell things to come: all this was done, and that in a singular and eminent manner, by Christ, our prophet (Mat 5:21, etc.; Joh 1:8). All light comes from this prophet. The apostle shows that all ministers are but stars which shine by a borrowed light (2Co 3:6-7). All the prophets of the Old, and all the prophets and teachers of the New Testament, lighted their tapers at this torch (Luk 21:15). It was Christ who preached by Noah (1Pe 3:19), taught the Israelites in the wilderness (Act 7:37),and still teaches by his ministers (Eph 4:11-12). On this subject bishop Butler (Analogy, part ii, ch. v) says: He was, by way of eminence, the prophet, the prophet that should come into the world' (Joh 6:14) to declare the divine will. He published anew the law of nature, which men had corrupted, and the very knowledge of which, to some degree, was lost among them. He taught mankind. taught us authoritatively, to live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world, in expectation of the future judgment of God. He confirmed the truth of this moral system of nature, and gave us additional evidence of it, the evidence of testimony. He distinctly revealed the manner in which God would be worshipped, the efficacy of repentance, and the rewards and punishments of a future life. Thus he was a prophet in a sense in which no other ever was.” Hence the force of the term ὁ λόγος, by Which John designates Christ. SEE PROPHET.

But, on the other hand, had the second person of the Trinity come to us in all the majesty of his divine nature, we could not have approached him. as our instructor. The Israelites, terrified at the exhibitions of Deity, cried out that the Lord might not so treat with them again ; it was then that he, in gracious condescension to their feelings, promised to communicate with them in future through a prophet like unto Moses. The son of God, in assuming the form of an humble man, became accessible to all. This condescension, moreover, enabled him to sympathize with his clients in all their trials (Heb 2:17-18; Heb 4:14-15). Thus we perceive the connection of Christ's prophetic office-he being both God and man-with the salvation of man. On this subject Chrysostom (Homil. 134, tom. v, p. 860) remarks: “A mediator, unless he has a union and communion with the parties for whom he mediates, possesses not the essential qualities of a mediator. When Christ, therefore, became mediator between God and man  (1 Timothy 2, etc.), it was indispensable that he should be both God and man.” Macarius, also (Homil. 6:97), on this question more pointedly observes: “The Lord came and took his body from the virgin; for if he had appeared among, us in his naked divinity, who could bear the sight? But he spoke as man to us men.”

Again, the Redeemer was not only to propound, explain, and enforce God's law, but it was needful that he. should give a practical proof of obedience to it in his own person (comp. Rom 5:19). Now, if he had not been man, he could not have been subject to the law; hence it is said, Gal 4:4, “‘When the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth his son, made of a woman, made under the law.;” and if he had not been God, he could not, by keeping the law, have merited forgiveness for us, for he had done but what was required of him. ‘It was the fact of his being very God and very man which constituted the merit of Christ's obedience.

(2.) Moreover, in working out the mighty scheme of redemption the mediator must assume the office of priest. To this office he was solemnly appointed by God (Psa 110:4; Heb 5:10), being qualified for it by his incarnation (Heb 10:6-7), and he accomplished all the ends thereof by his sacrificial death (Heb 9:11-12); as in sustaining his prophetic character, so in this, his Deity and humanity will be seen. According to the exhibition of type and declaration of prophecy, the mediator must die, and thus rescue us sinners from death by destroying him who had the power of death. “But we see Jesus,” says the apostle (Heb 2:9), “who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor, that he by the grace of God should taste death for every man. Forasmuch, then, as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same, that through death he might destroy him who had the power of death, that is, the devil.” On the other hand, had he not been God he could not have raised himself from the dead. “I lay down my life (saith he, Joh 10:17-18), and take it up again.” He had not had a life to lay down if he had not been man, for the Godhead could not die; and if he had not been God, he could not have acquired merit by laying it down: it must be his own, and not in the power of another. else his voluntarily surrendering himself unto death-as he did on the charge. that he, being only man, made himself equal with God-was an act of suicide, and consequently an act of blasphemy against God! It was, then, the mysterious union of both natures in the one  person of Christ which constituted the essential glory of his vicarious obedience and death.

Nor are the two natures of Christ more apparent in his death than they are in the intercession which he ever liveth to make in behalf of all who come unto God by him (Heb 7:25). The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews teaches us (chaps. 7, 9) that the high-priest under the Levitical dispensation typified Christ in his intercessory character: as the high-priest entered alone within the holiest place of the tabernacle once a year with the blood of the sacrifice in his hands, and the names of the twelve tribes upon his heart, so Christ, having offered. up himself as a lamb without spot unto God, has gone into glory bearing on his heart the names of his redeemed. We may then ask with the apostle (Rom 8:33), “Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth, who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us.” In this part of his mediatorial work God's incommunicable attributes of omniscience, omnipresence, and onnipotence are seen. He must therefore have been God, and on the ground of his being able from personal experience to sympathize with the suffering members of his mystical body, he must have been man; being perfect God and perfect man, he is then a perfect intercessor.

(3.) We come, lastly, to notice Christ's mediatorial character as king. The limits of this article will not admit of our even alluding to the varied and multiplied passages of Scripture which delineate Christ as “Head over all things to the Church” (see Psa 2:6; Psalms 70; Isa 32:1 : Dan 9:25; Col 1:17-18, etc.). Suffice it here to say that Christ could not, without the concurrence of his divine nature, gather and govern the Church, protect and defend it against all assailants open and secret, and impart to it his Holy Spirit, to enlighten and renew the minds and hearts of men and subdue Satan—-all these are acts of his kingly office.

Such, then, is the work of Christ's mediatorship salvation revealed by him as prophet, procured by him as priest, and applied by him as king-the work of the whole person wherein both natures are engaged. Hence it is that some of the ancients speaking of it, designate it θεανδρίκη ἐνεργεία, “a divine-human operation” (see Dionys. Areopag. Epist. IV ad Caiam Damascenum, iii 19).  Thus Jesus Christ is the mediator between an offended God and sinful man (1Ti 2:5). Both Jews and Gentiles have a notion of a mediator: the Jews call the Messiah אמצעא,the Mediator, or Middle One. The Persians call their god Mithras μεσίτης, a mediator; and the daemons, with the heathens, seem to be, according to them, mediators between the superior gods and men. Indeed, the whole religion of paganism was a system of mediation and intercession. The idea, therefore, of salvation by a mediator is not so novel or restricted as some imagine; and the Scriptures of truth inform us that it is only by this way human beings can arrive to eternal felicity (Act 4:12; Joh 14:6). Man, in his state of innocence, was in friendship with God; but, by sinning against him, he exposed himself to his just displeasure; his powers became enfeebled, and his heart filled with enmity against him (Rom 8:6); he was driven out of his paradisaical Eden, and was totally incapable of returning to God, and making satisfaction to his justice. Jesus Christ, therefore, was the appointed mediator to bring about reconciliation (Gen 3:12. Col 1:21); and in the fulness of time he came into this world, obeyed the law, satisfied justice, and brought his people into a state of grace and favor; yea, into a more exalted state of friendship with God than was lost by the fall (Eph 2:18).

We have seen above some of the reasons why in order to accomplish this work it was necessary that the Mediator should be God and man in one person. We may specify, the following in addition.

(a) It was necessary that he should be man:

1. That he might be related to those to whom he was to be a mediator and redeemer (Php 2:8; Heb 2:11-17).

2. That sin might be atoned for, and satisfaction made in the same nature which had sinned (Rom 5:17-21; Rom 8:3).

3. It was meet that the mediator should be man, that he might be capable of suffering death; for, as God, he could not die, and without shedding of blood there was no remission (Heb 2:10; Heb 2:15; Heb 8:3-6; Heb 9:15-28; 1Pe 3:18).

4. It was necessary that he should be a-holy and righteous man, free from all sin, that he might offer himself without spot to God (Heb 7:26; Heb 9:14; 1Pe 2:22.)

(b) But it was not enough that the mediator should be truly man, and an innocent person; he must be more than a man; it was requisite that he should be really God.

1. No mere man could have entered into a covenant with God to mediate between him and sinful men (Rom 9:5; Heb 1:8; 1Ti 3:16; Tit 2:13).

2. He must be God, to give virtue and value to his obedience and sufferings (Joh 20:28; Act 20:28; 2Pe 2:1; Php 2:5-11).

3. The Mediator being thus God and man, we are encouraged to hope in him. In the person of Jesus Christ the object of trust is brought nearer to ourselves. If he were God and not man, we should approach him with fear and dread; and if he were man and not God, we should be guilty of idolatry to worship and trust in him at all (Jer 17:5). The plan of salvation by such a Mediator is therefore the most suitable to human beings; for here “Mercy and truth are met together, righteousness and peace have kissed each other” (Psa 85:10).

The properties of Christ as Mediator are these:

1. He is the only Mediator (1Ti 2:4). Praying, therefore, to saints and angels is an error of the Church of Rome, and has no countenance from Scripture.

2. Christ is a Mediator of men only, not of angels; good angels need not any; and as for evil angels, none is provided nor admitted.

3. He is the Mediator both for Jews and Gentiles (Eph 2:18; 1Jn 2:2).

4. He is the Mediator both for Old and New Testament saints.

5. He is a suitable, constant, willing, and prevalent Mediator; his mediation always succeeds, and is infallible.

For a more ample view of this important subject, see Flavel. Panstratia of Shamier, vol. iii (Geneva, folio), 7:1, in which the views of the Romish Church are ably controverted. See also Brinsley (John), Christ's Mediation (Lond. 1657, 8vo); Gill's Body of Divinity, 1:336; Witsii (Econ. Faed. lib. ii, c. 4; Fuller's Gospel its own Witness, ch. iv, p. 2; Hurrion's Christ Crucified, p. 103, etc.; Owen, On the Person of Christ; Goodwin's Works,  b. iii; M'Laughlan, Christ's Mediatorship (Edinb. 1853); Kitto, Bibl. Cyclop. s.v.; Buck, Theol. Dict. s.v.; Amer. Presb. Revelation 1863, p. 419. SEE ATONEMENT.

## Medicamentum[[@Headword:Medicamentum]]

             or MEDICINA CORPORIS ET MENTIS, a name occasionally found in the writings of the Church fathers as asynoiyme of our term” the Lord's Supper.” Ignatius and others not unusually speak of “the medicine of immortality” “mediciie or preservative of the soul.” See Riddle Christian Antiquities, p. 551.

## Medici, The House Of[[@Headword:Medici, The House Of]]

             one of the most noted families of Italy's nobility, figures largely in the ecclesiastical history of mediaeval times and the days of the Renaissance that we cannot pass it without a somewhat detailed account of its different members.

1. The early history of the family of the Medici is obscure, although some authors have traced their genealogy from the' age of Charlemagne. But it must be remembered that these genealogies were made after the elevation of this family to suprep power in the republic of Florence-a position which they attained only by degrees, after the accumulation of wealth sufficient to control the affairs of the Italian nation. It appears, however, from authentic monuments, that many individuals of this family had signalized themselves on various important occasions even in early times. Giovanni de' Mediti in the yea 1251, with a body of only one hundred Florentines, forced his way through the Milanese army, then besieging the fortress of Scarperia, and entered the place with :he loss of twenty lives. Francesco de' Medici was at the head of the magistracy of Florence in 1348, at the time when the black plague, which had desolated so large a portion of the world, extended its ravages to that city.: Salvestro de' Medici acquired great reputation by his temperate but firm resistance to the nobles, who, in order to secure their power, accused those who opposed them of being attached to the party of the Ghibelines, then in great odium at Florence. The persons so accused, were said to be ammoniti (admonished), and by ‘that act were excluded from all offices of government. In the year 1379, Salvestro, being chosen chief magistrate, exerted his power to reform this abuse, which was not, however, effected without a violent commotion, several of the nobility losing their lives in the attempt. It is from this time that we date the rise of  the Medici to prominence in political, and finally also in ecclesiastical affairs.

2. The founder, however. of that almost regal greatness which the Medici enjoyed for more than two centuries was not Salvestro, who first received great public distinctions, but Giovanni de' Medici. His immense wealth, honorably acquired by commercial dealings, which had already rendered the name of Medici celebrated in Europe, was expended with liberality and magnificence. Of a mild temper and averse to cabals, Giovanni de' Medici did not attempt to set up a party, but contented himself with the place in the public councils to which even his enemies declared him entitled in virtue of his eminence, his acquirements, and the purity of his character. He died in 1429, leaving to his sons, Cosmo and Lorenzo, a heritage of wealth and honors hitherto unparalleled in the republic.

Cosmto (born 1389, died 1464), on whom was gratefully bestowed the honored title of Father of his country,” really began the glorious epoch of the Medici. Cosno's life, except during a short period, when the Albizzi and other rivals re-established a successful opposition against the policy and credit of the Medici, was one uninterrupted course of prosperity; at once a munificent patron and a successful cultivator of art and literature, he did more than any other sovereign in Europe to revive the study of the ancient classics, and to foster a taste for mental culture. He assembled around him learned men of every nation, and gave liberal support to numerous Greek scholars, whom the subjection of Constantinople by the Turks had driven into exile; and by his foundation, of. an academy for the study of the philosophy of Plato, and of a library of Greek, Latin, and Oriental MSS he inaugurated a new sera in modern learning and art. In the lifetime of his father, Cosmo had engaged not only in the extensive business by which the family had acquired its wealth, but also in the affairs of state. Such was his authority and reputation that in the year 1414, when Balthasar Cossa, who had been elected pope, and had assumed the name of John XXIII, was summoned to attend the Council of Constance, he chose to be accompanied by Cosmo de' Medici, among other men of eminence, whose characters might countenance his cause. By this council, which continued nearly four years, Balthasar was deprived of his pontifical dignity, and Otto Colonna, who took the name of Martin V, was elected pope. Cosmo did not desert in adversity the mal to whom he had attached himself in prosperity. At the expense of a large sum of money, he redeemed him from the hands of the duke of Bavaria, who had seized upon his  person; and afterwards gave him a hospitable shelter at Florence during the remainder of his life. The successful pontiff, instead of resenting the kindness shown to his rival, soon afterwards paid a public visit to Florence, where, on the formal submission of Balthasar, and at the request of the Medici, he created the ex-pope a cardinal, with. the privilege of taking the first place in the sacred college. The new-made cardinal died in 1419, and it was rumored that the Medici at his death possessed themselves of immense wealth which he had acquired during his pontificate. This rumor was afterwards encouraged by those who well knew its falsehood. The true source of the. wealth of the Medici was their superior talents and application to business, and the property of the cardinal was scarcely sufficient to discharge his debts and legacies. During the retirement of his latter days, his happiest hours were devoted to the study of letters and philosophy, and the conversation of learned men. He also endowed numerous religious houses, and built a hospital at Jerusalem for the relief of distressed pilgrims.

3. Cosmo's grandson, Lorenzo, afterwards surnamed the “ Magnificent” (born Jan. 1,1448, died April 8,1492), was introduced to a knowledge of public affairs, on account of the infirmities of his father, immediately upon the decease of Cosmo. Though only a youth, he was at once pushed forward to take upon himself the work supposed to belong to a much maturer mind. To afford him a clearer insight into political affairs than he could secure at home, he was sent to visit the principal courts in Italy. Upon the accession of Sixtus IV to the papal throne, he went. with other citizens of Florence, to congratulate the new pope, and was invested with the office of treasurer of the holy see; and while at Rome embraced the opportunity to add to the remains of ancient art which his family had collected. One of the first events after he undertook the administration of affairs was a revolt of the inhabitants of Volterra, on account of a dispute with the Florentine republic. By the recommendation of Lorenzo, force was used, and the result was the sack of Volterra. Like his grandfather, hp encouraged literature and the arts, employed learned men to collect choice books and antiquities for him from every part of the known world, established printing-presses in his dominions as soon as the art was invented but, above all, he deserves special commendation for his re- establishment of the Academy of Pisa, to which city-he removed in order to complete the undertaking: he selected the most eminent professors, and contributed a large sum from his private fortune, in addition to that granted  by the state of Florence. In another respect also Lorenzo resembled his grandfather Cosmo. He was or affected to be, an admirer of Plato, took an active part in the establishment of an academy for the cultivation of the Platonic philosophy, and instituted an annual-festival in honor of Plato.

While Loreiuzo was dividing his time between the administration of the state and the promotion of literature, the Pazzi, a numerous and distinguished family in Florence, of all the opponents of the Medici the most inveterate, formed a conspiracy to assassinate Lorenzo and his brother experience having taught them the impossibility of overthrowing the reign of the Medici in any other way. Giuliano was killed, but Lorenzo escaped. “A horrible transaction this, which has been justly quoted as an incontrovertible proof of the practical atheism of the times in which it took place-one in which a pope, a cardinal, an archbishop, and several other ecclesiastics, associated themselves with a band of ruffians to destroy two men who were an honor to their age and ‘country; and purposed to perpetrate their crime at a season of hospitality, in the sanctuary of a Christian Church, and at the very moment of the elevation of the host, when the congregation bowed down before it, and the assassins were presumed to be in the immediate presence of their God. The plan was concocted at Rome, with the participation of pope Sixtus IV. On the 6th of April, 1478, in the church of the Reparata, during the mass, while the host was elevated and the multitude were kneeling, the murderous blow was struck, the very mass-bell itself sounding the signal to the other conspirators to possess themselves of the palace and government.” The failure of this dastardly scheme only made the Medici the more invincible. The people, who had always been attached to them, exasperated by this open and daring attempt to rob them of those whom they conceived to be their best friends, now took the execution of the law in their own hands, and put to death or apprehended the assassins. Salviati, archbishop of Pisa, was hung through the windows of the palace, and was not allowed to divest himself even of his robes and Jacopo de'.Pazzi, with one of his nephews, shared the same fate. The name and arms of the Pazzi family were suppressed, its members were banished, and Lorenzo rose still higher in the regard of his fellow-citizens. The troubles of the Medici, however, did not stop here. For them yet remained the punishment at. the disposal of the papal party, and the latter, madened by the failure of their plot, determined now to vail themselves of the advantages which Rome could afford as “ecclesiastical thunderer.”

Sixtus IV promptly excommunicated  Lorenzo and the magistrates of Florence, laidan interdict upon the whole territory, and, forming a league with the king of Naples, prepared to invade the Florentine dominions.Lorenzo appealed to all the surrounding potentates, and, zealously supported by his fellow-citizens, commenced hostilities, and carried on two campaigns. At the close, of 1479, Lorenzo took the bold resolution of paying a visit to the king of Naples, and, without obtaining any previous promise of security, trusted himself to the mercy of his enemy. The result of this confidence was a treat. of mutual defence and friendship between the king of Naples and Florence, and this finally forced Sixtus to consent to a treaty of peace. In 1484 Sixtus IV died, and his successor on the papal throne, Innocent VIII, manifesting a determination to re-establish friendly relations with the different Italian princes, SEE INNOCENT VIII, the contest of the Medici with the Church seemed to have come to a happy close. There was, however, still one dark cloud on the firmament of the heavens, and it threatened sooner or later to bring trouble and discomfiture to the Medici we refer to Savonarola, the great Italian reformer, who was in the very strength of his manhood at this time. The Italian monk had long opposed the licentious habits of the court and the nobility. He was opposed, moreover, to the display of regal splendor, and boldly preached. in favor of democracy and republican institutions. Lorenzo sought in more than one way to conciliate the sturdy reformer, but all efforts proved futile. Not even the cardinalate could tempt him SEE SAVONAROLA and Lorenzo was forced to admit himself,” Besides this man, I have never seen a true monk.” Gradually Savonarola gave system to his republican ideas, and, gathering about him a host of followers, these opponents of the ruling, administration came to be known by the name of Piagnoni (q.v.) or “weepers,” so called because of their determination to stem the progress of the voluptuous refinement of the day by ascetic severity o. morals. Lorenzo himself saw clearly the inherent insufficiency of art and philosophy alone for the security of a state; but while he sighed for a purely religious influence, he feared the dangerous tendency of the Piagnoni towards a popular and democratic form of government, and he had failed to extinguish or abate his opposition when suddenly cut down by disease an death, April 8, 1492.

Lorenzo is credited with even greater love and devotion to the development of literary life and the study of the fine arts than any of his predecessors. His own productions are sonnets, canoni, and other lyric pieces; some longer works in stanzas, some comic satires, carnival songs,  and various sacred poems. Many of the lighter kind were popular in their day. Although the ancestors of Lorenzo laid the foundation of the immense collection of manuscripts contained in the Laurentian library Lorenzo has the credit of adding most largely to the stock. For the purpose of enriching his collection of books and antiquities, he employed learned men in different parts of Italy, and especially his intimate friend Politian, who made several journeys in order to discover and purchase the valuable remains of antiquity. Two journeys were undertaken it the request of Lorenzo into the East by John Lascaris and the result was the acquisition of a great number manuscripts. On his return from his second expedition, Lascaris brought two hundred manuscripts, many of which he had procured from a monastery at Mount Ahos; but this treasure did not arrive till after the death of Lorenzo, who in his last moments expressed to Politian and Pico of Mirandola his regret that he could not live to complete the-collection which he was forming. On the discovery of the art of printing, Lorenzo quickly saw and appreciated its importance.

At his suggestion, several Italian scholars devoted their attention to collating the manuscripts of the ancient authors, for the purpose of having them accurately printed. On the capture of Constantinople by the Turks, many learned Greeks took refuge in Italy; and an academy was established at Florence for the purpose of cultivating the Greek language, partly under the direction of native Greeks, and partly under native Italians. The services of these learned men were procured by Lorenzo, and were amply rewarded by his bounty. “Hence,” as Roscoe observes (in his Life of Lorenzo del Medici. 1795,2 vols. 4to Bohn's edit. Lond. 1851, 12mo), succeeding scholars have been profuse of their acknowledgments to their great patron, who first formed that establishment, from which (to use their own scholastic figure), as from the Trojan horse, so many illustrious champions have sprung, and by means of which the knowledge of the Greek tongue was extended, not only through Italy, but through France, Spain, Germany, and England, from all which countries numerous pupils attended at Florence, who diffused the learning they had there acquired throughout the rest of Europe.” Lorenzo also augmented his father's collection of the remains of ancient art. He appropriated his gardens in Florence to the purpose of an academy for the study of the antique, which he furnished with statues, busts, and other works of art, the best of their kind that he could procure. The higher class of his fellow-citizens were incited to these pursuits by the example of Lorenzo, and the lower class by his liberality. To the latter he not only allowed competent stipends while  they attended to. their studies, but gave considerable premiums as rewards of their proficiency. To this institution. more than to any other circumstance, Roscoe ascribes. the sudden and astonishing advance which, towards the close of the 15th century, was evidently made in the arts, and which, commencing at Florence, extended itself to the rest of Europe.

4. Lorenzo's successor in the government of Florence was his eldest son Pietro; but of far greater interest to the ecclesiastical student is the history of his younger son Giovanni, and that of his nephew Giulio. The former of the two last named, Giovanni, was honored, by the prudent manipulations of Lorenzo, with the cardinal's hat when only a boy of thirteen years, at the hands of Innocent VIII, and on the death-of Julius II, brought credit upon the name of Medici by his accession to the papal throne. SEE LEO X.

Of Giulio's history we have the following from Roscoe Shortly after the attempt at assassination, he says, Uprenzo received a visit from Antonio da San Gall, who informed him that. the untimely death of Giuliano had prevented his disclosing to Lorenzo a circumstance with which it was now become necessary that he should be acquainted: this was the birth of a son, whom a lady of the family of Gorini had borne to Giuliano about twelve months before his death, and whom Antonio had held over the baptismal font, where he received the name of Giulio. Lorenzo immediately repaired to the place of the infant's residence, and, taking him under his protection, delivered him to Antonio, with whom he remained until he had arrived ‘at the seventh year of his age. This concealed offspring of illicit love, to whom the kindness of Lorenzo supplied the untimely loss of a father, was destined to act an important part in the affairs of Europe. The final extinction of the liberties of Florence, the alliance of the family of Medici with the royal house of France, the expulsion of Henry VIII of England from the bosom of the Roman Church, and the consequent establishment of the doctrines of the Reformers in Great Britain, are principally to be referred to this illegitimate so of Giuliano de' Medici, who through various vicissitudes of fortune at length obtained the supreme direction of the Roman see, and, under the name of Clement VII guided the bark of St. Peter through a succession of the, severest storms which it has ever experienced.”

Pietro possessed neither capacity nor prudence, and in the troubles which the ambition of her princes and the profligacy of her popes brought upon Italy, by plunging her into civil and foreign war, he showed himself treacherous and vacillating alike to friends and foes. Lodovico Sforza,  surnamed the “Moor,” relying on the friendship which, from the middle of the 15th century, had prevailed between the Sforza family of Milan and the Medici, applied to him for assistance in establishing his claim to the duchy of Milan; but, seeing that no reliance could be. placed on Pietro, he threw himself into the arms of Charles VIII of France. The result was the invasion of Italy by a French army of 32,000 men. Pietro, in hopes of conciliating the powerful invader, hastened to meet the troops on their entrance into the dominions of Florence, and surrendered to Charles the fortresses of Leghorn and Pisa, which constituted the keys of the republic. The magistrates ‘and people, incensed at his perfidy, drove him from the. city, and formally deposed the family of the Medici from all participation of power in 1494.

The attempts of Giovanni, then a cardinal, to uphold the Medician authority, and his success in the reestablishment of his house in 1512, we have narrated in our article on Leo X. Pietro was slain in 1503, while fighting in the French ranks.

It was during the invasions of the French-in Italy, in the days of Pietro, that Florence was robbed of one of her greatest treasures the invaluable-library which had been collected by the care of his father and grandfather. “The French troops, which had entered the city without opposition, led the way to this act of barbarism, in which they were joined by the Florentines themselves. who openly carried off or purloined whatever they could discover that was rare or valuable. Besides the numerous manuscripts, the plunderers carried off the inestimable specimens of the arts which the palace of the Medici contained, and which had long made it the admiration of strangers and the chief ornament of the city. Exquisite pieces of ancient sculpture, vases, cameos, and gems of various kinds, were lost amid the indiscriminate plunder, and the rich accumulations of half a century were destroyed or dispersed in a single day.” During the interregnum, the labors of the Piagnoni were suddenly checked by the martyrdom of their beloved leader, Savonarola, in 1498; and, when the Medici came again to rule over Florence, this disposition of some of their strongest opponents threw a weight of power into the hands of the Medici which rendered all attempts to maintain even a show of independence futile on the part of the Florentines. The faintest indication of republican spirit was at once crushed by the combined aid of pope and emperor.  5. The accession of Clement VII only strengthened the Medici in Florence, and, though the legitimate male line of Cosmo was extinct (with the exception of the pope), Clement VII gave, in 1529, to Alessandro, natural son of the last prince Lorenzo II, the rank of duke of Florence; and on his death, by assassination, without direct heirs, in 1537, raised Cosmo I, the descendant of a collateral branch, to the ducal chair.

Cosmo, known as the Great, possessed the astuteness of-character, the love of elegance, and taste for literature, but not the frank and generous spirit that had distinguished his great ancestors; and while he founded the academies of painting and of fine arts, made collections of paintings and statuary, published magnificent editions of his own works and those of others, and encouraged, trade, for the protection of which he instituted the ecclesiastical order of St. Stephen, he was implacable in his enmity. and scrupled not utterly to extirpate the race of the Strozzi, the hereditary foes of his house. His acquisition of Sienna gained for him the title of grand- duke of Tuscany from Pius V; and he died in 1574, leaving enormous wealth and regal power to his descendants, who, throughout the next half century, maintained the literary and artistic fame of their family. In the 17th century the race rapidly degenerated, and, after several of its representatives had suffered themselves to be made the mere tools of Spanish and Austrian ambition, the main line of the Medici family became extinct in 1737. The genealogy of the Medici to the present time is given in a splendid work but little known, entitled Famiglie celebri Italiane, by Litta. The Medici and their descendants are comprised in Fascicolo XVII (in seven parts, Milan, i827-30, folio). See also Modern Universal History, vol. xxxvi; Noble, Memoirs of the House of Medici, illustrated with genealogical tables; Tenhove, Memoirs of the House of Medici, translated from the French by Sir R. Clayton ‘(Bath, 1797,2 vols. 4to); Roscoe, Life of Lorenzo de' Medici, and his Life and Pontificate of Leo X (Liverp. 1805,4 vols. 4to); Guicciardini, Storia d'ltalia; Botta, Storia d'ltalia; Sismondi. Hist. des Republiques Italiennes; Leo, Gesch. v. Italien; Trollope, Hist. of Florence (Lond. 1865, 4 vols. 8vo); Hallam, Middle Ages (Smith's ed., Harpers, 1872), p. 229 sq.; National Quart. Revelation Dec. 1863, art. iii; Foreign Quart. Revelation v. 475; and the excellent article in the English Cyclopaedia, s.v.

## Medicine[[@Headword:Medicine]]

             (תְּרוּפָה, teruphahh a medical powder, Eze 47:12; Sept. ὑγίεια, comp. θεραπεία of Rev 22:2; Vulg. medicina; also the plur. רְפֻאוֹת, rephuoth', medicaments, or remedies for wounds, Jer 30:13; Jer 46:11; “healed,” Eze 30:21; but גֵּהָה,gehah', in Pro 17:12, is properly the removal of the bandages from a sore, hence its healing; therefore render, “ a joyful heart perfects a cure “). ‘‘In the following article we endeavor as far as possible to treat the subject from the modern scientific point of view. SEE HEAL

I. Sources of Medical Science among the Hebrews.-

1. Natural. — Next to care for food, clothing, and shelter, the curing of hurts takes precedence even among savage nations. At a later period comes the treatment of sickness; and recognition of states of disease, and these mark a nascent civilization. Internal diseases, and all for which an obvious cause cannot be assigned, are in the most early period viewed as the visitation of God, or as the act of some malignant power, human — as the evil eye or else superhuman, and to be dealt with by sorcery, or some other occult supposed agency. The Indian notion is that all diseases are the work of an evil spirit (Sprengel, Gesch. der Arzeneikunde, 2:48). But among a civilized race the pre-eminence of the medical art is confessed in proportion to the increased value set on human life, and the vastly greater amount of comfort and enjoyment of which civilized man is capable.

2. Egyptian. — It would be strange if their close connection historically with Egypt had not imbued the Israelites with a strong appreciation of the value of this art, and with some considerable degree of medical culture. From the most ancient testimonies, sacred and secular, Egypt, from whatever cause, though perhaps from necessity, was foremost among the nations in this most human of studies purely physical. Again, as the active intelligence of Greece flowed in upon her, and mingled with the immense store of pathological records which must have accumulated under the system described by Herodotus, Egypt, especially Alexandria, became the medical repertory and museum of the world. Thither all that was best worth preserving amid earlier civilizations, whether her own or foreign, had been attracted, and medicine and surgery flourished amid political decadence and artistic decline. The attempt has been made ‘by a French  writer (Renouard, Histoire de' Medicine depuis son Origine, etc.) to arrange in periods the growth of the medical art as follows

1st. The Primitive or Instinctive Period, lasting from the earliest recorded treatment to the fall of Troy.

2dly. The Sacred or Mystic Period, lasting till the dispersion of the Pythagorean Society, BC. 500.

3dly. The Philosophical Period, closing with the foundation of the Alexandrian Library, BC. 320.

4thly. The Anatomical Period, which continued till the death of Galen, AD. 200.

But these artificial lines do not strictly exhibit the truth of the matter. Egypt was the earliest home of medical and other skill for the region of the Mediterranean basin, and every Egyptian mummy of the more expensive and elaborate sort involved a process of anatomy. This gave opportunities. of inspecting a vast number of bodies, varying in every possible condition. Such opportunities were sure to be turned to account (Pliny, N. H. 19:5) by the more diligent among the faculty, for ‘ the physicians” embalmed (Genesis 1, 2). The intestines had a separate receptacle assigned them, or were restored to the body: through the ventral incision (Wilkinson, v. 468); and every such process which we can trace in the mummies discovered shows the most minute accuracy of manipulation. Notwithstanding these laborious efforts, we have no trace of any philosophical or rational system of Egyptian origin, and medicine in Egypt was a mere art or profession. Of science the Asclepiadae of Greece were the true originators. Hippocrates, who wrote a book on “Ancient Medicine,” and who seems to have had many opportunities of access to foreign sources, gives no prominence to Egypt. It was no doubt owing to the repressive influences of her fixed institutions that this country did not attain to a vast and speedy proficiency in medical science, when post mortem examination was so general a rule instead of being a rare exception. Still it is impossible to believe that considerable advances in physiology could have failed to be made there from time to time, and similarly, though we cannot so well determine how far, in Assyria. Recent researches at Kuyunjik have given proof, it is said of the use of the-microscope in minute devices, and yielded up even specimens of magnifying lenses. A cone engraved with a table of cubes, so small as to be unintelligible without a lens, was brought home by Sir H.  Rawlinson, and is now in the British Museum. As to whether the invention was brought to bear on medical science, proof is wanting. Probably such science had not yet been pushed to the point at which the microscope becomes useful. Only those who have quick keen eyes for the nature world feel the want of such spectacles. The best guarantee for the advance of medical science is, after all, the interest which every human being has in it, and this is most strongly felt in large gregarious masses of population. Compared with the wild countries around them, at any rate, Egypt must have seemed incalculably advance. Hence the awe with which Homer's Greeks speak of her wealth, resources, and medical skill (II 9:3 1; Od. 4:229. See also Herod. 2:84, and 1:77). The simple heroes had reverence for the healing skill which extended only to wounds. There is hardly Any recognition of disease in Homer. There is sudden death, pestilence, and weary old age, but hardly any fixed morbid condition, save in a simile (Od. v. 395). See, however, a letter De rebus ex Homnero medicis, D. G. Wolf (Wittenberg, 1791). So likewise even the visit of Abraham, though prior to this period, found Egypt no doubt in advance of other countries. Representations of earl, Egyptian surgery apparently occur on some of the monuments of Beni-Hassan. Flint knives used for embalming have been recovered; the “Ethiopic stone” of Herodotus (2. 86; comp. Ezekiel 4:25) was probably either black flint or agate SEE KNIFE, and those who have assisted at the opening of a mummy have noticed that the teeth exhibit a dentistry not inferior in execution to the work of the best modern experts. | This confirms the statement of Herodotus that every part of the body was studied by a distinct practitioner. Pliny (7. 57) asserts that the Egyptians claimed the invention of the healing art, and (26. 1) thinks them subject to many diseases. Their” many medicines” are mentioned (Jer 46:11). Many valuable drugs may be derived from the plants mentioned by Wilkinson (iv. 621). and the senna of the adjacent interior of Africa still excels all other. Athothmes II, king :of the country, is said to have written on the subject of anatomy. Hermes (who may perhaps be ‘the same as Athothmes, intellect personified, only disguised as a deity instead of a legendary king), was said to have written six books on medicine, in which an entire chapter was devoted to diseases of the eye (Rawlinson's Herod. note to 2:84), and the first half of which related to anatomy. The various recipes known to have been beneficial were recorded, with their peculiar cases, in the memoirs of physic, inscribed among the laws, and deposited in the principal temples of the place (Wilkinson, 3:396, 397). The reputation of its practitioners in historical times was such that both  Cyrus and Darius sent to Egypt for physicians or surgeons (Herod. 3:1, 129-132); and by one of the same country, no doubt, Cambyses's wound was tended, though not, perhaps, with much zeal for his recovery.

Of midwifery we have a distinct notice (Exo 1:15), and of women as its practitioners, which fact may also be verified from the sculptures (Rawlinson's note on Herod, 2:84). The sex of the practitioners is clear from the Hebrews grammatical forms. The names of two, Shiphrah and Puah are recorded. The treatment of new-born Hebrew infants is mentioned (Eze 16:4) as consisting in washing, salting, and swaddling-this last was not used in Egypt (Wilkinson). The physicians had salaries from the public treasury, and treated always according to established precedents, or deviated from these at their peril, in case of a fatal termination if, however, the patient died under accredited treatment, no blame was attached. They treated gratis patients when travelling or ‘on military service. Most diseases were by them ascribed to indigestion and excessive eating (Diod. Sicul. 1:82), and when their science failed them magic was called in. On recovery it was also customary to suspend in a temple an exvoto, which was commonly a model of the part affected; and such offerings doubtless, as in. the Coan Temple of Esculapius, became valuable aids to the pathological student. The Egyptians who lived in the corn-growing region are said by Herodotus (ii. 77) to have been specially attentive to health. The practise of circumcision is traceable on monuments certainly anterior to the age of Joseph. Its antiquity is involved in obscurity, especially as all we know of the Egyptians makes it. unlikely that they would have borrowed such a practice, so late as the period of Abraham, from any mere sojourner among' them. Its beneficial effects in the temperature of Egypt and Syria have often been noticed, especially as a preservative of cleanliness, etc. The scrupulous attention paid to the dead was favorable to the health of. the living. Such powerful drugs as asphaltum, natron, resin, pure bitumen, and various, aromaticgums, suppressed or counteracted all noxious effluvia from the corpse; even the saw-dust of the floor, on which the body had been cleansed, was collected in small linen bags, which, to the number of twenty or thirty, were deposited in vases near the tomb (Wilkinson, v. 468, 469). For. the extent to which these practices were imitated among the Jews, SEE EMBALMING.

At any rate, the uncleanness imputed to contact with a corpse was a powerful preservative against the inoculation of the livings  frame with morbid -humors: But, to pursue to later times this merely general question, it appears (Pliny, N. H. 19:5) that the Ptolemies themselves practiced dissection, and that, at a period when Jewish intercourse with Egypt was complete and reciprocal, there existed in Alexandria a great deal for anatomical study. The only influence of importance which would tend to check the Jews from sharing this was the ceremonial law, the special reverence of Jewish feeling towards human remains, and the abhorrence of “uncleanness.” Yet those Jews and there were, at all times since the Captivity, not a few, perhaps who tended to foreign laxity, and affected Greek. philosophy and. culture, would assuredly, as we shall have further occasion to notice that they in fact did, enlarge their anatomical knowledge from sources which repelled their stricter brethren, and the result would be apparent in the general elevated standard of that profession, even as practiced in Jerusalem. The diffusion of Christianity in the 3d and 4th centuries exercised a similar but more universal restraint on the dissecting-room; until anatomy as a pursuit became extinct, and, the notion of profaneness quelling everywhere such researches, surgical science became stagnant to a degree to which it had never previously sunk within the memory of human records.

3. Grecian.-In comparing the growth of medicine in the rest of the ancient world, the high rank of its practitioners — princes and heroes-settles at once the question as to the esteem in which it was held in the Homeric and preHomeric period. To descend to the historical, the story of Democedes at the court of Darius illustrates the practice of Greek surgery before the. period of Hippocrates anticipating, in its gentler waiting upon nature, as compared (Herod. 3:130) with that of the Persians and Egyptians, the methods, and maxims of that father of physic, who wrote against the theories and speculations of the so-called Philosophical school, and was a true empiricist before that sect was formularized. The Dogmatic school was founded after his time by his disciples,. who departed from his eminently practical and inductive method. It recognized hidden causes of health and sickness arising from certain supposed principles or elements, out of which bodies were composed, and by virtue of which all their parts and members were tempered together and became sympathetic. Hippocrates has some curious remarks on the sympathy of men with climate, seasons, etc. He himself rejected supernatural accounts of disease, and especially demoniacal possession.

He refers, but with no mystical sense, to numbers as furnishing a rule for cases. It is remarkable that he  extols the discernment of Orientals above Westerns, and of Asiatics above Europeans, in medical diagnosis. The Empirical school, which arose in the 3d century BC., under the guidance of Acron of Agrigentum, Serapion of Alexandria, and Philinus of Cos, waited for the symptoms of every case, disregarding the rules of practice based on dogmatic principles. Amongits votaries was a Zachalias (perhaps Zacharias, and possibly a Jew) of Babylon, who (Pliny, N. H 37:10; comp. 36:10) dedicated a book on medicine to Mithridates the Great; its views were also supported by Heroddotus of Tarsus, a place which, next to Alexandria, became distinguished for its schools of philosophy and medicine; as also by a Jew named Theodas, or Theudas, of Laodicea (see Wunderbar, Biblisch- Talmudische Medicin, 1:25), but a student of Alexandria, and the last, or nearly so, of the empiricists whom its schools produced. The remarks of Theudas on the right method of observing, and the value of experience, and his book on medicine, now lost, in which he arranged his subject under the heads of indicatoria, curatoria, and salubris, earned him high reputation as a champion of empiricism against the reproaches of the dogmatists, though they were subsequently impugned by Galen and. Theodosius of Tripoli. His period was that from Titus to. Hadrian., The empiricists held that observation and the application of known remedies in one case to others presumed to be similar constitute the whole art of cultivating medicine. Though their views were narrow, and their information scanty when compared with some of the chiefs of the other sects, and although they rejected as useless and unattainable all knowledge of the causes and recondite nature of diseases, it is undeniable that, besides personal experience, they freely availed themselves of historical detail, and of a. strict analogy founded upon observation and the resemblance of phenomena” (Dr. Adams, Paul. AEgin. ed. Sydenham Soc.).

This school, however, was opposed by another, known as the Methodic, which had arisen under the leading of Themison, also of Laodicea, about the period of Pompey the Great. Asclepiades paved the way for the “method” in question, finding a theoretic basis in the corpuscular or atomic theory of physics which he borrowed from Heraclides of Pontus. He had passed some early years in Alexandria, and thence came to Rome shortly before Cicero's time (Quo nos medico amicoque usi sumus,” Cicero, de Orat. 1:14).: He was a transitional link between the Dogmatic arid Empiric schools and this :later, or. Methodic (Sprengel, ut sup. pt. v. 16), that sought to rescue medicine from the bewildering mass of particulars into  which empiricism had plunged it. He reduced diseases to: two classes, chronic arid acute, and endeavored likewise to simplify remedies. In the meanwhile, the most judicious of medical theories since Hippocrates, Celsus, of the Augustan period had reviewed medicine in the light which all these schools afforded, land, not professing any distinct teaching, but borrowing from all, may be viewed as eclectic. He translated Hippocrates largely verbatim; quoting in a less degree Asclepiades and others. Antonius Musa, whose “cold-water cure,” after its successful trial on Augustus himself, became generally popular, seems to have had little of scientific basis, but by the usual method, or the usual accidents, became merely the fashionable practitioner of his day in Rome. Attalia, near Tarsus, furnished also, shortly after the period of Celsus, Athenaeus, the leader of the last of the schools of medicine which divided the ancient world, under the name of the “Pneumatic,” holding the tenet “of an ethereal principle ῥ (πνεῦμα) residing in the microcosm, by means of which the mind performed the functions of the body.” This is also traceable in Hippocrates, and was an established opinion of the Stoics. It was exemplified in the innate heat, θερμὴ ἔμφυτος (Aret. de Caus. et Sign. Morb. Chron. ii; 13), and the calidum innatum of modern physiologists, especially in the 17th century (Dr. Adams, Pref. Aretceus, ed. Sydelh. Soc.).

4. Effect of these Systems.-It is clear that all these schools may easily have contributed to form the medical opinions current at the period, of the N.T.; that the two earlier among them may have influenced rabbinical teaching on that subject at a much earlier period; and that, especially at the time of Alexander's visit to Jerusalem, the Jewish people, whom he favored and protected, had an opportunity of largely gathering from the medical lore of the West. It was necessary, therefore, to pass in brief review the growth of the latter, and especially to note the points at which it intersects the medical progress of the Jews. Greek Asiatic medicine culminated in Galen, who was, however, still but a commentator on his Western predecessors, and who stands literally without rival, successor, or disciple of note, till the period when Greek learning was reawakened by the Arabian intellect. The Arabs, however, continued to build wholly upon Hippocrates and Galen, save in so far as their advance in chemical science improved their pharmacopoeia: this may be seen on reference to the works of Rhazes, AD. 930, and Haly Abbas. AD. 980. The first mention of small-pox is ascribed to Rhazes, who, however, quotes several earlier writers on the subject. Mohammed himself is said to have been versed in medicine, and to have  compiled some aphorisms upon it; — and a herbalist literature was always extensively followed in the East from the days of Solomon downwards (Freind's History of Medicine, 2:5,:27). Galen himself belongs to the period of the Antonines, but he appears to have been acquainted with the writings of Moses, and to have travelled in quest of medical experience over Egypt, Syria, and Palestine, as well as Greece, and a large part of the West, and, in particular, to have visited the banks of the Jordan in quest of opobalsamum, and the coasts of the Dead Sea to obtain samples of bitumen. He also mentions Palestine as producing a watery wine, suitable for the drink of feeble patients.

II. Historical Notices.— Having thus described the external influences which, if any, were probably most potent in forming the medical practice of the Hebrews, we may trace next its internal growth. The cabalistic legends mix up the names of Shem and Heber in their fables about healing, and ascribe to those patriarchs a knowledge of simples and rare roots, with, of course, magic spells and occult powers, such as have clouded the history of medicine from the earliest times down to the 17th century.

1. In the Old Testament. — So to Abraham is ascribed a talisman, the touch of which healed all disease. We know that such simple surgical skill as the operation for circumcision implies was Abraham's; but severer operations than this are constantly required in the flock and herd, and those who watch carefully the habits of animals can hardly fail to amass some guiding principles applicable to man and beast alike. Beyond this, there was probably nothing but such ordinary obstetrical craft as has always been traditional among the women of rude tribes, that could be classed as medical lore in the family of the patriarch, until his sojourn brought him among the more cultivated Philistines and Egyptians. The only notices which Scripture affords in connection with the subject are' the cases of difficult midwifery in the successive households of Isaac, Jacob, and Judah (Gen 25:26; Gen 24:17; Gen 38:27), and so, later, in that of Phinehas 2 Samuel 4:19). :Doubts have been raised as to the possibility of twins being born, one holding the other's heel; but there does not seem to be any such limit to the operations of nature as an objection on that score would imply. After all it was perhaps only just such a relative position of the limbs of the infants at the. mere moment of birth as would suggest the “holding by the heel.” The midwives, it seems, in case of twins, were called upon to distinguish the first-born, to whom important privileges appertained. The tying on of a thread or ribbon was an easy way of preventing mistake, and  the assistant in the case of Tamar seized the earliest possible moment for doing it. “When the hand or foot of a living child protrudes, it is to be pushed up, and the head made to present” (Paul. AEgin. ed Sydenh. Soc. 1:648, Hippocr. quoted by Dr Adans). This probably the midwife did, at the same time marking him as first-born in virtue of being thus “presented” first. The precise meaning of the doubtful expression in Gen 38:27 and mag. is discussed by Wunderbar, ut sup. p. 50, in reference both to the children and to the mother. Of Rachel a Jewish commentator says, “Multis etiam ex itinere difficultatibus praegressis,viribusque post diu protractos dolores exhaustis, atonia uteri, forsan quidem hemorrhagia in pariendo mortua est” (ibid.). The traditional value ascribed to the mandrake, in regard to generative functions, relates to the same branch of natural medicine; but throughout this period there occurs no trace of any attempt to study, digest, and systematize the subject.

But, as Israel grew and multiplied in Egypt, they doubtless derived a large mental cultivation from their position until cruel policy turned it into bondage; even then Moses was rescued from the lot of his brethren, and became learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians, including, of course, medicine and cognate sciences (Clem. Alex. i, p. 413), and those attainments, perhaps, became suggestive of future laws. Some practical skill in metallurgy is evident from Exo 32:20. But, if we admit Egyptian learning as an ingredient, we should also notice how far exalted above it is the standard of the whole Jewish legislative fabric, in its exemption from the blemishes of sorcery and juggling pretences. The priest, who had to pronounce on the cure, used no means to advance it, and the whole regulations prescribed exclude the notion of trafficking in popular superstition. We have no occult practices reserved in the hands of the sacred caste. It is God alone who doeth great things, working by the wand of Moses, or the brazen serpent; but the very mention of such instruments is such as to expel all pretence of mysterious virtues in the things themselves. Hence various allusions to God's “healing mercy,” and the title “Jehovah that healeth” (Exo 15:26; Jer 17:14; Jer 30:17; Psa 103:3; Psa 147:3; Isa 30:26). Nor was the practice of physic a privilege of the' Jewish priesthood. Any one might practice it, and this publicity must have kept it pure. Nay, there was no scriptural bar to its practice by resident aliens. We read of “physicians,” “healing,” etc., Exo 21:19; 2Ki 8:29; :2Ch 16:12; Jer 8:22. At the same time the greater leisure of the Levites and their other  advantages would make the the students of the nation, as a rule, in all science, and their constant residence in cities would give. them the opportunity, if carried out in fact, of a far wider field of observation.

The reign of peace in Solomon's days must have opened, especially with renewed. Egyptian intercourse new facilities for the study. He himself seems to have included in his favorite natural history some knowledge of the medicinal uses of the creatures. His works show him conversant with the motion of; remedial treatment (Pro 3:8; Pro 6:15; Pro 12:18; Pro 12:22; Pro 20:30; Pro 29:1; Ecc 3:3); and one passage (Ecc 12:3-4) indicates considerable knowledge of anatomy. His repute in magic is the universal theme of Eastern story. It has even been thought he had recourse to the shrine of Esculapius at Sidon, and enriched his resources by its records-or relics; but there is some doubt whether this temple was of such high antiquity. Solomon, however, we cannot doubt, would have turned to the account, not only of wealth but of knowledge, his peaceful reign, wide dominion, and wider renown, and would have sought to traffic in learning as well as in wheat and gold. To him the Talmudists ascribe all volume of cures” (ספר רפואות), of which they make frequent mention (Fabricius, Cod. Pseudep. V. T. p. 1043). Josephus (Ant. 8:2) mentions his knowledge of medicine, and the use of spells by him to expel daemons who cause sicknesses,” which is continued among us,” he adds, “to this time.” The dealings of. various prophets with quasimedical agency cannot be' regarded as other than the mere accidental torn which their miraculous gifts took (1Ki 13:6; 1Ki 14:12; 1Ki 17:17; 2Ki 1:4; 2Ki 20:7; Isa 38:21). Jewish tradition has invested Elisha it would seem, with a function more largely medicinal than that of the other servants of God; but the scriptural evidence on the point is scanty, save ‘that he appears to have known at once the proper means to apply to heal the waters, and temper the noxious pottage (2Ki 2:21; 2Ki 4:39-41).

His healing the Shinammite's son has been discussed as a case of suspended animation and of animal magnetism applied to resuscitate it; but the narrative clearly implies that the death was real As regards the lepros, had the Jordan commonly possessed the healing power which Naaman's faith and obedience found in it, would there have been “many lepers in Israel in the days of Eliseus the prophet,” or in any other- days? Further, if our Lord's words (Luk 4:27) are to be taken literally, Elisha's reputation could not have; been founded on any succession of lepers healed.: The washing was a part of the enjoined illustration of the leper after his cure was  complete; Naaman was to act as though clean, like the ten men that were lepers,”bidden to “go and show themselves to the priest” in either case it, Was “as thou hast believed, so be it done unto thee.” The sickness of Benhadad is certainly so described as to imply treachery on the part of Hazael (2Ki 8:15). Yet the observation of Bruce, upon a “cold- water cure” practiced among the! people near the Red Sea, has suggested a view somewhat different. The bed-clothes -are. soaked with cold water, and kept thoroughly wet, and the patient drinks cold water freely. But the crisis, it seems occurs on the third day, and not till the fifth is it there usual to apply this treatment. If the chamberlain, through ‘carelessness,' ignorance, or treachery, precipitated the application, a fatal issue may have suddenly resulted. The “brazen serpent,” once the means of healing, and worshipped idolatrously in Hezekiah's reign, is supposed to have acquired those honors under its Esculapian aspect. This notion is not inconsistent with the Scripture narrative, though not therein traceable. It is supposed that something in the “volume of cures,” current under the authority of Solomon, may have conduced to the establishment ‘Of these rites, and drawn away the popular homage, especially in prayers during sickness, or thanksgivings after recovery from Jehovah. The statement that king Asa (2Ch 16:12) “sought not to Jehovah but to the physicians,” may seem to countenance the notion that a rivalry of actual worship, based on some medical fancies, had beer set up, and would so far support the Talmudical tradition.

The captivity of Babylon brought the Jews into contact with a new sphere of thought. Their chief men rose to thy highest honors, and an improved mental culture among a large section of the captives was no doubt the result which they imported on their return. Wunderbar regards the Babylonian captivity as parallel it its effects to the Egyptian bondage, and seems to think that the people would return debased from its influence. On the contrary, those whom subjection had made ignoble and unpatriotic would remain. If any returned it was a pledge that they were not so impaired; and, if not impaired, they would certainly be improved by the discipline they had undergone. He also thinks that sorcery had the largest share in any Babylonian or Persian system of medicine. This is assuming too much there were magicians in Egypt, but physicians also (see above)of high cultivation. Human nature has so great an interest in human life that only in the savage, rudimentary societies is its economy left thus involved in phantasms. The earliest steps of civilization include something of  medicine. Of course ‘superstitions' are found copiously involved in such medical tenets, but this is not equivalent to abandoning the study to a class of professed magicians.

Thus in the Ueberreste de;- altbabylonischen Literatur, p. 123, by D. Chwolson, St. Petersb. 1859 (the value of which is not, however, yet ascertained), a writer on poisons claims to have a magic antidote, but declines stating what it is, as it is not his business to mention such things, and he only does so in cases where the charm is in connection with medical treatment and resembles it; the magicians, adds the same writer on another occasion, use a particular means of cure, but he declines to impart it, having a repugnance to witchcraft. So (p. 125-6) we find traces of charms introduced into Babylonian treatises on medical science, but apologetically; and as if against sounder knowledge. Similarly, the opinion of fatalism is not without its influence on medicine; but it is chiefly resorted to where, as often happens in pestilence, all known aid seems useless. We know, however, too little of the precise. state of medicine in Babylon, Susa; and the “cities of the Medes,” to determine the direction in- which the impulse so derived would have led the exiles; but the confluence of streams of thought. from opposite sources, which impregnate each other, would surely produce a tendency to sift established practice and accepted axioms, to set up a new standard by which to try the current rules of art, and to determine new lines of inquiry for any eager spirits disposed to search for truth. Thus the visit of Democedes to the court of Darius, though it seems to be an isolated fact, points to a general opening of Oriental manners to Greek influence, which was not too late to leave its traces in some-perhaps of the contemporaries of Ezra. That great reformer, with the leaders of national thought gathered about him, could not fail to recognise medicine among the salutary measures which distinguished his epoch. Whatever advantages the Levites had possessed in earlier days were now speedily lost even as regards the study of the divine law, and much more therefore as regards that of medicine; into which competitors would crowd fin proportion to its broader and more obvious human. interest, and effectually demolish any narrowing barriers of established privilege, if such previously existed.

2. In the Interval between the Old and the New Testament.-It may be observed that the priests in their ministrations, who performed at all seasons of the year barefoot on stone pavement, and without perhaps any variation of dress to meet that of temperature, were peculiarly liable to sickness (Kall, De Morbis Sacerdotum, Hafn. 1745). Hence the permanent  appointment of a Temple physician has been supposed by some, and a certain Ben-Ahijah is mentioned by Wunderbar as occurring in the Talmud in that capacity. But it rather appears as if such an officer's appointment were precarious, and varied with the demands of the ministrants.

The book of Ecclesiasticus shows the increased regard given to the distinct study of medicine by the repeated mention of physicians, etc., which it contains, and which, as probably belonging to the period of the Ptolemies, it might be expected to show. The wisdom of prevention is recognised in Sir 18:19; perhaps also in Sir 10:10. Rank and honor are said to be the portion of the physician, and his office to be from the Lord (Sir 38:1; Sir 38:3; Sir 38:12). The repeated allusions to sickness in Sir 7:35; Sir 30:17; Sir 31:22; Sir 37:30; Sir 38:9, coupled with the former recognition of merit, have caused some to suppose that this author was himself a physician. If he was so, the power of mind and wide range of observation shown in his work would give a favorable impression of the standard of practitioners; if he was not, the great general popularity of the study and practice may be inferred from its thus becoming a common topic of general advice offered by a non-professional writer. In Wis 16:12, plaister is spoken of; anointing, as a means of healing, in Job 6:8.

3. In the New Testament. — Luke, “the beloved physician,” who practiced at Antioch while the body was his care, could hardly have failed to be conversant with all the leading opinions current down to his own time. Situated between the great schools of Alexandria and Cilicia, within easy sea-transit of both, as well as of the Western homes of science, Antioch enjoyed a more central position than any great city of the ancient world, and in it accordingly all the streams of contemporary medical learning may have probably found a point of confluence. The medicine of the New Test. is not solely, nor even chiefly, Jewish medicine; and even if it were, it is clear that the more mankind became mixed by intercourse, the more medical opinion and practice must have ceased to be exclusive. The great number of Jews resident in Rome and Greece about the Christian aera, and the successive decrees by which their banishment from the former was proclaimed, must have imported, even into Palestine, whatever from the West was best worth knowing; and we may be as sure that it's medicine and surgery expanded under these influences as that, in the writings of the. Talmudists, such obligations would be unacknowledged. But, beyond ‘this, the growth of large mercantile communities, such as existed in Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, and Ephesus. of itself involves a peculiar sanitary  condition from the mass of human elements gathered to a focus under new or abnormal circumstances. Nor are the words in which an eloquent modern writer describes the course of this action less applicable to the case of an ancient than to that of a modern metropolis. Diseases once indigenous to a section of humanity, are slowly but surely creeping up to commercial centres, whence they will be rapidly propagated. One form of Asiatic leprosy is approaching the Levant from Arabia. The history of every disease which is communicated from man to man establishes this melancholy truth, that ultimately such maladies overleap all obstacles of climate, and demonstrate a solidarity in evil as well as in good among the brotherhood of nations” (Dr. Ferguson, Pref. Essay to Gooch on Diseases of Women, New Sydenham Society, London, 1859, p. xlvi)., In proportion as this “melancholy truth” is perceived would an intercommunication of medical science prevail also.

4. In Contemporary Heathen Writers. — The medicine and surgery referred to in the New Test., then, was probably not inferior to that commonly in demand among educated Asiatic Greeks, and must have been, as regards its basis Greek medicine, and not Jewish. Hence a standard Gentile medical writer, if any is to be found of that period, would best represent the profession to which the evangelist belonged. Without absolute certainty as to date, we seem to have such a writer in Areteus, commonly called “the Cappadocian,” who wrote certainly after Nero's reign began, and probably flourished shortly before and after the decade in which Paul reached Rome and Jerusalem fell. If he were of Luke's age, it is striking that he should also be perhaps the only ancient medical authority. in favor of daemoniacal possession as a possible account of epilepsy. If his country be rightly indicated by his surname, we know that it gave him the means of intercourse with both the Jews and the Christians of the apostolic period (Act 2:9; 1Pe 1:1). It is very likely that Tarsus, the nearest place of academic repute to that region, was the scene of, at any rate, the earlier studies of Areteeus, nor would any chronological difficulty prevent his having been a pupil in medicine there when Paul and also, perhaps, Barnabas Were, as is probable, pursuing their early studies in other subjects at the same spot. Aretseus, then, assuming the date above indicated, may be taken as expounding the medical practice of the Asiatic Greeks in the latter half of the first century. There is, however, much of strongly-marked individuality in his work, more especially in the minute verbal portraiture of disease. That of pulmonary consumption in particular,  is traced with the careful description of an eye-witness, and represents with a curious exactness the curved nails, shrunken fingers, slender, sharpened nostrils, hollow, glazy eye, cadaverous look and hue; the waste of muscle and startling prominence of bones, the scapula standing ‘off like the wing of a bird; as also the habit of body marking predisposition to the malady, the thin, veneer-like frames, the limbs like pinions, the prominent throat and shallow-chest, with a remark that moist and cold climates -are the haunts of it (Αρετ. φθίσεως).

His work exhibits strong traits here and there of the ‘Pneumatic school, as in his statement regarding lethargy, that it is frigidity implanted by nature; concerning elephantiasis even more emphatically, that it is a refrigeration of the innate heat, “or, rather, a congregation as it were one great winter of the system.” The same views betray themselves in his statement regarding the blood, that it is the warming principle of all the parts; that diabetes is a sort of dropsy, both exhibiting the watery principle; and that the effect of white hellebore is as that of fire: “so that whatever fire does by burning, hellebore effects still more by penetrating inwardly.” The last remark shows that he gave some scope to his imagination, which indeed we might illustrate from some of his pathological descriptions; e.g. that of elephantiasis, where the resemblance of the beast to the afflicted human being is wrought to a fanciful parallel. Allowing for such overstrained touches here and there, we may say that he generally avoids extravagant crotchets, and rests chiefly on wide observation, and on the common-sense which sobers theory and rationalizes facts. ‘He hardly ever quotes an authority; and though much of what he states was taught before, it is dealt with as the common property of science, or as become sui juris through being proved by his own experience. The freedom with which he follows or rejects earlier opinions has occasioned him to be classed by some among the Eclectic school. His work is divided into-I, the causes and signs of (1) acute and (2) chronic diseases; and, II, the curative treatment of (1) acute and (2) chronic diseases. His boldness of treatment is exemplified in his. selection of the vein to be opened in a wide range of parts the arm, ankle, tongue, nose, etc. He first has a distinct mention of leeches, which Themison is said to have introduced; and in this respect his surgical resources appear to be in advance of Celsus. He was familiar with the operation for the stone in the bladder, and prescribes, as Celsus also does, the use of the catheter, where its insertion is not prevented by inflammation, then the incision into the neck of the bladder, nearly as in modern lithotomy.

His views of the internal economy were a strange mixture of truth and error, and the disuse  of anatomy was no doubt the reason why this was the weak point of his teaching. He held that the work of producing the blood pertained to the liver, “which is the root of the veins;” that the bile was distributed from the gall-bladder to the intestines; and, if this vesica became gorged, the bile was thrown back into the veins, and by them diffused over the system. He regarded the nerves as the source of sensation and motion; and had some notion of them as branching in pairs from the spine. Thus he has a curious statement as regards paralysis, that in the case of any sensational point below the head, e.g. from the membrane of the spinal marrow being affected injuriously, the parts on the right side will be paralyzed if the nerve towards the right side be hurt, and similarly, conversely, of the left side; but that if the head itself be so affected, the inverse law of consequence holds concerning the parts related, since each nerve passes over to the other side from that of its origin, decussating each other in the form of the letter X. The doctrine of the Pneuma, or ethereal principle existing in the microcosm by which the mind performs all the functions of the body, holds a more prominent position in the works of Aretaeus than in those of any of the other authorities (Dr. Adams's Preface to Aret. p. x, xi). He was aware that the nervous function of sensation was distinct from the motive power; that either might cease and the other continue. His pharmacopoeia is copious and reasonable, and the limits of the usefulness of this or that drug are laid down judiciously. He makes large use of wine, and prescribing the kind and the number of cyathi to be taken; and some words of his on stomach disorders (περὶ καρδιαλγίης ) forcibly recall those of Paul to Timothy (1Ti 5:23), and one might almost suppose them to have been suggested by the intenser spirituality of his Jewish or Christian patients. “Such disorders,” he says, “are common to those who toil in teaching, whose yearning is after divine instruction, who despise delicate and varied diet, whose nourishment is fasting, and whose drink is water.” As a purge of melancholy, he prescribes “ a little wine, and some other more liberal sustenance.” In his essay on causus, or “brain” fever, he describes the powers acquired by the soul before dissolution in the following remarkable words: “Every sense is pure, the intellect acute, the gnostic powers prophetic; for they prognosticate to themselves in the first place their own departure from life; then they foretell what will afterwards take place to those present, who fancy sometimes that they are delirious: but these persons wonder at the result of what has been' said. Others also talk to certain of the dead, perchance they alone perceiving them to be present, in virtue of their acute and pure sense, or perchance from their  soul seeing beforehand, and announcing the men with whom they are about to associate. For formerly they were immersed in humors, as if in mud and darkness; but when the disease has drained these off, and taken away the mist from their eyes, they perceive those things which are in the air, and, through the soul being unencumbered, become true prophets.” To those who wish further to pursue the study of medicine at this sera, the edition of Aretaeus by the Sydenham Society, and in a less degree that by Boerhaave (Lugd. Bat. 1735). to which the references have here been made, may be recommended.

As the general science of medicine and surgery of this period may be represented by Areteus, so we have nearly a representation of its Materia Medica by Dioscorides. He too was of the same general region-a Cilician Greek-and his first lessons were probably learnt at Tarsus. His period is tinged by the same uncertainty as that of Aretaeus; but he has usually been assigned to the end of the first or beginning of the second century (see Smith, Dict. of Class. Biog. s.v.). He was the first author of high mark who devoted his attention to Materia Medica. Indeed, this branch of ancient science remained as he left it till the times of the Arabians; and these, though they enlarged the supply of drugs and pharmacy, yet copy and repeat Dioscorides, as, indeed, Galen himself often does, on all common subject-matter. Above 90 minerals, 700 plants, and 168 animal substances are said to be described in the researches of Dioscorides, displaying an industry and skill which has remained the marvel of all subsequent commentators. Pliny, copious, rare, and curious as he is, yet, for want of scientific medical knowledge, is little esteemed in this particular branch, save when he follows Dioscorides. The third volume of Paulus AEgin. (ed. Sydenham Soc.) contains a catalogue of medicines simple and compound, and the large proportion in which the authority of Dioscorides has contributed to form it will be manifest at the most cursory inspection. To abridge such a subject is impossible, and to transcribe it in the most meagre form would be far beyond the limits of this article.

III. Pathology in the Bible.-Before proceeding to the examination of diseases in detail, it may be well to observe that the question of identity between any ancient malady known by description and any modern one known by experience is often doubtful. Some diseases, just as some plants and some animals, will exist almost anywhere; others can only be produced within narrow limits depending on the conditions of climate, habit, etc.-and were only equal observation applied to the two, the habitat of a disease  might be mapped as accurately as that of a plant. It is also possible that some diseases once extremely prevalent may run their course and die out, or occur only casually; just as it seems certain that, since the Middle Ages, some maladies have been introduced into Europe which were previously unknown. See Biblioth. Script. Med. (Geneva, 1731), s.v.; Hippocrates, Celsus, Galen; Leclerc's History of Medicine (Paris, 1723; transl. London, 179f); Freind's History of Medicine.

1. General Maladies. — Eruptive diseases of the acute kind are more prevalent in the East than in colder climes. They also run their course more rapidly; e.g. common itch, which in Scotland remains for a longer time vesicular, becomes, in Syria, pustular as early sometimes as the third day. The origin of it is now supposed to be an acarus, but the parasite perishes when removed from the skin. Disease of various kinds is commonly regarded as a divine infliction, or denounced as a penalty for transgression; “the evil diseases of Egypt” (perhaps in reference to some of the ten plagues) are especially so characterized (Gen 20:18; Exo 15:26; Lev 26:16; Deu 7:15; Deu 28:60; 1Co 11:30); so the emerods SEE HAEMORRHOIDS of the Philistines (1Sa 5:6) ; the severe dysentery (2Ch 21:15; 2Ch 21:19) of Jehoram, which was also epidemic SEE BLOOD, ISSUE OF; and SEE FEVER, the peculiar symptom of which may perhaps have been prolapsus ani (Dr. Mason Good, 1:311-13, mentions a case of the entire colon exposed); or, perhaps, what is known as diarrhaea tubularis, formed by the coagulation of fibrine into a membrane discharged from the inner coat of the intestines, which takes the mould of the bowel, and is thus expelled; so the sudden deaths of Er, Onan (Gen 38:7; Gen 38:10), the Egyptian first-born (Exo 11:4-5), Nabal, Bathsheba's son, and Jeroboam's (1Sa 25:38; 2Sa 12:15; 1Ki 14:1; 1Ki 14:5), are ascribed to the action of Jehovah immediately, or through a prophet. Pestilence (Hab 3:5) attends his path (comp. 2Sa 24:15), and is innoxious to those whom he shelters (Psa 91:3-10).

It is by Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Amos associated (as historically in 2Sa 24:13) with “the sword” and “famine” (Jer 14:12; Jer 15:2; Jer 21:7; Jer 21:9; Jer 24:10; Jer 27:8; Jer 27:13; Jer 28:8; Jer 29:17-18; Jer 32:24; Jer 32:36; Jer 34:17; Jer 38:2; Jer 42:17; Jer 42:22; Jer 44:13; Eze 5:12; Eze 5:17; Eze 6:11-12; Eze 7:15; Eze 12:16; Eze 14:21; Eze 33:27; Amo 4:6; Amo 4:10). The sicknesses of the widow's son of Zarephath, of Ahaziah, Benhadad, the leprosy of Uzziah, the boil of Hezekiah, are also noticed as diseases sent-by Jehovah, or in which he interposed (1Ki 17:17; 1Ki 17:20; 1 Kings 2  Kings 1:3; 20:1). In 2Sa 3:29, disease is invoked as a curse, and in Solomon's prayer (1Ki 8:37; comp. 2Ch 20:9) anticipated as a chastisement. Job and his friends agree in ascribing his disease to divine infliction; but the latter urge his sins as the cause. So, conversely, the healing character of God ‘is invoked or promised (Psa 6:2; Psa 41:3; Psa 103:3; Jer 30:17). Satanic agency appears also as procuring disease (Job 2:7; Luk 13:11; Luk 13:16). Diseases are also mentioned as ordinary calamities; e.g. the sickness of old age, headache (perhaps by sunstroke), as that of the Shunammite's son, that of Elisha, and that of Benhadad, and that of Joram (Gen 48:1; 1Sa 30:13; 2Ki 4:20; 2Ki 8:27; 2Ki 8:29; 2Ki 13:14; 2Ch 22:6).

2. Among special diseases mentioned in the Old Test. are, ophthalmia (Gen 29:17, מְכִלּוֹת עֵנִיַם)., which is perhaps more common in Syria and Egypt than anywhere else in the world, especially in the fig season, the juice of the newly-ripe fruit having the power of giving it. It may occasion partial or total blindness (2Ki 6:18). The eye-salve (κολλύριον, Rev 3:18; Hor. Sat. i) was a remedy common to Orientals, Greeks, and Romans (see Hippocr. κολλούριον ; Celsus, 6:8, De oculorum morbis, [2] De diversis collyriis). Other diseases are- barrenness of women, which mandrakes were supposed to have the power of correcting (Gen 20:18; comp. 12:17; 30:1, 2, 14-16); “consumption,” and several, the names of which are derived from various words, signifying to burn or to be hot (Lev 26:16; Deu 28:22) SEE FEVER; compare the kinds of fever distinguished by Hippocrates as καῦσος and πῦρ.

The “burning boil,” or “of a boil” (Lev 13:23, הִשְּׁחַין צָרֶבֶת, Sept. οὐλὴ τοῦ ἕλκους), is again merely marked by the notion of an effect resembling -that of fire, like the Greek φλεγμονή, or our “carbuncle;” it may possibly find an equivalent in the Damascus boil of the present time. The “botch (שְׁחַין) of Egypt” (Deu 28:27) is so vague a term as to yield a. most uncertain sense; the plague, as known by its attendant bubo, has been suggested-by Scheuchzer. It is possible that the Elephantiasis Graecorum may be intended by שְׁחַין, understood in the widest sense of a continued ulceration until the whole body, or the portion affected, may be regarded as one שְׁחַין.

Of this disease some further notice will be taken below; at present it is observable that the same word is used to express the “boil” of Hezekiah. This was certainly a single locally-confined eruption, and was  probably a carbuncle, one of which may well be fatal, though a single “boil” in our sense of the word seldom is so. Dr. Mead supposes it to have been a fever terminating in an abscess. The diseases rendered “scab” and “scurvy” in Lev 21:20; Lev 22:22; Deu 28:27, may be almost any skin-disease, such as those known under the names of lepra, psoriaris, pityriasis, icthyosis, favus, or common itch. Some of these may be said to approach the type of leprosy as laid down in Scripture, although they do not appear to have involved ceremonial defilement, but only a blemish disqualifying for the priestly office. The quality of ‘being incurable is added as a special curse, for these diseases are not generally so, or at any rate are common in milder forms., The “running of the reins” (Lev 15:2-3; Lev 22:4, marg.) may perhaps mean gonorrhoea, or more probably blennorrhcea (mucous discharge). If we compare Num 25:1; Num 31:7, with Jos 22:17, there is ground for thinking that some disease of this class 'derived from polluting sexual intercourse, remained among the people.

The existence of gonorrhoea in early times -save in the mild form- has been much disputed. Michel Levy (Traiti d'Hygine, p. 7) considers the affirmative as established by the above passage, and says of syphilis, “Que pour notre part, nous n'avons jamais pu considerer comme une nouveaute du xve siecle.” He certainly gives some strong historical evidence against the view that it was introduced into France by Spanish troops under Gonzalvo de Cordova'on their return from the New World, and so into the rest of Europe, where it was ‘known as the morbus Gallicus. He adds, “La syphilis est perdue confusdment dans la pathologie ancienne par. la diversite de ses symptomes et de ses altdrations; leur interpretation collective, et leur redaction en une seule unite morbide, a fait croire a l'introduction d'une maladie nouvelle.” See also Freind's History of Med., Dr. Mead, Michaelis, Reinhart (Bibelkrankheiten), Schmidt (Biblisch. Med.), and others. Wunderbar (BibTalm. Med. 3:20, commenting on Leviticus 15, and comparing Mishna, Zabim. 2:2, and Maimonides, ad loc.) thinks that gonorrhoea benigna was in the mind of the latter writers. Dr. Adams, the editor of Paul. AEgin. (Sydenh. Soc. 2:14), considers syphilis a modified form of elephantiasis. For all ancient notices of the cognate diseases, see that work, 1:593 sq. The “issue” of 15:19, may be the menorrhagia, the duration of which in the East is sometimes, when not checked by remedies, for an indefinite period (Mat 9:20), or uterine hemorrhage from other causes.  In Deu 28:35 is mentioned a disease attacking the “knees and legs,” consisting in a “ sore botch which cannot be healed,” but extended, in the sequel of the verse, from the “sole of the foot to the top of the head.” The latter part of the quotation would certainly accord with Elephantiasis Graecorum; but this, if the whole verse be a mere continuation of one described malady, would be in contradiction to the fact that this disease commences in the face, not in the lower members. On the other hand, a disease which affects the knees and legs, or more commonly one of them only-its principal feature being intumescence, distorting and altering all the proportions — is by a mere accident of language known as Elephantiasis Arabum, Bucnemia Tropica (Rayer, 3:820-841), or “Barbadoes leg,” from being well known in that island. Supposing, however, that the affection of the knees and legs is something distinct, and that the latter part ‘of the description applies to the Elephantiasis Graecorum, the incurable and all-pervading character of the malady are well expressed by it. This disease is what now passes under the name of “ leprosy” (Michaelis, 3:259)-the lepers, e.g. of the huts near the Zion gate of modern Jerusalem are elephantiacs. It has been asserted that there are two kinds, one painful, the other painless; but, as regards Syria and the East, this is contradicted. There the parts affected are quite benumbed and lose sensation. It is classed as a tubercular disease, not confined to the skin, but pervading the tissues and destroying the bones. It is not confined to any age or either sex. It first appears in general, but not always, about the face, as an indurated nodule (hence it is improperly called tubercular), which gradually enlarges, inflames, and ulcerates. Sometimes it commences in the neck or arms.

The ulcers will heal spontaneously, but only after a long period, and after destroying a great deal of the neighboring parts. If a joint be attacked, the ulceration will go on till its destruction is complete, the joints of finger, toe, etc., dropping off one by one. Frightful dreams and fetid breath are symptoms mentioned by some pathologists. More nodules will develop themselves, and, if the face be the chief seat of the disease, it assumes a leonine aspect (hence called also Leontiasis), loathsome and hideous; the skin becomes thick, rugose, and livid; the eyes are fierce and staring, and the hair generally falls off from all the parts affected. When the throat is attacked the voice shares the affection, and sinks to a hoarse, husky whisper. These two symptoms are eminently characteristic. The patient will become bed-ridden, and, though a mass of bodily corruption, seems happy and contented with his sad condition, until, sinking exhausted under the ravages of the disease, he is generally carried off, at least in  Syria, by diarrhoea. It is hereditary, and may be inoculated, but does not propagate itself by the closest contact; e.g. two women in the aforesaid leper-huts remained uncontaminated though their husbands were both affected, and yet the children born to them were, like the fathers, elephantisiac, and became so in early life. On the children of diseased parents a watch for the appearance of the malady is kept; but no; one is afraid of infection, and the neighbors mix freely with them, though, like the lepers of the Old Test., they live “ in a several house.” Many have attributed to these wretched creatures a libido inexplebilis (see Proceedings of Med. and Chirurg. Soc. of London, Jan. 1860, 3:164, fromwhich some of the above remarks are taken). This is denied by Dr. Robert Sim (from a close study of the disease in Jerusalem), save insd' far ‘as idleness and inactivity, with animal wants supplied, may conduce to it. It became first prevalent in Europe during the crusades, and by their means was diffused, and the ambiguity of designating it leprosy then originated, and has been generally since retained. Pliny (Nat. Hist. xxvi, 5) asserts that it was unknown in Italy till the time of Pompey the Great, when it was imported from Egypt, but soon became extinct (Paul. AEgin. ed. Sydenh. Soc. 2:6). It is, however, broadly distinguished from the λέπρα, λεύκη etc. of the Greeks by name and symptoms, no less than by Roman medical and even popular writers; comp. Lucretius, whose mention of it' is the earliest —

   ”Est elephas morbus,

   qui propter flumina Nili,

   Gignitur AEgypto in media,

   neque piretelrea usquam.”

It is nearly extinct in Europe, save in Spain and Norway. A case was seen lately in the Crimea, but may have been produced elsewhere. It prevails in Turkey and the Greek Archipelago. One case, however, indigenous in England, is recorded among the medical facsimiles at Guy's Hospital. In Granada it was generally fatal after eight or ten years, whatever the treatment. This favors the correspondence of this disease with one of those evil diseases of Egypt, possibly its botch,” threatened in Deu 33:27. This “botch,” however, seems more probably to mean ‘the foul ulcer mentioned by Areteus (De Sign. et Caus. Maor. Acut.i, 9), and called by him ἄφθα or ἐσχάρη. He ascribes its frequency in Egypt to the mixed vegetable diet there followed, and to the use of the turbid water of the Nil:' but adds that it is common in Coele-Syria.' The Talmud speaks of the elephantiasis (Baba Kama, 80 b) as being “moist without and dry within” (Wunlderbar, Biblisch-Talmudische Med. Mes Heft, 10, 11). ‘ Advanced  cases are said to have: a cancerous aspect, and some even class it as a form of cancer; a disease dependent on faults of nutrition;

It has been asserted that this, which is perhaps the most dreadful disease of the East, was Job's malady. Origen, Hexapla on Job 2:7, mentions that one of the :Greek versions gives it, loc. cit., as the affliction which befel him. Wunderbar (ut sup. p. 10)'supposes it to have been the Tyrian leprosy, resting chiefly on the itching implied, as he:-supposes, by Job 2:7-8. Schmidt (Biblischer Med. 4:4) thinks the “sore boil” may indicate some graver disease, or complication of diseases. But there is no need to go beyond the statement of Scripture, which speaks not only of this “boil,” but of “kin loathsome and broken,” “covered with worms and clods of dust;” the second symptom is the result of the ‘first' and the “worms” are probably the larvae of some fly, known so to infest and make its nidus in any wound or sore exposed to the air, and to increase rapidly in'size. The “clods of dust” would of course follow from his “ sitting in ashes.” The “breath strange to his wife,” if it be not a figurative expression for her estrangement from him, may imply a fetor, which in such a state of body hardly requires explanation. The expression my “ bowels boiled” (Job 30:27) may refer to the burning sensation in the stomach and bowels, caused by acrid bile, which is common in ague. - Aretaeus (De Cur. Morb. Acut. 2:3) has a similar expression, θερμασίη τῶν σπλάγχνων οἵον ἀπὸ πυρός, as attending syncope. The “scaring dreams” and “terrifying visions” are perhaps a mere symptom of the state of mind bewildered by unaccountable afflictions. The intense emaciation was (Job 33:21) perhaps the mere result of protracted sickness.

The disease of king Antiochus (2Ma 9:5-10, etc.) is that of a boil breeding worms (ulcus verminosunz). So Sulla, Pherecydes, and Alcman, the' poet, are mentioned (Plut. Vita Sullae) as similar cases. The examples of both the Herods (Josephus, Ant. 17:6,5;; War, 1:33, 5) may also be adduced, as-that of Pheretime (Herod. 4:205). There is some doubt :whether this disease ‘be not allied to phthiriasis, in which lice are bred, and cause ulcers. This condition may originate either in a' sore, :or in a morbid habit of body brought on by uncleanliness, suppressed perspiration, or neglect; but the vermination, if it did not commence in a sore, would - produce one. ‘Dr. Mason Good (iv. 504-6), speaking of μάλις, μαλιασμός =cutaneous vermination, mentions a case in the Westminster Infirmary, and an opinion that universal phythiriasis was no unfrequent disease among the ancients; he also states (p. 500) that in gangrenous  ulcers, especially in warm climates, innumerable grubs or maggots will appear almost every morning. The camel and other creatures, are known to be the habitat of similar parasites.” There are also cases of vermination without any wound or faulty outward state, such as the Vena :Medinensis, known in Africa as the “Guinea worm,” of which Galen had heard only, breeding under the skin, and needing to be drawn out carefully by a needle, lest it break, when great soreness and suppuration succeed (Freind, Hist. of Med. i,'49; De Mandelslo's Travels, p.-4; and Paul. AEgin. t. iv, ed. Sydenh. Soc.). Rayer (iii. 808-819) gives a list of parasites, most of them in the skin. This “Guinea-worm,” it appears, is also found in Arabia Petraea, on the coasts of the Caspian and Persian Gulf, on the Ganges, in Upper Egypt and Abyssinia (ib. 814). Dr. Mead refers Herod's disease to ἐντοζῶα, or intestinal worms. Shapter, without due foundation, objects that the word in that case should have been not σκώληξ, but εὐλή (Medica Sacra, p. 188).

In Deu 28:65 it is possible that a palpitation of the heart is intended to be spoken of (comp. Gen 45:26). In Mar 9:17 : (comp. Luk 9:38) we have an apparent case of epilepsy, shown especially in the foaming, falling, wallowing, and similar violent symptoms mentioned; this might easily be a form of demoniacal manifestation. The case of extreme hunger recorded in 1 Samuel 14 was merely the result of exhaustive fatigue; but it is remarkable that the bulimia of which Xenophon speaks (Anab. iv 5, 7); was remedied by an application in which “honey” (compr.; 1Sa 14:27) was the chief ingredient.

Besides the common injuries of wounding, bruising, striking out eye, tooth, etc., we have in Exo 21:22 the case of miscarriage produced by a blow, push, etc., damaging the foetus.

The plague of “boils and blains” is not said to have been fatal to man, as the murrain preceding was to cattle; this alone would seem to contradict the notion of Shapter (Medica Sacra, p. 113), that the disorder in question was small-pox, which, wherever it has appeared, until mitigated by vaccination, has been fatal to a great part perhaps a majority of those seized. The small-pox also generally takes some days to :pronounce and mature, which seems opposed to the Mosaic account. The expression of Exo 9:10, a “boil” flourishing, or ebullient with blains, may perhaps be a disease analogous to phlegmonous erysipelas, or even common erysipelas, which is often accompanied by vesications such as the word  “blains” might fitly describe. This is Dr. Robert Sim's opinion. On comparing, however, the means used to produce the disorder (Exo 9:8), an analogy is perceptible to what is called “bricklayer's itch,” and therefore to leprosy. A disease involving a white spot breaking forth from a boil related to leprosy, and clean or unclean according to symptoms specified, occurs under the general locus of leprosy (Lev 13:18-23).

The “withered hand” of Jeroboam (1Ki 13:4-6), and of the man (Mat 12:10-13; comp. Luk 6:10), is such an effect as is known to follow from the obliteration of the main artery of any member, or from paralysis of the principal nerve, either through disease or through injury. A case with a symptom exactly parallel to that of Jeroboam is mentioned in the life of Gabriel, an Arab physician. It was that of a woman whose band had become rigid in the act of swinging, and remained in the extended posture. The most remarkable feature in the case, as related, is the remedy, which consisted in alarm acting on the nerves, inducing a sudden and spontaneous effort to use the limb-an effort which, like that of the dumb son of Croesus (Herod. 1:85), was paradoxically successful. The case of the widow's son restored by Elisha (2Ki 4:19), was probably one of sunstroke. The disease of Asa” in his feet” (Schmidt, Biblischer Med. 3:5, 2), which attacked him in his old age (1Ki 15:23; 2Ch 16:12), and became exceeding great, may have been either adema, dropsy, or podagra, gout. The former is common in aged persons, in whom, owing to the difficulty of the return upwards of the sluggish blood, its watery part stays in the feet. The latter, though rare in the East at present, is mentioned by the Talmudists (Sotah, 10 a, and Sanhedrin, 48 b), and there is no reason why it may not have been known in Asa's time. It occurs in Hippocr. Aphor. vi, Prognost. 15; Celsus, 4:24; Aretseus, Morb. Chron. 2:12, and other ancient writers.

In 1Ma 6:8, occurs a mention of “sickness of grief;” in Sir 37:30, of sickness caused by excess, which require only a passing mention. The disease of Nebuchadnezzar has been viewed by Jahn as a mental and purely subjective malady. It is not easy to see how this satisfies the plain, emphatic statement of Dan 4:33, which seems to include, it is true, mental derangement, but to assert a degraded bodily state to some extent, and a corresponding change of habits. The “eagles' feathers” and “birds' claws” are probably used only in illustration, not necessarily as describing a new type to which the hair, etc., approximated. (Comp. the simile of Psa 103:5, and that of 2Ki 5:14.) We may regard it as Mead (Med. Sacr. vol. vii), following Burton's Anatomy of Melancholy, does, as a species of -the melancholy known as Lycanthropia (Paulus JEgin. 3:16; Avicenha, 3:1, 5, 22). Persons so affected wander like wolves in sepulchres by night, and imitate the howling of a wolf or a dog. Further, there are well-attested accounts of wild or half-wild human creatures, of. either sex, who have lived as beasts, losing human consciousness, and acquiring a superhuman ferocity, activity, and swiftness. Either the lycanthropic patients or these latter may furnish a partial analogy to Nebuchadnezzar in regard to the various points of modified outward appearance and habits ascribed to him. Nor would it seem impossible that a sustained lycanthropia might produce this latter condition.

Here should be noticed the mental malady of Saul. His melancholy seems to have had its origin in his sin; it was therefore grounded in his moral nature, but extended its effects, as commonly, to the intellectual. The “evil spirit from God,” whatever it mean, was no part of the medical features of his case, and may therefore be excluded from the present notice. Music, which soothed him for a while, has entered largely into the milder modern treatment of lunacy.

The palsy meets us in the New Test. only, and in features too familiar to need special remark. The words “grievously tormented” (Mat 8:6) have been commented on by Baier (De Paral. p. 32), to the effect that examples of acutely painful paralysis are not wanting in modern pathology, e.g. when paralysis is complicated with neuralgia. But if this statement be viewed with doubt, we might understand the Greek expression (βασανιζόμενος) as used of paralysis agitans, or even of chorea (StVitus's dance), in both of which the patient, being never still for a moment save when asleep, might well be so described. The woman's case who was “bowed together” by “ a spirit of infirmity” may probably have. been paralytic (Luk 13:11). If the dorsal muscles were affected, those of the chest and abdomen, from want of resistance, would undergo contraction, and thus cause the patient to suffer as described.

Gangrene (γάγγραινα, Celsus, 7:33, de gangrena), or mortification in its various forms, is a totally different disorder from the “canker” of the AV. in 2Ti 2:17. Both gangrene and cancer were common in all the countries familiar to the scriptural writers, and neither differs from the  modern disease of the same name (Dr. M. Good, 2:669, etc., and 579, etc.).

In Isa 26:18; Psa 7:14, there seems an allusion to false conception, in which, though attended by pains of quasi-labor and other ordinary symptoms, the womb has been found unimpregnated, and no delivery has followed. The medical term (Dr. M. Good, 4:188) ἐμπνευμάτωσις, mola ventosa, suggests the scriptural language, “We have, as it were, brought forth wind ;” the whole passage is figurative for disappointment after great effort.

Poison, as a means of destroying life, hardly occurs in the Bible, save as applied to arrows (Job 6:4). In Zec 12:2, the marg. gives “ poison” as an alternative rendering, which does not seem preferable, intoxication being probably meant. In the annals of the Herods poisons occur as the resource of stealthy murder.

The bite or sting of venomous beasts can hardly be treated as a disease, but in connection with the “fiery (i.e. venomous) serpents” of Num 21:6, and the deliverance from death of those bitten, it deserves a notice. Even the Talmud acknowledges that the healing power lay not in the brazen serpent itself, but “ as soon as they feared the Most High, and uplifted their hearts to their heavenly Father, they were healed, and in default of this were brought to naught.” Thus the brazen figure was symbolized only; or, according to the lovers of purely natural explanation, was the stage-trick to cover a false miracle. It was customary to consecrate the image of the affliction, either in its cause or in its effect, as in the golden emerods, golden mice, of 1Sa 6:4; 1Sa 6:8, and in the ex-votos common in Egypt even before the exodus; and these may be compared with the setting up of the brazen serpent. Thus we have in-it only an instance of the current custom, fanciful or superst tious, being sublimed to a higher purpose. The bite of a white she-mule, perhaps in the rutting season, is, according to the Talmudists, fatal; and they also mention that of a mad dog, with certain symptoms by which to discern his state (Wunderbar, ut sup. p. 21). The scorpion and centipede are natives of the Levant (Rev 9:5; Rev 9:10), and, with a large variety of serpents, swarm there. To these, according to Lichtenstein, should be added a venomous solpuga, or large spider, similar to the Calabrian tarantula; but the passage in Pliny adduced (H. N. 29:29) gives no satisfactory ground for the theory based upon it, that its bite was the cause of the emerods. It is, however,  remarkable that Pliny mentions with some fulness a mus araneus-not a spider resembling a mouse, but a mouse resembling a spider-the shrewmouse, and called araneus, Isidore says from this resemblance, or from ifs eating spiders. Its bite was venomous, caused mortification of the part, and a spreading ulcer attended with inward griping pains, and when crushed on the wound it was its own best antidote. SEE DISEASE.

The disease of old age has acquired a place in Biblical nosology chiefly. owing. to the elegant allegory into which “.The Preacher” throws the succeeding tokens of the ravage of time on man (Ecclesiastes 12). The symptoms enumerated have. each their. significance for the physician;: for, though his art can do little to arrest them, they yet mark an altered condition calling for a treatment of its own. “The Preacher” divides the sum of human existence into that period which involves every mode of growth, and that which involves every mode of decline. The first reaches from the point of birth or even of generation, onwards to the attainment of the “grand climacteric,” and the second from that epoch backwards through a corresponding period of decline till the point of dissolution is reached. These are respectively called the ימי העַליהand the ימי העמידהof the rabbins (Wunderbar, 2tes. Heft). This latter course is marked in metaphor by the darkening of the great lights of nature, and the ensuing season of life is compared to the broken weather of the wet season, setting in when summer is gone, when after every shower fresh clouds are in the sky, as contrasted with the showers of other seasons, which pass away into clearness. Such he means are the ailments and troubles of declining age, as compared with those of advancing life. The “keepers of the house” are perhaps the ribs which support the frame, or the arms and shoulders which enwrap and protect it. Their “trembling,” especially that of the arms, etc., is a sure sign of vigor past. The “strong men” are its supporters, the lowerlimbs bowing themselves” under the weight they once so lightly bore. The “grinding” hardly needs to be explained of the teeth, now become “few.” The “lookers from the windows” are the pupils of the eyes, now “darkened,” as Isaac's were, and Eli's; and Moses, though spared: the dimness, was yet in that very exemption a marvel (Genesis 27; comp. 48:10; 1Sa 4:15; Deu 34:7). The “ doors shut” represent the dulness of those other senses which are the portals of knowledge; thus the taste and smell, as in the case of Barzillai, became impaired, and the ears stopped against sound. The “rising up at the voice of  a bird” portrays the light, soon-fleeting, easily broken slumber of the aged man; or rather “to the voice of the bird,” i.e. the high key, the

— “big, manly voice

Now turn'd again to childish treble.”

The “daughters of music brought low” suggest the cracked voice of age, or, as illustrated again by Barzillai, the failure in the discernment and the utterance of musical notes. The fears of old age are next noticed: “They shall be afraid of that which is high ;” an obscure expression, perhaps, for what are popularly called “nervous” terrors, exaggerating and magnifying every object of alarm, and “making,” as the saying is, “mountains of mole- hills.” Or, even more simply, these words may be understood as meaning that old men have neither vigor nor breath for going up hills, mountains, or anything else that is “high” nay, for them the plain, even the road has its terrors-they walk timidly and cautiously even. along that. “Fear in the way” is at first less obvious; but we observe that nothing unnerves and agitates an old person more than the prospect of a long journey. Thus regarded, it becomes a fine and subtile touch in the description of decrepitude. All readiness to haste is arrested, and a numb despondency succeeds. The “flourishing” of the “almond-tree” is still more obscure; but we observe this tree in Palestine blossoming when others show no sign of vegetation, and when it is dead winter all around-no ill type, perhaps, of the old man who has survived his own contemporaries and many of his juniors. Youthful zest dies out, and their strength, of which “the grasshopper'? is probably a figure, is relaxed. The “silver cord” has been thought to be that of nervous sensation, or motion, or even the spinal marrow itself. Possibly some incapacity of retention may be signified by the “ golden bowl broken;” the “ pitcher broken at the well” suggests the vital supply stopping at the usual source — derangement perhaps of the digestion or of the respiration; the “wheel shivered at the cistern” has been imagined to convey, through the image of the water-lifting process familiar in irrigation, the notion of the blood, pumped, as it were, through the vessels, and fertilizing the whole system; for “the blood is the life.”

IV. Hebrew Therapeutics. — This careful register of the tokens of decline might lead us to expect great care for the preservation of health and strength; and this indeed is found to mark the Mosaic system, in the regulations concerning diet, the “divers washings,” and the pollution imputed to a corpse-nay, even in circumcision itself. These served not only  the ceremonial purpose of imparting self-consciousness to the Hebrew, and keeping him distinct from alien admixture, but had a sanitary aspect of rare wisdom, when we regard the country, the climate, and the age. The laws of diet had the effect of tempering, by a just admixture of the organic substances of the animal and vegetable kingdoms, the regimen of Hebrew families, and thus providing for the vigor of future ages, as well as checking the stimulus which the predominant use of animal food gives to the passions. To these effects may be ascribed the immunity often enjoyed by the Hebrew race amid epidemics devastating the countries of their sojourn. The best and often the sole possible exercise of medicine is to prevent disease. Moses could not legislate for cure, but his rules did for the great mass of the people what no therapeutics, however consummate, could do-they gave the best security for the public health by provisions incorporated in the public economy. Whether we regard the laws which secluded the leper as designed to prevent infection or repress the dread of it, their wisdom is nearly equal, for of all terrors the imaginary are the most terrible. The laws restricting marriage have in general a similar tendency, degeneracy being the penalty of a departure from those which forbid commixture of near kin. Michel Ldvy remarks on the salubrious tendency of the law of marital separation (Leviticus 15) imposed (Levy, Traite de, Hygiene, p. 8).

The precept also concerning purity on the necessary occasions in a desert encampment (Dent. 23:12-14), enjoining the return of the elements of productiveness to the soil, would probably become the basis of the municipal regulations having for their object a similar purity in towns. The consequences of its neglect in such encampments is shown by an example quoted by Michel Levy, as mentioned by M. de Lamartine (ib. 8, 9). Length of life was regarded as a mark of divine favor, and the divine legislator had pointed out the means of ordinarily insuring a fuller measure of it. to the people at large than could, according to physical laws, otherwise be hoped for. Perhaps the extraordinary means taken to-prolong vitality may be' referred to this source (1Ki 1:2), and there is no reason why the case of David should be deemed a singular one. We may also compare the apparent influence of vital warmth enhanced to a miraculous degree, but having, perhaps, a physical law as its basis, in the cases of Elijah, Elisha, and the sons of the widow of Zarephath, and the Shunammite. Wunderbar has collected several examples of such influence similarly exerted, which, however, he seems to exaggerate to an absurd pitch. Yet it would seem not against analogy to suppose that, as pernicious exhalations, miasmata, etc., may pass from the sick and affect the healthy,  so there should be a reciprocal action in favor of health. The climate of Palestine afforded a great range, of temperature within a narrow compass- e.g. a long sea coast, a long, deep valley (that of the Jordan), a broad, flat; plain (Esdraelon), a large portion of table-land (Judah and Ephraim), and the higher elevations of Carmel, Tabor, the lesser and greater Hermon, etc. Thus it partakes of nearly all supportable climates. In October its rainy reason begins with moist westerly winds.

In November the trees are bare. In December snow and ice are often found, but never lie long, and only during the north wind's prevalence. The cold disappears at the end of February, and the “latter rain” sets in, lasting through March to the middle of April, when thunder-storms apt common, torrents swell, and the heat rises in the low grounds. At the end of April the hot season begins, but preserves moderation till June, thence till September becomes extreme; and during all this period rain seldom occurs, but often heavy dews prevail. In September it commences to be cool, first at night, and sometimes the rain begins to fall at the end of it. The migration with the season from an inland to a sea-coast position, from low to high ground, etc., was a point of social development never systematically reached during the scriptural history of Palestine. But men inhabiting the same regions for centuries could hardly fail to notice the connection between the air and moisture of a place and human health, and those favored by circumstances would certainly turn their knowledge to account. The Talmudists speak of the north wind as preservative of life, and the south and east winds as exhaustive, but the south as the most insupportable of all, coming hot and dry from the deserts, producing abortion, tainting the babe yet unborn, and corroding the pearls in the sea. Further, they dissuade from performing circumcision or venesection during its prevalence (Jebamoth, 72 a, ap Wunderbar, 2tes Heft, vol. ii, A). It is stated that “the marriage-bed placed. between north and south will be blessed with male issue” (Berachoih, 15, ib.), which may, Wunderbar thinks, be interpreted of the temperature when moderate, and in neither extreme (which these winds respectively represent), as most favoring fecundity. If the fact be so, it is more probably related to the phenomena of magnetism, in connection with which the same theory has been lately revived. A number of precepts are given by the same authorities in reference to health; e.g. eating slowly, not contracting a sedentary habit, regularity in natural operations, cheerfulness of temperament, due sleep (especially early morning sleep is recommended), but not somnolence by day (Wunderbar, ut sup.). We may mention likewise in this connection that possession of an abundance of salt tended to banish much disease  (Psa 60:2; 2Sa 8:13; 1Ch 18:12). Salt-pits (Zep 2:9) are still dug by the Arabs on the shore of the Dead Sea. For the use of salt to a new-born infant, Eze 16:4; comp. Galen, De Sanit. lib. i, cap. 7.

The rite of circumcision, besides its special surgical operation, deserves some notice in connection with the general question of the health, longevity, and fecundity of the race with whose history it is identified. Besides being a mark of the covenant and a symbol of purity, it was perhaps also a protest against the phallus-worship, which has a remote antiquity in the corruption of mankind, and of which we have some trace in the Egyptian myth of Osiris. It has been asserted also (Wunderbar, 3tes Heft, p. 25) that it distinctly contributed to increase the fruitfulness of the race, and to check inordinate desires in the individual. Its beneficial effects in such a climate as that of Egypt and Syria, as tending to promote cleanliness, to prevent or reduce irritation, and thereby to stop the way against various disorders, have been. the subject of comment to various writers on hygiene. In particular a troublesome and sometimes fatal kind of boil (phymosis and paraphymosis) is mentioned as occurring commonly in those regions, but only to the uncircumcised. It is stated by Josephus (Cont. Rev 2:13) that Apion, against whom he wrote, having at first derided circumcision, was circumcised of necessity by reason of such a boil, of which, after suffering great pain, he died. Philo also appears to speak of the same benefit wen he speaks of the “anthrax” infesting those who retain the foreskin. Medical authorities have also stated that the capacity of imbibing syphilitic virus is less, and that this has been proved experimentally by comparing Jewish with other, e.g. Christian populations (Wunderbar, 3tes Heft, p. 27). The operation itself consisted of originally a mere incision, to which a further stripping off the skin from the part, and a custom of sucking the blood from the wound, was in a later period added, owing to the attempts of Jews of the Maccabaean period, and later (1Ma 1:15; Josephus, Ant. 12:5,1: comp. 1Co 7:8), to cultivate heathen practices. The reduction of the remaining portion of the praeputium after the more simple operation, so as to cover what it ‘had exposed, known as epispasmus, accomplished by the elasticity of the skin itself, was what this anti-Judaic practice sought to effect, and what the later, more complicated and severe, operation. frustrated. To these were subjoined the use of the warm-bath, before and after the operation, pounded cummin as a styptic, and a mixture of wine and oil to heal the  wound. It is remarkable that the tightly-swathed rollers, which formed the first covering of the new-born child (Luk 2:7), are still retained among modern Jews at the circumcision of a child, effectually preventing any movement of the body or limbs (Wunderbar, p. 29). SEE CIRCUMCISION.

No surgical operation beyond this finds a place in holy Scripture, unless, indeed, that adverted to under the article SEE EUNUCH. The Talmudists speak of two operations to assist birth, one known as קריעת הדופן (gastrotomia), and intended to assist parturition, not necessarily fatal to the mother; the other known as קריעת הבמן (hysterotomia, sectio caesarea), which was seldom practiced save in the case of death in the crisis of labor, or, if attempted on the living, was either fatal, or at least destructive of the powers of maternity. An operation is also mentioned by the same authorities having for its object the extraction piecemeal of an otherwise inextricable foetus (ibid. p. 53, etc.).

Wunderbar enumerates from the Mishna and Talmud fifty-six surgical instruments or pieces of apparatus;: of these, however, the following only are at all alluded td in Scripture. A cutting instrument, called ציר, supposed to be a “sharp stone” (Exo 4:25). Such was probably the “,Ethiopian stone” mentioned by Herodotus (2, 86), and Pliny speaks of what he calls Testa samia, as a similar implement. Zipporah seems to have caught up the first instrument which came to hand in her apprehension for the life of her husband. The “knife” (מאכלת) of Jos 5:2 was probably a more refined instrument for the same purpose. An “awl” (מרצע) is mentioned (Exo 21:6) as used to bore through the ear of the bondman who refused release. and is supposed to have been a surgical instrument. A seat of delivery; called in Scripture אבנים, Exo 1:16, by the Talmudists משבי (comp. 2Ki 19:3), “the stools;” but some have doubted whether the word Used by Moses does not mean rather the uterus itself, as that which moulds and shapes the infant.

Delivery upon a seat or stool is, however, a common practice in France at this day, and also in Palestine. The' “roller to bind” of Eze 30:21 was for a broken limb, as still used. Similar bands, wound with the most precise accuracy, involve the mummies. A scraper (חרס), for which the “potsherd” of Job was a substitute (Job 2:8).  Exo 30:23-25 is a prescription in form. It may be worth while also to enumerate the leading substances which, according to Wunderbar, composed the pharmacopeia of the Talmudists-a much more limited one which will afford some insight into the distance which separates them from the leaders of Greek medicine. Besides such ordinary appliances as water, wine (Luk 10:34), beer, vinegar, honey, and milk, various oils are found; as opobalsamim (“ balm of Gilead”), the oil of olive, myrrh, rose, palma christi, walnut, sesamum, colocynth, and fish; figs (2Ki 20:7), dates, apples (Son 2:5), pomegranates, pistachio-nuts, and almonds (a produce of Syria, but not of Egypt, Gen 43:11); wheat, barley, and various other grains; garlic, leeks, onions, and some other common herbs; mustard, pepper, coriander seed, ginger, preparations of beet, fish, etc., steeped in wine or vinegar, whey, eggs, salt, wax, and suet (in plasters), gall of fish (Tob 6:8; Tob 11:11), ashes, cow dung, etc.; fasting- saliva, urine, bat's blood, and the following rarer herbs, etc.; ammesision, menta gentilis, saffron, mandragora, Lawsonia spinosa (Arab. alhenna), juniper, broom, poppy, acacia, pine, lavender or rosemary, cloverroot, jujub, hyssop, fern, sampsuchum, milk-thistle, laurel, Eruca muralis, absynth,jasmine, narcissus, madder, curled mint, fennel, endive, oil of cotton, myrtle, myrrh, aloes, sweet cane (acorus calamus), cinnamon, canella alba, cassia, ladanum, galbanum, frankincense, storax nard, gum of various trees, musk, blatta byzantina; and these minerals-bitumen, natrum, borax, alum, clay. aetites, quicksilver, litharge, yellow arsenic. The following preparations were also well known: Theriacas, an antidote prepared from serpents; various medicinal drinks, e.g. from the fruit- bearing rosemary; decoction of wine. with vegetables; mixture of wine, holiey, and pepper; of oil, wine, and water; of asparagus and other roots steeped in wine; emetics, purging draughts, soporifics, potions to produce abortion or fruitfulness; and various salves, some used cosmetically, e.g. to remove hair; some for wounds and other injuries. The forms of medicaments were cataplasm, electuary, liniment. plaster (Isa 1:6; Jer 8:22; Jer 46:11; Jer 51:8; Josephus, War, 1:33,5), powder, infusion, decoction, essence, syrup, mixture.

An occasional trace occurs of some chemical knowledge, e.g. the calcination of the gold by Moses; the effect of “vinegar upon nitre” (Exo 32:20; Pro 25:20; comp. Jer 2:22). The mention of “ the apothecary” (Exo 30:35; Ecc 10:1), and of the merchant in “powders” (Son 3:6), shows that a  distinct and important branch of trade was set up in these wares, in which, as at a modern druggist's, articles of luxury, etc., are combined with the remedies of sickness (see further, Wunderbar, stes Heft, p. 73, ad fin.).

Among the most favorite of external remedies has always been the bath. As a preventive of numerous disorders its virtues were known to the Egyptians, and the scrupulous Levitical bathings prescribed by Moses would merely enjoin the continuance of a practice familiar to the Jews, from the example especially of the priests in that country. Besides the significance of moral purity which it carried, the use of the bath checked the tendency to become unclean by violent perspirations from within and effluvia from without; it kept the porous system in play, and stopped the outset of much disease. In order to make the sanction of health more solemn, most Oriental nations have enforced purificatory rites by religious mandates-and so the Jews. A treatise collecting all the dicta of ancient medicine on the use of the bath has been current ever since the revival of learning, under the title De Balneis. According to it, Hippocrates and Galen prescribe the bath medicinally in peripneumonia rather than in burning fever, as tending to allay the pain of the sides, chest, and back, promoting various secretions, removing lassitude, and suppling joints. A hot bath is recommended for those suffering from lichen (De Baln. p. 464). Those, on the contrary, who have looseness of the bowels, who are languid, loathe their food, are troubled with nausea or bile, should not use it, as neither should the epileptic. After exhausting journeys in the sun, the bath is commended as the restorative of moisture to the frame (p. 456- 458). The four objects which ancient authorities chiefly proposed to attain by bathing are

1, to warm and distil the elements of the body throughout the whole frame, to equalize whatever is abnormal, to rarefy the skin, and promote evacuations through it;

2, to reduce a dry to a moister habit;

3 (the cold bath), to cool the frame and brace it;

4 (the warm bath), a sudorific to expel cold. Exercise before bathing is recommended, and in the season from April till November inclusive it is the most conducive to health; if it be kept up in the other months, it should then be but once a week, and that fasting. Of natural waters some are nitrous, some saline, some aluminous, some sulphureous, some bituminous,  some copperish, some ferruginous, and some compounded of these. Of ali the natural waters the power is, on the whole, desiccant and calefacient, and they are peculiarly fitted for those of a humid and cold habit. Pliny (H. N. xxxi) gives the fullest extant account of the thermal springs of the ancients (Paul. AEgin. ed. Sydenh. Soc. 1:71). Avicenna gives precepts for salt and other mineral baths; the former he recommends in case of scurvy an ditching, as rarefying the skin, and afterwards condensing it. Waters medicates with alum, natron, sulphur, naphtha, iron, litharge, vit ,riol, and vinegar, are also specified by him. Frictitr and unction are prescribed, and a caution given against staying too long in the water (ibid. p. 338-340; comp Aetius, De Baln. 4:484). A sick bather should lie quiet and allow others to rub and anoint him, and use no strigil (the common instrument for scraping the skin). but a sponge (p. 456).

Maimonides, chiefly following Galen, recommends the bath, especially for phthisis in the aged, as being a case of dryness with cold habit, and to a hectic-fever patient as being a case of dryness with hot habit; also in cases of ephemeral and tertian fevers, under certain restrictions, and in putrid fevers, with the caution not to incur shivering. Bathing is dangerous to those who feel pain in the liver after eating. He adds cautions regarding the kind of water, but these relate chiefly to water for drinking (De Baln. p. 438, 439). The bath of oil was formed, according to Galen and Aetius, by adding the fifth part of heated oil to a waterbath. Josephus speaks (War, 1:33, 5) as though oil had, in Herod's case, been used pure. There were special occasions on which the bath was ceremonially enjoined after a leprous eruption healed, after the conjugal act, or an involuntary emission, or any gonorrhea discharge, after menstruation, childbed, or touching a corpse; so for the priests before and during their times of office such a duty was prescribed. The Pharisees and Essenes aimed at scrupulous strictness of all such rules :(Mat 15:2; Mar 7:5; Luk 11:38). Riverbathing was common, but houses soon began to include a bath-room (Lev 15:13;. 2Ki 5:10; 2Sa 11:2; Susanna 15). Vapor-baths, as among the Romans, were latterly included in these, as well as hot and. cold bath. apparatus, and the use of perfumes and oils after quitting it was everywhere diffused (Wunderbar, 2tes Heft, vol. ii, B). The vapor was sometimes sought to be inhaled, though this was reputed mischievous to the teethe It was deemed healthiest after a warm to take also a cold bath(Paul. AEgin. ed. Sydenh. Soc. 1:68). The Talmud has it-” Whoso takes a warm bath, and does not also drink thereupon some warm water, is like a stove hot only from without, but not heated also from within. Whoso bathes, and does not  withal anoint, is like the liquor outside a vat. Whoso having had a warm bath does not also immediately pour cold water over him, is like an iron made to glow in the fire, but not thereafter hardened inl the water.” This succession of cold water to hot vapor is commonly practiced in Russian and Polish baths, and is said to contribute much to robust health (Wunderbar, ibid.). SEE BATHE.

V. Literature.-Besides the usual authorities on Hebrew antiquities, Talmudical and modern, Wunderbar 2stes Heft, p. 57-69) has compiled a collection of writers on the special subject of scriptural, etc., medicine, including its psychological and botanical aspects, as also its political relations; a distinct section of thirteen monographs treats of the leprosy; and every various disease mentioned in Scripture appears elaborated in one or more such short treatises. Those out of the whole number which appear most generally in esteem, to judge from references made to them, are the following, which include a few from other sources: Rosenmuller's Natural History of the Bible (in the Biblical Cabinet, vol. xxvii); De Wette, Hebraisch-judische Archdologie, § 271 b; Calmet (Augustin), La Mgdecine et les Medecins des anc. Hebreux (in his Comm. litrale, Paris, 1724, vol. v); idem, Dissertation sur la Sueur du Sang (Luk 22:43-44); Pruner, Krankheiten des Orients; Sprengel (Kurt), De medic. Ebrceorum (Halle, 1789, 8vo); idem, Beitrage zur Geschichte der Medicin (Halle, 1794, 8vo); idem, Versuch einer pragm. Geschichte der A rzeneikunde (Halle, 1792, 1803, 1821; the last edition by Dr. Rosenbaum, Leipsic; 1846, 8vo, vol. i, § 37-45); idem, Histor. Rei Herbar. (lib. i, cap. i, Flora Biblica); Bartholini (Thom.), De morbis biblicis, miscellanea medica (in Ugolini, 30:1521); idem, Paralytici novi Testamenti (in Ugolini, 30:1459), Schmidt (Joh. Jac.), Biblischer Medicus (Ziillichau, 1743, 8vo, p. 761); Kall, De morbis sacerdot. V. T. (Hafn. 1745, 4to); Reinhard (Chr. Tob. Ephr.), Bibelkrankheit., welche imn alten Testam. vorkommen (i and 2:1767, 8vo, p. 384; v. 1768, 8vo, p. 244); Shapter (Thomas),:Medica sacra, or Short Expositions of the more important Diseases mentioned in the Sacred Writings (London, 1834) ; Wunderbar (R. J.), Biblisch- Talmudische Medicin (in 4 parts, Riga, 1850-1853, 8vo; new series, 1857); Celsius (01.), Hierobofanicon, s. deplantis sacrce scripturce dissertationes breves (2 parts, Upsal, 1745, 1747, 8vo; Amstelod. 1748); Bochart (Samuel), Hierozoicon, s. bipartitum, opus de animulibus sacrce scripturce (London, 1665, fol.; Frankfort, 1675, fol.; edited by, and with'the notes of Ern. F. G. Rosenmuller, Lips. 1793, 3 vols. 4to);  Spencer, De legibus Hebroeorum ritualibus (Tiibingen, 1732, fol.); Reinhard (Mich. H.),-De cibis Hebrceorum prohibitis; Diss. I respon. Seb. Muller (Viteb. 1697, 4to); Diss. II respon. Chr. Liske (ibid. 1697, 4to); Eschenbach (Chr. Ehrenfr.), Progr. de lepra Judceorum (Rostock, 1774, 4to; in his Scripta medic. bibl p. 17-41); Schilling (G. G.), De lepra commentationes, rec. J. D. Hahn (Lugd. Bat. 1788, 8vo); Chamseru (R.), Recherches sur le veritable caractere de la lepre des Hebreux (in Mem. de la Soc. medic. d'emulation de Paris, 1810, 3:335); Relation Chirurgicale de l'A rmee de l'Orient (Paris, 1804); Wedel (GeoW.), De lepra in sacris (Jena, 1715, 4to; in his Exercitat. med. philolog. Cent. II, dec. 4, p. 93- 107); idem, De morb. Hiskie (Jena, 1692, 4to; in his Exercitat. med. philolog. Cent. I, dec. 7); idem, De morbo Jorazmi exercitat. I, II (Jena, 1717, 4to; in his Exercitat. med. philolog. Cent. II, dec. 5); idem, De Saulo energumeno (Jena, 1685; in his Exercitat. med. philolog. Cent. I, dec. 2); idem, De morbis senumn Solomonceis (Jena, 1686, 4to; in his Exercitat. med. philolog. Cent. I, dec. 3); Lichtenstein, Versuch, etc. (in Eichhorn's Allgem. Bibliothek, 6:407-467); Mead (Dr. R.), Medica Sacra (London, 4to); Gudius (G. F.), Exercitatio philologica de Hebraica obstetricum origine (in Ugolini, 30:1061); Kall, De obstetricibus matsrum Hebrearum in AEgypto (Hamburg, 1746, 4to); Israels (Dr. AH.), Tentamene historico- medicum, exhibens collectanea Gyncecologica, quee ex Talmude Babylonico depromsit (Griningen, 1845, 8vo); Borner (F.), Dissert. de statu -Medicinoe ap. Vett. Hebr. (1735); Norberg, De Medicina Arabum (in Opusc. Acad. 2:404); Aschkenazei (Mos.), De ortu etprogressu Medicinee inter Hebrceos (Hamburg, 17., 8vo);' Ginsburger (B. W.), De Aledica ex Talnudis illustrata (Gotting. 1743, 4to); Goldmann, De rebus medices Vet. Test. (Bresl. 1846, 4to); Leutenschliger (J. H.), De medicis veterum Hebr. (Schleiz. 1786, 8vo); Lindlinger (J. S.), De Hebr. vett. medica de Dcemoniacis (Wittenb. 1774, 2 vols. 8vo); Reineccius (Chr.), Dictum Talmudieum de optimo nedico, Gehenne digno (Weissenb. 1724, fol.). SEE PHYSICIAN.

## Medicine, Heathen[[@Headword:Medicine, Heathen]]

             SEE SUPERSTITION.

## Medico, Sixto[[@Headword:Medico, Sixto]]

             a Venetian Dominican, was born about 1501. He was professor of philosophy at Venice, in 1545 professor of theology at Padua, and died November 29, 1561. He is best known as the author of De Foenere Judaeorum (Venice, 1551). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 2:338; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Mediety[[@Headword:Mediety]]

             (or Portion) is the name given to the division of a rectory church into several parsonages or vicarages.

## Medigo, Elia Ben-Mose, Abba Del[[@Headword:Medigo, Elia Ben-Mose, Abba Del]]

             a noted Jewish savan of the 15th century, celebrated for his attainments as a philosopher, flourished at Padua, Italy, as teacher of metaphysics. He died in 1493. For his works, see Furst, Bibl. Jud. 2:338.

## Medigo, Joseph Salomo Del[[@Headword:Medigo, Joseph Salomo Del]]

             another Jewish writer of note, and of the same family as the preceding, was born at Candia in 1591. He was highly educated, and though busily engaged in the practice of medicine as one of the most eminent of his profession, he nevertheless devoted much time and attention to the study of Jewish philosophical productions and the writings of Jewish mystics. He published dissertations on different philosophical subjects and on the Cabala, and biographies of several eminent Hebrew literati. He died at Prague in 1655. See Fiurst, Bibl. Judaica, 2:338 sq.

## Medina[[@Headword:Medina]]

             (Arab. city),.or, more fully, MEDINAT ALNABI (City of the Prophet), also called Tabah, Tibah, etc. (the Good, Sweet, etc.), and mentioned by Ptolemy as Jathrippa: the holiest city of Mohammedan countries, next to Mecca, and the second capital of Hejaz in Western Arabia, is situated about 270 miles north of Mecca, and 140 north by east of the port of Jembo, on the Red Sea, and contains about 16,000 inhabitants (Burton). Medina is about half the size of Mecca. The streets, between fifty and sixty in number, are deep and narrow, paved only in a few places. The houses are flat-roofed and double-storied, and are built of a basaltic scoria, burned brick, and palm-wood. Very few public buildings of any importance are to be noticed besides the great' mosque Al-Haram (the Sacred), supposed to' be erected on the spot where Mohammed died, and to enclose his tomb. It is of smaller dimensions than that of Mecca, being a parallelogram, 420 feet long and 340 feet broad, with a spacious central area, called El-Sahn, which is surrounded by a peristyle, with numerous rows of pillars. The Mausoleum, or Hujrah, itself is an irregular square, 50-55 feet in extent, situated in the southeast corner of the building, and separated from the walls of the mosque by a passage about 26 feet broad. A large gilt crescent above the “ Green Dome,” springing from a series of globes, surmounts the Hujrah, a glimpse into which is only attainable through a little opening, called the Prophet's Window; but nothing more is visible to the profane eye than costly carpets or hangings, with three inscriptions in large gold  letters, stating that behind them lie the bodies of the Prophet of Allah and: the two caliphs-which curtains, changed whenever worn out, or when a new sultan ascends the throne, are supposed to cover' a square edifice of black marble, in the midst of which stands Mohammed's tomb. Its exact place is indicated by a long pearly rosary (Kaukab al-Durri)-still seen- suspended to the curtain. The Prophet's body is supposed to lie (undecayed) stretched at full length on the right side, with the right palm supporting the right cheek, the face directed towards Mecca. Close behind him is placed, in the same position, Abubekr, and behind him Omar. The fact, however, is that when the mosque, which had' been struck by lightning, was rebuilt in 892, three deep graves were found in the interior, filled only with rubbish. Many other reasons, besides, make it more than problematic whether the particular spot at Medina really contains the Prophet's remains. That his coffin, said to be covered with a marble slab, and cased with silver (no European has ever seen it), rests suspended in the air, is a stupid story, invented by Christians, and long exploded. Of the fabulous treasures which this sanctuary once contained, little now remains. As in Mecca, a great number of ecclesiastical officials are attached in some capacity or other to the Great Mosque, as ulemas, mudarisin, imaums, khatibs, etc.; and not only they, but the townspeople themselves live to a great extent only on the pilgrims' alms. There are few other noteworthy spots to be mentioned in Medifia, save the minor mosques of Abubekr, Ali, Omar, Balal] etc.

Mediolanum.

SEE MILAN.

## Medina, Samuel De[[@Headword:Medina, Samuel De]]

             a Jewish writer of the 16th century, was born at Medina del Campo. He was a philosopher, jurist, and teacher of repute, and became the head of the college at Salonica. In 1596 he published his פסקים, a collection of answers to legal decisions, and left a volume of homilies, which were published under the title of בן שמואל, by his grandson, at Mantua, in 1622. See De' Rossi, Dizionario Storico (Germ. transl.), page 215; Lindo, History of the Jews in Spain and Portugal, page 359; Kayserling, Gesch. d. Juden in Portugal, page 89; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 2:339. (B.P.)

## Mediocres[[@Headword:Mediocres]]

             or SECOND GRADE, an epithet of that class of monks, from the age of twenty-four to forty, who were exempted from being taper-bearers, from the reading of the epistle, gospel, martyrology, collation in chapter, parva cantaria, and chanting the offices. See Walcott, Sacred Archaeology, s.v.

## Mediterranean[[@Headword:Mediterranean]]

             SEA, a later name (Solin. 22:18; see Forbiger, Handb. de alt.'Geogr. 2:13 sq.) for the usual Roman title (Mare Internum) of that immense body of water between Europe, Asia, and Africa, styled by the Hebrews “ the Great Sea” הִיָּם הִגָּדוֹל, Num 34:6 sq.; Jos 1:4; Eze 47:10,  etc.; likewise in the Talmud, ימא רבא; so ἡ μεγάλη θάλασσα, Hecat. Fragm. p. 349), or “the hinder (i.e. Western) sea” (הִיָּם הָאִחֲרוֹן; Deu 12:24; in distinction from “the forward [i.e. Eastern] sea,” i.e. the Dead Sea, Zec 14:8, etc.), “sea of the Philistines” ( יָם הִפְּלַשְׁתַּים, Exo 23:31), and also simply “the Sea” (Jos 19:6; as likewise in the Greek, ἡ θάλασσα, 1Ma 14:34; 1Ma 15:11; Act 10:6; Act 10:32), and bounding Palestine o0 the west. It has, from Tyre to Ptolemais, a high and rocky shore, which farther south becomes low and sandy (Strabo, 16:758 sq.; comp. Josephus, Ant. 15:9, 6; War, 1:21, 5; see Scholz, Reise, p. 130); it makes at Mount Carmel a great bay (that of Accho or Ptolemais), but elsewhere it affords very few good harbors (chiefly those of Ceesarea, Joppa, and Gaza). Its surface lies higher than that of the Dead Sea. The ebb and flow of the tide in the Mediterranean is irregular, and noticeable only in particular localities, and unimportant on the coast of Palestine (see Michaelis, Einleit. ins A. T. 1:74, anm.). The current of the sea is regularly from south to north, and is doubly strong at the time of the Nile freshet, so as to carry the deposit of mud and sand against the southern (Philistian) shore, which accordingly is continually pushing farther and farther into the sea (see Ritter, Erdk. 2:460, 462). Under the water there are found at the coast from Gaza to Jaffa large coral reefs (Volney, Voyage, 2:246); and the sea abounds in fish. Commerce finds on it. a great sphere; but the Phoenicians and Egyptians had-nearly a monopoly of this, as the Mosaic legislation was unfavorable even to coast trading. Particular portions of this vast body of water were designated by special names, hut of these only the Adriatic (οΑ῾᾿δραίς) is distinctively named in the Bible (Act 27:27). SEE ADRIA.

Vague mention, however, is made likewise of the Egman Sea, the modern Archipelago (Act 17:14; Act 17:18), the sound between Cilicia and Cyprus (Act 27:5), and the Syrtis of the Lybian Sea (Act 27:17). See generally Bachiene, Palast. I, 1:87 sq.; Hamesveld, Bibl. Geogr. 1:440 sqWiner, 2:70. SEE SEA.

The whole of the coast, from the Nile to. Mount Carmel, was anciently called the Plain of the Mediterranean Sea. The tract between Gaza and Joppa was simply called the Plain; in this stood the five principal cities of the Philistine satrapies -Ascalon, Gath. Gaza, Ekron or Accaron, and Azotus or Ashdod. The countries bordering on the Mediterranean were unquestionably the cradle of civilization, and they have in all ages been the scene of mighty changes and events, the investigation of which belongs to the general historian; all, however, that has relation to scriptural  subjects will be found stated under the heads SEE CYRENE, SEE EGYPT, SEE GREECE, SEE SYRIA, etc., and therefore to enter into the detail here would be superfluous, as would any lengthened notice of the sea itself, the Hebrews having never been a maritime people. See Smith, Dict. of Class. Geogr. s.v. Internum Mare; M'Culloch, Dict. of Geogr. s.v. SEE PALESTINE.

## Medler, Nicholas[[@Headword:Medler, Nicholas]]

             one of the three principal disciples of Luther, was born at Hof, in Saxony, in 1502. He studied at Erfurt and Wittenberg, where he held conferences on the Old Test. and mathematics. He afterwards opened a school at Eger, but came into conflict with the authorities of that city for teaching the doctrines of Luther to his pupils. He then took a situation as teacher in his native city, and was appointed pastor there in 1530, but preached such violent sermons that he was obliged to leave in 1531. Retiring to Wittenberg, he remained there six years as deacon. Luther often allowed him to supply his place in the pulpit, as he highly esteemed Medler for his great talents as well as zeal. He was made chaplain of the wife of Joachim I, who had fled to Wittenberg. In 1535 he was, together with Jerome Weller, made DD., and in 1536 superintendent at Naumburg. Here he engaged in numerous controversies, but was much beloved and respected both by the people and by the authorities. Maurice of Saxony succeeded in attracting him to the University of Leipsic. In 1541, as he went by order of the elector to hold the first evangelical worship in the cathedral of Naumburg, he found that the canon regulars had closed the doors: Medler caused one of them to be broken open and another he burned down. In the same year he got into a controversy with Sebastiar Schwebinger, who was surnamed the Greek, on account of his philosophical acquirements and his devotion to the cause of the canons. He also quarrelled with his colleague Amsdorf, and with the senate of Naumburg particularly with Mohr, to whom he addressed the reproach, “Quod numquam palam et expresse taxarit vel errores papisticae doctrinae et cultus impios, vel manifests scandala in vita illius gregis.” The faculty of Wittenberg approved the accusation, and deposed Mohr, but Medler himself was also obliged to resign. Medler now went to Spandau, near Berlin, where the Reformed doctrines were becoming established, and in 1546 finally became superintendent of Brunswick, after having three times declined the appointment, notwithstanding the advice of Melanchthon and Luther. In Brunswick he succeeded, after great efforts, in establishing a school, where  afterwards Melancthon, Urbanus Regius, Justus Jonas, and Flacius taught for a while after the downfall of Wittenberg in 1547. In 1551 he left Brunswick on account of his health, and went to Leipsic, where he was made superintendent of Bernburg, but on his first preaching he was struck with apoplexy, and died shortly after at Wittenberg. He was full of controversial zeal for the doctrines of Luther. His works are enumerated by Streitperger, v. 4, and by Schamelius, Numburgum literatum, p. 19, 37. A sermon of his against the Interim of Leipsic (q.v.). was often reprinted; also in Schamelius, Numburgum literatunr. See M. A. Streitperger, De vita D. N. Medl. (in Actus promotionis-per A mbrosium Reudenium, fol. O sq., Jena, 1591); Hummel, Neue Bibliothek, 3:536 sq.; Rethmeyer, Kirchengesch. v. Braunschweig, 3:173, 194; Danz, Epistolk P. Melanch. ad N. Medl.; Dollinger, Reformationsgesch. 2:74 sq.; Herzog, Real- Encyklopadie, 9:234. (J. N. P.)

## Medley, Samuel[[@Headword:Medley, Samuel]]

             an English poet, was born at Cheshunt, Hertfordshire, June 23, 1733. After various adventures on land and sea, he was converted in 1759, became pastor of a Baptist Church at Waterford in 1768, of one at Liverpool in 1772, and died there, July 17, 1799. He published numerous hymns in sheets, which were collected (1789-1800), and several of them (especially "Oh, could I speak the matchless worth") have found their way into most modern hymnals.

## Meeda[[@Headword:Meeda]]

             (Μεεδδά v. r. Δεδδά), a Graecized form (1Es 5:32) of the MEHIDA SEE MEHIDA (q.v.) of the Hebrews lists (Ezr 2:52; Neh 7:54).

## Meekness[[@Headword:Meekness]]

             (עִנְוָה, πραότης), a calm, serene temper of mind, not easily ruffled or provoked to resentment (Jam 3:7-8). Where the great principles of Christianity have disciplined the soul, where the holy grace of meekness reigns, it subdues the impetuous disposition, and causes it, trusting in God, both to submit and to forgive. It teaches us to govern our own anger whenever we are at any time provoked, and patiently to bear' the anger of others, that it may not be a provocation to us. The former is its office, especially in superiors; the latter in inferiors, and both in equals (Jam 3:13). The excellency of such a spirit appears, if we consider that it enables us to gain a victory over corrupt nature (Pro 16:32); that it is a beauty and an ornament to human beings (1Pe 3:4); that it is obedience to God's word, and conformity to the best patterns (Eph 5:12; Php 4:8). It is productive of the highest peace to the professor (Luk 21:19; Mat 11:28-29). It fits us for any duty, instruction, relation, condition, or persecution (Php 4:11-12). To obtain this spirit, consider that it is a divine injunction (Zep 2:3; Col 3:12; 1Ti 6:11). Observe the  many examples of it: Jesus Christ (Mat 11:28), Abraham (Genesis 13; Gen 16:5-6), Moses (Num 12:3), David (Zec 12:8; 2Sa 16:10; 2Sa 16:12; Psa 131:2), Paul (1Co 9:19). Note how lovely a spirit it is in itself, and how it secures us from a variety of evils; that peculiar promises are made to such (Mat 5:5; Isa 66:2); that such give evidence of their being under the influence of divine grace, and shall enjoy the divine blessing (Isa 57:15). See Henry, On. Meekness; Dunlop, Sermons, 2:434; Evans, Sermons on the Christian Temper, ser. 29; Tillotson, Sermon on 1Pe 2:21, and on Mat 5:44; Logan, Sermons, vol. i, ser. 10; Jortin, Sermons, vol. iii, ser. 11.

## Meelfuhrer, Johann[[@Headword:Meelfuhrer, Johann]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Culmbach, in Franconia, December 25, 1570. He studied at Wittenberg, was preacher and teacher at different places, and died December 3, 1640, at Ansbach. He is the author of, Manuale Lexici Hebraici (Leipsic, 1617): — Clavis Linguen Hebraece, etc. (Nuremberg, 1598, 1628): — Compendiosa Institutio Grammatica Hebr. (Ansbach, 1607; Jena, 1623): — Synopsis Institut. Hebr. (Leyden, 1642): — Vindiciae Evangelicea: — Vindiciae Apostolicae, etc. See Furst, Bibl Jud. 2:340; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Meelfuhrer, Rudolph Martin[[@Headword:Meelfuhrer, Rudolph Martin]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Ansbach. He studied at different universities, and was made a licentiate of theology. In 1712 he joined the Romish Church, but returned to the Lutheran 'Church again in 1725. He then went to Gotha and Holland, and while on his way home was imprisoned by the imperial government, and retained at Eger. When Meelfihrer died is not known. He wrote, Consensus Veterum Hebraeorum cum Ecclesia Christiana (Frankfort, 1701): — Causae Synagogae Errantis (Altdorf, 1702): — Jesus in Talmude (ibid. 1699): — De Versionibus Talmudis: — De Meritis Hebraeorum in rem Literariam: — De Impedimentis Conversionis Judaeorum. See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:563; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 2:340 sq.; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Meene, Heinrich[[@Headword:Meene, Heinrich]]

             a German theologian, was born at Bremen April 11, 1710, and was educated at the universities of Helmstadt and Leipsic. In 1734 he entered the ministry as pastor at Volkersheim, near Hildesheim, and in 1737 removed to Quedlinburg, where, in addition to his pastoral labors in town, he served as court preacher. He was honored at this time with the title of “ Consistorial-Rath.” In 1758 he accepted a call to Jever, and there he flourished until his death, May 20,1782; Besides many contributions to different periodicals, to Sinceri's Sanzmlung -lamburgiscker Kanzelraden. and to Cramer's Samnlungen zur Kirchengesch. u. theol. Gelehrsamk., etc., Meene published a large number of books in the department of religious literature. His works of special interest are, Die tretqfiche Eirsprache des heiligen Geistesfiir die Glaubigen (Helmstadt, 1745, 8vo; 2d edition much enlarged, 1754, 8vo) :-Unpartheiische Prufung der Abhandlung: Schrift und Vernunftmaszige Ueberlegung der beiderseitigen Griindefur und wider die ganz unendliche Ungiickseligkeit der Verbrecher Gottes und deren endliche selige Wiederbringung, angestellt, und zur Rechtfertigung der Gedanken des hochwiirdigen Berrn Abts Mosheim von denm Ende der Hollenstran (Helmstadt, 1747-1748, 3 vols, 8vo; also published under the title, Die gute Suche der Lehre von der unendlichen Dauer der Hollenstrafen. See Doring, Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands, 2:458 sq.

Meerza.

SEE MIRZA.

## Meeting[[@Headword:Meeting]]

             The Society of Friends, vulgarly called Quakers, have adopted the use of this word to designate their official gatherings for various purposes.

(1.) Meeting for Sufferings.-Its origin and purpose are thus given: “The yearly meeting of London, in the year 1675, appointed a meeting to be held in that city, for the purpose of advising and assisting in cases of suffering for conscience sake, which hath continued with great use to the society to this day. It is composed of Friends, under the name of correspondents, chosen by the several quarterly meetings, and residing in or near the city. The same meetings also appoint members of their own in the country as correspondents, who are to join their brethren in London on emergency. The names of all these correspondents, previously to their being recorded, are submitted to the approbation of the yearly meeting. Such men as are approved ministers and appointed elders are also members of this meeting, which is called the ‘Meeting for Sufferings,' a name which arose from its original purpose, and has not yet become entirely obsolete. The yearly meeting has intrusted the Meeting for Sufferings with the care of printing and distributing books, and with the management of its stock; and, considered as a standing committee of the yearly meeting, it hath a general care of whatever may arise, during the intervals of that meeting, affecting the society, and requiring immediate attention, particularly of those circumstances which may occasion an application to government.” SEE FRIENDS.

(2.) Monthly Meeting, a gathering of Friends of several particular congregations, situated within a convenient distance of one another. The business of the monthly meeting is to provide for the subsistence of the poor, and for the education of their offspring; to judge of the sincerity and fitness of persons appearing to be convinced of the religious principles of the society, and desiring to be admitted into membership; to excite due attention to the discharge of religious and moral duty; and to deal with disorderly members. Monthly meetings also grant to such of their members as remove into the limits of other monthly meetings certificates of their membership and conduct. It is likewise the duty of this body to appoint overseers for the proper observance of the rules of discipline, and for the disposal of difficulties among members by private admonition, agreeably to the Gospel rule (Mat 18:15-17), so as to prevent if possible, their being laid before the monthly meeting. When a case, however, is  introduced to the monthly meeting, it is usual for a small committee to be appointed to visit the offender, in order to endeavor to convince him of his error, and induce him to forsake and condemn it. Time is allowed to judge of the effect of this labor of love, and if needful the visit is repeated. If these endeavors prove successful, the person is by minute declared to have made satisfaction for the offence; if not, he is disowned by the society. In disputes between individuals, it has long been the decided judgment of the society that its members should not sue each other at law. It therefore enjoins all to end their differences by speedy and impartial arbitration, agreeably to rules laid down. If any refuse to adopt this mode, or, having adopted it, to submit to the award, it is the direction of the yearly meeting that such be disowned. To monthly meetings also belongs the allowing of marriages; for the society has ‘always scrupled to acknowledge the exclusive authority of the priests in the solemnization of marriage. A record of marriages is kept by the monthly meeting, as also of the births and burials of its members. A certificate of the date, of the name of the infant, and of its parents, is the subject of one of these last-mentioned records; and an order for the interment, countersigned by the gravemaker, of the other.

(3.) Quarterly Meeting, among the Society of Friends, is an assembly composed of several monthly meetings. At the quarterly meeting are produced written answers from the monthly meetings to certain queries respecting the conduct of their members, and the meetings' care over them. The accounts thus received are digested into one, which is sent, also in the form of answers to queries, by representatives to the yearly meeting. Appeals from the judgment of monthly meetings are brought to the quarterly meetings, whose business also is to assist in any difficult case, or where remissness appears in the care of the monthly meetings over the individuals who compose them. SEE QUARTERLY MEETING.

(4.) Yearly Meeting, an annual meeting of the Society of Friends. “The yearly meeting has the general superintendence of the society in the country in which it is established; and therefore, as the accounts which it receives discover the state of inferior meetings, as particular exigencies require, or as the meeting is impressed with a sense of duty, it gives forth its advice, makes such regulations as appear to be requisite, or excites to the observance of those already made, and sometimes appoints committees to visit those quarterly meetings which appear to be in need of immediate advice.” At the yearly meeting another meeting (a sort of subcommittee) is appointed, bearing the name of the morning meeting, for the purpose of  revising the denominational manuscripts previous to publication; and also the granting, in the intervals of the yearly meeting, of certificates of approbation to such ministers as are concerned to travel in the work of the ministry in foreign parts, in addition to those granted by their monthly and quarterly meetings. When a visit of this kind does not extend beyond Great Britain, a certificate from' the monthly meeting of which the minister is a member is sufficient. If to Ireland, the concurrence of the quarterly meeting is also required. Regulations of similar tendency obtain in other yearly meetings. The “stock” of the yearly meeting consists of occasional voluntary contributions, which is expended in printing-books, salary of a clerk for keeping records, the passage of ministers who visit their brethren beyond sea, and some small incidental charges; but not, as has been falsely supposed, the. reimbursement of those who suffer distraint for tithes and other demands with which they scruple to comply. Appeals from the quarterly meetings are heard at the yearly meetings. There are ten yearly meetings-namely, one in London, to which representatives from Ireland are received; one in Dublin; one in New England; one in New York; one in Pennsylvania; one in Maryland; one in Virginia; one in the Carolinas; one in Ohio; and one in Indiana. Reports of each of these may be found in the Annual Monitor.

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

             Among the Methodists, the quarterly meeting is a general meeting of the stewards, leaders, and other officers, for the purpose of transacting the general business of the “ circuit” or “district ;” in the Methodist Episcopal Church presided over by the “ presiding elder,” or the minister in charge. Its special object is, besides the celebration of the Love-feast (qv.), to examine the spiritual and financial conditions of the Church. See Discipline, chap. ii, sect. 1:3. SEE CONFERENCE, QUARTERLY.

## Meeting-House[[@Headword:Meeting-House]]

             a place appropriated for the purpose of public Christian worship. In England the churches of Dissenters are so called by the Anglican communicants, and in the United States the Quakers thus name their places of public worship. SEE CHURCH; SEE CHAPEL.

## Meganck, Francois Dominique[[@Headword:Meganck, Francois Dominique]]

             a noted Dutch theologian and valiant defender of the cause of the Jansenists, was born at Menin about 1683; studied at the University of Louvain, and then devoted himself wholly to the polemical field of theology. At first he wielded his pen only, but after a time he entered the pulpit also, determined to combat the Romanism of the Ultramontanes. He was a member at the council, in 1763, at Utrecht. He died at Leyden, Oct. 12,1775. His principal works are, Refutation abregee du Traite du Schisme (1718, 12mo; Paris, 1791, 8vo) :-Defense des contrats de vente rachetables des deux c6tes (1730,4to):-Primaute de Saint Pierre et de ses Successeurs (1763 and 1772, 12mo). In the last-named work he questions the pope's supremacy over a council.

## Megander[[@Headword:Megander]]

             (also known under the name of Grosmann), CASPAR, was born at Zurich in 1495. He was educated at the University of Basle, where he secured. the degree of MA. in 1518, and soon after was appointed chaplain of the hospital at Zurich. Here he early espoused the doctrines of Zwingle, and with him, in 1525, publicly demanded the suppression of the mass and the evangelical celebration of the Lord's Supper. After the Berne disputation, in 1528, he was called as professor of theology to Berne, where he soon obtained the first position among the leading personalities, and zealously labored in this place for the advance of Zwinglian doctrines. In 1532, at Zofingen, he took part in the deliberations of the Anabaptists; and again, as deputy of the council, at the disputes at Lausanne in 1536, and of the synod at the same place in 1537. He also compiled the Berne Catechism in 1536. His Zwinglianism involved him in many serious disputes with Bucer in the latter's attempts at union. As one of the originators of the Helvetic Confession of 1536, he successfully defended the Wittenberg Formula of Concord at the convent at Berne Oct. 19, 1536, and in consequence Bucer was dismissed. In 1537, however, Bucer's justification of his conduct was finally accepted, and Megander was charged to modify his Catechism in conformity with the Formula of Concord. Megander no longer opposed the alteration, the revised Catechism was at once prepared by Bucer, and was accepted by the Council of Berne in 1537. Megander, however, refusing to be governed by these alterations, was deposed from office, and returning to Zurich was there reappointed archdeacon at the cathedral, and in this position he arduously labored to oppose the efforts of Bucer. Megander  died in 1545. Of his works, the Anmerkungen to Genesis and Exodus, Hebrews and Epistles of John, deserve special mention. See Hundeshagen, Conflicte des Zwingl., Luterth. und Cau,. in Berne (Berne, 1842),

## Megapolensis, Joannes[[@Headword:Megapolensis, Joannes]]

             a minister of the (Dutch) Reformed Church, was the second clergyman sent out by the Classis of Amsterdam to this country, under the patronage of the Dutch West India Company and the patroon Van Rensselaer (in 1642). He was also the first missionary to the Indians, preceding the celebrated “apostle to the Indians,” John Eliot, some three years. His original family name was VAN MEKELENBURG, which, after the pedantic fashion of the age, was Hellenized into Megapolensis. Leaving his two congregations in Holland, he engaged with the patroon to serve for six years, his outfit and expenses of removal to be paid, and at a salary of eleven hundred guilders per year ($440). In addition to the usual duties of a missionary pastor at an outpost of civilization, like Rensselaerwvck, he soon interested himself in the Indians who came thither to trade, and learned what he called “their heavy language” so as to speak and preach fluently in it. The early records of the First Reformed Church in Albany contain many names of Indians converted, baptized, and received into the communion of the Church under his labors. Thus completely were the home and foreign missionary work and spirit combined in this apostolic man. In 1644 he wrote a tract (which was published in 1651 in Holland) on the Mohawk Indians in New Netherlands, (now translated in the New York Historical Society's Collections, vol. ii, series i, p. 158). While our subject was residing in Albany, the celebrated Jesuit missionary, father Isaac Jogues, was captured on the St. Lawrence- by the Mohawks, and subjected to horrible cruelties by the savages. The Dutch at Fort Orange tried to ransom him. At length, escaping from his captors, he remained in close concealment for six weeks. During this time Megapolensis was his constant friend, and rendered him every kindness that was in his power. The Jesuit father was at length ransomed by the Dutch, and sent to Manhattan, whence he returned to Europe.

But in 1646 he came back again to Canada, and revisited the Mohawks, who put him to a cruel death. Another Jesuit, father Simon le Moyne, who discovered the salt springs at Onondaga in 1654, also became intimate with the dominie of Fort Orange, and wrote “three polemical essays” to convert his ‘ Dutch clerical friend to the Romish doctrine.” But the stanch minister wrote a vigorous and elaborate reply, which, however, was lost in the wreck of the ship by which he sent it  to Canada. At the close of his stipulated term of service Megapolensis proposed to return to Holland, but governor Stuyvesant persuaded him to remain in New Amsterdam (now New York) as pastor of the Dutch Church. Here, for twenty years, he labored as senior pastor, being assisted from 1664 to 1668 by his son Samuel. He died in 1670. in the sixty-seventh year of his age, retaining his pastoral relation to the last. “He was a man of thorough scholarship, energetic character, and devoted piety, and he is entitled to a high, if not pre-eminent position in the roll of early Protestant missionaries among the North American savages. For nearly a quarter of a century he exercised a marked influence in the affairs of New Netherlands. He saw the infancy of the Dutch province, watched its growth, aid witnessed its surrender to overpowering English force. His name must ever be associated with the early history of New York, towards the illustration of which his correspondence with the Classis of Amsterdam, now in the possession of the General Synod of the Reformed Protestant Dutch Church, and his sketch of the Mohawk Indians, form original and very valuable contributions.” See J. Ronevn Brodhead, in the N. Y. Hist. Society's Coll. vol. iii;, Revelation E. P. Rogers, DD., Historicale Discourse; Sprague, Annals, vol. 9:(W. J. R. T.)

## Megapolensis, Samuel[[@Headword:Megapolensis, Samuel]]

             son of the above, was born in 1634, and was educated at Harvard College, Cambridge, Mass., where he spent three years; afterwards went to the University of Utrecht, Holland, and there he graduated in 1659, having pursued a full theological course. He next went to Leyden University; and, after a complete course in that most celebrated medical school of Europe, obtained the degree of doctor of medicine. Returning to America, he was associate pastor of the Church of New Amsterdam with his venerable father for over four years-1663-68. In 1664 he was appointed one of the Dutch commissioners who prepared the terms of surrender to the English government. “Probably it was through his influence that the rights of the Reformed Church were so carefully guarded.” In 1668 he returned to Holland, and settled at Wernigerode, where he ministered seven years, 1670 to 1677. Afterwards, “being well skilled in both the English and Dutch languages,” he served the English or Scotch churches of Flushing (1677-85) and Dordrecht (16851700), when he was declared emeritus, or honorably laid aside from his work, after a ministry of thirty-seven years. The date of his death is not known. See Revelation Dr. DeWitt, in  Sprague's Annals, vol. ix;. Corwin's Manual of the Ref. Church, sv. (W.J.R.T.)

## Megara, School Of[[@Headword:Megara, School Of]]

             one of the schools founded by disciples of Socrates, but so modified in position from their teacher as to deserve the name of a peculiar society. Its principal supporter was Euiclid of-Megara, who was born about 440 BC., and was himself a pupil of Parmenides, one of the most prominent leaders in the Eleatic School (q.v.). After the death of Socrates, his disciples, fleeing for safety from Athens. found a pleasant home in the house of Euclid, and there, guided by him, finally established principles which gave them the name of Megarists. They taught that ethics stands in the service of dialectics. The essence of good is unity-unity so entire as to embrace immobility, identity, and permanence. Hence the sensible world has no part in existence. Being and good are thus the same thing, viz. unity; good therefore alone exists, and evil is but the absence of existence. It does not follow, however, that there is but a single being and a single sort of good, for unity may be found contained in various things. Euclid expressly taught that, in spite of their unity, being and good clothe themselves in different forms, present themselves under different points of view, and receive different names, as wisdom, God, intelligence, and the like. Euclid also anticipated Aristotle in distinguishing the act from the power, and resolved, according to his ideas of being, the relation between the two. Other supporters of this school were Eubulicles, Alexinos, Diodorus, Chronos, Philo, and Stilpo. See Dyck, De Megaricorum doctrina (Bonn, 1827); Ritter, Ueber die Philosophie der Megarischen Schule; Ueberweg, History of Philosophy, vol. i.

## Megas, Joseph Ibn[[@Headword:Megas, Joseph Ibn]]

             SEE MIGAS.

## Megerlin, David Friedrich[[@Headword:Megerlin, David Friedrich]]

             a noted German Orientalist and mystic, was born at Stuttgard near the opening of the 18th century. After holding for some time a professorship at the gymnasium at Montbelliard, he preached at Laubach, whence, in 1769, he removed to Frankfort-on-the-Main to continue in the pastorate. He died in August, 1769. Megerlin took a lively interest in the welfare of the Jews, and labored earnestly for their conversion. In 1756 he gained great notoriety by his public intercession in behalf of rabbi Eibeschiitz, who had published a cabalistic work containing many points to which his brethren had taken decided exception, particularly the favorable allusions to  Sabbathai Zewi (q.v.). The Jews were greatly provoked with Eibeschiitz because they had found him a believer in the messiahship of the pretender Sabbathai, but Megerlin insisted that Eibeschutz had been misinterpreted, and that the rabbi was a believer in Jesus Christ. He made these views public in his Geheime Zeugnisse fir die Wahrheit der christlichen Religion (Leipsic, 1756, 4to); and in Neue Erweckung der Zerstreuten Judenschaft (1756), and Christlicher Zuruf an die Rabbinen (1757). His other valuable works are, De scriptis et collegiis orientalibus; item Observationes critico-theologicce (Tubing. 1729, 4to) :-Hexas orientalium. collegiorum philologicorum (1729, 4to) :-De Bibliis Latinis Moguntice primo impressis 1450-1462 (1750, 4to); and a translation of the Koran into German. See Meusel, Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v.; Gratz, Gesch. der Juden, 10:416.

## Megethius[[@Headword:Megethius]]

             SEE MARCION.

## Megiddo[[@Headword:Megiddo]]

             (Hebrews Megiddo', מַגַדּוֹ, according to Gesenius, perh. place of troops, according to: Ftirst, rich in ornaments, i.e. noble, fruitful; Sept. Μαγεδδώ, but Μαγεδώ in Jdg 1:27, Μαγδώ,in 1Ki 9:1 l, and Μαγεδών v. r. Μαγεδδών and Μαγεδδώ in 2Ch 35:22; Vulg. Mageddo), once in the prolonged form MEGIDDON (Zec 12:11, Hebrews Megiddon', מְגַדּוֹן, Sept. renders ἐκκοπτόμενος,-Vulg. Mageddon), a town belonging to Manasseh (Jdg 1:27), although at first within the boundaries of Issachar (Jos 17:11), and commanding one of those passes fr om the north into the hill-country which were of such critical importance on various occasions in the history of Judah (Jdt 4:7). It had originally been one of the royal cities of the Canaanites (Jos 12:21). This tribal arrangement was made partly to supplement the mountain-territory of Manasseh, and partly to give those strongly- fortified places to a tribe who, from their courage and their alliance with Ephraim, might be able to drive out the old inhabitants. The task, however, proved too great even for the warlike Manassites; but when the power of Israel was fully established, the Canaanites were reduced to slavery (Jos 17:13-18; Jdg 1:27-28). Indeed, we do not read of Megiddo being firmly in the occupation of the Israelites till the time of Solomon. That monarch placed one of his twelve commissariat officers,  named Baana, over “Taanach and Megiddo,” with the neighborhood of Beth-shean and Jezreel (1Ki 4:12). In this reign it appears that some costly works were constructed at Megiddo (9:15). These were probably fortifications, suggested by its important military position. Nearly all the notices of the place are connected with military transactions. Of these there were three notable ones, the sacred records of which, and perhaps some profane or monumental reminiscences, remain. SEE ESDRAELON.

(1.) The first was the victory of Barak. The song of Deborah brings the place, vividly before us, as the scene of the great conflict. Jabin, king of Hazor, successor of the prince who had organized the northern confederation against Joshua, was now the oppressor of Israel, and Sisera was his general. The army of Jabin, with its 900 chariots of iron, was led down into the great plain, and drawn up at Megiddo, in a position to afford the best ground for the terrible war-chariots. With much difficulty Deborah the prophetess induced Barak to collect the warriors of the northern tribes. They assembled on Tabor. Deborah gave the signal, and the Israelites marched down to attack the enemy, full of hope and enthusiasm. At this moment a hail-storm from the east burst over the plain, and drove full in the faces of the advancing Canaanites (Josephus, Ant. v. 4). “The stars in their courses fought against Sisera.” His army was thrown into confusion. The waters of the Kishon rose rapidly, the low plain became a morass; chariots, horses, soldiers, all together were engulfed (Judges 4, 5). Those who have visited Megiddo and traversed its plain in the spring, after a heavy fall of rain, have found the Kishon greatly swollen, its banks quagmires, and all the ordinary roads impassable. SEE KISHON.

(2.) To this place Ahaziah fled when his unfortunate visit to Joram had brought him into collision with Jehu, and here he died (2Ki 4:27), within the confines of what is elsewhere called Samaria (2Ch 22:9). As there are some difficulties in the history, we give the texts at length: Short (2Ki 9:21).

“And when Ahaziah the king of Judah saw this, he fled by the way of the garden-house. And Jehu followed after him, and said, Smite him also in the chariot. And they did so at the going up to Gur, which is by Ibleam. And he fled to Megiddo, and died there. And his servants carried him in a chariot to Jerusalem, and buried him in his sepulchre with his fathers in the city of David.”  Full (2Ch 22:7-9).

“And the destruction of Ahaziah was of God by coming to Joram: for when he was come, he went out with Jehoram against Jehn the son of Nimshi, whom the Lord had anointed to cut off the house of Ahab. And it came to pass that when Jehu was executing judgment upon the house of Ahab, and found the princes of Judah, and the sons of the brethren of Ahaziah, that ministered to Ahaziah, he slew them. And he sought Ahaziah: and they caught him (for he was, hid in Samaria), and they brought him. to Jehu and when they had slain him, they buried him: Because, said-they, he is the son of Jehoshaphat, who sought the Lord with all his heart. So the house of Ahaziah had no power to keep still the kingdom.”

With reference to the above two accounts of the death of Ahaziah, which have been thought irreconcilable(Ewald, 3:529; Parker's De Wette, p. 270; Thenius, etc.), it may be here remarked that the order of the events is sufficiently intelligible if we take the account in Chronicles, where the kingdom of Judah is the main subject, as explanatory of the brief notice in Kings, where it is only incidentally mentioned in the history of Israel. The order is clearly as follows: Ahaziah was with Jehoram at Jezreel when Jehu attacked and killed him. Ahaziah escaped and fled by the Beth-gan road to Samaria, where the partisans of the house of Ahab were strongest, and where his own brethren were, and there concealed himself. But when the sons of Ahab were all put to death in Samaria, and the house of Ahab had hopelessly lost the kingdom, he determined to make his submission to Jehu, and sent his brethren to salute the children of Jehu (2Ki 10:13), in token of his acknowledgment of him as king of Israel (not, as Thenius and others, to salute the children of Jehoram, and of Jezebel, the queen- mother). Jehu, instead of accepting this submission, had them all put to death, and hastened on to Samaria to take Ahaziah also, who he had probably learned from some of the attendants, or as he already knew, was at Samaria. Ahaziah again took to flight northwards, towards Megiddo, perhaps in hope of reaching the dominions of the king of the Sidonians, his kinsman, or more probably to reach the coast where the direct road from Tyre to Egypt would bring him to Judah. SEE CAESAREA.

He was hotly pursued by Jehu and his followers, and overtaken near Ibleam, and mortally wounded, but managed to get as far as Megiddo, where it would seem Jehu followed in pursuit of him, and where he was brought to him as his prisoner. There he died of his wounds. In consideration of his descent from  Jehoshaphat, “who sought Jehovah with all his heart,” Jehu, who was at this time very forward in displaying his zeal for Jehovah, handed over the corpse to his followers, with permission to carry it to Jerusalem, which they did, and buried him in the city of David. The whole difficulty arises from the account in Kings being abridged, and so bringing together two incidents which were not consecutive in the original account. But if 2Ki 9:27 had been even divided into two verses, the first ending at' “garden-house,” and the next beginning “and Jehu followed after him,” the difficulty would almost disappear. ‘Jehu's pursuit of Ahaziah ‘would only be interrupted by a day or two, and there would be nothing the least unusual in the omission to notice this interval of time in the concise abridged narrative. We should then understand that the word also in the original narrative referred, not to Jehoram, but-to the brethren of Ahaziah, who had just before been smitten, and the death of Ahaziah would fall under 2Ki 10:17. If Beth-gan (A. V. “garden-house”) be the same as En-gannim, now Jenin, it lay directly on the road from Jezreel to Samaria, and is also the place at which the road to Megiddo andthe coast, where Caesarea afterwards stood, turns off from the road between Jezreel and Samaria. In this case the mention of Beth-gan in Kings as the direction of Ahaziah's flight is a confirmation of the statement in Chronicles that he concealed himself in Samaria. This is also substantially Keil's explanation (p. 288, 289). Movers proposes an alteration of the text' (p. 92, note), but not very successfully ( וִיָּבֹא הוּא לַיהוּדָהinstead of וִיְּבַאֻהוּ אֶלאּיֵהוּ). SEE JEHU.

(3.) But the chief historical interest of Megiddo is concentrated in Josiah's death. On this occasion Megiddo saw a very different sight from the first, and heard, instead of a song of triumph, a funeral wail from the vanquished host of Israel (Zec 12:11). Pharaoh Necho was on his march against the king of Assyria. He passed up the plains of Philistia and Sharon, and king Josiah foolishly attempted to stop him while defiling through the glens of Carmel into the plain of Megiddo. He was defeated, and as he fled the Egyptian archers shot him in his chariot. He was taken to Jerusalem, but appears to have died on the road (2Ki 23:29). ‘ The story is told in the Chronicles in more detail (2Ch 35:22-24). There the fatal action is said to have taken place “in the valley of Megiddo” (Sept. ἐν τῷ πεδίῳ Μαγεδδών). This calamity made a deep and permanent impression on the Jews. It is recounted again in 1Es 1:25-31, where in the A. V. “the plain of Magiddo” ‘represents the same Greek words. The  lamentations for this good king became ‘an ordinance in Israel” (2Ch 35:25). “ In all Jewry” they mourned for him, and the lamentation was made perpetual “in all the nation of Israel” (1Es 1:32). “ Their grief was no land-flood of present passion, but a constant channel of continued sorrow, streaming from an annual fountain” (Fuller's Pisgah Sight of Palestine, p. 165). Thus, in the language of the prophets (Zec 12:11), “the mourning of Hadadrimmon in the valley (Sept. πεδίῳ) of Megiddon” becomes a poetical expression for the deepest and most despairing grief; as ‘in the Apocalypse (Rev 16:16) sEE ARMAGEDDON, in continuance of the same imagery, is presented as the scene of terrible and final conflict. For the Septuagint version of this passage of Zechariah, we miay refer to Jerome's note on the passage. “Adadremmon,” pro quo LXX transtulerunt ῾Ροῶνος urbs est juxta Jesraelem, quae hoc olim vocabulo nuncapataest. et hodie vocatur Maximianopolis in Campo Mageddon.” Ar-Mageddon may be for עִר מְגַדּו, that is, “the city of Megiddo;” or if we regard the aspirated ap as equivalent to the Hebrew הִר, then the meaning will be “mountain of Megiddo,” which would likewise be appropriate (Alford, ad loc.). That the prophet's imagery is drawn from the occasion of Josiah's death there can be no doubt. In Stanley's S. and P.'(p. 347) this calamitous event is made very vivid to us by an allusion to the” Egyptian archers, in their long array, so well known from their sculptured monuments.” For the mistake in the account of Pharaoh-Necho's campaign in Herodotus, who has evidently put Migdol by mistake for Megiddo (ii. 159), it is enough to refer to Bahr's excursus on the passage (see below). The Egyptian king may have landed his troops at Acre; but it is far more likely that he marched northwards along the coast-plain, and then turned round Carmel into the plain of Esdraelon, taking the left bank of the Kishon, and that there the Jewish king came upon him by the gorge of Megiddo.

Eusebiuis and Jerome (Onomast.) do not attempt to mark the situation of the place, and it appears that the name Megiddo was in their time already lost. They often mention a town called Legio (Λεγεών), which must in their day have been an important and well-known place, as they assume it as a central point from which to mark the position of several other places in this quarter (e.g. fifteen miles west of Nazareth, and three or four from Taanach). This has been identified (Reland, Palaest. p. 873; comp. Benjamin of Tudela, 2:433) with the village now called Lejjun, which is situated upon the western border of the great plain of Esdraelon, where it  begins to rise gently towards the low range of wooded hills that connect Carmel with the mountains of Samaria (Onomast. s.v. Gabathon). This place was visited by Maundrell, who speaks of it as an old village near a brook, with a khan then in good repair (Journey, March 22). This khan was for the accommodation of the caravan on the route between Egypt and Damascus, which passes here. Having already identified the present village of Taannuk with the ancient Taanach, the vicinity of this to Lejjun induced Dr. Robinson (Bibl. Researches, 3:177-180; also new ed. 3:116-118) to conceive that the latter might be the ancient Megiddo, seeing that Taanach and Megiddo are constantly named together in Scripture (1Ki 4:12; . Chron. 7:29)'; and to this a writer in a German review (Grosse, in the Stud. u. Krit. 1845, 1:252 sq.) adds the further consideration that the name of Legio was latterly applied to the plain or low valley along the Kishon, as that of Megiddo had been in more ancient times ( עֶמֶק מְגַדּוֹ, 2Ch 35:22; בַּקְעִת מְגַדּוֹן, Zec 12:11; τό πεδίον Μαγεδδώ, 3 Esdr. 1:27). SEE ESDRAELON. Herodotus (ii. 159) appears to allude to the overthrow of Josiah at this place (2Ki 9:23; 2Ki 9:29), but -instead of Megiddo he names the town Magdolum (Μάγδολον), the MIGDOL of Egypt (see Harenberg, Bibl. Brem. 6:281; Rosenmiller, Alterth. II, 2:99). Rosellini (Monum. stor. ii, p. 133) thinks that Herodotus may still refer to the Palestinian locality, and he imagines that he finds traces of the name on the monuments (Makato, i.e. Magdo, ib. iv, p. 158), but Ewald (Isr. Gesch. 3:406) finds the Magdolum of Herodotus in el- Mejdel (the MIGDAL of Jos 19:38), between the Kishon and Acco (comp. Hitzig, Philist. 1:96). Megiddo or Lejjun is probably the place mentioned by Shaw as the Ras el-Kishon, or the head of the Kishon, under. the south-east brow of Carmel (Trav. p. 274). It was visited and described by Mr. Wolcott in 1842, who found it to be an hour and forty minutes distant from Taanach. The Nahr Lejjun is a stream five or six feet wide, running into the Kishon, and feeding three or four mills. A little distance up it is situated the Khan el-Lejjun, and on a small eminence on the opposite side the remains of the ancient Legio. Among the rubbish are the foundations of two or three buildings, with limestone columns mostly worn away; and another with eight or ten polished columns still remaining, and others of limestone among them. The finest structure appears to have been in the south-west corner of the ruins, by the side of the brook. Among its foundations are two marble columns with Corinthian capitals, and several of granite. A gateway with a pointed arch is still standing. A small bridge is thrown over the stream, and leads to the khan, which is of Saracenic  structure (Bibliotheca Sacra, 1843, p. 77). Van de Velde visited the spot in 1852, approaching it through the hills from the south-west. He describes the view of the plain as seen from the highest point between it and the sea, and the huge tells which mark the positions of the “key-fortresses” of the hills and the plain, Taanulk and el-Lejjan, the latter being the most considerable, and having another called Tell Metzellim, half an hour to the north-west (Syr. and Pal. 1:350-356). About a month later in the same year Dr. Robinson was there, and convinced himself of the correctness of his former opinion. He, too, describes the view over the plain, northwards to the wooded hills of Galilee, eastwards to Jezreel, and- southwards to Taanach, Tell Metzellim being also mentioned as on a projecting portion of the hills which are continuous with Carmel, the Kishon being just below (Bib. Res. 2:116-119). Both writers mention a copious stream flowing down this gorge (March and April), and turning some mills before joining the Kishon. Here are probably the “waters of Megiddo” (מֵי מַגַדּוֹ) of Jdg 5:19, though it should be added that by professor Stanley (S. and P. p. 339) they are supposed rather to be “the pools in the bed of the Kishon” itself, which has its springs in Tabor (Jdg 5:21; see Hollman, Commentar. in carm. Deborce, Lips. 1818, p. .42 sq.), and not (as in Michaelis, Suppl. p. 339; Hames-: veld, 3:138) the Sea of Cendevia (Pliny, v. 17; 36:65), at the foot of Carmel. The same author regards the.” plain (or valley) of Megiddo” as denoting not the whole of the Esdraelon level, but that broadest part of it which is immediately opposite the place. we are describing (p.335,336). The supposition of Raumer (Palastina, p. 402), that Legio represented the ancient Maximianopolis (which is given by Jerome as the later name for Hadadrimmon), based' upon the presumption that the remains of a Roman road said to be still visible to the south of Lejjun are those of the thoroughfare between Caesarea and Jezreel, is without good foundation (see Bibliotheca Sacra, 1844, p. 220). Yet Van de Velde (Memoir, p. 333) holds this view to be correct. He thinks he has found the true Hadadrimmon in a place called Runmmaneh, “at; the foot of the Megiddo hills, in a notch or valley about an hour and a half south of Tell Metzellim,” and would place the old fortified Megiddo on. this tell itself, suggesting further that its name, “the Tell of the Governor,” may possibly retain a reminiscence of Solomon's officer, Baana the son of Ahilud. Porter believes this tell was the site of the stronghold of Megiddo itself (Family Treasury, Dec. 1864).

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

             Lieut. Conder (Tent Work, 1:128 sq.; and still more extensively in the Memoirs to the Ordnance Survey, 2:90 sq.) impugns the grounds of identity between this place and Legio (now Lejjun), and prefers Khurbet el- Mujedda, a ruin three miles southwest of Beisan; but this is too far from the Kishon.

## Megiddon[[@Headword:Megiddon]]

             (Zec 12:1). SEE MEGIDDO.

## Megillah[[@Headword:Megillah]]

             SEE TALMUD.

## Megilloth[[@Headword:Megilloth]]

             (מְגַלּוֹת, rolls, from גָּלִל). The Hebrew MSS. were on rolls of parchment, usually written on one side, though sometimes also. on both (Eze 2:10). Afterwards the term מגלהwas used of a book consisting of several leaves fastened together (Jer 36:23-24); once it occurs in Scripture as designating the Pentateuch (Psa 40:8 [7]). In later Jewish usage the term Megilloth was applied to the five books, viz. Song of Songs, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, and Esther, which were read on certain festivals in the synagogue. SEE HAPHTHARAH. The title of Megillah was used κατ᾿ ἐξοχήν of the book of Esther, SEE ESTHER, BOOK OF; and from this it is supposed it was transferred to the others. To the reading of this at the Feast of Purim special importance was attached by the Jews (Talmud, Tr. Megillah, ed. Surenhus. 2:387). SEE ROLL.

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

             a Mohammedan name for an assembly or council specially convened to judge of the merits or demerits of their highest functionary. The members of the Megma are the imams, or “doctors of the law.” SEE IMAM.

## Mehadu[[@Headword:Mehadu]]

             is the name of a Hindu deity of inferior rank, supposed to have been created before the world, and which they hold will be used when the end of the world shall come as an instrument to destroy all created things. See Broughton, Biblioth. Hist. Sac. 2:78.

## Meharry; Alexander, D.D[[@Headword:Meharry; Alexander, D.D]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Adams County, Ohio, October 17, 1831. He was carefully and religiously trained; was converted in his thirteenth year: in 1833 entered into mercantile business; received license to preach in 1841, and in the same year joined the Ohio Conference. His fields of labor were Blendon, Bamibridge Circuit, Jacksonville, Deer Creek, Frankfort, and Augusta Circuit, Kentucky. In 1848 and 1849 he served New Street and East Cincinnati missions. He then acted as agent for the Ohio Wesleyan University, for six years, as well as part of the time as agent for the Springfield Highschool. His next appointments were Franklin, Middletown, Finley Chapel, Cincinnati, and Wilmington. In 1866 and 1867 he was agent for the Cincinnati Wesleyan College; from 1868 to 1870 was pastor at Eaton; in 1871 served as presiding elder of Ripley District; in 1872 and 1873 of Springfield District; from 1874 to 1877 held a superannuated relation; and in 1878 was appointed financial agent of the Ohio Wesleyan University. He died in Germantown, November 18 of thlat year. Dr. Meharry was a plain, practical, bold, and uncompromising preacher; a man of great energy, an indefatigable worker. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1879, page 16.

## Mehdivis[[@Headword:Mehdivis]]

             a Mohammedan sect in India, who take their name from believing their Wali or saint to have been the promised Mehdi or Mahadi. A pretender arose, who claimed to be the twelfth Imam. He was born at Benares, in the year A.D. 1443, and declared himself to be the Mahadi, at the black stone at Mecca, about A.D. 1495. He died at Khorassan, in the year A.D. 1505, after which his followers dispersed, without, however, giving up their belief in the reappearance of their leader as the long-expected Mahadi. They were subjected to a severe persecution by Aurungzebe, but are still found in small communities in various parts of India.

## Mehemet Ali[[@Headword:Mehemet Ali]]

             one of the most noted of Egypt's sovereigns, who filled the viceroyalty from 1804 to 1848, deserves a place here for his philanthropic acts towards the Christians, and his beneficence towards all men, without distinction of creed. He was born in 1769, and died at Cairo Aug. 3, 1849. Mehemet Ali  was particularly noted for his successful wars against the Mamelukes, and for his reduction of Syria, which he. conquered in 1830. “ As a ruler,” says a contemporary,”' Mehemet Ali displayed talents of a very high order, and few princes have founded more beneficent institutions or shown a more just and liberal spirit. He established schools and colleges, created an army and navy, and introduced the manufactures of Europe. He protected his Christian subjects, and aided by his liberality the researches of Champollion, Lepsius, and other eminent savants.” See F. Mengin, Histoire de l'Egypte sous le Gouvernement de -Mohammed Ali (1839); A. de Vaulabelle, Histoire. de I'Egypte; Creasy, Hist. of the Ottoman Turks, 2:392.

## Mehetabeel[[@Headword:Mehetabeel]]

             (Neh 6:10). SEE MEHETABEL.

## Mehetabel[[@Headword:Mehetabel]]

             (Hebrews Meheytabel', מְהֵיטִבְאֵל, whose benefactor is God; or, according to Gesenius, a Chald. form for , מֶיטַיבאֵל, blessed by God; Vulg. Metabee), the name of a man and of a woman.

1. (Sept. Μετεβεήλ, Μεταβεήλ) The daughter of Matred, and wife of Hadad, the last named of the original kings of Edom, whose native or regal city was Pai or Pan (Gen 36:39; 1Ch 1:50). BC. prob. cir. 1619.

2. (Sept. Μεηταβεήλ v. r. Μεταβεήλ, Auth. Vers. “Mehetabeel.”) The father of Delaiah, and grandfather of the Semaiah who connived with Sanballat in his attempts to decoy Nehemiah into signs of fear (Neh 6:10). BC. considerably ante 446.

## Mehida[[@Headword:Mehida]]

             (Hebrews Mechida', מְחַידָא, prob. joining; Sept. in Ezra Μεϊδά v. r. Μαουδά, in Nehemiah Μεειδά v. r. Μιδά; Vulg. Mahida), a name given in Ezr 2:52; Neh 7:54, apparently as that of a person whose descendants (or possibly a place whose inhabitants) were among the Nethinim of the “children” (i.e. probably residents) of Bazlith, after the exile. BC. ante 536.

## Mehir[[@Headword:Mehir]]

             (Hebrews Mechir', מְחַיר, price, as often; Sept. Μαχείρ vr. Μαχίρ), the son of Chelub and father (?founder) of Eshton, of the tribe of Judah (1Ch 4:11), but of what particular family does not clearly appear. BC. perhaps cir. 1618.

## Meholah[[@Headword:Meholah]]

             SEE ABEL-MEHOLAH.

## Meholathite[[@Headword:Meholathite]]

             (Hebrews Mecholathi', מְחֹלָתַי, Gentile adj. from Meholah; Sept. Μαουλαθίτης, Μοουλαθί), a native doubtless of ABEL-MEHOLAH (1Sa 18:19; 2Sa 21:8).

## Mehring, Heinrich Johann Friedrich[[@Headword:Mehring, Heinrich Johann Friedrich]]

             a Protestant theologian, who died at the age of eighty-one years, May 3, 1879, at Papendorf, near Pasewalk, where he occupied one and the same pastorate over fifty-six years, is the author of, Das Siindenregister imn Rdmerbrief, oder neue Erklarung der Stelle, Rom 1:8-32 (Wriezen- on-the-Oder, 1854): — Der Brief Pauli an die Romer (Stettin, 1868, 1 part). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2:864. (B.P.)

## Mehujael[[@Headword:Mehujael]]

             (Hebrews Mechuyael', מְהוּיָאֵל, smitten by ‘God; v.'r. in the same verse Mechiyael; מְחַיָיאֵל; Sept. has Μαλελεήλ v. r. Μαϊήλ; Vulg. Maniael), the son of Irad and father of Methusael, third antediluvian patriarch in descent from Cain (Gen 4:18). BC. cir. 3840.

## Mehuman[[@Headword:Mehuman]]

             (Hebrews Mehuman', מְהוּמָן, either from the Syr. faithful, or from some unknown Persian word; Sept. Α᾿μάν, Vulg, Mehunzam), the first named of the seven eunuchs whom Xerxes commanded to bring in Vashti to the royal presence (Est 1:10). BC. 483.

## Mehunim[[@Headword:Mehunim]]

             (Heb. Meunim, מְעוּנַאּם, habitations, as in 1Ch 4:41, etc.; Sept. in Ezra, Μοουνείμ v. r. Μοουνίμ, Auth Vers. “Meunim;” in Nehemiah Μεεινώμ v. r. Μεϊνών; Vulg. constantly Auninz), apparently a person whose “children” returned among the Nethinim from Babylon (Ezr 2:50; Neh 7:52); but rather, perhaps, to be regarded as indicating the inhabitants of some town in Palestine where they settled after the exile, and in that case probably identical with the inhabitants of MAON (or possibly the “‘Mehunims” [below] of 2Ch 26:7). SEE MAONITE.

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

             (הִמְּעוּנַים, i.e.. the Meznim; Sept. οἱ Μειναῖοι v. r. οἱ Μιναῖοι; Vulg. Ammonitae), a people against whom king Uzziah waged a successful war (2Ch 26:7). Although so different in its English dress, yet the name is in the original merely the plural of MAON (מָעוֹן), a nation named among those who in the earlier days of their, settlement in Palestine harassed and oppressed Israel. Maon, or the Maonites, probably inhabited the country at the back of the great range of Seir, the modern esh-Sherah, which forms the eastern side of the Wady el-Arabah, where at the present day there is still a town of the same name (Burckhardt, Syria, Aug. 24). This is quite in accordance with the terms of 2Ch 26:7, where the Mehunim are mentioned with “ the Arabians of Gur-baal,” or, as the Sept. renders it, Petra. Another notice of the Mehunims in the reign of Hezekiah (BC. cir. 726-697) is found in 1Ch 4:41. Here they are spoken of as a pastoral people, either themselves Hamites, or in alliance with Hamites, quiet and peaceable, dwelling in tents. They had been settled from “ of old,” i.e. aboriginally, at the east end of the valley of Gedor or Gerar, in the wilderness south of Palestine. A connection with Mount Seir is hinted at, though obscurely (1Ch 4:42). Here, however, the Auth. Vers. probably following the translations of Luther and Junius, which in their turn follow the Targum-treats the word as an ordinary noun, and renders it “ habitations;” a reading now relinquished by scholars, who understand the word to refer to the people in question (Gesenius, Thesaur. p. 1002 a, and Notes on Burckhardt, p. 1069; Bertheau, Chronik). A third notice of the Mehunim, corroborative of those already mentioned, is found in the narrative of 2 Chronicles 20, There is every reason to believe that in 2Ch 20:1 “ the Ammonites” should be read as “the Maonites,” who in that case are the “men of Mount Seir” mentioned later in the narrative (2Ch 20:10; 2Ch 20:22).

In all these passages, including the last, the Sept. renders the name by οἱ Μειναῖοι -the Minaeans a nation of Arabia renowned for their traffic in spices, who are named by Strabo, Ptolemy, and other ancient geographers, and whose seat is now ascertained to have been the south-west portion of the great Arabian peninsula, the western half of the modern Hadramaut (Smith, Dict. of Geography, s.v. Minaei). Bochart has pointed out (Phaleg, vol. ii, cap. xxii), with reason, that distance alone renders it impossible that these Minseans can be the Meunim of the Bible, and also that the people of the Arabian peninsula are Shemites, while the Meunim appear to have been  descended from Ham (1Ch 4:41). But, with his usual turn for etymological speculation, he endeavors nevertheless to establish an identity between the two, on the ground that Carn al-Manasil, a place two days' journey south of Mecca, one of the towns of the Minaeans, signifies the “horn of habitations,” and might therefore be equivalent to the Hebrew Meonim. Josephus (Ant. 9:10,3) calls them “the Arabs who adjoined Egypt,” and speaks of a city built by Uzziali on the Red Sea to overawe them. Ewald (Geschichte, 1:323, note) suggests that the southern Minueans were a colony from the Maonites of Mount Seir, who in their turn he appears to consider a remnant of the Amorites (see the text of the same page). That the Minaeans were familiar to the translators of the Sept. is evident from the fact that they not only introduce the name on the occasions already mentioned, but that they further use it as equivalent to NAAMATHITE. Zophar the Naamathite, one of the three friends of Job, is by them presented as “ Sophar the Minaean,” and “ Sophar king of the Minaeans.” In this connection it is not unworthy of notice that as there was a town called Maon in the mountain-district of Judah. so there was one called Naamah in the lowland of the same tribe. El Minyay, which is or was the first station south of Gaza, is probably identical with Minois, a place mentioned with distinction in the Christian records of Palestine in the 5th and 6th centuries (Reland, Palest. p. 899; Le Quien, Oriens Christ. 3:669), and both may retain a trace of the Minneans. BAAL-MEON' a town on the east of Jordan, near Heshbon, still called Ma'in, probably also retains a trace of the presence of the Maonites or Mehunim north of their proper locality.

The latest appearance of the name MEHUNIMS in the Bible is in the lists of those who returned from the captivity with Zerubbabel. Among the non- Israelites from whom the Nethinim-following the precedent of what seems to have been the foundation of the order-were made up, we find their name (Ezr 2:50, AV. “ Mehunim;” Neh 7:52, AV. “Meunim”). Here they are mentioned with the Nephishim, or descendants of Naphish, an Ishmaelitish people whose seat appears to have been on the east of Palestine (1Ch 5:19), and therefore certainly not far distant from Ma'an, the chief city of the Maonites.

## Meichelbeck, Charles[[@Headword:Meichelbeck, Charles]]

             a German monastic and scholar, was born May 29, 1669, at Oberndorf, in Algau. He was admitted in 1687 to the Order of the Benedictines of Buren,  in Bavaria. From 1697 he taught Latin, and-subsequently theology, in the different-convents of his order. After having prepared a history of the abbey of Buren-Chronico Benedicto-Buranum, (Buren, 1752, fol.)-he was commissioned in 1722, by the chief bishop of Freisingen, to write one of that city ,.Historia Frisingensis, ab anno 724 (Augsburg, 1724-29, 2 vols. fol.); the numerous diplomas contained in, this work render it very valuable as a history of Germanic institutions. Called later to Vienna to write the annals of the house of Austria, he declined the task on account of the bad state of his health. He died at Freisingen April 2,1734. P. Haidenfeld prepared a life of Meichelbeck, but it was never published. See Hirsching, Hist. liter. Handbuch; Zapf, Literarische Reisen, vol. i; Meucel, Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v.

## Meier, Christoph Paulus[[@Headword:Meier, Christoph Paulus]]

             (originally Solomon ben-Meir), a rabbi at Frankfort, who embraced Christianity, and was baptized August 5, 1673, at Nordhausen, is the author of, Judischer Narren spiegel (Wittenberg, 1685): — Jewish Ceremonies (ibid. 1678; Dantzic, 1682): — Tractatus de Brevi et Ridicula Judmeorum Expositione Cantici (Dantzic, 1678), etc. See Wolf, Bibl. Hebr. 1:1010 , 3:982; 4:967; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v.; Schudt, Jud. Denkwurdigkeiten, 2:124; Diefenbach, Judaeus Conversus, page 169 sq.; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 2:341. (B.P.)

## Meier, Ernst Heinrich[[@Headword:Meier, Ernst Heinrich]]

             a German Orientalist, was born at Rusbendt, in Schaumburg-Lippe, May 17, 1813. He studied at the University of Tubingen, and was appointed professor there in 1848. He died March 2,1866. Of his writings, the following deserve especial mention: Uebersetzung und Erklarung des Proph. Joel (Tubing. 1840) :-Hebraisches Wurzel worterbuch (Manh. 1845) : — Ueber die Bilditng und Bedeutung des Plural in den sem. und ge-manischen Sprachen (ibid. 1846) :-Die ursp-iingliche Form des Dekalogs (1846):-Commentar zu Jesaia, vol. i (Pforzh. 1850):-Die Form der hebr. Poesie (Tubing. 1853):-Geschichte der poetischen Nationalliteratur der Hebsraer-(ibid. 1856). This last-named work was an attempt to transform the introduction of the Old Test. into a history of the literature of the Hebrews.

## Meier, Friedrich Christ[[@Headword:Meier, Friedrich Christ]]

             (originally Israel Meier), a Jew who embraced Christianity, and was baptized with his daughter, at Altona, near Hamburg, September 21, 1701, wrote, Licht zu erleuchten die Juden (Leipsic, 1711; Halle, 1713): — Der guldene Leuchter im A.T. (Hamburg, 1718): — Balsam des Lebens, on Jewish ceremonies (Brunswick, 1719): — Der 91 Psalm gedeutet (Rostock, 1704): — Miloses mit Christus verglichen (Hamburg, 1715): — Glaubensbekentniss, etc., or יְשׁוּע ס8 מִגַּיד אֶמוּנִת(Altona, 1701). See Wolf, Bibl. Hebr. 1:990; 3:947; 4:959; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten- Lexikon, s.v.; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 2:341. (B.P.)

## Meier, Friedrich Karl[[@Headword:Meier, Friedrich Karl]]

             a German theologian, was born Aug. 11, 1808. He became privat-docent in 1832, and professor of theology at Jena in 1835. In 1836 he removed to Giessen to labor in the same capacity, and there he died, Feb. 13, 1841. His principal writings are, Geschichte der Transubstantionslehre (Heidelb. 1832):-Commentar zum Briefe an die Ephesier (Berlin, 1834):-Girolamo Savonarola (ibid. 1836):Lehrbuch der Dogmenigeschichte (Giess. 1840).

## Meier, Gebhard Theodor[[@Headword:Meier, Gebhard Theodor]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Hanover, May 16, 1633. He studied at Helmstadt, was in 1660 professor of theology, and died December 22, 1693. He wrote, Introductio in Universurnm Theologien Moralis Studium (1671): — Politia Ecclesia Primitivae ad Politiam Civilem Formata: — Historia Religionum Christianae, Judaicae, Gentilis et Muhammedanae, etc. See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:310, 624, 636, 664, 904; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Meier, Georg Friedrich[[@Headword:Meier, Georg Friedrich]]

             a German philosopher, was born in 1718 at Ammendorf; was a student, and in 1746 was appointed professor of philosophy, at Halle. He died there  in 1777. His writings are, Anfangsgriinde der schonen Wissenschqaften (Halle, 1748, 3 vols.; 2d edit. ibid. 1754):-Betrachtungen iiber den ersten Grundsatz aller schoner Kiinste und Wissenschaften (ibid. 1757):Metaphysik (ibid. 1756, 4 vols.) :-Philosophische Sittenlehre (ibid. 1756-61, 5 vols.):-Recht der Natur (ibid. 1767):-Versuch eines neuen Lehrgebdudes von den Seelen der Thiere (ibid. 1756):-Versuch einer allgemeinen A uslegungskunst (ibid. 1756) :- Untersuchung verschiedener Materien aus der Philosophie (ibid. 1768-71, 4 vols.). See his biography by S. G. Lange (ibid. 1778).

## Meier, Gerhard[[@Headword:Meier, Gerhard]]

             a German theologian, was born at Hamburg Aug. 26, 1664. He received his first instruction in the schools of his native city; studied theology at the university at Leipsic and at Wittenberg. In 1684 he received his degree, and in 1687 was appointed adjunct to the faculty of philosophy. In 1692 he received his degree of licentiate of theology. His dissertation at this time was De mysteriis pentecostalibus in Paradiso revelatis. In December of the same year he was called to the gymnasium of his native city as :professor of logic and metaphysics. He was next appointed pastor of St. Benedict's Church, and later was made superintendent and a Church councillor. In 1698 he went to Wittenberg to receive the degree of doctor of divinity. In 1700 he accepted a call to Bremen as councillor of the consistory, and superintendent and pastor of the cathedral In 1715 the position of general superintendent and professor of theology at Greifswalde was offered him, but he declined it. He died Feb. 25, 1723. Meier was esteemed for his sound theological research, which he displayed in several dissertations, mostly of a dogmatic character. A complete list of his works is given by Doring, Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands, 2:462.

## Meier, Johann Christian Wilhelm[[@Headword:Meier, Johann Christian Wilhelm]]

             a German theologian, was born at Engter July 5, 1731. He received his first instruction in languages and sciences at home, and afterwards at the gymnasium at Osnabruck. He studied theology in Jena and Gottingen. In 1753 he returned home, a candidate of theology, and was soon assigned a place as assistant to an aged pastor at Westen, near Nienburg. In this position he secured for himself the respect of his superior, and added to his literary fame by contributions to a theological periodical In 1756 he formed the acquaintance of major Von Busch at Nienburg, who appointed him  field chaplain to his regiment. In this capacity he accompanied the regiment to Canterbury, England. During his stay there he collected material for a history of the Methodists. After having travelled much for this purpose, he returned to Nienburg with his regiment in February, 1757. The history, we are sorry to say, was never published. Some of his dissertations, but particularly one, crowned with a prize, Schrift und Vernunige A handlung von dem versohnen der Zeitpunkte im Leben Jesu, published in 1756, recommended him to the favor of the count of Schaumburg-Lippe. With the title of a councillor of consistory, he became presiding superintendent of Buckeburg and supreme pastor at Stadthagen. At Rinteln he obtained the degree of a doctor of divinity by the defence of his dissertation De effectibus concionum Methodisticarum haud Miraculosis nec mirabilibus (Rintelii. 1758, 4to). He died in 1775. Meier was esteemed a theologian of great learning and sincere piety, and was untiring in his endeavors to elevate the moral qualities of the heart. (J. H. W.)

## Meigs, Benjamin Clark, DD[[@Headword:Meigs, Benjamin Clark, DD]]

             a missionary of the American board in Ceylon, was born at Bethlehem, Conn., Aug. 9, 1789; was educated at Yale College (class of 1809), and while a student there he was hopefully converted, and united with the college Church in 1809. His religious exercises were very deep and marked. He taught for a time in an academy at Bedford, New York, and then spent two and a half years at the Andover Theological Seminary. During his course there he attended, in connection with Samuel J. Mills and others, those select meetings of inquiry and prayer in reference to the subject of missions to the heathen which were commenced with the formation of the American board, Mr. Meigs, determined to devote himself to a missionary's life, was ordained at Newburyport, Mass., June 21, 1815, and sailed from that place October 23 following, to found the Ceylon mission at Jaffa. In connection with this mission he labored more than forty years, sharing in its toils and trials, its fears and hopes. In 1840, after an absence of twenty-five years, he returned to his native land, and sailed again from Boston Oct. 17, 1841, to continue his missionary labors. In 1858 the failure of his health compelled him to return again to America, and relinquish the work to which his life had been devoted. He died from a disease contracted by his long residence in India, at New York City, May 12,1862. See Missionary Herald, July, 1862.

## Meilah[[@Headword:Meilah]]

             SEE TALMUD.

## Meindaerts, Peter John[[@Headword:Meindaerts, Peter John]]

             a Dutch theologian of note, was born Nov. 7,1684, at Groningen. After having concluded his studies at Malines and Louvain, he became attached to the cause of Peter Codde, a Jansenistic prelate, who had just been dismissed by the pope from the vicarship of the United Provinces. Meindaerts was therefore obliged to go to Ireland to receive his sacerdotal ordination (1716). On his return he was made pastor of Leuwarden. In 1739 he was elected archbishop of Utrecht, in the place of Theodore van der Croon, and occupied the see until his death. Like his predecessors, Meindaerts was often obliged to defend the rights of his see against the encroachments of the court of Rome. Censured by Clement XII, he appealed from him to the first council, and executed the project, a long time meditated, of filling the vacant sees of his metropolis. It was thus that he revived the extinct bishoprics of Harlem and Deventer, by giving them, one to Jerome de Bock (1742), the other to Jean Byeveld (1758). These acts of authority drew upon him new censures from Benedict XIV and Clement XIII. In 1763. Meindaerts held a council at Utrecht, in which were seated his suffragans, his clergy, and many French Jansenists. This act further provoked the most animated controversies. He died at Groningen Oct. 31, 1767, after having presided many times at Utrecht over a religious assembly, to which he gave the name of Provincial Synod. His principal writings are, Recueil de temoignages en faveur Deuteronomy 1'eglise d'Utrecht (Utrecht, 1763, 4to; reprinted in 2 vols. 12mo) :-the Actes of the Council of Utrecht, in Latin, translated into French, 4to: — Lettre a Clement XIII (Utrecht, 1768, 12mo). See Chalnot, Biograph. Woordenbock, s.v.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Meineke, Johann Heinrich Friedrich[[@Headword:Meineke, Johann Heinrich Friedrich]]

             a German theologian, was born at Quedlinburg Jan. 11,1745, and was educated at the University of Helmstadt, which he entered, when in his nineteenth year, as a student of divinity; later he studied at Halle. He returned to Quedlinburg in 1767, and was two years after appointed to a position in the high-school of that city. He gave himself up to the study of literature and philosophy, especially Kant's system, which he studied diligently for several years. Though much engaged in his profession as a  teacher, he yet wished, as he advanced in years, to leave the pedagogical sphere, and he very readily accepted an appointment as minister at St. Blasius' Church at Quedlinburg. In the beginning of 1825 he was taken ill, and died July 25, 1825. Meineke united a perfect knowledge of theology, philosophy, and ancient languages, with a talent for the practical application of his knowledge. Though liberal in sentiment, he yet displayed the most decided abilities of a polemic who gave no quarter. He knew only one cause, that of his God and of his Church, and to serve it faithfully was his only endeavor. His best polemical production, entitled Finsterlinge unserer Zeit, he published under the nom de plume of Aloysius Frey (in 1822). For the use of ministers, he published in 1811 Repertorium fur alle Kanzelbedurfnisse der Prediger an Sonn- und Festtagsfruhpredigten oder in der Woche (Quedlinburg, 1811, 8vo), vol. i; the second volume was never published, but an appendix to this he published in 1817:-Tagliches Handbuch-fur Prediger und Predigamts-Candidaten zur leichtern Auffindung der Materialien zu ihren Kanzelvortragen (ibid. 1817, 8vo). But perhaps the most valuable production of his life was Die Bibel ihrem Gesammtinhalte nach summarisch erkladrt zurichtiger Beurtheilung und zweckmassigem Gebrauche derselben fir Lehrer in Burger und Landschulen (Quedlinburg, 1819, 2 vols. 8vo). See Doring, Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands, s.v.

## Meiner, Johann Werner[[@Headword:Meiner, Johann Werner]]

             a Lutheran theologian, born at Romershofen, Franconia, March 5, 1723, was rector at Langensalza, and died March 23, 1789. He wrote, Die wahren Eigenschaften der hebraischen Sprache (Leipsic, 1748): — Analysis et Versio iii Ecclesiastae (ibid. 1751): — Auflosung der vornehmsten Schwierigkeiten der hebr. Sprache (Langensalza, 1757): — Progr. II de Hebraeorum Censibus (1764-66): — Beitrag zur Verbesserung der Bibel uber setzung (Ratisbon, 1781). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 2:341 sq.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:115. (B.P.)

## Meiners, Christoph[[@Headword:Meiners, Christoph]]

             a celebrated German philosopher, was born at Otterndorf, Hanover, in 1747. About his early life but little is known. He studied at the University of Gottingen, and became a professor at his alma mater in 1772. He died in 1810. He wrote, Revision der Philosophie (Gottingen,1772) :-Versuch einer Religionsgeschichte der iltesten Volker besonders Aegyptens (ibid. 1775):-Historia doctrine de vero. Deo (Lemgo, 1780, 2 vols.):-Geschichte des Ursprungs der Wissenschaften in Griechenland und Rom (ibid. 1781, 2 vols.): -Geschichte des Verfalls der Sitten und Staatsverfassung der Romer (Leips. 1782) :-Geschichte des Verfalls der Sitten, Wissenschaften und Sprache der Romer (Wien, 1791):-Geschichte aller Religionen (Hanover, 1806, 2 vols.):-Geschichte der Ethik (ibid. 1800, 2 vols.):- Untersuchungen iiber die Denk- und Willenskrafte (Gutting. 1806) :- Geschichte der Entstehung und Entwickelung der hohen Schulen (ibid. 1802,4 vols.):-Geschichte des. weiblichen Geschlechts (Hanov. 1798, 4 vols.):- Lebensbeschreibungen von Mannein aus der Zeit ‘der Wiederherstellung der Wissenschaften (Zurich, 1796) :- Historische  Vergleichung der Sitten des Mittelalters mit denen unseres Jahrhunderts (Hanov. 1793, 3 vols.). Besides these, his own works, he edited, in connection with T. G. Feder, Philosophische Bibliothek (Getting. 1788- 91,4 vols.); in connection with Spittler, Gottingisches historisches Magazin (Hanov. 1787-90); Neueres Magazin (ibid. 1791-92,3 vols.).'. Meiners's literary works evince great activity, and at the same time a great variety in his themes; the most of his writings, however, are devoted to show the difference between past and present morals.

## Meinertzhagen, Gustav[[@Headword:Meinertzhagen, Gustav]]

             a Protestant theologian, who died at Bremen in 1856, is the author of, Predigten (Bremen, 1834): — Die Hoffnung der Glaubigen (ibid. 1842): — Vorlesungen uber die Christologie des Alten Testaments (ibid. 1843): — Die religiose Bedeutung der biblischen Wunder (1845): — Ueber Werth und Bedeutung der biblischen Geschichte (1849): — Die Versuchung Christi (1855). After his death Achelis published Nacchgelassene Predigten (1857). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2:865 sq. (B.P.)

## Meinhart, Georg Friedrich[[@Headword:Meinhart, Georg Friedrich]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Ohrdruff, in the county of Hohenlohe, April 5, 1651. He studied at Jena and Wittenberg, was in 1683 superintendent at Arnstadt, and died April 10, 1718, doctor of theology. He wrote, Meditationes in Zachariae 9:9: — Disputationes de Propheta Mosi: — De Nasiraeis Disputationes Tres: — De Cothan Dissertationes Tres: — De Pauli Nasirceatu: — De Selenolatria a Jeremia Improbata: — De Fabrica Templi Mystici. See Unschuldige, Nachrichten; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

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

             a German theologian, was born Feb. 27, 1797, at Netzelkow, on the isle of Usedom, and was educated at Greifswalde. In 1820 he was appointed rector of the school at Usedom, and soon after minister at Koserow, near the Baltic; in 1826 at Krummin, and in 1844 at Rehwinkel, near Stargard. He resigned this position in 1850, and joined the Roman Catholic confession. He died in 1851 at Charlottenburg. He published Athanasia oder die Verklarung Friedrich Wilhelm III (1844): — Die babylonische Sprachen und Ideenverwirrung der modernen Presse (Leips. 1848). His works were collected and published at Leipsic (1846-52), entitled Gesammelte Schriften.

## Meinrad, St[[@Headword:Meinrad, St]]

             a German Roman Catholic ascetic, was born towards the close of the 8th century. He was educated at the abbey of Reichenau. He secluded himself in a desert near the Etzel Mountains, and afterwards near the spot where now stands the Benedictine convent of Einsiedeln, which was built in 934 by the canon Benedictus of Strasburg. Meinrad was murdered Feb. 21, 863.

## Meintel, Conrad Stephen[[@Headword:Meintel, Conrad Stephen]]

             a German theologian, was born at Schwabach, Bavaria, in the early part of the 18th century. In his very youth he made such rapid progress in old and modern languages that he had finished in his twelfth year the reading of the Bible in the original. He studied theology at the university at Altdorf in 1745; continued in 1746 at Jena; went in 1747 home to Peternaurach, where his father was then installed as a minister of the Gospel. In 1751 he returned to Altdorf. He gained great notoriety in 1751 by means of his  dissertation De locis quibusdam Jobi, in quibus celeberr. Schultens majorem lucem desideravit.

In the latter part of 1751 he went home to assist his father, and stayed there till 1754, when he went to Erlangen, and then gained great distinction by his defence of the dissertation Observationes philologico-philosophicce in Ecclesiastis septempriores versus. He was given the privilege of holding public lectures. He had hopes of a professorship, but love for his home made him return to it again, and he became an assistant of his father. He finally accepted a call from St. Petersburg, Russia, and died, as minister of the Protestant congregations at Wags sili-Ostrow, Aug. 13, 1764. A short time before his death the doctorate in divinity was given to him by the University of Krnigsberg. Besides several literary essays, he published the following.: Notae selectissimorum commentatorum Judaicorum in Psalmos Davidi ex collectione Hebraica celeberr. H. J. v. Bashuysen, Latine redditae (Suabaci. 1744, 8vo):-Cento quattro historic scelte della Biblia raccolte dal fee Sgr. Giov. Hubner ed hora tradftte de original Tedesco in Italiano (ibid. 1745, 4to).

## Meintel, Johann Georg[[@Headword:Meintel, Johann Georg]]

             a Protestant theologian of the 18th century, is the author of Notae Selectissimorum Commentatorum Judaicorum in Psalmos Davidi (Schwabach, 1744): — Monarchie der Hebirer (Nuremberg, 1751); — Probe einer kritischen Polyglottenbibel (ibid. 1764-70): — Kurze Erklarung des Buches Hiob (1771): — Metaphrasis Libri Jobi, sive Jobus Metricus (1774). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 2:342. (B.P.)

## Meinwerk[[@Headword:Meinwerk]]

             bishop of Paderborn from 1009 to 1036, was of noble descent. He was educated at Halberstadt and Hildesheim, and became royal chaplain under Otto III. Henry II made him bishop, and took him to Italy in 1013. Meinwerk also accompanied Henry's successor, Conrad II, to Italy in 1026, and by the services which Meinwerk thus rendered he greatly advanced the cause of the Church. By the munificence of his royal patrons he was enabled to devote much of his time in the interest of the school and in founding new monasteries. He died June 5, 1036, but was not canonized until 1376. His life is found in Pertz, Monumenta Germanie, 11:104-161. See also Wattenbach, Deutsche Geschichtsquellen (Berlin, 1878), 2:29-33, 279; Otto, De Henrici II in Actes Litterasque Meritis (Bonn, 1810); Hirsch, Jahrbucher des deutschen Reichs unter Heinrich II; Bresslau, Jahrbucher des deutschen Reichs unter Konrad II; Plitt-Herzog, Real- Encyklop. s.v. (B.P.)

## Meir[[@Headword:Meir]]

             Rabbi (surnamed “illuminator,” i.e. the enlightener, from the estimate which his contemporaries had formed of his merit), lived about 120. He was a native of Asia Minor. Legend traces his origin to the emperor Nero. He was a disciple of the famous rabbi Akiba (q.v.), and was very intimate with Elisa ben Abua, who, after his apostasy and subserviency to the Romans, was called Acher, i.e. the other one. Meir's talents early procured him ordination from his teacher Akiba. As an instructor, he was remarkable for a thorough and effective investigation of his subject. The rabbins used to say, in their Oriental manner, that he dealt with difficulties of the law as a giant would uproot the mountains, and shatter them against each other. So replete was he with knowledge, and so successful in the communication of it, that “were a man even to touch the staff of rabbi Meir, he would become wise.” His wife was Beruria, the talented and accomplished daughter of Chananja ben-Teradion, who was burned, wrapped-in the roll which he had been discovered studying, during the persecution under Hadrian. Meir supported himself by making copies of the Scriptures. This occupation required not only considerable learning, but especially scrupulous exactness, a quality for which Meir was not particularly distinguished. His teacher, the conscientious Ishmael, anxiously set these  things before him, representing the danger which must result from any neglect on his part. But Meir, who felt no peculiar scruples, and was vain of his excellent memory, which on one occasion had enabled him to copy the whole book of Esther, set these prudent counsels aside. It was the. practice of Jewish copyists to use an ink which, in case of any mistake, could easily be obliterated. On the other hand, Meir, confident of his accuracy, used an indelible ink prepared from sulphate of copper (Chalcanthon). Referring to this, he replied to Ishmael's admonitions in his usual off-hand manner, “ Oh, I have a remedy at hand against all mistakes: I use sulphate of copper.” As has already been -said, his talents had procured him ordination from Akiba. The youthful appearance of the rabbi excited the jealousy of some, whom he reminded that, as it was not the vessel but its contents which were precious, it might happen that, while a new vessel contained old, an old-looking vessel might only enclose new wine. Meir was very fond of illustrating his doctrine by apologue and parable, and is reported to have invented no less than three hundred fables about foxes (Sanh. 38, b; Sota, 49, a). The. only lasting merit of rabbi Meir was his continuation of the labors of Akiba in the arrangement of the Ilalacha. This he carried a stage further, by dividing, according to their contents, the traditions which had hitherto been only strung ‘together according to their number. In this respect Jehuda Hakkodesh, the compiler of the Mishna, was much indebted to his tuition.

The domestic history of Meir is in many respects touching. “It has already been stated that our rabbi was married to Beruria, so famed for her talents and rabbinical lore; as, in the opinion of contemporaries, to occupy a high place among the sages of the time. Her sister had, after the martyrdom of their parents, been carried to Rome for the purpose of public prostitution. But there Providence had watched over her honor. When the persecutions ceased, Beruria found no rest till Meir went to Rome to rescue his sister- in-law from. infamy. Before entering on the dangerous undertaking, he resolved to try whether her principles had remained unshaken. Disguising himself as a Roman, he approached her, and, having satisfactorily ascertained her steadfastness, he bribed the attendants and procured her escape, though in the attempt he himself escaped capture only by disguise and feigning to :eat forbidden meat... Beruria, throughout all these trials, proved herself not only an attached, but a devoted wife. She had shared his trials when, during the persecutions, Meir had fled from Palestine. On his return she cheered and encouraged. him, and by her conduct softened the  domestic afflictions ,with which he was visited. For example, while on a certain Sabbath the rabbi was engaged in the college, his two sons were suddenly taken ill and died. To spare her husband some hours of grief, and' especially not to commute the festivities of the Sabbath into a season of mourning, the mother carefully repressed her own feelings and concealed the sad tidings. The Sabbath had been spent as usual, and its holy exercises and stillness were ended with the evening, when Beruria asked her husband whether it were not duty readily and: cheerfully to restore to its owner any property, however pleasant, which had been intrusted for safe-keeping. When the astonished rabbi answered the strange inquiry in the affirmative, his weeping wife took him by the hand, and led him to the bed on which the lifeless remains of their two children were stretched, reminding him that he whose two children these right fully were had taken back what for a time he had in trusted to their keeping.” Unfortunately Beruria afterwards compromised her character and committed suicide. Her death appears to have unsettled Meir's tranquillity. He left Palestine and resided some time in Babylonia, whence he returned to his colleagues with another and less learned bride.

Meir, besides cultivating intercourse with the most noted theologians of his own time, was also on friendly and even intimate terms with heathen sages, especially with Naumenius the philosopher, of Apamea, in Svria. The principles of this philosopher were essentially those of Neo-Platonism, in the peculiar modification of that philosophy which the influx of Eastern elements had brought about. The most noted, if not the most sophistical, among Meir's numerous pupils, was Symmachus, of Samaritan origin, known as a translator of the Bible into Greek. He had attended Meir's prelections, and thoroughly imbibed his method. It is said that this dialectician on one occasion undertook by forty-nine arguments to prove that the touch of a certain dead reptile could not defile a person. It was opprobriously said of Symmachus by his contemporaries that his ancestors could not have heard the law on Mount Sinai. Svmmachus afterwards joined the Christian sect of the Ebionites. His translation of the Bible is stated to have been more free from errors and more faithful than that of Aquila. According to Grttz, this Symmachus is not the translator of the Bible.

Meir had frequently changed his residence. ‘When the Sanhedrim was restituted under Simeon (q.v.), he returned to the Holy Land, and was elected vicar of the rabbinical see; but his continual disagreements with the  Nasi induced him at last to leave Palestine for Asia Minor, where he died, bequeathing to his countrymen the following proud and characteristic message: “Tell the children of the Holy Land that their Messiah has died in a strange country.” According to his expressed wish, the tabernacle of his unquiet spirit found its last resting-place by the- sea-shore, where his grave was washed by the waves, and looked out upon the wide, storm-tossed ocean. See Etheridge, Intr. to Hebr. Literature, p. 79 sq.; Griitz, Gesch. d. Juden, 4:188-196, 468-470; Edersheim, Hist. of the Jewish Nation (Edinburgh, 1857), p. 251-259. (B. P.)

## Meir Ben-Baruch[[@Headword:Meir Ben-Baruch]]

             (also called by the Jews Mahaaram, from the initial letters = מה8 רם מורנו הרב מאיר, our teacher the rabbi Meir), one of the most distinguished Jewish literati during the Middle Ages, was born in 1230. He was the first official chief rabbi in the German empire, to which dignity he was nominated by the emperor Rudolph I of Hapsburg. He had his seat and college at Rottenburg-an-der-Tauber, whence he is also called Meir ofRottenburg or Meier Rottenburg. The unsettled condition of the Jews in the German empire, especially the oppressions and persecutions which threatened them. every year, obliged Meir to leave the country. In the spring of 1286 he prepared to go to Syria. There, it was said, a Messiah had appeared to deliver the unhappy people. When about to enter the vessel which would convey him and his co-religionists who had followed him from Italy to the East, he was recognised by a former co-religionist,  named Knippe, who was in the suite of the bishop of Basle. Rabbi Meir was imprisoned by the emperor, not so much for punishment as for the purpose of extorting from him or his co-religionists a sum of money. Meir died in 1293 in prison at Worms, where his tombstone was discovered a few years since in the “ Gottesacker,” or cemetery. The Ashkenazim, or German Jews, venerate him as a saint. Meir wrote Theological Decisions, or Questions and Answers (שאלות ותשובות), which have been published at Cremona, 1557; Prague, 1603. He. also wrote Commentaries on the Masorah (באירי מסרת), which are still in MS. in the public libraries. He also wrote some liturgical pieces, which are still in use among the Jews; among other pieces, the famous lamentation שרופה באש שאלי, in commemoration of the burning of the law at Paris in 1242. See Etheridge, Introd. to Hebrews Literature, p. 288; Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden, 7:107, 170- 172, 188-191, 445, 456-60 (new edit. Leipsic, 1873); Jost, Geschichte des Judenthums u. s. Sekten, 3:32, 58; Furst, Biblioth. Jud. 3:176, 177; Zunz, Geschichte und Literatur, p. 40, .2,'128 (Berlin, 1845); Literatnurgeschichte der Synagogales Poesie, p. 357-62,623 (Berlin, 1865). (B. P.)

## Meir Ibn-Gabbai[[@Headword:Meir Ibn-Gabbai]]

             a Jewish writer, was born in 1481 in Spain. When eleven years old he was obliged to leave his country on account of the edict of Ferdinand and Isabella, which banished all Jews from the land. Little is known of his personal history after this time. He wrote several cabalistical works: דֶּרֶךְ אֶמוּנָה. i.e. the way of truth, ten sections on the ten Sephiroth (Padua, 1563; Berlin, 1850, by N. A. Goldberg):-— הִקֹּדֶשׁ עֲבֹדִת, also מִרְאוֹת אֵֹלהַים, in four sections: a, on the unity of God; b, on the mysteries of the adoration of God; c, on the end of the higher and lower creatures; d, on the mysteries of the law (Mantua, 1545, folio; Venice, 1567; Krakau, 1578); and a work on prayer, entitled תּוֹלִעִת יִעֲקֹב(Kstpl. 1560; Zolkiew, 1799). See Fitrst, Bibloth. Jud. 1:311, 312; Jost, Geschichte des Judenthums, 3:138; Griitz, Geschichte d. Juden, 9:239 (Berl. 1866). (B. P.)

## Meir Joseph Ben-Joshua[[@Headword:Meir Joseph Ben-Joshua]]

             surnamed Ha-Sephardi, i.e. the Spaniard, a Jewish savant of note, flourished in the early part of the 16th century. He was born in 1496 at  Avignon, whither his father had retired on leaving Spain. He is the author of a most valuable historic work, entitled דַּבְרֵי הִיָּמַיםChronicles of the Kings of France and the Ottoman Sovereigns, in two parts; the first from the creation till 1520, and the second of transactions from that time till 1553 (Venice, 1554; Amsterd. 1733). The value of the work consists in the fact that it throws aside much of the fable and wild imagination which render almost worthless all other rabbinical histories. Though contemporary with those events, the chronicler must be regarded as an impartial historian. A part of this work has been translated into Latin by L. Ferrand (Paris, 1670). To English readers this work is made accessible by C. H. Bialloblotzky's translation, The Chronicles of R. Joseph ben-Joshua Meir, the Se-phardi (Lond. 1836-38). See Furst, Biblioth. Jud. 2:115; Etheridge, Introd. to Hebrews Literat. p. 453; Lindo, ‘ist. of the Jews of Spain and Portugal, p. 451; Jost, Geschichte des Judenthums, 3:124; Milman, History of the Jews, 3:461 (New York, 1870); Da Costa, Israel and the Gentiles, p. 397 sq. (New York, 1855). (B. P.)

## Meir Rofe Of Hebron[[@Headword:Meir Rofe Of Hebron]]

             Like his father Chija Rofe, he was a physician. Little is known of his life, except that he was one of the adherents of Sabbathai Zewi (q.v.), or Aga Mohammed Effendi, the Messiah, who during the 17th century excited the whole of Europe and Asia. (B. P.)

## Meir, Abulafia El-Lewi Ben-Todros[[@Headword:Meir, Abulafia El-Lewi Ben-Todros]]

             a Jewish savant of note, was born about 1180, and was a native of Burgos. He taught the law at Toledo, where he died in 1244. He wrote various cabalistical works, such as the לַפְנֵי וְלַפְנַים, a part of which was published in Hebrew and Latin by Rittangel in the סֵפֶר יְצַירָה(Amst. 1662). He wrote also a letter against Maimonides's אַגְרוֹת, a treatise on the Masorah, entitled “ The Fence of the Law,” מָסֹרֶת סְיָג לִתּוֹרָה, and some novellas on parts of the Mishna. See Furst, Bibl. Jud 1:16; Etheridge, Introd. to Hebr. Literature, p. 276, 277; Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden, 7:33 sq.; Jost, Gesch. d. Judenthums, iii,'8, 9; Lindo, History of the Jews of Spain and Portugal, p. 81; Finn, Sephardim, or the History of the Jews in Spain and Portugal, p. 193 (Lond. 1841). (B. P.)

## Meiri[[@Headword:Meiri]]

             ( לְבֵית מֵאַירor מֵאַירַי), MENACHEM BENSALOMO, also: called Don Vidal Salomo, also Menachem bei-Salomo, a Jewish savant, was born at Perpignan, in Franie, in 1249. He was a man of great learning, and, like Maimonides, he tried to harmonize philosophy with the Talmud. He wrote in a lucid style, and in this respect made an exception to that bombastic method which was prevalent in his times. In his explanations of the holy Scriptures he kept aloof from the philosophical and mystical interpretation, and, though he acknowledged that some passages contain a higher hidden sense, he nevertheless adhered to the literal interpretation of the Word. He died between 1317 and 1320. Besides a commentary on the book of Proverbs, he wrote commentaries on the Talmudical tract Megilla (מְגַלָּה בֵּית הִבְּחַירָה עִל; new edition Konigsberg, 1860, 4to); on Joma, printed with Isaiah Nufies-Vaez's שַׂיחִ יַצְחָק. (Livorno, 1760); on  Jebamoth, Sabbath, Nedarian, Nazir, Sota (Livorno and Salonica, 1794 and 1795). But his greatest commentary is on the tract Aboth ( בֵּית אָבוֹתor לְאָבוֹת פֵּרוּשׁ, with an introduction to the Talmud, etc. This latter work has been edited by M. Stern (Vienna, 1854), with biographical and bibliographical matter. See Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden, 7:240-42 (Leipsic, 1873); Jost, Gesch. des Judenthums u. s. Sekten,. 3:57; Furst, Biblioth. Jud. 2:345, 346; Zunz, Zur Gesch. u. Literatur, p. 476-481 (Berl. 1845). (B. P.)

## Meis, Friedrich Ernst[[@Headword:Meis, Friedrich Ernst]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born June 26, 1658. He studied at Jena and Leipsic, was in 1688 conrector at Ichleusingen, in 1691 superintendent and pastor primarius, in 1699 doctor of theology, and died Dec. 20,1744. He wrote, De Sanguine Vetito ex Gen 9:3-4 : — De Morte ex Rom 5:12 : — De Resurrectione Mortuorum ex Joh 5:28-29 : — De Extremo Judicio ex 2Co 5:10 : — De Inferno ex Mat 25:41 : — De Deo Unitrino ex Esa. 48:16: — De Christo Jesu Nazarens ex Esa. 28:26: — De Scripturae Zacra ex 2Ti 3:16-17 : — De Angelis ex Ebr. 1:14: — De Providentia Dei ex 1Pe 5:7 : — Explanatio Prioris Hemistichii 1Co 15:17, contra Spinozam: — Explicatio Jer 32:17, contra Spinozam, etc. See Ludovici, Notitia Ephororum Schleusingensium Neubauer, Jetztlebende Theologen; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexion, s.v. (B.P.)

## Meisel, Marco Or Mordechai[[@Headword:Meisel, Marco Or Mordechai]]

             a great Jewish philanthropist, was born in 1528 and died in 1601. Little is known of'his life, except that he was one of the wealthiest men at that time in Germany, and that he used his means for philanthropic purposes. He built homes, hospitals, synagogues, colleges, and did all in his power to elevate the condition of his brethren, especially at Prague. The German emperor. Rudolph I, honored him by the appointment of councillor. See Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden, 9:497-99 (Leipsic, 1866); Jost, Gesch. d. Judenthums, 3:281. (B. P.)

## Meisels, Bar[[@Headword:Meisels, Bar]]

             a celebrated rabbi, was born in 1797, and died on the 15th of February, 1871, at Warsaw, where for many years he had ably filled the eminent distinction of a leader in Israel. A decided republican in politics, he was long the eyesore of the Russian government, but the very eye-apple of the Poles. Of his life we hardly know anything, because the papers were prohibited by the police from giving any biographical notices of the deceased, or any description of the demonstration at his funeral. That Meisels's death was felt as a loss to the community at large, we may gather from the fact that forty thousand people, representing all creeds, nationalities, and races, attended his funeral. In him the Poles lost one of their stanchest patriots, a man who was never afraid to utter his political sentiments. In 1861 he suffered imprisonment for six months on account of his political activity. (B. P.)

## Meisner, Balthazar[[@Headword:Meisner, Balthazar]]

             one of the most eminent German Protestant theologians of the early part of the 17th century, was born in 1587. He studied at Wittenberg, Giessen, Strasburg, and Tibingen, and in 1613 became professor at Wittenberg. In  connection with B. Mentzer (q.v.) of Giessen, and J. Gerhard of Jena, he perceived the requirements of the Church, and did his utmost to satisfy them. This we see in a remarkable sketch of his on the subject, published anonymously at Frankfort in 1679, under the title B. Meisneri pia desideria paulo ante beatum ‘obitum ab ipso manifestata.

The principal passages of it were also published in Tholuck's Wittenberger Theologen, p. 96. He had made himself known in the literary world when but twenty-four years of age by his Philosophia sobria (Giessen, 1611), which passed through several editions. This work involved him in a controversy with Cornelius Martin of Helmstadt, the champion of the Aristotelian school (see Henke, Calixtus, 1:258). His merits as a theologian have lately been fully recognised by Kaltenborn, in his Vorldufer d. Grotius auf demn Gebiete des “ Jus nature gentium” (1848), p. 220. Meisner died Dec. 29,1626. See Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 9:251. (J. N. P.)

## Meisner, Johann[[@Headword:Meisner, Johann]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Torgau, April 4, 1615. He studied at Wittenberg, was rector at his native place, afterwards doctor and professor of theology at Wittenberg, and died in 1681. He wrote, Theologia Naturalis Tribus Dissertationibus: — Compendium Theologiae Disputationibus 22: — Fasciculi Disputationum Theologicarum ad Gen 1:6-7 : — De Protevangelio Paradisiaco ad Gen 3:15 :  — De Confusione Linguarum Babylonica ad Genesis 11:11-9: — De Christo Redemtore Vivo ad Job 19:25 : — De Plerophoria Hiobi in Golern Redivivum ad Job 19:25 sq.: — De Origine et Progressu Arianismi: — De Persecutionibus et Vartyribus Veterum Christianorum: — De Vetere Novoque Hominae: — De Maria Dei Genetriae: — De Transsubstantiatione et Missa: — De Spiritu Sancto contra Socinianos: — Num Christus in Triduo fortis verus Permansertit Homo? — De Peccato in Spiritum Sanctum. See Witte, Diaium; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:425. (B.P.)

## Meisner, Johann Heinrich[[@Headword:Meisner, Johann Heinrich]]

             a Lutheran theologian, was born at Leipsic, December 11, 1755, and died there, April 10, 1813, doctor and professor of philosophy. He published, Nova Veteris Testamenti Clavis (Leipsic, 1800, 2 volumes): — In Carmine Davidis 2Sa 23:1-7 (1783): — (Economia Cap. 12 Hoseae (1788). In connection with Doderlein he published Biblia Hebraica cum Variis Lectionibus (1793). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:39, 120; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 2:347. (B.P.)

## Meisnic Interim[[@Headword:Meisnic Interim]]

             is the former name for the first formula of the SEE LEIPSIC INTERIM (q.v.).

## Meister, Christoph Andreas[[@Headword:Meister, Christoph Andreas]]

             a German theologian, was born at Ahornberg Aug. 23, 1671. He was the son of a minister, who gave him his first education. Afterwards he attended school at Mbnchberg, Hof, and Bayreuth, where he excelled in the study of the ancient languages. He went to Wittenberg to study theology, and, thanks to several influential men, he became in 1693 minister at Langensteinach, but resigned in 1701, when he was appointed minister at the court of Limburg-Speckfeld, and located at Mark Eimersheim. In 1704 he became chief minister and inspector at Sommerhausen, and in 1709 minister at the court of Hohenlohe; also superintendent and counsellor of the consistory at Weikersheim, where he died Oct. 31, 1728. Meister bore the reputation of one thoroughly acquainted with the theology of his time. He was above all things tolerant towards those who differed from him in their religious opinions. Several of his sermons were published. A list of them is given by Doring, Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands, s.v.

## Meister, Christoph Georg Ludwig[[@Headword:Meister, Christoph Georg Ludwig]]

             a German theologian, was born at Halle Aug. 12, 1738, where he began his education at Franke's orphan school; in riper years he was a student at the  university of his native town. In 1763 he was appointed second minister at Ballenstedt. In 1784 he was called to Duisburg, on the Rhine, where ha filled, besides the office of a minister, a professorship of theology. In the autumn of 1784 he was called to Bremen, and was there installed as third minister of the Liebfrauen Kirche, at the same time serving also as professor of theology at the highschool; he became in 1789 second minister of the same church, and in 1795 first minister. He died Jan. 26,1811, holding in his hands the manuscript of a sermon which he was to deliver the day after. Meister was highly esteemed by his contemporaries as the author of several ascetic works. He published also J. L. von Mosheim's Ersklrung wichtiger Stellen der heiliqen Schrift, aus dessen Werken gezogen und mitpractischen Zusitzenfir die hdusliche Andacht begleitet (Leipsic and Wesel, 1777, 8vo); and Kleine theologische Schriften (Brem. 1790,8vo).

## Mejarkon[[@Headword:Mejarkon]]

             This is held by Lieut. Conder (Tent Work, 1:230) to be the Nahr el-Aujah, a stream turbid with yellow sand, running into the Mediterranean a few miles north of Jaffa.

## Mekhitar Kosh[[@Headword:Mekhitar Kosh]]

             surnamed the Beardless, a learned Armenian ecclesiastic, who was born about 1140, founded a monastery in the valley of Dandsoud, in Eastern Armenia, in 1191, and became its first abbot. He died in 1213. Mekhitar Kosh left several works, but they still continue in MS. form, and are of minor value. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 34:786.

## Meklenburg, Jacob Hirsch[[@Headword:Meklenburg, Jacob Hirsch]]

             a Jewish writer, who died at Konigsberg, April 6, 1865, is the author of הכתב והקבלה, or Die Schrift und die Ueberlieferung (Leipsic, 1839), etc. See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 2:348; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2:867. (B.P.)

## Mekonah[[@Headword:Mekonah]]

             (Hebrews Mekonah', מֲכֹנָה, a base, as in 1Ki 7:27, etc.; Sept. in most editions omits, but v. r. Μαχνά and Μαβνή , Vulg. Mochona), a town in the southern part of the tribe of Judah, and inhabited after the exile (Neh 11:28). From its being coupled (in that passage) with Ziklag,we should infer that it was situated far to the south, while the mention of the” daughter towns” (בְּנוֹת, AV. “villages”) dependent on it, seem to show that it was a place of some magnitude. Reland (Palest. p. 892) thinks it may be identical with Mechanum, a village located by Jerome between Eleutheropolis and Jerusalem, eight miles from the former (Onomast. s.v. Bethmacha). It seems strange that Jerome should speak of a village south of Jerusalem when describing Beth-maachah, which lay at the northern extremity of Palestine (2Sa 20:14). The only unappropriated site at about the required distance is Jerash, not far north- east of Beit Nettif (Robinson, Researches, 2:342, note).

## Mekshirim[[@Headword:Mekshirim]]

             SEE TALMUD.

## Mel (Or Mell), Conrad[[@Headword:Mel (Or Mell), Conrad]]

             a German theologian, was born Aug. 14,1666, at Gudensberg (Hesse). He was the son of a Protestant minister, studied theology at the Dutch University of Groningen, then returned to Germany, and performed pastoral duties at Mittau, Memel, andKodnigsberg. In 1705 he was called to take charge of the Gymnasium of Hersfeld as director, and later received due recognition for his services from his prince, the landgrave, in the position of superintendent of the churches of Hesse. He died at Cassel, May 3, 1733. Mel had made sacred antiquity a special study, and, if his works were written too hastily, it must be attributed to the necessity of providing for the support of a large family. Mel belonged to the Royal Societies of London and Berlin. Of his works we notice Die Posaune derEwigkeit-sermons (Kinigsb. 1697, 4to; 7th edit. Cassel, 1755,4to); there is a kind of sequel, under the title Der Herold der. Ewigkeit (Berlin, 1729, 4to):-Legatio orientalis Sinensium, Samaritanorum, Chaldceorum, et Hebraeorum, cum interpretationibus (Konigsberg, 1760, fol): -Omina bruta (1704, 8vo); inserted in D'Haubert's Bibl. nagica :-Der wurdige Gast an des He-rrn Tafel-sermons (Konigsberg, 1704, 4to, eight  editions):-Antiquarius sacer, seu de usu antiquitatum Judaicarum, Grecarum, et Romanarum in explicandis obscurioribus Scripturce dictis (Schleusingen, 1707, 8vo; the edition of Frankfort, 1719, 4to, is augmented by the addition of four small works):-Pantometsrum nauticum'(Hersfeid, 1707, fol.). He invented a machine by which he pretended to measure longitude at sea with great exactness, and offered models to several academies; those of London and Berlin presented several objections, to which he replied in the Pharus illustrans (ibid. 1709, fol.): Der Tabernackel oder griindiche Beschreibung der Stiftshiitte, sammt allen ihren Theilen und heiligen Gerahten (Frankfort, 1709, 1711, 4to; Cassel. 1720, 4to): -Missionarius evangelicus (Hersfeld, 1711, 8vo) :- Zion's Lehre und Wunder — sermons (Frankfort,' 1713, 4to, eight editions) :-Das Leben' der Patriarchen (Frankfort, 1715, 1716, 2 vols. 4to)':-Die Lust der Heiligen (Cassel, 1715, 8vo; 15th edit. ibid. 1779) ;- Salomon's Ternpel (Frankfort, 1724, 4to; Cassel, 1726, 4to). The manuscripts of Mel are preserved in the library of Cassel, among which is a Histoire litteraire de la Hesse. See Acta Histor. Ecclesiastes 1:105; J. H. Lederhose, Ehrengeddchtniss Conrad Mel (Cassel, 1733, 4to); Streides, Grundl. zu einer Hess. Gelehrten Geschichte, 8:391. - (J. H. W.)

## Melach[[@Headword:Melach]]

             SEE SALT.

## Melah[[@Headword:Melah]]

             SEE TEL-MELAH.

## Melancholy[[@Headword:Melancholy]]

             in so far as it is a mental disease, and must more or less affect the religious state of the believer, demands our consideration. It is generally held that melancholy is the exaggeration of the natural and legitimate feelings of grief, despondency, and apprehension, which become morbid where the emotion is without a cause, or is disproportioned to the actual cause, or is so intense as to disturb and destroy the exercise of the other mental powers. This dejection and suffering is found associated with exalted sensations, or delusions as to the personal or physical condition of the individual, which originate in habitually cherishing certain impressions, in fixing the attention upon certain vital processes, which maybe unhealthy, or become so by the very concentration of thought bestowed upon them. The  patient lives in fear of death, in the conviction that he is-differently or more exquisitely constructed than those around; that he labors under some foul or fatal disease; that he is destitute of strength or comeliness. This has been regarded as hypochondriacal melancholy — the maladie Anglaise, and affects ‘the ‘opening of life. Similar feelins are called forth in reference to the social position. Tiere arises a dread of poverty and want. The victim is haunted by imaginary debts, obligations, peculations. He feels incapable of extricating himself. The poor, as well as the rich, entertain such doubt and dread. They starve in order to husband their resources. This affection prevails at maturity at the period of greatest activity and usefulness. Towards the decline of life although encountered at every age-morbid depression assumes the form of religious anxiety, despair, remorse. Moral statistics show that among the inhabitants of Northern Europe the number of cases of melancholy exceeds those of mania; and it has been supposed that the rudiments of the malady may be detected in the original character, the temperament and habits of the race, as well as in ‘the climate, domestic condition, and diet, by which these are modified. Defective blood nutrition, or anaemia, appears to be the physical state with which the great majority of cases of melancholy are connected, and to which all modes, of treatment are directed. Powerful and permanent and depressing moral emotions act as effectively in arresting healthy digestion and alimentation as the use of injudicious food, or the use of proper nourishment under circumstances such as the respiration of impure air, or indulgence in intemperate or degraded tendencies, which render assimilation impossible. The aspect of the melancholiac corroborates the view of inanition and exhaustion. The surface is pale, dry, cold, attenuated, even insensible; the muscles are rigid; the frame is bent; the eyes sunk, and fixed or flickering; the lips parched and colorless. There is a sense of exhaustion or pain, or impending dissolution. It has been remarked that in proportion to the intensity of the internal agony is there an obtuseness or anesthesia to wounds or external injuries. Such an immunity causes il lunatics an indifference to the most grievous forms of suffering, and has given rise to the supposition, on the part of those scientists who cannot see any virtue in religion, that Christian martyrs displayed at the stake a fortitude inspired rather by a lunatic condition than by heroic faithfulness to their convictions.-Chambers, Cyclop. sv.

To remove the oppressiveness of melancholy the following remedies may be applied:

1, early rising; 2, plain, nourishing food; 3, strict temperance; 4, exercise in the open air.

Or, if it arises particularly from the mind:

1, associate with the cheerful;

2, study the Scriptures;

3, Consider the amiable character of God, and the all-sufficient atonement of his Son;

4, avoid all sin;

5, be much in prayer, so as to enjoy the promised presence of the Holy Spirit, the infallible Comforter;

6, be constantly engaged in such employments as combine the sense of duty and the feelings of benevolence

See Burton, Baxter, and Rogers, On Melancholy; Cecil, Remains; Fuller, Works; Haslam, Observations on Madness and Melancholy; Esquirol, Maladies Mentales, 1:398; Crichton, Inquiry into the Nature and Origin of Mental Derangement. SEE ALSO MIND; SEE MONOMANIA.

## Melangists (Or Convulsionists)[[@Headword:Melangists (Or Convulsionists)]]

             is the name of a degenerate sect of Jansenists (q.v.). It originated in 1727, upon the decease of Francois de Paris. He had been noted for his piety and asceticism, and, now that he had left his earthly abode, multitudes flocked to his grave, and there, in various ways, testified their superstitious regard and veneration. Marvellous cures were claimed to be wrought there, and miracles were said to be performed. Strong religious emotions were manifested, and some were seized with convulsions. Some were endowed with the spirit of prophecy, and predicted the overthrow of Church and State. Many of the fanatics themselves claimed that their miraculous doings were divinely inspired, while others ascribed them to evil influences. Those who considered these curious works inspired by evil influences were called “Discernents,” while the believers received the name of Melangists, because they supposed themselves partly actively, partly passively inspired. ‘The superstition and fanaticism which prevailed at Francois's grave soon after his death were not wholly confined to the common people, but were shared by a considerable number of men of rank and learning. These religious excesses, however, tended to create a general prejudice against Jansenism, and really ruined the cause-at least in France; or, as Voltaire aptly remarks, “The grave of St. Francois of Paris became the grave of Jansenism.”

## Melania, St[[@Headword:Melania, St]]

             called THE YOUNGER, a Roman lady of a noble family, who was born about AD. 388, became a convert to Christianity and founded a convent in Palestine, and subsequently a monastery near Mount Calvary. She was the  daughter of a Roman consul, and one of the many noble ladies of the Eternal City who joined the cause of the Christians. She died in 439, and her death is commemorated by the Church of Rome Dec. 31. See Mace, Hist. de Sainte-Melanie (Paris, 1729, 12mo).

## Melanothon, Philip[[@Headword:Melanothon, Philip]]

             the most noted associate of Luther in the German Reformation.

Life. — Philip was born at Bretten, then in the Lower Palatinate, but now in the grand-duchy of Baden, Feb. 16,1497. His father, George Schwartzerd, was a skilful armorer, and an earnest, pious man, whose personal worth and success in his art had gained for him the patronage and esteem of many of the princes of Germany. His mother, Barbara Reuter, was a frugal, industrious, and energetic woman, the daughter of the burgomaster of the village, and the supposed authoress of several household rhymes still popular in Germany. His education was begun, under the superintendence of his grandfather Reuter, at his native place. Among his earliest teachers was John Unger, to whose thoroughness Melancthon, in later years, paid the tribute “ He made me a grammarian.” Already, under Unger his quickness of comprehension, the facility with  which he memorized, the readiness with which he clearly explained what he knew, his deep interest in his studies, and his eagerness to converse upon them, marked the young pupil as a boy of rare promise. Upon the death of his grandfather, he was removed in 1508 to Pforzheim, in Baden, where he attended a Latin school, and made his home with a female relative (according to some authorities, his grandmother), who was a sister of the renowned Reuchlin. Here he became a favorite of this great classical scholar, who presented him with books, and in recognition of his extraordinary attainments, according to a custom of the times, translated his German name Schwartzerd into the Greek Melanchthon (μέλας, black; χθών, earth)-a name retained throughout his life, although he usually spelled it Melanthon; at present many writers have come to adopt the spelling Melancthon, and, as this is the orthography of this Cyclopaedia, we have conformed to it.

In October, 1509, he entered the University of Heidelberg, where, notwithstanding his extreme youth, he soon gained great distinction as a linguist, being known among his fellow-students as “the Grecian.” When only a few months over fourteen he received the degree of bachelor of arts, became private tutor to the sons of count Lowenstein, and composed the Greek Grammar which was published several years afterwards. The severity of the climate occasioning repeated attacks of fever, and the refusal of the faculty, on account of his youth, to admit him to the master's degree, induced him in 1512 to remove to Tibingen. Here he devoted himself to a wide range of study, embracing Greek and Latin literature, philosophy, history, rhetoric, logic, mathematics, medicine, jurisprudence, and theology. In theology he attended the lectures of Lempan, and read William Occam. In medicine, he studied Galen with such diligence that he could repeat the most of that author from memory. In 1514 he received his master's degree, and began to lecture on Virgil and Terence. The next year found him aiding Reuchlin in the controversy with the monks. About the same time (1515) Erasmus expressed his unqualified admiration of the young master's attainments. “What promising hopes does Philip lMelancthon give us, who, yet a youth, yes, almost a boy, deserves equal esteem for his knowledge of both languages. “What sagacity in argument, what purity of expression, what a rare and comprehensive knowledge, what extensive reading, what delicacy and elegance of mind does he not display !” Three years later he wrote: “ Christ designs this youth to excel/us all: he will totally eclipse Erasmus.” In 1516 he lectured on rhetoric, and expounded Livy and Cicero; and before leaving Tiibingen had published his Greek Grammar.  Of the spiritual struggles of Melancthon during this period we know nothing. His great modesty prevented him from giving publicity to the details of his inner history. Whatever was the mode in which God was preparing this chosen vessel for his service we cannot discern, as in the case of Luther, any crisis, marked on the one side by the anguish of felt guilt and agonizing efforts to satisfy. God's law, and on the other by rest in the merits of Christ and joy in the assurance of personal salvation. From his earliest youth God's Spirit seems to have sanctified his mind through the principles of the divine Word, which he had made the object of the most conscientious study; so that when he was called to the assistance of Luther, by his personal experience of the grace of God, he had already apprehended the great doctrine of justification by faith, which he was summoned to expound and defend.

Called in 1518, upon the recommendation of Reuchlin, to the Greek professorship at Wittenberg, he declined, on his way thither, invitations from both Ingolstadt and Leipsic. At his arrival, his boyish appearance, and his timid and retiring manners, caused a feeling of disappointment; but when, four days later (Aug. 29), he delivered his inaugural lecture, “On reforming the Studies of Youth,” he won the enthusiastic applause of all his hearers. Luther, especially, was delighted. Two days afterwards he wrote: “We quickly forgot all our thoughts about his person and stature, and rejoiced and wondered at his treatment of his theme.. -I really desire no other teacher of Greek so long as he lives.” And again, Sept. 2, “ Philip has his lecture-room crowded with students. He has especially infused an enthusiasm for the study of Greek into the students of theology of all classes.” This favorable opinion was only strengthened by further intimacy, Which revealed the extensive erudition of Melancthon, and called forth eulogiums still more ardent. “A wonderful man, in whom everything is almost supernatural, yet my most cherished and intimate friend” (Luther to Reuchlin, Dec. 14,1518). Although repeatedly called elsewhere, even to France and England, he remained at Wittenberg until the close of his life, exerting, by his varied attainments, marvellous industry, and simple piety, an influence second only to that of the great Reformer. Married in 1520 to Catharine Krapp, daughter of the burgomaster of Wittenberg, whom his friend Camerarius describes as a pious and devoted wife and mother, Melancthon enjoyed in his domestic life much happiness, but during his later years suffered great trouble and anxiety. Of his two sons, one died in infancy; Philip died in 1603, a pious but not a gifted man, at one time secretary of the Consistory. Of his two daughters, Anna married the learned bht erratic and  unprincipled George Sabinus, provost of the University of Konigsberg, and died in 1547; while Magdalena became the wife of Dr. Caspar Reucer, afterwards professor at Wittenberg, and survived her father.

Melancthon's last years were embittered not only by domestic griefs, but also by the distracted condition of the Church. He longed to be delivered, as he said, from the “rabies theologica.” A violent cold, contracted in travelling, April, 1560, terminated in a fever, which eventually proved fatal. Although in much feebleness, he continued to lecture until a week before his death, which occurred April 19. Almost his last words were, “Nothing but heaven.” Two days afterwards his body was laid by the side of that of Luther, where, on the anniversary of his death, in 1860, the corner-stone of a monument to his memory was laid with appropriate ceremonies. It has since been reared, in 1869.

Melancthon as a Teacher. - His reputation as a teacher gave him the title of Proeceptor Germazice, and attracted to Wittenberg crowds of students not only from all parts of Germany, but also from England; France, Poland, Hungary, Denmark, and even Italy and Greece. He frequently lectured to an audience of2000. His lectures covered Old and New Testament exegesis, dogmatic theology, the explanation -of :the principal Latin and Greek classics, ethics, logic, physics, and occasionally metaphysics. In addition, he received private pupils at his house, and exercised over them- a truly paternal oversight. By his work in the organization of many of the schools of Germany, and more especially by his valuable text-books, he continued for many years after his death to exert a more powerful influence than any living teacher, and became, as Hallam (Hist. of Lit. 1:145) remarks, “far above all others, the founder of general learning throughout Europe.” His Latin Grammar, prepared originally for his private pupils, was almost universally adopted in Europe, running through fifty-one editions, and continuing until 1734 to be the text-book even in the Roman Catholic schools of Saxony. His Greek Grammar also enjoyed great popularity. Of his Terence, 73 editions had been published within 106 years of its first publication. He also published either scholia upon or expositions or paraphrases of the De Offciis, Lelius, De Oratore, Orator, Topicce, Epistles, and 19 Orations of Cicero, Porcius Latro, Sallust, the Germania of Tacitus, Pliny, Quintilian, 1. xii, six orations of Demosthenes, one of AEschines, Lycurgus, Stobeeus, AElian, Lucian, Thucydides, Xenophon, Plutarch, Lysis, Ptolemaeus, selections from Homer and Sophocles, 18 tragedies of Euripides, Aristophanes, Menander, 19th Idyl of  Theocritus,.Tyrteeus, Solon, Theognis, Calimachus, Pindar, Empedocles, Virgil, Ovid, the Miles of Plautus, and the Theognis of Seneca, in addition to composing 391 Latin and Greek odes. His style (genus dicendi Philippicum), which is said, in purity of diction and correctness of classical taste, to excel even that of Erasmus, for a time was regarded in the schools as a model, even to the exclusion of Cicero and Quintilian.

In philosophy, although, in his first edition of his Loci Communes, he sympathizes with Luther's antagonism to Aristotle, yet he soon learned to distinguish between the use and the abuse of that author, and, while condemning Aristotle as perverted by Romish scholasticism, he effectually employed him in his true meaning as an important aid to the student of theology for the detection of sophistry and the attainment of a clear method of thought. He declared that he had never understood the use of philosophy until he had apprehended the pure doctrine of the Gospel.: Among his philosophical works were an Epitome. of Moral Philosophy; Elements of Ethics; Explanation of Aristotle's Ethics; Commentary on Aristotle's Politics; Elements of Rhetoric; Logical Questions; and dissertations on various ethical subjects, such as oaths, contracts, etc. For many years instruction in these works was the regular course in ethics in most of the schools of Protestant Germany. A writer before quoted pronounces them “more clear, elegant, and better. arranged than those of Aristotle himself or his commentators” (Hallam's Literature, 2:50). He was the author, also, of an elementary text-book of physics, and a sketch of universal history, from the creation to the Reformation (Chronicon Carionis). His miscellaneous orations, lectures, and essays fill over two volumes of the Corpus Reformatorum.

Melancthon as a Theologian and Reformer. — But it is with Melancthon as a theologian that we have chiefly to do. He never entered the ministry, and therefore performed his work in the Church entirely in the capacity of a layman. Immediately upon going to Wittenberg he identified himself with the Reformation, which had begun the preceding year. During his first fall and winter there he delivered lectures on Titus, following them by a course on the Psalms, Matthew, and Romans. His published exegetical lectures embrace, in addition, Genesis, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Lamentations, Daniel, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, John, Corinthians, Colossians, and Timothy. His lectures on Romans and Corinthians were published by Luther without the author's knowledge. Extemporaneous explanations of the Gospels, during a later period of his life, delivered on  Sundays at his residence, were committed to writing by some of his hearers, and, after revision by Pezel, were published under the title of Postils.

He accompanied Luther to the Leipsic Disputation (1519), at which he remained a mere spectator, but afterwards published a letter to OEcolampadius, in which he gave a succinct account of the discussion. Though written in the best spirit, it provoked a very bitter reply from Dr. Eck, in which, while acknowledging Melancthon's pre-eminence as a grammarian, he expressed ,the utmost contempt for his theological attainments, and advised him thereafter to confine his attention to classical pursuits, and not to attempt to enter a higher sphere. The reply of Melancthon is brief and modest, but the indignation of Luther manifested itself in a severer answer, in which he pronounced Melancthon better versed in Scripture than all the Ecks together. During the same year Melancthon received the degree of BD.

Early in 1521, under the assumed name of Didymus Faventinus, he published an apology for the Reformation, in reply to Emser (Rhadinus). About Easter of the same year he laid the foundation of Protestant systematic theology by the publication of his Loci Communes seu Hypotyposes Theologicce. It originated from a very brief summary of doctrine, prepared for his private use, which was afterwards delivered to ,his pupils, as an introduction to his lectures on Romans, and published by them without his consent or revision. The Loci Communes were intended to take the place of this meagre, and, to its author, very unsatisfactory sketch. They are marked by the clearness of method and purity of style for which Melancthon was distinguished. Luther declared that the little book could not be refuted, and that it was worthy not only of immortality, but even of canonical authority. Chemnitz affirms that Luther often remarked in private conversation that there was. more solid doctrine contained in it than in any other volume since the days of the apostles. The same author quotes the Romish theologian, Alphonso de'Zamara, as declaring: “It explains its doctrinal statements in such appropriate and accurate terms, and, by a methodical treatment, renders them so clear and strong, that it is injuring the papal power more than all other writings of the Lutherans.” Erasmus termed it “a wondrous army, ranged in order of battle against the Pharisaic tyranny of false teachers;” and Calvin, “So beautiful is the proof that it affords, that the most perfect simplicity is the noblest method of  handling the Christian doctrine.” The couplet of Selnecker was often repeated:

 “Non melior liber est ullus post biblia Christi,

 Quam qui doctrinue, corpusque, locique vocatur.”

During the author's life it passed through over sixty editions, but was subjected to constant changes. The only exception of any moment taken within the Lutheran Church to the first edition is against its statement of the doctrine of the freedom of the will, to which Huitter and others have objected that it inclines towards fatalism. Seckendorf, on the contrary, claims that on this point it was misunderstood. In 1535 the objectionable sentence, “All things happen necessarily,” was omitted. After 1543 the work was greatly enlarged, and so far changed on that subject as to seem far more in harmony with the teaching of Erasmus than that of Luther. It was repeatedly translated into the German. The translation of Justus Jonas was revised by Luther, who suggested that, while the articles on justification and the holy supper were well treated, they were not sufficiently full. A French translation appeared, with the commendation of Calvin, in 1546, and one into Italian (1534 or 1535) found eager readers even at Rome. There were also Dutch and Wendic versions. Portions of it have been translated into English-” On the Divine Essence,” by Dr. J. A. Seiss, in the Evangelical Review, 12:1-46; “On the Nature of Sin,” Theological Essays from the Princeton Review, p. 218-228. It was attacked by the papist, Richard Smyth, of England, and defended by Paulus ab Eitren, a Hamburg theologian, who prepared an edition' with additional notes, and citations from the fathers. The renowned Loci Theologici of Chemnitz is a commentary upon it. Similar commentaries were written by Preetorius, Pezel, Strigel, and Fabricius, while Spangenberg, Sohn, Mayer, and Hemmingius have prepared abridgments. For many years it continued to be a text-book in the Lutheran schools,' until-supplanted by Hutter's Compend.

During Luther's absence at the Wartburg, the care of the Reformation rested mainly upon Melancthon, With great ability he defended Luther against the theologians of Paris, but found himself unable to withstand the storm of fanaticism which arose among some of his former friends. He was even for a time greatly in doubt as to whether the pretensions of Carlstadt and the Zwickau prophets might not be true, and received from Luther a reproof because he dealt with them with so much mildness. Without any  reserve, he insisted on his own inability to meet the crisis, and urged the return of Luther as the only solution of the difficulty.

After Luther's return, he was diligently occupied in revising the translation of the Bible-a work in which his philological attainments were at several periods of invaluable service to the Church. In 1522 Luther wrote to Spalatine, asking that Melancthon might be relieved of teaching the classics, in order to devote his entire time to theology, but the latter objected, and preferred even to cease his theological instructions. In 1526, however, he was formally appointed professor of theology. During the two succeeding years he was the principal member of the commission to visit the churches and church-schools of Thuringia. The Articles of Visitation, prepared in connection with this commission, to give the ministers some directions concerning their preaching and teaching, are sometimes regarded as the earliest confession of the Lutheran Church. The importance which- they attach to the preaching of the law, in order to guard against the abuse of the doctrine of justification by faith, excited the opposition of Agricola and others, and led to a conference at Torgau (q.v.), November, 1527, in which the position of Melancthon was approved. In February, 1529, he accompanied his prince to the Diet of Spires, and assisted in the preparation of the Protest, presented April 19th, from which the friends of the Reformation obtained the name Protestants. A few months later, October 1-3, he participated, together with Luther, Brentius, and others, in the Colloquy at Marburg (q.v.) with Zwingle and his adherents. In 1530 he accompanied the evangelical princes to the Diet of Augsburg, and there, on the basis of the seventeen articles prepared by Luther at Schwabach, elaborated the Augsburg Confession, which was presented to the emperor June 25.

During its preparation the work was repeatedly revised by Luther, then at Coburg, in almost daily correspondence with Melancthon. “ Melancthon, then, was by pre-eminence the composer of the Confession, not as a private individual, but as chief of a body of advisers, without whose concurrence nothing was fixed; Luther, by pre-eminence, as the divinely called representative of the Church, its author.” For a thorough examination of the relation which Melancthon sustained to the Augsburg Confession, the reader is referred to Krauth's Conservative Reformation, p. 201-267. The hypothesis of the rationalist Ruckert, that Melancthon intended by it to effect a compromise with Rome, and that, for this purpose, a conspiracy was formed to keep Luther in ignorance of the plan, is there completely overthrown. Melancthon's excessive love of peace, and  his desire to bring together into an organic union all the Protestant churches, caused him in after years to forget that the Augsburg Confession was the work of the Church, and not-his own; for he felt himself at liberty to publish numerous revised editions, in which he made frequent changes. These changes, originating the distinction between the Variata and Invariata, almost caused a rupture with Luther, and ultimately resulted in controversies which imperilled the life of the Lutheran churches. Notwithstanding these changes, it cannot be proved that his personal convictions were at any succeeding period actually different from the teaching of the unaltered Confession. He repeatedly declared, until the close of his life, that his faith was unchanged. His object in the alterations was simply to generalize those statements which were so specific in their declaration of the Lutheran faith as to prevent the endorsement of the adherents of Calvin and others. He was constantly seeking for a generic form of agreement in which the specific differences might be lost sight of. He remained at Augsburg until late in September, employed in fruitless negotiations with the Romish theologians. The confutation of the Augsburg Confession, presented August 3, led him in reply to prepare the Apology-a masterpiece which the Lutheran Church has prized so highly as to number it among her symbols.

His Catechism (Catechesis Puerilis) appeared in 1532. In 1535 and 1536 he was actively engaged in negotiations with Bucer to secure a union of the Protestant churches on the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. As the result of these efforts, the Wittenberg Concord was signed May 28,1536. In February, 1537, he was at member of the convention at Smalcald, and signed the Articles, with the proviso that he would acknowledge the supreme authority of the pope, jure humano, if the latter would permit the preaching of the pure Gospel. In the negotiations with the papists at Worms (1540), and at Ratisbon (1541), he was the principal theologian of the Protestants. At the latter conference his compromising spirit acceded to articles clothed in such ambiguous language as to admit the interpretation either of an affirmation or a denial of the doctrine of justification by faith; but the object of the conference failed, because of an irreconcilable difference concerning the externals of religion, in which Melancthon displayed more than his ordinary firmness. In 1542 and 1543 he was employed by the archbishop and elector of Cologne to superintend the introduction of the Reformation into his territories. The book of instruction prepared in connection with this work excited the indignation of Luther  against Melancthon, until the latter assured him that Bucer was alone responsible for the article on the Lord's Supper. Early in 1545, at the request of the elector, he prepared a pamphlet on The Reformation of Wittenberg, which was sent to the Council of Trent as a summary of the doctrines of the Lutheran Reformers. After the death of Luther, in 1546, he was the acknowledged head of the Reformation, but unfortunately became again involved in negotiations with the papists, to whom he made the most remarkable concessions. His connection with the Leipsic Interim (1548) was the most unfortunate act of his life. Under the form of an apparent compromise, he yielded to the papists many of the most essential points of difference between them and the Protestants. “He was willing to tolerate both a popedom and a hierarchy, stripped, however, of divine rights, and deprived of all power in matters of faith. The relation of faith to works, and the doctrine of the sacraments, might, in his estimation, be veiled in a judicious obscurity of phrase.” In every part of the evangelical Church the Interim was most violently resisted, and his connection with it strongly condemned. In addition to private rebukes from Calvin and Brentius, Agricola, Flacius, and others publicly attacked him. In 1550' he published his Explanation of the Nicene Creed, and in the succeeding year the Confessio Saxonica, in which he had gained courage to entirely repudiate the concessions of the Interim. In 1552 he was engaged in a controversy with Osiander, who had confounded justification with sanctification; in 1553 he published brief treatises against Schwenckfeldt and Stancar, and in 1554 his Examnen Ordinandorum, a brief outline of doctrinal, ethical, and polemical theology, for the use of candidates for the ministry. His efforts during his last years to unite the followers of Calvin with those of Luther, and his attendance at another religious conference at Worms (1557) with the papists, were equally unsuccessful.

Melancthon was undoubtedly the great theologian of the Lutheran Reformation. Yet the very gifts which were of such great service in reducing the purified doctrine to a connected system, and organizing the outward form of the Church, constantly tempted him to seek for external union, even at the expense of principles essential to all true inner harmony. This tendency, fostered by his classical tastes and natural amiability and timidity, rendered him very unsafe as a leader, although so strong when under the guidance of a firmer will, as that of Luther. It is to this that Calvin referred when he heard of Melancthon's death: “O, Philip Melancthon! for it is upon thee whom I call, upon thee, who now livest  with Christ in God, and art waiting for us, until we shall attain that blessed rest. A hundred times, worn out with fatigue and overwhelmed with care, thou hast laid thy head upon my breast and said, Would God I might die here. And a thousand times since then I have earnestly desired that it had been granted us to be together. Certainly thou wouldst have been more valiant to face danger, and stronger to despise hatred, and bolder to disregard false accusations.”

Literature. — The first edition of his collected work was published at Basle, 15,1; the second, edited by his son-in-law, Peucer, Wittenberg, 1562-64 (4 vols. fol.). The most valuable is that of the Corpus Reformatorum, edited by Bretschneider and Bindseil (1834-60, 28 vols. fol.). A complete catalogue of Melancthon's writings, and of their different editions, etc., was published by H. E. Bindseil, entitled Bibliotheca Melancthoniana (Halle, 1868, 8vo, 28 pp.). The tercentenary of Melancthon's decease has called forth a large number of addresses and essays to celebrate his memory. Besides the admirable orations of Dorner, Kahnis, and Rothe, are W. Thilo, Melancthon in the Service of the Holy Scriptures; F. A. Nitzelnadel, Philip Melancthon, the Teacher of Germany; W. Beyschlag, Philippians Mel., a Sketch in Church History; FW. Genthe, Oration at Eisleben; H. Keil, Laudatio Philippians Melancthonis; IH. K. Sack, a Sermon at Magdeburg; C. Schlottmann, De Philippians Mel. reipublicoe literarice Reformnator; J. Classen, Melancthon's Relations to Frankfort-on-the-Main. Other works have been published upon some of the pupils and friends of Me-lancthon; e.g. J. Classen, on Jacob Micyllus, rector at Frankfort, and professor in Heidelberg, 1526 to 1558; E. W. Lihn, on Dr. Caspar Creutziger (Cruciger), a pupil of both Melancthon and Luther, Reb. Tagmann, on Petrus Vincentius of Breslau. The earliest life of Melancthon' was written by his friend Camerarius. The Annales Vita, in vol. xxviii, Corp. Ref., afford the richest biographical material. Biographies have been written by Camerarius (1566), Strobel (1777), Niemeyer (1817), Kdthe (1829), Facius (1832), Ulenberg (1836), Heyd (1839), Galle (1840), Matthes (1841), Ledderhose (1847), Wohlfahrt (1860), C. Schmidt (1861), Meurer, Plank (1866), and others. Those accessible to English readers are the valuable but brief sketch by Dr. F. A. Cox, and an excellent translation of Ledderhose by Dr. G. F. Krotel (Phila. 1855). See also Krauth's Conservative Reformation, p. 220 sq.; Seckendorf's Historia Lutheranismi; Ranke, Hist. Ref. p. 132; Cunningham, Reformers; D'Aubignd, Hist. Ref. 1:97,325; Nisard, Etudes sur la Renaissance;  Hardwick, Hist. Ref. p. 30 sq.; Barnet, Hist. Ref.; Gieseler, Church Hist. vol. iv, ch. i; Mosheim, Ecclesiastes Hist. vol. iii; Hagenbach, Kirchengesch. vol. iii; Fisher, Hist. Ref. p. 97 sq.; Dorner, Gesch. der protestant. Theologie, p. 108, 320, 329; Bibliotheca Sacra, 1846, p. 301 1864, p. 448; Jahrbuch deutscher Theol. vol. x, pt. i, p. 185; 1870, 3:503; 4:615; Mercersburg Revelation 1850, p. 325, Kitto, Journ. Sac. Lit. 1854, p. 185; 3 Meth. Qu. Revelation 1855, p. 163; 1860, p. 676: Studien u. Kritiken, 1859, vol. ii; Brit. and For. Ev. Revelation 1861, Jan.;. 1868, Oct.; Am. Theol. Revelation 1861, April; 1860, p. 529; Amer. Presbyt. Revelation 1861, p. 261; Zeitschrf. wissensch. Theol. 1871, vol. ii, art. 8:(H. E. J.)

## Melatiah[[@Headword:Melatiah]]

             (Hebrews Melatyah', מְלִטְיָה, deliverance of Jehovah; Sept. Μαλταίς, but most copies omit), a Gibeonite who repaired part of the walls of Jerusalem on the northern side, after the return from Babylon (Neh 3:7). BC. 446.

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

             a Protestant theologian of Germany, who died at Freienwalde, February 10, 1880, is the author of, Verhaltniss der vier kanonischen Evangelien unter einander (Berlin, 1847): — Beitrage zum Ferstandniss der Heiligenschrift (1859). See Zuchold; Bibl. Theol. 2:869. (B.P.)

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

             a Roman Catholic prelate, studied and took his doctor's degree at Modena, was ordained in 1830, and became chaplain to the court. In 1843 he came to America with bishop Rosati, and was stationed at Little Rock, Arkansas, whence he was transferred to St. Mary's Church, St. Louis, Missouri, of which diocese he became vicar-general. He remained pastor there until he was made the first bishop of Green Bay, Wisconsin, July 12, 1868. He introduced several working orders, such as the Ursulines, Franciscan Tertiaries, Servites, etc. Dr. Melcher died December 20, 1873, at the age of sixty-six, leaving a flock of 60,000 and sixty-nine churches. See De Courcy and Shea, Hist. of the Cath. Church in the United States, page 598.

## Melchi[[@Headword:Melchi]]

             (Μελχί, for Hebrews מִלְכַּי, my king), the name of two of Christ's maternal ancestors. SEE GENEALOGY OF JESUS CHRIST.

1. The son of Addi and father (maternal grandfather) of Neri or Neriah (Luk 3:28); probably identical with the MAASEIAH of 2Ch 34:8).

2. The son of Janna and father of Levi, fourth in ascent from the Virgin Mary (Luk 3:24). BC. much ante 22.

## Melchi-Shua[[@Headword:Melchi-Shua]]

             (1Sa 14:49; 1Sa 31:2). SEE MALCHISHUA,

## Melchiades[[@Headword:Melchiades]]

             SEE MITIADES.

## Melchiah[[@Headword:Melchiah]]

             (Hebrews Malkiyah, מִלְכַּיָּה, Jehovah's king; Sept. Μελχίας), a priest, the father of Pashur (Jer 21:1); elsewhere called MALCHIAH (Jer 38:1; Neh 11:12) and MALCHIJAH (1Ch 9:12).

## Melchias[[@Headword:Melchias]]

             (Μελχίας), the Greek form (in'the Apocrypha) of the Hebrews MALCHIAH; namely, (a) 1Es 9:26; (b) 1Es 9:32; (c) 1Es 9:44.

## Melchiel[[@Headword:Melchiel]]

             (Μελχειήλ), a person whose son Charmis was one of the three governors of Bethulia (Jdt 6:15). The Vulgate has a different reading, making Charmis the same as Gothoniel; and the Peshito gives the name Manshajel.

## Melchior[[@Headword:Melchior]]

             the name attributed in Romish legends to one of the wise men who visited the infant Saviour. SEE MAGI.

## Melchior, ALBRECHT WILHELM[[@Headword:Melchior, ALBRECHT WILHELM]]

             a German theologian, was born at Herborn March 12,1685. His father, who died in 1690, was superintendent and professor of theology. Albrecht commenced his academic course at Duisburg, but continued his studies at the university at Franecker. He -paid special attention to Oriental languages and literature. He finished his studies at Utrecht, and returned to Duisburg. He was in 1709 installed as minister at Mihlheim, and made professor of theology at Hanau in 1718. Upon taking this position he delivered an essay, De religione et verce religionis criteriis. In 1723 he was called to a professorship of theology and Church history at Franecker, where he died. Aug. 11, 1738. Melchior made quite a name for himself in theological literature. He published several dogmatic and exegetical dissertations to prove the authenticity of the miracles of Christ. ‘A list of all his productions, of minor value at present, is given by Diring, Gelehrte Theol. Deutschl. s.v.

## Melchior, Johann[[@Headword:Melchior, Johann]]

             a Reformed theologian of Germany, was born in 1646. He studied at different universities; was in 1667 pastor at Frech, in the duchy of Julich, in 1672 at Kattekirchen, in 1677 at Dusseldorf, in 1682 doctor of theology, and died at Dillenburg, October 15, 1689. He wrote, Clavis Prophetica Cantici Canticoruum Salomonis: — Conmmentarius in Prophetam Michceam: — Parallelismus Locorum Veteris Testamenti in Novo Ci- tatorum: — Analysis Epistolae ad Romanos: — Explanatio Epistolae ad Colossenses: — Commentarius in Epistolam ad Hebraeos: — Quaestiones in Apocalypsin: — De Religione ejusque Natura et Principio contra Spinozam: De OEconomia Dei circa Gentes et Judaeos ex Parabola Lucae 15:11-32. Melchior's Latin writings were published at Franeker in 1706, with a biography written by Johann Heinrich Florinius. See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Melchisedec[[@Headword:Melchisedec]]

             (Hebrews v-vii). SEE MELCHIZEDEK.

## Melchites[[@Headword:Melchites]]

             or MELERITES (from מֶלֶךְ, a king), i.e. Royalists, is the name given tothose Syriac, Egyptian, and other Christians of the Levant, who acknowledge the authority of the pope and the doctrines of the Church of Rome. Excepting some few points of little or no importance, which relate only to ceremonies and ecclesiastical discipline, the Melchites are in every respect professed Greeks; but they are governed by a particular patriarch, who assumes the title of Patriarch of Antioch. Their origin is referred to the labors of the Jesuits in the 17th century, and the name of Melchites was given to them because they agreed with the Greeks who submitted to the Council of Chalcedon, and was designed by their enemies to brand them  with the reproach of having done so merely in conformity to the religion of the emperor. They celebrate mass in the Arabic language, use unleavened bread in the Eucharist, and their priests (not their bishops) are allowed to marry. They have also some monastic establishments, whose inmates follow the rule of St. Basil, the common rule of all the Greek monks. See Farrar, Ecclesiastes Dict.; Eadie, Ecclesiastes Cyclop.; Neale, Hist. East. Church, ch. 2:7; Neander, Church Hist. 3:176.

## Melchizedek[[@Headword:Melchizedek]]

             (Hebrews Malki'-Tse'dek, מִלְכַּיאּצֶדֶק, king of righteousness, i.e. righteous king, comp. Hebrews vii 2; Sept. and N.T. Μελχισεδέκ, and so Anglicized in the N.T. “Melchisedec;” Josephus, Μελχισεδέκης, Ant. 1:10, 2), the “priest of the most high God,” and king of Salem, who went forth to meet Abraham on his return from the pursuit of Chedorlaomer and his allies, who had carried Lot away captive. The interview is described as haying occurred in the “valley of Shaveh (or the level valley), which is the king's valley.” He brought refreshment, described in the general terms of “bread and wine,” for the fatigued warriors, and bestowed his blessing upon their leader, who, in return, gave to the royal priest a tenth of all the spoil which had been acquired in his expedition (Gen 14:18; Gen 14:20). BC. cir. 2080. SEE ABRAHAM.

In one of the Messianic Psalms (cx. 4) it is foretold that the Messiah should be “a priest after the order of Melchizedek;” which the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews (vi. 20) cites as showing that Melchizedek was a type of Christ, and the Jews themselves, certainly, on the authority of this passage of the Psalms, regarded Melchizedek as a type of the regal-priesthood, higher than that of Aaron, to which the Messiah should belong. The bread and wine which were set forth on the table of show-bread, was also supposed to be represented by the bread and wine which the king of Salem brought forth to Abraham (Schottgen, Hor. Hebrews 2:615). In the following discussions respecting his person, office, and locality, we substantially adhere to the traditionary view of this character.

There is something surprising and mysterious in the first appearance of Melchizedek, and in the subsequent references to him. Bearing a title which Jews in afterages would recognise as designating their own sovereign, bringing gifts which recall to Christians the Lord's Supper, this Canaanite crosses for a moment the path of Abraham, and is unhesitatingly recognised as a person of higher spiritual rank than the friend of God.  Disappearing as suddenly as he came in, he is lost to the sacred writings for a thousand years, and then a few emphatic' words for another-moment bring him into sight as a type of the coming Lord of David. Once more, after another thousand years, the Hebrew Christians are taught to see in him a proof that it was the consistent purpose of God to abolish the Levitical priesthood. His person, his office, his relation to Christ, and the seat of his sovereignty, have given rise to innumerable discussions, which even now can scarcely be considered as settled. Hence the faith of early ages ventured to invest his person with superstitious awe.

A mysterious supremacy came also to be assigned to him (“ the great high-priest,” Philo, Opp. 2:34) by reason of his having received tithes from the Hebrew patriarch; and on this point the Epistle to the Hebrews (Heb 7:1-10) expatiates strongly. But the Jews, in admitting this official or personal superiority of Melchizedek to Abraham, sought to account for it by alleging that the royal priest was no other than Shem, the most pious of Noah's sons, who, according to the shorter chronology might have lived to the time of Abraham (Bochart, Phaleg, 2:1), and who, as a survivor of the deluge, is supposed to have been authorized by the superior dignity of old age to bless even the father of the faithful, and entitled, as the paramount lord of Canaan (Gen 9:26), to convey (xiv. 19) his right to Abraham. Jerome, in his Ep. lxxiii, ad Evangelum (in Opp. 1:438), which is entirely devoted to a consideration of the person and dwelling-place of Melchizedek, states that this was the prevailing opinion of the Jews in his time; and it is ascribed to the Samaritans by Epiphanius (Haer. 55:6, p. 472). It was afterwards embraced by Luther and Melancthon, by H. Broughton, Selden, Lightfoot (Chor. Marco proem. ch. 10:1, § 2), Jackson (On the Creed, bk. ix, § 2), and by many others. Equally old, perhaps, but less widely diffused, is the supposition, not unknown to Augustine (Quest. in Genesis lxxii, in Opp. 3:396), and ascribed by Jerome (l. c.) to Origen and Didymus, that Melchizedek was an angel. The fathers of the 4th and 5th centuries record with reprobation the tenet of the Melchizedekians that he was a Power, Virtue, or Influence of God (August. De Hceresibus, § 34, in Opp. 8:11; Theodoret, Hoeret. fab. 2:6, p. 332; Epiphan. Hoer. 55:1, p. 468; comp. Cyril Alexand. Glaph. in Genesis 2:57) superior to Christ (Chrysost. Hom. in Melchiz. in Opp. vi, p. 269) and the not less daring conjecture of Hieracas and his followers that Melchizedek was the Holy Ghost (Epiphan. Hoer. lxvii. 3, p. 711, and 55:5, p. 472). Epiphanius also mentions (Leviticus 7, p. 474) some members of the Church as holding the erroneous opinion that Melchizedek was the Son of God appearing in  human form an opinion which Ambrose (De Abrah. i, § 3, in Opp. 1:288) seems willing to receive, and which has been adopted by many modern, critics. Similar to this was a Jewish opinion that he was the Messiah (ap. Deyling, Obs. Sacr. 2:73; Schittgen, 1. c.; comp. the book Sohar, ap. Wolf, Curae Philippians in Heb 7:1). Moder writers have added to these conjectures that he may have been Ham (Jurieu), or a descendant of Japhet (Owen), or of Shem (ap. Deyling, 1. c.), or Job (Kohlreis), or Mizraim, or Canaan, or even Enoch (Deyling, Observat. Sacr. 2:71 sq.; Clayton, Chronology of the Hebrews Bible, p. 100). Other guesses may be found in Deyling (1. c.) and in Pfeiffer (De persona Melch. in Opp. p. 51).

All these opinions are unauthorized additions to Holy Scripture-many of them seem to be irreconcilable with it. The conjecture, however, which holds Melchizedek to have been Shem (see Jerome, ad Isaiah xli), and which we find in Rashi on Genesis as well as in the Jerusalem Targum, and also that of Jonathan (ad loc. Gen.), but not in that of Onkelos, requires an explanation how his name came to be changed, how he is found reigning in a country inhabited by the descendants of Ham, how he came forth to congratulate Abraham on the defeat of one of his own descendants, as was Chedorlaomer, and how he could be said to have been without recorded parentage (Heb 7:3), since the pedigree of Shem must have been notorious. In that case, also, the difference of the priesthoods of Melchizedek and. Levi would not be so distinct as to bear the argument which the Epistle to the Hebrews founds upon it. Rejecting on such grounds this opinion, others, as we have seen, in their anxiety to vindicate the dignity of Abraham from marks of spiritual submission to, any mortal man, have held that Melchizedek was no other than the Son of God himself. But in this case it would hardly have been said that he was made “like unto the Son of God” (Heb 7:3), or that Christ was constituted” a priest” after the order of Melchizedek (Heb 6:20), or, in other words, was a type of himself. The best founded opinion seems to be that of Carpzov (Apparat. Antiq. Sacr. Cod. chap. iv, p. 52) and most judicious moderns, who, after Josephus (War, 6:10), allege that he: was a principal person among the Canaanites and posterity of Noah, and eminent for holiness and justice, and therefore discharged the priestly as well as regal functions among the people; and we may conclude that his twofold capacity of king and priest (characters very commonly muted in the remote ages; see Schwebel,. De causis conjunctce olim c. regno sacerdotii dignitatis, Onold. 1769; JG. Miller, De regibus ap. antiq. populos sacerdotibus, Jen. 1746) afforded Abraham an opportunity of  testifying his thankfulness to God, in the manner usual in those times, by offering a tenth of all the spoil. This combination of' characters happens for the first time in Scripture to be exhibited in his person, which, with the abrupt manner in which he is introduced, and the nature of the intercourse between him and Abraham, render him in various respects an appropriate and obvious type of the Messiah in his united regal and priestly character. The way in which he is mentioned in Genesis would lead to the immediate inference that Melchizedek was of one blood with the children of Ham, among whom he lived, chief (like the king of Sodom) of a settled Canaanitish tribe. This was the opinion ‘of most of the early fathers (ap. Jerome, 1. c.), of Theodoret (in Genesis lxiv, p. 77), and Epiphanius (Hoer. lxvii, p. 716), and is now generally received (see Grotius in Hebr.; Patrick's Commentary in Gen.; Bleek, Hebraer, 2:303; Ebrard, Hebraer; Fairbairn, Typology, 2:313, ed. 1854). As Balaam was a prophet, so Melchizedek was a priest among the corrupted heathen (Philo, Abrah. 39; Euseb. Praep. Evang. 1:9), not self-appointed (as Chrysostom suggests, Hom. in Genesis 35, § 5; comp. Heb 5:4), but constituted by a special gift from God, and recognised as such by him.

Melchizedek combined the offices of priest and king, as was not uncommon in patriarchal times. Nothing is said to distinguish his kingship from that of the contemporary kings of Canaan; but the emphatic words in which he is described, by a title never given even to Abraham, as a “priest of the most high God,” as blessing Abraham and receiving tithes from him, seem to imply that his priesthood was something more (see Hengstenberg, Christol. Psalms 110) than an ordinary patriarchal priesthood, such as Abraham himself and other heads of families (Job 1:5) exercised. Although it has been observed (Pearson, On the Creed, p. 122, ed. 1843) that we read of no other sacerdotal act performed by Melchizedek, but only that of blessing [and receiving tithes, Pfeiffer]; yet; it may be assumed that he was accustomed to discharge all the ordinary duties of those who are “ordained to offer gifts and sacrifices” (Heb 8:3); and we might concede (with Philo, Grotius, 1. c., and others) that his regal hospitality to Abraham was possibly preceded by an unrecorded sacerdotal act of oblation to God, without implying that his hospitality was in itself, as recorded in Genesis, a sacrifice.

The “ order of Melchizedek,” in Psa 110:4, is explained by Gesenius and Rosenmuller to mean “ manner” =likeness in official dignity = a king and priest. The relation between Melchizedek and Christ as type and  antitype is made in the Epistle to the Hebrews to consist in the following particulars:

1. Melchizedek was the priest of the most high God by an immediate divine constitution; so Christ was a priest after his order, and not after that of Aaron.

2. Melchizedek derived his priestly office from no predecessor, and delivered it down to no successor; in this respect Christ also stands alone: “ Our Lord sprang from the tribe of Judah, of which tribe Moses spake nothing concerning priesthood.”

3. Melchizedek was superior to Abraham, consequently his priesthood was superior to that of Levi and his descendants. So Christ's priesthood was superior to the Aaronic.

4. Melchizedek was the priest appointed to exercise his office in behalf of all the worshippers of the true God; so Christ is the universal priest, the only one appointed to make intercession for our guilty race.

5. Melchizedek's priesthood was limited to no definite time; this circumstance is noticed just as it would have been had his priesthood had neither beginning nor end “ Christ is a priest forever” (Psa 110:4). 6. Each sustained the high honors of king and priest; and the significant appellations are applied to birth. “Righteous King and King of Peace” (Isa 32:1; Isa 7:6-7). In the Messianic prediction (Psa 110:4), “.Thou art a priest forever after the order of Melchizedek,” the phrase “forever” is not to be understood in the absolute sense, either of Melchizedek's priesthood or of Christ's. Melchizedek's priesthood terminated with his life; so Christ's priestly and kingly office as Mediator will both cease when the work of redemption is fully accomplished (1Co 15:24-28). But in neither case is there any statute which limits the specified accession to office and of egress from it. To these points of agreement, noted by the apostle, human ingenuity has added others which, however, stand in need of the evidence of either an inspired writer or an eye-witness before they can be received as facts and applied to establish any doctrine. Thus J. Johnson (Unbloody Sacrifice, 1:123, ed. 1847) asserts on very slender evidence that the fathers who refer to Gen 14:18, understood that Melchizedek offered the bread and wine to God; and hence he infers that one great part of our Saviour's Melchizedekian priesthood consisted in offering bread and wine. Bellarmine asks in what  other respects is Christ a priests after the order of Melchizedek. Waterland, who does not lose sight of the deep significancy of Melchizedek's action, has replied to Johnson in his Appendix to “the Christian Sacrifice explained” (ch. iii, § 2, Works, v. 165, ed. 1843). Bellarmine's question is sufficiently answered by Whitaker, Disputation on Scripture (Quest. ii, ch. x, p. 168, ed. 1849). The sense of the fathers, who sometimes expressed themselves in rhetorical language, is cleared from misinterpretation by bishop Jewel, Reply to Harding, art. xvii (Works, 2:731, ed. 1847). In Jackson, On the Creed (bk. ix, § 2, ch. vi-xi, p. 955 sq.), there is a lengthy but valuable account of the priesthood of Melchizedek; and the views of two different theological schools are ably stated by Aquinas (Summa, 3:22, § 6) and Turretin (Theologia, 2:443-453).

Another fruitful source of discussion has been found in the site of Salem and Shaveh, which certainly lay in Abraham's road from Hobah to the plain of Mamre, and which are assumed to be near to each other. The various theories may be briefly enumerated as follows:

(1) Salem is supposed to have occupied in Abraham's time the ground on which afterwards Jebus and then Jerusalem stood; and Shaveh to be the valley east of Jerusalem through which the Kidron flows. This opinion, abandoned by Reland (Pal. p. 833), but adopted by Winer, is supported by the facts that Jerusalem is called Salem in Psa 76:2, and that Josephus (Ant. 1:10, 2) and the Targums distinctly assert their identity; that the king's dale (2Sa 18:18), identified in Gen 14:17, with Shaveh, is placed by Josephus (Ant. 7:10, 3), and by mediaeval and modern tradition (see Ewald, Gesch. 3:239), in the immediate neighborhood of Jerusalem; that the name of a later king of Jerusalem, Adonizedek (Joshua x,l), sounds like that of a legitimate successor of Melchizedek; and that Jewish writers.(ap. Schottgen, Hor. Hebrews in Heb 7:2) claim Zedek= righteousness, as a name of Jerusalem.

(2) Jerome (Opp. 1:446) denies that Salem is Jerusalem, and asserts that it is identical with a town-near Scythopolis or Bethshan,'which in his time retained the name of Salem, and in which some extensive ruins were shown as the remains of Melchizedek's palace. He supports this view by quoting Gen 30:18, where, however, the translation is questionable; compare the mention of Salem in Jdt 4:4, and in Joh 3:23.

(3) Stanley, (S. and P. p. 237) is of opinion that there is every probability that Mount Gerizim is the place where Melchizedek, the priest of the Most  High, met Abraham. Eupolemus (ap. Eusebius, Prep. Evang. 9:17), in a confused version of this story, names Argerizim, the mount of the Most High, as the place in which Abraham was hospital bly entertained. (4) Ewald, Gesch. 3:239) denies positively that it is Jerusalem, and says that it must be north of Jerusalem on the other side of Jordan (i. 410): an opinion which Rodiger (Gesen. Thesaurus, p. 1422 b) condemns. There, too, Stanley thinks that the king's dale was situate, near the spot where Absalom fell. SEE KING'S DALE.

Some Jewish writers have held the opinion that Melchizedek was the writer and Abraham the subject of Psalm cx. See Deyling, Obs. Sacr. 3:137. It may suffice to mention that there is a fabulous life of Melchizedek printed among the spurious works of Athanasius, 4:189.

Reference may be made to the following works in addition to those already mentioned: two tracts on Melchizedek by M. J. H. von Elswick, in the Thesaurus Novus Theolog.-philologicus; L. Borgisius, Historia Critica Melchisedeci (Bern. 1706); Quandt, De sacerdotio Melch. (Regiom. 1737); Gaillard, Melchisedecus Christus (Leyd. 1686); M. C. Hoffman, De Melchisedeco (1669); H. Broughton, Treatise on Melchizedek (1591); Kirchmaier, De Melchisedecho (Rotterd. 1696); Lange, idem (Hal. 1713,1714); Danhauer, idem (Strasb.1684); Pietsch, idem (Hale, .1713); Reinhart, idem (Wittenb. 1751); Wahner, idem (Gitt. 1745); Henderson, Melchisedek (Lond. 1839); and other monographs cited in Darling, Cyclop. Bibliogr. col. 183,1607. See also J. A. Fabricius, Cod. Pseudepig. V. T.; P. Molinaeus, Vates, etc. (1640), 4:11; J. H. Heidegger, Hist. Sacr. Patriarcharum (1671), 2:288; Hottinger, Ennead. Disput.; P. Cuneus, De Republ. Heb 3:3, apud Crit. Sacr. vol. v; Ursini, Analect. Sacr. 1:349; Krahmer, in Illgen's Zeitschr. 7:4, p. 87; Auberlein, in the Stud. u. Krit. 3:1857, 453 sq.; Presb. Quar. Revelation Oct. 1861.

## Melchizedekians[[@Headword:Melchizedekians]]

             a sect which arose in the Christian Church about the beginning of the 3d century, and was composed mainly of Jewish converts. They affirmed that Melchizedek was not a man, but a heavenly power superior to Jesus Christ; for Melchizedek, they said, was' the intercessor and mediator of the angels; and Jesus Christ was only so for man, and his priesthood only a copy of that of Melchizedek. Similar views were revived among the Hieracites. See Theodoret, Hoeres. Sat. 2:5, 6.

## Meldenius, Rupertus[[@Headword:Meldenius, Rupertus]]

             a German Protestant theologian of the 17th century, is known especially by his work entitled Pareanesis votivapro pace ecclesice ad Theologos: Augustance Confessionis s. 1, et a. Very little is known of his life, and it was even at one time supposed that the name was fictitious. Yet the existence of Meldenius appears now well established. He was a warm supporter of the Formula Concordice, and did not contemplate a union of the two churches, but at the same time he wished the spirit of scholastic controversy which then ruled the churches to give way to real, practical piety and peace. In the first part of his work he denounces the state of the Lutheran Church, and in the second he presents the remedy for it. He accused theologians of not distinguishing sufficiently between essentials and non-essentials, and maintains that, while they should always be ready to defend their opinions, they ought not to be ceaselessly engaged in controversies. He claims that in order to labor efficiently for the edification of his flock the minister must himself lead a holy life, and nothing, in his opinion, can be worse. than Pharisaical hypocrisy, which is the origin of φιλοδοξία, φιλαργυρία, and φιλονειχία. He ends his description of these besetting sins of the Church with the exclamation, Serva nos Domine, alioqui(n) perimus. In the second part he contrasts with these faults the opposite virtues of humility, moderation, and peacefulness which the Christian should possess. Want of Christian love he considers as the true cause of the state of affairs; there is enough of science, but a great lack of love. He cannot understand a minister whose sins have been pardoned by God not hiding under the shield of love the faults of his colleague. “ Omnium vero norma,” says Rupertus, “sit caritas cum prudentia quadam pia et humilitate non ficta conjuncta.” He does not wish all controversies to cease, but to be conducted in a more moderate, charitable spirit. He then compares the actual state of religion with its state in the early ages, and concludes by saying, “ Si nos servaremus il necessariis unitatem, in non necessariis libertatem, in utrisque caritatem, optimo certe loco essent res nostrae.” As essentials, Rupertus considers those principles which refer directly to the articles of faith or principal points in the Catechism, or such as can be clearly established from Scripture, such as were held by the early Church, proved such by the acts of synods or symbolic works, and, finally, those which all orthodox theologians agree upon as such. On the other hand, he holds as non-essential such points as are not clearly demonstrated by Scripture, do not forma an article of the Catechism, were not held by  the ancient Church, or considered necessary by the greater number of orthodox theologians. Rupertus openly declares that he does not hold the views of those who consider purity of doctrine as essential. The work is published by J. G. Pfeiffer in his Miscellanea Theologica (Leips. 1736); also by Liicke, Ueber das Alter, den Verofasser, etc., des Kirchlichen Friedenspruches: In necessariis unitas, in non necessariis libertas, in utrisque caritas (Getting. 1850). See Herzog, Real-Encyklopadie, 9:304.

## Melea[[@Headword:Melea]]

             (Μελεᾶς, of uncertain signification), u person named as the son of Menan and father of Eliakim, among the maternal ancestry, of Jesus, in the private line of David (Luk 3:31), but the name itself i3 of doubtful authenticity (see Meth. Quar. Revelation 1852, p. 597).

## Melech[[@Headword:Melech]]

             (Hebrews Me'lek, מֶלֶךְ, king; Sept. Μελάχ and Μαλάχ v. r. Μαλώχ and Μαλώθ), the second named of the four sons of Micah, the grandson of Saul's son Jonathan (1Ch 8:35; 1Ch 9:41). BC. post 1037. SEE ALSO HAMMELECH; SEE EBED-MELECH; SEE NATHANMELECH; SEE REGEM-MIELECH.

## Melech, Salomo Ibn[[@Headword:Melech, Salomo Ibn]]

             a Jewish writer of the 16th century, was a resident at Constantinople, where he published, in 1554, his מַכְלִל יֹפַי, "The Perfection of Beauty," scholia on the Hebrew Bible. It has been repeatedly edited, but the best edition is that of Amsterdam (1685, fol.), with Abendana's additions. It is a very valuable contribution to grammatical exegesis, since it is brief and  condensed, giving almost exclusively grammatical and lexical explanations, for the most part from Kimchi's writings. It has been highly valued among Christians, and several parts of it have been translated into Latin; that on Canticles, by Chr. Molitor (Altdorf, 1659); on Joshua and Malachi, by Nik. Koppen (Greifswalde, 1708, 1709); on Ruth, by J.B. Carpzov, reprinted in his Collegium Rabbinico-Biblicum (Leipsic, 1705); on Jonah, by G. Chr. Bureklin (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1697), Job. Leusden (ibid. 1692), and E. Chr. Fabricius (Gottingen, 1792); on Obadiah, by Brodberg (Upsala, 1711), etc. See Ffurst, Bibl. Jud. 2:350; Etheridge, Introduction to Jewish Lit. page 417; De' Rossi, Dizionario Storico Degli Autori (Germ. transl. by Hamburger), page 217; Wolf, Bibl. Hebr. 1:1075 sq. 3:1055 sq. (B.P.)

## Meletians[[@Headword:Meletians]]

             ASIATIC. The Arians in 331 had deposed Eustathius, bishop of Antioch, a learned and zealous Nicene; but ‘a party who adhered to the Nicene symbol, and who called themselves Eustathians, contirned to exist at Antioch. After appointing several successors to Eustathius. the Arians, in 360, transferred Meletius from the bishopric of Sebaste to that of Antioch. Although the Arians found they had made a mistake, and soon deposed him as an enemy of Arianism, yet only a part of the Nicenes at Antioch would acknowledge him as bishop, since the Eustathians regarded an Arian ordination as invalid. In this way two parties were formed among the Nicenes at Antioch-a strict party, the Eustathians; and a moderate party, the Meletians. This schism, after Athanasius had tried in vain to remove it, Lucifer made worse by ordaining as bishop over the Eustathians the presbyter Paulinus, in opposition to the wishes of Eusebius of Vercelli, who had been sent with him to Antioch, by the Alexandrian Synod, as his co-deputy. The entire Nicene portion of Christendom now became divided, in reference to this matter, into two parties; the Occidentals and Egyptians  recognising Paulinus as the true bishop of Antioch, and the majority of the Orientals, whose Nicene proclivities had been somewhat weakened by semi-Arian influences, recognising Meletius. SEE EUSTATHIANS. SEE MELETIUS OF ANTIOCH.

Meletios, M.

an Eastern prelate, was born in the latter part of the 16th century, in Janina, in Epirus, and flourished first as metropolitan at Lepanto and Arta, and in the same position, after 1703, at Athens. He died at Constantinople in 1714. ‘He wrote Kirchengeschichte, aus demn Altgriechischen in's Neugriechische iibertragen (Wein. 1780, 3 vols., with Notes by JVendoti).

## Meletius Of Antioch[[@Headword:Meletius Of Antioch]]

             an eminent Greek ecclesiastic, was born in the beginning of the 4th century at Melitene, in Armenia Minor. His first important appointment was that of bishop of Sebaste (AD. 357), to which office he succeeded Eustathius, who had been deposed. SEE EUSTATHIANS. The wilful conduct of the people soon caused Meletius to resign, and he retired to Beroea, in Syria. At this time the Arian controversy caused so much excitement that sectarian zeal was fast displacing true piety. Meletius, however, by confining himself to the essential doctrines of the Gospel and ignoring polemical subjects, succeeded in winning the esteem of all except the extremrists of both factions, and by universal assent was raised to the bishopric of Antioch (AD. 360). His new position gave such importance to his opinions that he could no longer remain indifferent to the disputes which were marring the concord of the Christian world. At the request of the emperor Constantius he gave an exposition of Pro 8:22, in which he expressed himself as being in sympathy. with the orthodox party. At this avowal the Arians became greatly excited, and succeeded in influencing the emperor to banish him to his native Melitene. Euzoius was installed in his place, and the orthodox party separated from the communion of the Arians. Previous to this the most zealous portion of the orthodox had withdrawn on account of the deposition of Eustathius, but the two seceding parties remained separate-the Eustathians adhering at this time to presbyter Paulinus, the intended successor of Eustathius, who had died in the mean while, and the other orthodox gathering around Meletius. On the accession of Julian as emperor (362), Meletius was recalled, and for two years endeavored to reconcile and unite the two factions of the  orthodox party; but the Eustathians refused to recognise him, and elected Paulinus as their bishop, who was duly ordained by Lucifer of Cagliari. On the accession of Valens, Meletius was again banished, but by an edict of Gratian (378) was recalled, and shortly after reinstated. The unrelenting prejudice of Paulinus frustrated all attempts at reconciliation, though Meletius proposed to him a just plan of union. Meletius died at an advanced age while attending the Council of Constantinople in AD. 381. His funeral oration, pronounced by Gregorius Nyssenus, is still extant. The schism in the Church lasted until 413 or 415, when bishop Alexander succeeded in reconciling the old orthodox party with the successor of Meletius. See Schaff, Ch. Hist. 1:372 and 394; Gieseler, Ecclesiastes Hist. 1:201 sq.; Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Romans Biog. vol. ii, s.v.; Walch, Ketzerhistorie, vol. 4:SEE MELETIANS. (H. W. T.)

## Meletius Of Lycopolis[[@Headword:Meletius Of Lycopolis]]

             flourished in the Egyptian district of Thebais in the beginning of the 4th century. He was a prelate in the Church, and the founder of the Meletian sect, or, as they termed themselves, the Church of the Martyrs. During the bitter persecutions which the Christians suffered under the reign of Diocletian, he and his superior, Peter, archbishop of Alexandria, were thrown into prison. Many Christians had abjured their religious belief for the sake of freedom from persecution, and some of these, regretting their faithlessness, repaired to the two imprisoned bishops, desiring to receive absolution, and to become reconciled with the Church. Peter was in favor of granting the request of these lapsi, provided they Would do penance; but Meletius, denouncing them as traitors, refused to have any intercourse with them, until at least all persecution had ceased. A majority of the Christians then in conifinement approved of his course. This gave rise to a schism, which gained some prominence after the release of Meletius, who became the leader of the rebels, and from whom they received their name. After regaining his freedom he ordained some twenty-nine bishops, and even encroached upon the diocese of Peter with ordinations and excommunications. He was finally checked by the Council of Nice, who censured him, but allowed him to retain his title. The council also agreed to confirm his appointments, provided they would receive a new ordination from the proper authorities. The sect to which he gave rise, sometimes called Egyptian Meletians, lasted ‘for nearly a century and a half, when its members made common cause with the Arians. See Schaff, Ch. Hist. i,451;  Gieseler, Ecclesiastes Hist. 1:166; Stanley, Hist. of the East. Ch. p. 256; Mosheim, Ecclesiastes Hist. 1:75; Hase, Ch. Hist. p. 690. (H.W.T.)

## Melicu[[@Headword:Melicu]]

             (-Hebrews marg. Meliku', מְלַיכוּ, text Meloki', מְלוֹכַי; Sept. Μαλούχ v. r. Α᾿μαλούχ, ulg. Milicho; Neh 12:14). SEE MALLUCH.

## Melissus Of Samos[[@Headword:Melissus Of Samos]]

             a Greek philosopher, was born at Samos, and flourished in the 5th century (about 444) before Christ. It is said that he was not less distinguished as a citizen than as a philosopher, and that he commanded the fleet of his country during its insurrection against Athens. Melissus seems to have been the disciple of Parmenides; he studied at least the writings of the philosophers of the Eleatic school, and adopted their doctrines in a modified form; or, as one has it, “He took up the letter rather than the spirit of their system.” He made his opinions known in a work written in Ionic prose, probably entitled Of Being and of Nature. He treated not of the infinite variety of things produced or engendered, but of eternal nature considered abstractly, apart from all concrete things, and, like Parmenides, called it being. Simplicius has preserved some fragments of this treatise, and the author (Aristotle or Theophrastus) of the book on Melissus, Xenophanes, and Gorgias, has made its doctrines well known. Melissus taught the same system of idealism as did the leaders of the Eleatic school, Xenophanes and Parmenides,'but he is characterized by greater boldness in his way of stating it, and in some respects by profounder views. What really existed, he maintained, could neither be produced nor perish; it exists without having either commencement or end; infinite (differing in this respect from Parmenides), and consequently one; invariable, not composed of parts, and indivisible: which doctrine implies a denial of the existence of bodies, and of the dimensions of space. All that our senses present to us (that is to say, the greater part of things which exist) is nothing more than an appearance relative to our senses (τὸ ἐν ἡμῖν), and is altogether beyond the limits of real knowledge.

He thus made the first though weak attempt, which was afterwards carried out by Zeno with far more acuteness and sagacity, to prove that the foundations of all knowledge derived from experience are in themselves contradictory, and that the reality of the actual world is inconceivable. As for the relation between real existence and the Deity, we are ignorant of the sentiments of Melissus on this head;  for what is reported by Diogenes Laertius (ix. 24) can be considered as relating only to the popular notions. Some important fragments of Melissus have been collected by Brandis in the first part of the Commentationum Eleaticarum, pars prima, p. 185 sq., and by M. Mullach in his excellent edition of the treatise Aristotelis de Melisso, Xenophane, et Gorgia, Disputationes, cum Eleaticorum philosophorum fragmentis (Berlin, 1846). The same editor inserts them in the Fragmenta Philosophorum Graecorum of the Didot collection (1860, 8vo). See Diogenes Laertius, 9:24; Plutarch, Pericles, p. 26, 27; Simplicius, In Arist. Phys. de Celo.; Ritter, Gesch. der Philosophie, vol. i; Tenneman's Manual of Philosophy, p. 68, 69; Smith, Dict. of Class. Biog. s.v.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Melita[[@Headword:Melita]]

             (Μελίτη; probably of Phoenician etymology, and signifying refuge, otherwise clay; but according to Hammeker, Miscell. Phoenic. p. 46, so named from its abundance of ash-trees), an island in the Mediterranean, on which the ship which was conveying the apostle Paul as a prisoner to Rome was wrecked, and which was the scene of the interesting circumistances recorded in Act 27:28 (see J. Ab. Ciantari Diss. apol. de Paulo in Melitam naufragio ejecto,Ven. 1738).

I. Identification of the Locality. — Melita was the ancient name of Malta (see J. F. Wandalin, Diss. de Melita Pauli, Havn. 1707), and also of a small island in the Adriatic, now called Meleda (Μελιτίνη νῆσος, Ptol. 2:17, 39; comp. Pliny, 3:30; Apollon. Rhod. 4:572), and each of these has found warm advocates for its identification with the Melita of Scripture (see Ciantar's edition of Abela's Malta Illustrata, 1:608), the former being the traditionary and long-established opinion (see Ign. Giorgi, Paulus in mari quod nunc Venetus sinus dicitur, naeafragus,Ven. 1730; Jac. de Rhoer, De Pauli ad insul. Melit. naufragio, Traj. ad R. 1743; comp. Bibl. Ital. 11:127; Nov. Miscell. Lips. 4:308; Paulus, Samml. 4:356), liable only to the objection that the part of the Mediterranean in which it is situated was not properly “the Sea of Adria” (Dr. Falconer's Dissertation on St. Paul's Voyage, 1817), which has been shown (see Wetstein's Comment. ad loc.) to be without force (see J. Smith, Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul, Lond. 1848; also Conybeare and Howson's Life of St. Paul, 2:353). As,  however, the controversy on this subject has been somewhat voluminous, we will discuss it in detail, referring to other articles for confirmation of the opinions and conclusions here expressed.

1. Arguments in Favor of Malta. —

(1.) We take St. Paul's ship in the condition in which we find her about a day after leaving Fair Havens, i.e. when she was under the lee of Clauda (Act 27:16). laid to on the starboard tack, and strengthened with “undergirders” SEE SHIP, the boat being just taken on board, and the gale blowing hard from the east-north-east. SEE EUROCLYDON.

(2.) Assuming (what every practiced sailor would allow) that the ship's direction of drift would be about west by north, and her rate of drift about a mile and a half an hour, we come at once to the conclusion, by measuring the distance on the chart, that she would be brought to the coast of Malta on the thirteenth day (see Act 27:27).

(3.) A ship drifting in this direction to the place traditionally known as St. Paul's Bay, would come to that spot on the coast without touching any other part of the island previously. The coast, in fact, trends from this bay to the south-east. This may be seen on consulting any map or chart of Malta.

(4.) On Koura Point, which is the south-easterly extremity of the bay, there must infallibly have been breakers, with the wind blowing from the north- east. Now the alarm was certainly caused by breakers, for it took place in the night (Act 27:27), and it does not appear that the passengers were at first aware of the danger which became sensible to the quick ear of the “sailors.”

(5.) Yet the vessel did not strike; and this corresponds with the position of the point, which would be some little' distance on the port side, or to the left of the vessel.

(6.) Off this point of the coast the soundings are twenty fathoms (Act 27:28), and a little farther, in the direction of the supposed drift, they are fifteen fathoms (Act 27:28).

(7.) Though the danger was imminent, we shall find from examining the chart that there would still be time to anchor (Act 27:29) before striking on the rocks ahead.

(8.) With bad holding-ground there would have been great risk of the ship dragging her anchors. But the bottom of St. Paul's Bay is remarkably tenacious. In Purdy's Sailing Directions (p. 180) it is said of it that “while the cables hold there is no danger, as the anchors will never start.”

(9.) The other geological characteristics of the place are in harmony with the narrative, which describes the creek as having in one place a sandy or muddy beach (κόλπον ἔχοντα αἰγιαλόν, Act 27:39), and which states that the bow of the ship was held fast in the shore, while the stern was exposed to the action of the waves (Act 27:41). For particulars we must refer to the work (mentioned below) of Mr. Smith, an accomplished geologist.

(10.) Another point of local detail is of considerable interest-viz. that, as the ship took the ground, the place was observed to be διθάλασσος, i.e. a connection was noticed between two apparently separate pieces of water. We shall see, on looking at the chart, that this would be the case. The small island of Salmonetta would at first appear to be a part of Malta itself; but the passage would open on the right as the vessel passed to the place of shipwreck.

(11.) Malta is in the track of ships between Alexandria and Puteoli; and this corresponds with the fact that the “Castor and Pollux,” an Alexandrian vessel which ultimately conveyed St. Paul to, Italy, had wintered in the island (Act 28:11).

(12.) Finally, the course pursued in this conclusion of the voyage, first to Syracuse and then to Rhegium, contributes a last link to the chain of arguments by which we prove that Melita is Malta.

2. Objections to Malta. — The case is established to demonstration. Still it may be worth while to notice one or two objections. It is said, in reference to Act 27:27, that the wreck took place in the Adriatic or Gulf of Venice. It is urged that a well-known island like Malta could not have been unrecognised (Act 27:39), nor its inhabitants called “barbarous” (Act 28:2). And as regards the occurrence recorded in 28:3, stress is laid on the facts that Malta has no poisonous serpents, and hardly any wood. To these objections we reply at once that ADRIA, in the language of the period, denotes not the Gulf of Venice, but the open sea between Crete and Sicily; that it is no wonder if the sailors did not recognise a  strange part of the coast on which they were thrown in stormy weather, and that they did recognise the place when they did leave the ship (Act 28:1); that the kindness recorded of the natives (Act 28:2; Act 28:10), shows that they were not “barbarians” in the sense of being savages, and that the word denotes simply that they did not speak Greek; and, lastly, that the population of Malta has increased in an extraordinary manner in recent times, that probably there was abundant wood there formerly, and that with the destruction of the wood many indigenous animals would disappear.

3. Objections to Meleda. — In adducing positive arguments and answering objections, we have indirectly proved that Melita in the Gulf of Venice was not the scene of the shipwreck. But we may add that this island could not have been reached without a miracle under the circumstances of weather described in the narrative; that it is not in the track between Alexandria and Puteoli; that it would not be natural to proceed from it to Rome by means of a voyage embracing Syracuse: and that the soundings on its shore do not agree with what is recorded in the Acts.

4. History of the Controversy.-An amusing passage in Coleridge's Table Talk (p. 185) is worth noticing as the last echo of what is now an extinct controversy. The question has been set at rest forever by Mr. Smith, of Jordan Hill, in his Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul, the first published work in which it was thoroughly investigated from a sailor's point of view. It had, however, been previously treated in the same manner, and with the same results, by admiral Penrose, and copious notes from his. MSS. are given in The Life and Epistles of St. Paul. In that work (2d ed. p. 426, note) are given the names of some of those who carried on the controversy in the last century. The ringleader on the Adriatic side of the question, not unnaturally, was padre Georgi, a Benedictine monk connected with the Venetian or Austrian Meleda, and his Paulus Naufragus is extremely curious. He was, however, not the first to suggest this untenable view. We find it, at a much earlier period, in a Byzantine writer, Const. Porphyrog. De Adm. Imp. (c. 36, vol. ii, p.' 164, of the Bonn ed.).

II. Description and History of the Locality. — (In this portion we chiefly use the statements found in Kitto's Cyclopedia, s.v.)

1. The immediate Scene. — The name of St. Paul's Bay has been given to the place where the shipwreck is supposed to have taken place. This, the sacred historian says. was at “a certain creek with a shore,” i.e. a seemingly practicable shore, on which they purposed, if possible, to strand the vessel, as their only apparent chance to escape being broken on the rocks. In attempting this the ship seems to have struck and gone to pieces on the rocky headland at the entrance of the creek. This agrees very well with St. Paul's Bay, more so than with any other creek of the island. This bay is a deep inlet on the north side of the island, being the last indentation of the coast but one from the western extremity of the island. It is about two miles deep, by one mile broad. The harbor which it forms is very unsafe at some distance from the shore, although there is good anchorage in the middle for light vessels. The most dangerous part is the western headland at the entrance of the bay, particularly as there is close to it a small island (Salamone), and a still smaller islet (Salmonetta), the currents and shoals around which are particularly dangerous in stormy weather. It is usually supposed that the vessel struck at this point. From this place the ancient capital of Malta (now Citta Vecchia, Old City) is distinctly seen at the distance of about five miles' and on looking towards the bay from the sop of the church on the summit of the hill whereon the city stands, it is evident that the people of the town night easily from this spot have perceived in the morning that a wreck had taken place; and this is a circumstance which throws a fresh light on some of the circumstances of the deeply interesting transactions which ensued., SEE SHIPWRECK.

2. The Island in General.-The island of Malta lies in the Mediterranean, about sixty miles south from Cape Passaro, in Sicily. It is about seventeen miles in length, and nine or ten in breadth. Near it, on the west, is a smaller island; called Gozo, the ancient Gaulos. Malta has no mountains or high hills, and makes no figure from the sea. It is naturally a barren rock, but has been made in parts abundantly fertile by the industry and toil of man. It was famous for its honey an d fruits, for its cotton-fabrics, for excellent building stone, and for a wellknown breed of dogs. A few years before St. Paul's visit, crsairs from his native province of Cilicia made Melita. a frequent resort; and through subsequent periods of its history, Vandal and Arabian, it was often associated with piracy, The Christianity, however, introduced by Paul was never extinct. Melita, from its position in the Mediterranean, and from the excellence of its harbors, has always been important both in commerce and war.  The island was first colonized by the Phoenicians (hence the term “barbarian,” that is, neither Greek nor Roman, used in the sacred narrative, Act 28:2), from whom it was taken by the Greek colonists in Sicily, about BC. 736; but the Carthaginians began to dispute its possession about BC. 528, and eventually became entire masters of it. The Phoenician language, in a corrupted form, continued to be spoken there in St. Paul's day (Gesenius, Versuch ub. malt. Sprache, Leips. 1810). From the Carthaginians it passed to the Romans in the Second Punic War, BC. 242, who treated the inhabitants well, making Melita a municipium, and allowing the people to be governed by their own laws. The government was administered by a proprietor, who depended upon the pruetor of Sicily; and this office appears to have been held by Publius when Paul was on the island (Act 28:7).

Its chief officer (under the governor of Sicily) appears from inscriptions to have had the special title of πρῶτος Μελιταίων, or Primus Melitensium, and this is the very phrase which Luke uses (Act 28:7). Mr. Smith could not find these inscriptions. There seems, however, no reason whatever to doubt their authenticity (see Bochart, Opera, 1:502; Abela, Descr. Melitca, p. 146, appended to the last volume of the Antiquities of Grsevius; and Bockh, Corp. Insc. 3:5754). On the division of the Roman empire, Melita belonged to the western-portion; but having, in AD. 553, been recovered from the Vandals by Belisarius, it was afterwards attached to the empire of the East. About the end of the 9th century the island was taken from the Greeks by the Arabs, who made it a dependency upon Sicily, which was also in their possession. The Arabs have left the impress of their aspect, language, and many of their customs upon the present inhabitants, whose dialect is to this day perfectly intelligible to the Arabians and to the Moors of Africa. Malta was taken from the Arabs by the Normans in AD. 1090, and afterwards underwent other changes till AD. 1530, when Charles V, who had annexed it'to his empire, transferred it to the Knights of St. John of Jerusalem, whom the Turks had recently dispossessed of Rhodes. Under the knights it became a flourishing state, and was the scene of their greatest glory and most signal exploits (see Porter, Malta and its Knights, Lond. 1872). The institution having become unsuited to modern times, the Order of St. John of Jerusalem, commonly called Knights of Malta, gradually fell into decay, and the island was surrendered to the French under Bonaparte when on his way to Egypt in 1798. From them it was retaken by the English with the concurrence and assistance of the natives; and it was to have been restored to the Knights of Malta by the stipulations of the treaty of Amiens; but as  no sufficient security for the independence of the order (composed mostly of Frenchmen) could be obtained, the English retained it in their hands; and this necessary infraction of the treaty was the ostensible ground of the war which only ended with the battle of Waterloo. The island is still in the hands of the English, who have lately remodelled the government to meet the wishes of the numerous inhabitants. It has recently become the actual seat of an Anglican bishopric, which, however, takes its title from Gibraltar out of deference to the existing Catholic bishopric of Malta. See, in addition to the works above cited, P. Carlo, Origine della Fede in Malta (Milan, 1759) ; Carstens, De apothesi Pauli in Melita (Lubec, 1754); L. de Boisgelin, Malte ancienne et moderne (Par. 1809); Bartlett's Overland Route (Lond.1851), p. 3-118; Smith's Dict. of Class. Geogr. s.v. Melita; M'Culloch's Gazetteer, s.v. Malta; also the observations and travels cited by Engelmann, Bibl. Geog. (see Index, s.v. Malta); and the monographs cited by Volbeding, Index Program. p. 84. SEE PAUL.

## Melito Of Sardis[[@Headword:Melito Of Sardis]]

             bishop of the place after which he is named, and a writer of considerable eminence, flourished in the .2d century. So little is known of his personal history that it cannot be determined at what date he was elevated to the episcopacy, though he probably held the bishopric when the controversy arose at Laodicea respecting the observance of Easter, which caused him to write a book on the subject. This took place under Marcus Aurelius, to whom Melito presented an Apology for Christianity, according to Eusebius, in his Chronicon, in AD. 169-170. In this apology (which, recently re-discovered in a Syriac translation and placed in the British Museum, was lately [1866] rendered into English by the celebrated Cureton) Christianity is described as a philosophy that had indeed originated among the barbarians, but had attained to a flourishing condition under the Roman empire, to the benefit of which it greatly redounded. According to a fragment preserved by Eusebius, he beseeches the emperor “to examine the accusations which were brought against the Christians, and to stop the persecution by revoking the edict which he had published against them. He represents to him that the Roman empire was so far from being injured or weakened by Christianity that its foundation was more firmly established and its bounds considerably enlarged since that religion had taken footing in it. He puts him in mind that the Christian religion had been persecuted by none but the worst emperors, such as Nero and Domitian; that Hadrian and Antoninus had granted privileges in its favor,  and that he hoped from his clemency and goodness that they should obtain the same protection of their lives and property from him.” According to the testimony of Tertullian (in a work now lost, but which Jerome cites), Melito was regarded as a prophet, by many of his contemporaries. The Church of Rome commemorates him as a saint April 1. From a passage in Origen, quoted by Theodoret (Quest. in Genesim, c. 20), Melito appears to have believed that God possessed a bodily form, and to have written in support of that doctrine. This assertion of Origen is supported by the testimony of Grenadius of Massilia (Lib. Dogm. Ecclesiastes c. 4); and Tillemont, though unwilling to allow this, admits that the early Church may possibly have been withheld from honoring his memory by an appointed office on account of this imputation, or else on account of the ascription to him: of the book De Transitu Beatae Virginis. The surnames of Asianus and of Sardensis given him by Jerome designate rather his see than his birthplace. Polycrates of Ephesus, a somewhat later writer, in a letter to Victor, bishop of Rome, calls him Eunuchus; yet this is not to be taken in the literal sense, but rather indicates only that he remained faithful to his vow of chastity. As to the particulars of the death of Melito, scarcely anything is known. Polycrates, in a letter addressed to pope Victor (AD. 196), says, “ What shall I say of Melito, whose actions' were all guided by the operations of the Holy Spirit? who was interred at Sardis, where he waits the resurrection and the judgment.” From this it may be inferred that he had died some time previous to the date of this letter at Sardis, the place of his interment. Melito was especially skilled in the literature of the Old Testament, and was one of the most prolific authors of his time. Eusebius furnishes the following list of Melito's works: Περὶ τοῦ πάσχα δύο ; Περὶ πολιτείας καὶ προφητῶν ; Περὶ κυριακῆς ; Περὶ φύσεως ἀνθρώπου ; Περὶ πλάσεως ; Πε'ρὶ ὑπακοῆς πὶστεως αἰσθςτηρίων ; Περὶ ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος ; Περὶ λουτροῦ ; ῝Περὶ ἀληθείας; Περὶ κτίσεως καὶ γενέσεως Χριστοῦ ; ε'ρὶ προφηείας ; ῝Περὶ φιλοξενίας ; Η κλεἰς ; Περὶ τοῦ διαβόλου καὶ τῆς ἀποκαλύψεως Ι᾿ωάννου ; Περὶ ἐνσωμάτου θεοῦ ; Π῝ρὸς Α᾿ντωνῖνον βιβλίδιον ; Ε᾿κλογαί; Περὶ σαρκώσεως Χριστοῦ, against Marcion; Λόγος εἰς τὸ πάθος. Although these works are lost, the testimony of the -fathers remains to inform us how highly they were esteemed. Eusebius. gives some important fragments of Melito's works; some others are found in the works of different ecclesiastical writers. The best collection of these fragments is found in Routh, Reliquiae Sacrae (Oxford, 1814, 8vo), 1:109. Dom Pitra published several fragments in the Spicilegium Solesmense., Fragments' of  his works, found preserved in a Syriac translation, are now stored in the library of the British Museum. Cureton has translated some; others have been published in Kitto's Journal of Sacred Literature, vol 15:A satire against monks was published in France under the title Apocalypse de Meliton. See Eusebius, Hist. Ecclesiastes vol. iv; Jerome, De Vir ilust.; Chronon Paschale; Cave, Hist. Litteraria, ad ann. 170; Tillemont, Mem. pour servir a Hist. eccles. 2:407 sq., 663 sq.; Ceillier, Auteurs Sacres, 2:78 sq.; Lardner, Credibility, pt. ii, c. 15; Le Clerc, Hist. Ecclesiastes duorumprim. sceculor.; Ittig, De Hceresiarch. sec. ii, cxi; Woog, Dissertationes de Melitone (Leips. 1744-51, 4to); Semler, Hist. Ecclesiastes selecta capita scluli, vol. ii, c.:.5; Dupin, Nouvelle Bibliotheque des auteurs eccles. vol. i; Galland, Bibl. Patrum, volii, Proleg.; Pressense, Histoire des trois premiers siecles, 2:2, p. 166; Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Romans Biog. and Mythol. 2:1023; Herzog, Real- Encyklopadie, 9:313; Neale, Hist. of the East. Ch. Introd. 1:38; Donaldson, Ch. Literature; Schaff, Ch. Hist. 1:166, et al.; Journal Sacred Lit. vols. xv, xvi, and xvii; Piper, in Studien und Kritiken, 1838; Steitz, ibid. 1856 and 1857; Welte, Tubinger theol.- Quartalschrift, 1862, p. 302 sq.

## Melitonians[[@Headword:Melitonians]]

             so called from MELITO OF SARDIS (q.v.), a sect who maintained that not the soul, but the body of man, was made after God's image.

## Melius, John Peter[[@Headword:Melius, John Peter]]

             a Hungarian theologian, was born at Horki in 1536. After having embraced Calvinism; he became in 1558 professor in the school of Debrezin, and later superintendent. He died in 1572. Melius contributed largely towards propagating the reformed religion among the nobles of Transylvania. He is mainly known, however, by his translations of the New Testament and many parts of the Old into Hungarian. See Gerdes, Scrinium Antiquarium, vol. vii; Selig, Historie der Augsburgischen Confession, vol. ii.

## Melkart[[@Headword:Melkart]]

             SEE HERCULES.

## Mellen, John (1)[[@Headword:Mellen, John (1)]]

             a Unitarian divine, was born at Hopkinton, Mass., in 1722. He graduated at Harvard College in 1741, was pastor of the Church in Lancaster, Mass., and subsequently at Hanover, and died in 1807. Mr. Mellen was the author of Eight Occasional Sermons, 1735-95, and Fifteen Discourses on Doctrinal Subjects, 1765. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors. vol. ii, s.v.

## Mellen, John (2)[[@Headword:Mellen, John (2)]]

             a Unitarian divine, was born in 1752. He graduated at Harvard College, in 1770, was minister of Barnstable, Mass., and died in 1828. Mr. Mellen published eight-separate Sermons and Discourses (179-1, ‘93, ‘95, ‘97, ‘99), and also two Dudleian Lectures (1795, ‘99).

## Mellin, Georg Samuel Albrecht[[@Headword:Mellin, Georg Samuel Albrecht]]

             a German theologian, was born at Halle in 1775. After finishing his education he was appointed minister and counsellor of the consistory at Magdeburg, where he died in 1825. He wrote, Marginalien und Register zu Kant's Kritik des Erkentnissverumogens (Zillichau, 1794,2 vols. 8vo) : Encyklopadisches Worterbuch der kritischen Philosophie (ibid. 1797- 1804, 6 vols. 8vo):-Marginalien undRegister zu Kant's metaphysischen Anfangsgrunden der Rechtslehre (ibid. 1800) : — Worterbuch der Philosophie (Magdeburg, 1805-7, 2 vols. 8vo).

## Mellitus[[@Headword:Mellitus]]

             a noted prelate of the Church in the Anglo-Saxon period, flourished in the 7th century. He was sent in AD. 601, by pope Gregory the Great, as missionary to the assistance of Augustine, who was then laboring in England. Mellitus, with other zealous missionaries, proved a valuable help in the promotion of Christianity on the Anglican shores. He brought from Rome all the paraphernalia necessary for the performance of Church services; also a manuscript copy of the Bible in two volumes, two copies of the Psalms, as they were sung in the churches, two copies of the Gospels. Lives of the Apostles and Martyrs, and a Commentary on the Gospels and Epistles. These were the first books ever known among the Saxons. Sebert, king of Essex, permitted Mellitus to preach the Gospel to his subjects, made him first bishop of the Saxons in London, and favored him with a  life-long friendship. At his death Sebert was succeeded by three pagan sons, who did not continue their father's protection. It is related that after the decease of Sebert, Mellitus encountered much opposition, and was finally required to leave the country; and consequently he, with others of the persecuted, crossed over to France. Subsequently Edbald, who succeeded Ethelbert in Kent, embracing Christianity and relenting towards the exiles, Mellitus was recalled, and afterwards labored zealously in the cause of Christianity, which from that time became firmly established in Kent. Mellitus appears to have been endowed with much prudence as well as piety: not making fierce inroads upon paganism, but watching for and seizing the favorable moment for speaking and doing, he effected much for Christianity. He was afterwards made archbishop of Canterbury, and died about the year 625. See Maclear, Hist. of Missions, p. 105 sq.; Churton, Hist. of the Early Engl. Ch.; Inett, Hist. of the Engl. Ch. (see Index).

## Mello, Guillaume De[[@Headword:Mello, Guillaume De]]

             an ascetic French author. a native of Nantes, flourished in the latter half of the 17th century. He was canon of the collegiate church of Notre Dame of Nantes. He wrote Les Elvations de l'ame a Dieu par les degres de Creatures, taken from the Latin of cardinal Bellarmine (Nantes, 1666, 4to):-Le Devoir des Pasteurs, translated from the Latin of Barthelemi des Martyr (Paris, 1672, 12mo):-Les divines Opierations de Jesus (Paris, 1673, 12mo):-Le Predicateur evangelique (Paris, 1685, 7 vols. 12mo). These works are anonymous. It is believed that Mello is also the author of a Vie des Saints (Paris, 1688, 4 vols. 8vo).

## Mellor, Enoch, D.D[[@Headword:Mellor, Enoch, D.D]]

             an English Congregational minister, was born at Salendine Nook, near Huddersfield, November 20, 1823. He studied in Huddersfield College, graduated A.M. from the University of Edinburgh in 1845, and afterwards studied theology in the Lancashire Independent College. About the close of the year 1847 he accepted the pastorate of the church at Square Road, Halifax. His fame as a preacher spread rapidly, and he was frequently invited to larger fields of usefulness. In 1861 he became pastor of the church at Great George Street, Liverpool, where he achieved signal success. In 1867 he returned to his former charge in Halifax, where he met with a hearty welcome, and continued to labor until the close of life, October 26, 1881. He was active in the interests of his denomination, and was often called to positions of honor in that connection. He published, The Atonement; its Relation to Pardon, etc.: — Ritualism and its Related Dogmas: — Priesthood in the Light of the New Testament. See (Lond.) Cong. Year-book, 1882, page 315.

## Melnard, Francois[[@Headword:Melnard, Francois]]

             a Dutch writer of note, was born at Stellewroof, in Friesland, in 1570. ‘ He established himself at Poitiers, where he was at first professor of humanity, and later professor of jurisprudence. He obtained a pension from Louis XIII. The time of his death is not known. His important works are, Regicidium detestatum, quaesitum, precceutun (Poitiers, 1610), written on the occasion of the death of Henry IV: Disputationes dejuribus episcoporum (Poitiers, 1612, 8vo), ‘which displays a deep knowledge of civil and canonical law; and Des notes sur la vie de Ste. Radegerel et sur la regle de Saint-Cesaire (edited by Charles Pidoux, Poitiers, 1621).

## Melo, David Abenatar[[@Headword:Melo, David Abenatar]]

             a converted Spanish Jew, was born about the middle of the 16th century. Of his early life we know nothing beyond the fact that for several years he was an inmate of the prison of the Inquisition. Whether he was committed there because, as Milman states, he was baptized, and was suspected of not being a true Christian, or in order to crush out of him the betrayal of some of his kindred, or, as Kayserling states, because he translated some of David's Psalms into Spanish, is very difficult to say. He was released in  1611, and found a refuge in Holland, where a great many of his countrymen and co-religionists had settled. He soon became the head of the synagogue at Amsterdam, lecturing at the same time at the Academy of De los Pintos. Melo, whom Barrios calls "traductor harmonioso del Psalterio misterioso,'" is especially known as the translator of the Psalms into Spanish, which were printed at Frankfort in 1626, under the title, Los Psalmos de David en Varius Ninas, and which leads to the supposition that be went thither on his way to Holland, and spent some time there. See Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden (Leipsic, 1868), 10:5 sq.; Kayserling, Sephardim, page 169 sq.; De' Rossi, Dizionario Storico (Germ. transl. by Hamburger), page 218; Milman, History of the Jews (N.Y. 1870), 3:454; De los Rios, Estudios Sobre los Judios de Espana, page 521 sq.; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 2:351. (B.P.)

## Melody[[@Headword:Melody]]

             (זַמְרָה, zimrah', a song or music, of the voice, Isa 51:3 [“ psalm,” Psa 81:2; Psa 98:5], or of an instrument, Amo 5:23; metaphorically, a song of the land, i.e. its “ best fruits,” Gen 43:11; נָגִן, nagan', to strike, i.e. sound a musical chord, Isa 23:13, elsewhere “ play” =ψάλλω, Eph 5:19, elsewhere “ sing”) is strictly a musical science, the pleasing variation between notes of a different pitch in the same part or strain, in distinction from harmony, which is the accord of sounds between the different parts; but in general terms ‘it is synonymous with music or sweetness of sound. SEE MUSIC.

## Melon[[@Headword:Melon]]

             (only in the plur. אֲבִטַּחַים, abattichinm', from טָּבִח, according to Gesenius by transposition for טָבִח, to cook, but perh. rather a foreign word; Sept. likewise πέπονες, Vulg. pepones) occurs only in Num 11:5, where the murmuring Israelites say, “ We remember the fish which we did eat freely in Egypt, the cucumbers and the melons,” etc. The correctness of this translation is evident from the kindred word butikh used for the melon generically by the Arabs (Abdulp. 52, 54; Rhaz. De var. p. 56; Abulf. Ann. 2:65), whence the Spanish budiecas, and French pasteques. The Mishna, however (Jemmoth, 8:6; Maaser, 1:4), distinguishes this term from watermelons (דלועים); but it uses the singular (Chilaim, 1:8; Edujoth, 3:3) undoubtedly in the sense of muskmelon, a signification which all the versions (Onkelos, Syr., Arab., and Samar.) have affixed to it. A similar distinction prevails among the Arabs, who call the watermelon butikh-hindi. or Indian melon. The muskmelon is called in Persian khurtpuzeh, and in Hindi khurbuja. It is probably a native of the Persian region, whence it has been carried south into India, and north into Europe, the Indian being a slight corruption of the Persian name. As the Arabian authors append fufash as the Greek name of butikh, it is more than probable that this is intended for πέπων, especially if we compare the description in Avicenna with that in Dioscorides. By Galen it was called Melopepo, from melo and pepo, the former from being roundish in form, like the apple. The melon is supposed to have been the σίκυος of Theophrastus, and the σίκυος πέπων of Hippocrates.

It was known to the Romans, and cultivated by Columella, with the assistance of some precaution at cold times of the year. It is said to have been introduced into England about the year 1520, and was called muskmelon to distinguish it from the pumpkin, which was then usually called melon. All travellers in Eastern countries have borne testimony to the refreshment and delight they have experienced from the fruit of the melon (Hasselquist, Trav. p. 528; Bellon, Observ. 2:75; Joliffe, Trav. p. 231; Tournefort, 3:311; Chardin, 3:330; Sonnini, 2:216, 328). Alpinus speaks of their very general use, under the title Batech, by the Egyptians (Rerum AEgypt. Hist. 1:17). He also describes in the same chapter the kind of melon called Abdellavi, which, according to De Sacy, is oblong, tapering at both ends, but thick in the middle (De Plantis AEgypti, tab. xli); but Forskal applies this name also to the Chate (which is separately described by Alpinus, and a figure given by him at tab. xl), and says it is the  commonest of all fruits in Egypt, and is cultivated in all their fields, and that many prepare from it a very grateful drink (Flora Egyptiaco-Arabica, p. 168). The Chate is a villous plant with trailing stems, leaves roundish, bluntly angled, and toothed; the fruit pillose, elliptic, and tapering at both ends (Alpin. 50:c. p. 54). Hasselquist calls this the “ Egyptian melon” and “ queen of cucumbers,” and says that it grows only in the fertile soil round Cairo; that the fruit is a little watery, and the flesh almost of the same substance as that of the melon, sweet and cool. “This the grandees and Europeans in Egypt eat as the most pleasant fruit they find, and that from which they have the least to apprehend. It is the most excellent fruit of this tribe of any yet known” (Hasselquist, Travels, p. 258). These plants, though known to the Greeks, are not natives of Europe, but of Eastern countries, whence they must have been introduced into Greece. They probably may be traced to Syria or Egypt, whence other cultivated plants, as well as civilization, have travelled westwards. In Egypt they formed a portion of the food of the people at the very early period when the Israelites were led by Moses from its rich cultivation into the midst of the desert. The melon, the watermelon, and several others of the Cucurbitaceie, are mentioned by Wilkinson (Thebes, p. 212; Ancient Egyptians, 4:62) as still cultivated there, and are described as being sown in the middle of December, and cut, the melons in ninety and the cucumbers in sixty days.

It is not necessary to exclude from the generic term abattich in the above passage the watermelon (Cucurbita citrullus), which is clearly distinguished by Alpinus as cultivated in Egypt, and called by names similar to the above. Serapion, according to Sprengel (Comment. in Dioscor. 2:162) restricts the Arabic Batikh to the watermelon. It is mentioned by Forskal, and its properties described by Hasselquist. Though resembling the other kinds very considerably in its properties, it is very different from them in its deeply-cut leaves. The plant is hairy, with trailing cirrhiferous stems. Hasselquist says that it is cultivated on the banks of the Nile, in the rich clayey earth which subsides during the inundation, and serves the “Egyptians for meat, drink, and physic. It is eaten in abundance, during the season, even by the richer sort of the people; but the common people, on whom Providence hath bestowed nothing but poverty and patience, scarcely eat anything but these, and account this the best time of the year,  as they are obliged to put up with worse at other seasons of the year” (Travels, p. 256).

The common melon (Cucumis melo) is cultivated in the same places and ripens at the same time with the watermelon, but the fruit in Egypt is not so delicious (see Sonnini's Travels, 2:328); the poor in Egypt do not eat this melon. “A traveller in the East,” says Kitto (note on Num 11:5), “who recollects the intense gratitude which a gift of a slice of melon inspired while journeying over the hot and dry plains, will readily comprehend the regret with which the Hebrews in the Arabian Desert looked back upon the melons of Egypt.”

For further details, see Ol. Celsius, De Melonibus AEgyptiis (Lugd. B. 1726), and Hierobot. 1:356 sq.; Salmasii Homonyles latricce, c. 35; Rosenmuller, Morgen. 2:241 sq.; Thomson, Land and Book, 2:261; Tistram, Nat. Hist. of the Bible, p. 468

## Melos, Johann Georg[[@Headword:Melos, Johann Georg]]

             a Lutheran theologian, was born August 24, 1770, at Grossenmonnra, near Merseburg, and died at Weimar, February 16, 1828, professor at the seminary. He published, Biblische Geschichten-des Alten indu Neuen Testaments (Weimar, 1820): — Geschichte der Refornmation fur Burger- und Landschulen (5th ed. edited by Rothe, Berlin, 1837): — Beschreibung des judischen Landes zur Zeit Jesu. (Weimar, 1822; 2d ed. 1830): — Geist des Christenthunns (1824). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 2:254, 262, 309, 318; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2:869; First, Bibl. Jud. 2:351. (B.P.)

## Melpomene[[@Headword:Melpomene]]

             in Greek mythology, was the muse of tragedy. SEE MUSES.

## Melsheimer, Ludwig Friedrich[[@Headword:Melsheimer, Ludwig Friedrich]]

             a Protestant theologian, was born September 18, 1771. He entered upon his ministerial functions in 1795 at Kleinfischlingen, Bavaria, was in 1806 pastor at Bochingen, and died August 8, 1827, doctor of theology. He published, Das Buch Hiob metrisch ubersetzt und erlautert (Mannheim, 1823): — Die Spriche Salomonis ubersetzt mit Anmerkungen (1821). See Winer; Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:206, 212; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 2:351. (B.P.)

## Melugin, Thomas Maddin[[@Headword:Melugin, Thomas Maddin]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church., South, was born near Covington, Ky., Sept. 17, 1838; in 1853 he was converted, and joined the above Church; was licensed to preach in August, 1861, and in November following was admitted into the Memphis Conference on trial, and sent to La Grange Circuit; in 1862 to Randolph Circuit; in 1863 to Huntingdon Circuit, where his health failed, and he was compelled to leave the work. In 1864 he received a supernumerary relation, in which he was assigned to Randolph Circuit, and in 1865 to Covington Station, where he remained until his death, April 2, 1866. Mr. Melugin was ever devoted to his work, and in his last illness exemplified the power of the Christian's faith. See Minutes of the M. E. Church South, 1866.

## Melville, Andrew[[@Headword:Melville, Andrew]]

             one of Scotland's celebrated characters, the most eminent worker in the “Kirk” next to John Knox himself, and denominated by Anglican churchmen “the father of Scottish Presbytery” (Stephen, 1:258; compare, however, Hetherington, p. 78, Colossians 1), was born Aug. 1,1545. He was the youngest of the nine sons of Richard Melville of Baldovy, a small estate on the banks of the South Esk, near Montrose. He had the misfortune to lose both his parents when only about two years old, his father falling at the  battle of Pinkie in 1547, and his mother dying in the course of the same year; and the education of young Andrew devolved upon his eldest brother, who was minister of the neighboring parish of Maritoun after the establishment of the Reformation in 1560. Even as a child Andrew distinguished himself by the quickness of his capacity, and, though a delicate boy, it was determined that he should have all the advantages the schools of his day could afford him. At the age of fourteen he was removed from the grammar-school of Montrose, where he had been for some time, to St. Mary's College, in the University of St. Andrew's. Here he studied for four years most devotedly, and, upon the completion of the curriculum, bore away the reputation of being “the best philosopher, poet, and Grecian of any young master in the land.” We are told that John Douglas, who was at that time rector of St. Andrew's, showed Andrew Melville much marked attention, and that the old rector was so much pleased with his shrewdness and accuracy of observation, that, on parting with him, Douglas exclaimed, “My silly fatherless and motherless boy, it's ill to wit what God may make of thee yet.” Anxious to continue his studies under the guidance of master minds, he determined to go abroad, and take his place at the feet of the learned of other lands. ‘First among the highschools of that day figured Paris, and thither he now directed his steps. He was only a boy of nineteen, but he had the purposes of a man, and without the loss of a moment, he made haste to reach Paris, and recommenced his studies at the French capital. After a two-years' stay he proceeded to Poitiers, to devote some time to the study of civil law, not, however, for the purpose of preparing for the legal profession, but only as a source of discipline “connected with a complete course of education.”

Melville had gone to Poitiers, as he imagined, a perfect stranger, but his reputation as a scholar had reached the place long before he made his actual debut, and he was greeted with the offer of a professorship at the highschool which he had intended to enter as a student. For three years he labored at the College of St. Marceon with most marked success, at the same time, however, adhering steadfast to the chief intention of his visit thither, viz. the study of civil law. In 1567 the renewed political disturbances obliged him to quit France. He retired to Geneva, and by the exertions of Beza the chair of humanity, which happened to be then vacant, in the academy of that place, was secured for him. Andrew Melville was now more in his element, both politically and religiously, and Geneva was a scene to which his mind often recurred in after-life. It was there he made  that progress in Oriental learning for which he became so distinguished. There also he enjoyed the society of some of the best and most learned men of the age; but above all it was there the hallowed flame of civil and religious liberty began to glow in his breast, with a fervor which continued unabated ever after. In the spring of 1574, at the urgent request of his friends at home, he resigned his position here, and decided to return to his native country, from which he had now been absent altogether about ten years. On this occasion Beza addressed a letter to the General Assembly, in which, among other expressions of a like kind, he declared that Melville was “equally distinguished for his piety and his erudition, and that the Church of Geneva could not give a stronger proof of affection to her sister Church of Scotland than by suffering herself to be bereaved of him that his native country might be enriched with his gifts.”

On Melville's arrival in Edinburgh, in July, 1574, he was invited by the regent Morton to enter his family as a domestic tutor; but this invitation was declined by Melville, who was averse to a residence at court, and preferred an academic life. He was early gratified in this wish, for, having taught for a short time as private tutor in the house of a near relative, he was urged by archbishop Boyd and other leading men for the principalship of Glasgow College, and was promptly appointed by the General Assembly. In this new position his learning, energy, and talents were eminently serviceable, not only to the university over which he presided, but to the whole kingdom and to literature in general. He introduced improvements of great importance in teaching and discipline, and infused an uncommon ardor into his pupils. It was not, however, as a mere scholar or academician that Melville now distinguished himself. The constitution of his office, as a professor of divinity, entitled him to a seat in the ecclesiastical judicatories, and he took a prominent part in the ecclesiastical disputes of the time, and was active in the Church courts and in the conferences' held with the Parliament and' privy council on the then much agitated subject of Church government. During Melville's absence from Scotland, an incongruous species of Church government-nominally Episcopalian, but which neither satisfied Episcopalians nor Presbyterians- had been introduced. He, however, was not a believer in prelacy. He insisted that prelacy is not founded upon scriptural authority, and that it is foreign to the institutions and practices of apostolical times.

His stay in Geneva, moreover, had afforded him a very favorable opportunity to judge of the workings of the Presbyterian parity, and, in consequence, he was  determined to exert himself for the establishment of like institutions in his own country. Hetherington will have it that the Episcopalians are in “the habit of ascribing the decided Presbyterian form of Church government in Scotland to the personal influence of Andrew Melville, who, they say, had brought from Geneva the opinions of Calvin and Beza, and succeeded in infusing them into the Scottish ministers, who had previously been favorable to a modified prelacy.” But no less an authority than Dr. Cook. himself a Presbyterian, holds that until Melville's arrival from Geneva “a modified and excellent form of episcopacy” was prevailing in the Church of Scotland, and that it was the indifference of the earl of Morton, who was now acting regent that resulted perniciously to the country, and paved the way for the. agitation of “new plans of ecclesiastical polity” (i. 237, 238). He certainly was not given the name of Episcopomastrix, or the “scourge of bishops,” by any Episcopalian, and there seems every reason for the opinion that Melville was really the first Scotchman to press the interests of Presbyterianism. There is one thing certain, however, that even though Melville did not come determined to oust prelacy from Scottish churches, he yet steered clear of the regent's proposals, which, if Melville had acceded to them, “ might have enabled that crafty statesman [Morton] to rivet securely the fetters with which he was striving to bind the Church, instead of being mightily instrumental in wrenching them asunder” (Hetherington, p. 78, Colossians 2). Melville's intrepidity was often very remarkable. On one occasion, when threatened by Morton in a menacing way, which few who were acquainted with the regent's temper could bear without apprehension, Melville replied, “Tush, man! threaten your courtiers so. It is the same to me whether I rot in the air or in the ground; and I have lived out of your country as well as in it. Let God be praised; you can neither hang nor exile his truth !”

In March, 1575, Melville had an opportunity to publicly press his reforming schemes. He was at this time a member of the General Assembly, and his name was included in a committee appointed to confer with the government on the subject of the polity of the Church, and to prepare a scheme of ecclesiastical administration to be submitted to a general assembly. In 1578 his labors were finally-crowned with success. He presided this year over the assembly, and had the pleasure to take the vote approving the secondbook of Discipline, from that period the standard of Presbyterian Church government. Another matter to which thei attention of the General Assembly was at this time directed was the reformation and  improvement of the universities. Here Melville also took a leading part. The high state of learning and discipline to which the University of Glasgow had been raised by him, and the comparatively low grade of education in the other colleges, had become an object of public notoriety, and it was necessary that measures be taken for reforming and-remodelling them. A new theological school was agreed upon for St. Andrew's, and it' was resolved to translate Melville thither. At the end of the year 1580 he was installed principal of St. Mary's College, in the University of St. Andrew's, and in this new position he distinguished himself by his usual zeal and ability. Besides giving lectures on theology, he taught the Hebrew, Chaldee, Syriac, and rabbinical languages, and his prelections were attended not only by young students in unusual numbers, but also by several masters of the other colleges.

But his scholastic labors, however arduous and multifarious, could not prevent him from continuing an active worker for the interests of the Church, even in the pulpit. Immediately after his removal to St. Andrew's, Melville began to perform divine service, and he also took a share of the other ministerial duties of the parish. His gratuitous labors were highly gratifying to the people in general, but the freedom and fidelity with which he reproved vice exposed him to the resentment of several leading individuals, and the most atrocious calumnies against Melville were conveyed to the king, whose mind was predisposed to receive any insinuations to his disadvantage. A bad matter was made worse in 1582, when Melville was sent to the General Assembly, and was by that body honored with the office of moderator. In this prominent place he had many-opportunities to advocate the interests of his pet plans on ecclesiastical government. But even here matters did not rest. He was invited to preach before the assembly, and in his sermon he boldly inveighed against the tyrannous measures of the court, and against those who had brought into the country the “bludie gullie” of absolute power.

This fearless charge, which the assembly had applauded, and had seconded by a written remonstrance, intrusted to Melville for presentation at court, led to a citation before the privy council for high-treason, and, though the crime was not proved, he was sentenced to imprisonment for contempt of court, as he had refused to appear, maintaining that whatever a preacher might say in the pulpit, even if it should be called treason, he was not bound to answer for it in a civil court until he had been first tried in an ecclesiastical court. Apprehensive that his life was really in danger, he set out for London, and did not return to the North till the faction of Arran was dismissed in the year following. After being reinstated in his office at  St. Andrew's, Melville and his nephew took an active part in the proceedings of the'. Synod of Fife (q.v.), which terminated in the excommunication of archbishop Adamson, for having dictated and defended the laws subversive of ecclesiastical discipline. When Adamson was relaxed from censure, and restored to his see, Melville was charged to retire to the north of the Tay, and was not permitted to return to his post till the college had reluctantly consented to gratify one of the king's menial servants by renewing a lease, to the great diminution of the rental. Not long afterwards, the king, accompanied by Du Bartas, the poet, on a visit to St. Andrew's, had an opportunity of hearing from Melville a most spirited and learned, though extemporaneous, refutation of an elaborate lecture by Adamson in favor of' his views of royal prerogative, and, upon the decease of Adamson in 1592, Melville had the pleasure of seeing the passage of an act of Parliament ratifying the government of the Church by general assemblies, provincial synods, presbyteries, and kirk sessions, and explaining away or rescinding the most offensive of the acts of the year 1584-the black acts, as they were usually called. This important action is considered to this day as the legal foundation of the Presbyterian government, and it was regarded by Melville as an ample reward for his laborious efforts. The king, however, was not sincerely in favor of these measures, and secretly displayed a strong desire to make the “ Kirk” a mere tool of political power, or to restore episcopacy. Melville strenuously resisted every such attempt, whether made in an open or clandestine form.

In 1596 a very favorable opportunity seemed to present itself for the court to effect its purposes. A tumult had taken place at Edinburgh on December 16, and this opportunity was seized by the court as a handle for the purpose of effecting a change in the constitution of the Church. Melville, and the Synod of Fife, and many leading clergymen, protested. To reach the king's ears, Melville was selected as chairman of a deputation to the king. Upon this occasion Melville displayed the same intrepidity of character that he had exhibited on meeting Morton while in the regency. King James seemed to be displeased with the Protestants, and reminded Melville that he was his vassal. “Sirrah,” retorted Melville, “ye are God's silly vassal; there are two kings and two kingdoms in Scotland: there is king James, the head of the commonwealth; and there is Christ Jesus, the king of the Church, whose subject James the Sixth is, and of whose kingdom he is not a king, nor a lord, nor a head, but a member.” It is not to be wondered at that such plain speaking met the displeasure of the man  who had a peculiar liking for stratagems, or who was accustomed to look upon the works of darkness as the essence of “kingcraft.” A general assembly was summoned by the king to meet at Perth; and as it was composed chiefly of ministers from the north, who were studiously infected with prejudices against their southern brethren, the adherents of Melville were left in the minority.

But the next assembly at Dundee, as we shall see presently, was not quite so tractable. and it became quite clear to king James that in this way he would not succeed in annihilating, nor even lessening, Melville's ascendency. An opportunity, however, was not long wanting for such' a nefarious attempt. A royal visitation of the university was determined upon, and king James went to St. Andrew's in person, where, after searching in vain for matter of accusation against Melville, it was ordained that all professors of theology or philosophy, not being actual pastors, should thenceforth be precluded from sitting in sessions, presbyteries, synods, or assemblies, and from teaching in congregations. When the assembly met at Dundee in 1588, Melville made his appearance, notwithstanding the restrictions under which he had just been placed; but, when his name was called, king James objected, and declared that he would not permit any business to be done until Melville had withdrawn. Melville defended himself, and boldly told the king that the objection was invalid; to prevent difficulty, however, he finally withdrew under protest. Preparation was now made for restoring the order of bishops, and the first approach to this measure was to induce the commissioners of the General Assembly to solicit that the ministers and elders of the Church might be represented in Parliament. A statute was accordingly passed, declaring prelacy to be the third estate, and asserting the right of such ministers as should be advanced to the episcopal dignity to the same legislative privileges which had been enjoyed by the former prelates. The next conference, held at Falkland, Melville attended. and there, in presence of his majesty, maintained his sentiments with his accustomed fearlessness and vehemence, and the king judged it prudent to refer all the matters which were still intended to be adjusted to an assembly which met at Montrose in March, 1600. Melville appeared as a commissioner from his presbytery, and though, by the king's objections, he was not suffered to take his seat, his counsels and his unconquerable zeal served to animate and confirm the resolution of his brethren; and the assembly was with great difficulty prevailed upon to adopt the scheme of the court, under certain modifications. In 1601 Melville, nothing daunted by the fierce opposition of his royal master, attended the assembly at Burnt Island. Melville's conduct was grossly  misrepresented, and James, incensed by the perseverance of his subject, immediately set out for St. Andrew's, and there, without even the sanction of his privy council, issued a lettre de cachet, charging Melville to confine himself within the walls of the college; the royal mandamus decreeing, at the same time, “if he fail and do in the contrary, that he shall be incontinent thereafter, denounced rebel, and put to the law, and all his movable goods escheat to his highness's use for his contemption.” The king's conduct towards the Church from this time forward we have already treated in detail in the article JAMES SEE JAMES I (q.v.).

James's accession to the English throne brought to Melville a permit enlarging his circle of activity to within six miles of the college, and three congratulatory poems, which he had written for the occasion, seemed even to have established peace between the two combatants. In 1606, however, the war broke out anew, and this-time it ended only with the removal of the sturdy reformer. In 1604 and in 1605. Melville had sorely provoked the king by his activity against the royal measures. In 1606 Melville was selected to represent his presbytery at Parliament, and protest against the act of restoring episcopacy and reviving chapters. This action was unfavorably commented upon before the king, and the latter determined to punish Melville. One fine day Melville quite unexpectedly received a letter from his majesty desiring him to repair to London before September 15, that his majesty might consult him and others of his learned brethren on ecclesiastical matters. Melville and others went accordingly, and had various interviews with the king, who at times condescended even to be jocular with them; but they soon learned that they were interdicted from leaving the place without special permission from his majesty, and that James was only waiting for a favorable opportunity to vent his wrath upon Melville.

The occasion was not long wanting. Melville having written a short Latin epigram, in which he expressed his feelings of contempt and indignation at some rites of the English Church on the festival of St. Michael, was immediately summoned before the privy council, found guilty of “scandalum magnatum,” and, after a confinement of nearly twelve months, first in the house of the dean of St. Paul's, and afterwards in that of the bishop of Winchester, was committed to the Tower, and was there kept a prisoner for more than four years, in violation of every principle of justice. The first year of his imprisonment was particularly severe. He was deprived of all opportunity to give expression to his thoughts either by writing or oral communication. Through the influence of Sir James Sempill,  he was removed, at the end of ten months, to a more healthy and spacious apartment, and was allowed the use of pen, ink, and paper. When the rigor of his confinement was relaxed, he was consulted both by Arminius and his antagonist Lubbertus on their theological disputes. He continued to refresh his mind by occasionally writing a poem, and in two or three letters to his nephew, James Melville, whom he loved as a son, he reviewed Dr. Downham's sermon on Episcopacy. In 1610 he printed a specimen of poetical translations of the Psalms into Latin verse, and he never wrote a letter to his nephew without transmitting copies of some of his verses. In 1611 he was released, on the, solicitation of the duke of Bouilion, who wanted his services as a professor in the university at Sedan, in France. Melville, now in his sixty-sixth year, would fain have gone home to Scotland to lay his bones there, but the king would on no account hear of such a thing, and he was forced to spend his old age in exile. Melville died about 1622, but neither the date of his death nor the events of his last years are ascertained.

Melville appears to have been low in stature and slender in his person, but possessed of great physical energy. His voice was strong, his gesture vehement, and he had much force and fluency of language, with great ardor of mind and constancy of purpose. His natural talents were of a superior order, and he was a scholar and divine of no common attainments. “As a preacher of God's word, he was talented in a very high degree-zealous, untiring, instant in season and out of season, and eminently successful-and as a saint of God, he was a living epistle of the power of religion on the heart. Sound in faith, pure in morals, he recommended the Gospel in his life and conversation-he fought the good fight; and, as a shock cometh in at its season, so he bade adieu to this mortal life, ripe for everlasting glory. If John Knox rid Scotland of the errors and superstitions of popery, Andrew Melville contributed materially, by his fortitude, example, and counsel, to resist, even to the death, the propagation of a form of worship uncongenial to the Scottish character” (Howie, p. 278). Dr. McCrie concludes his two interesting volumes of Melville's Life (1819) with the declaration, “Next to the Reformer, I know no individual from whom Scotland has received such important services, or to whom she continues to owe so deep a debt of national respect and gratitude, as Andrew Melville.” See, besides McCrie's biography, Hetherington, Hist. of the Church of Scotland (N. Y. 1856, 8vo), p. 78 sq.; Cook, Reformation in Scotland, chap. xxvii; Stephen, Hist. of the Church of Scotland (Lond. 1845, 4 vols. 8vo), 1:258 sq.; Russel,  Hist. of the Church of Scotland (Lond. 1834,2 vols. 18mo), i, chap. ix; ii, chap. x sq.; Howie, Scots Worthies, p. 239 sq.; Chambers and Thomson, Biog. Dict. of Eminent Scotsmen (1855), 4:1 sq.; Blackwood's Magazine, Sept. 1824. (J.H.W.)

## Melville, Henry, B.D[[@Headword:Melville, Henry, B.D]]

             an eminent English divine and pulpit orator, was born at Pendennis Castle, Cornwall, Sept. 14, 1800; was educated at St. Peter's College, Cambridge, graduated BA. in 1821, and soon after became a fellow and tutor; later he determined to take holy orders, and was appointed minister of Camden Chapel, Camberwell, London; in 1843 he was made principal of East India College, Haileybury; in 1846 he accepted the appointment as chaplain to the Tower of London, and incumbent of the church within its precincts; about 1848 he was elected to the Golden Lectureship of St. Margaret's. Lothbury; in 1853 he became chaplain to the queen, and in 1856 canon of St. Paul's; in 1863 rector of Barnes and rural dean. He died in London Feb. 9,1871. A ‘number of Mr. Melville's Lectures and Sermons were published. many of them without his consent (1845,1846,1850,1851.1853); they have also been several times republished in this country. Also Voices of the Year: Readings for the Sundays and Holidays through the Year (1856, 2 vols.) :-Golden Counsels: Persuasions to a Christian Life (1857); and other works. “ No other clergyman of the English Church during the present century has ‘had the reputation for eloquence and rhetorical finish in his discourses which Mr. Melville retained to the last. His sermons were very carefully and elaborately written, and delivered with great earnestness and fervor. If there was fault anywhere, it was in the superabundance of his imagery, and his more than Oriental wealth of style.”-New Amer. An. Cyclop. 1871, p. 495; Allibone's Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, 2:1262; English Encyclop. vol. ii, s.v.

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

             an eminent Scotch scholar and divine, was born in 1556. He was professor of Hebrew and Oriental languages in the University of St. Andrew's in 1580, minister of Anstrutherwerter in 1596, and subsequently of Kilrenny. He died in 1614. Mr. Melville was a zealous advocate of Presbyterian discipline. He was the author of Ad Jacobum I Ecclesice Scotiance Libellus supplex (1645), and his Autobiography and Diary (1556-1610).  See Dr. M'Crie's Life of Andrew Melville ; Blackwood's Magazine, 16:256.

## Melzar[[@Headword:Melzar]]

             (Hebrews meltsar', מֶלְצִר, prob. from the Pers. master of wine, i.e. chief butler; so Bohlen, Symbol. p. 22; others, treasurer), the title rather than the name of an officer in the Babylonian court (as in the margin, “steward,” but Sept. Α᾿μερσάρ, on account of the Hebrews art., Vulg. Malasar), being that of the person who had charge of the diet of the Hebrew youths in training for promotion as magi (Dan 1:11; Dan 1:16; comp. Lengerke, Stuart, Comment. ad loc.). “The melzar was subordinate to the ‘master of the eunuchs;' his office was to superintend the nurture and education of the young; he thus combined the duties of the Greek παιδαγωγός and τροφεύς, and more nearly resembles our ‘tutor' than any other officer. As to the origin of the term, there is some doubt; it is generally regarded as of Persian origin, the words mal cara giving the sense of ‘ head cup-bearer;' Furst (Lex. s.v.) suggests its connection with the Hebrew nazar, ‘ to guard.”'

## Member[[@Headword:Member]]

             (in the plur. יְצַרַים, yetsirim, forms, Job 17:7; μέλη, parts, i.e. limbs) properly denotes a part of the natural body (1Co 12:12-25); figuratively, sensual affection, like a body consisting of many members (Rom 7:23); also true believers, members of Christ's Mystical body, as forming one society or body, of which Christ is the head (Eph 4:25).

## Membership In The Christian Church, Conditions Of[[@Headword:Membership In The Christian Church, Conditions Of]]

             We may premise in general that, with the exception of the Quakers or Friends (q.v.), the one essential and universal mode or sign of admission to Church communion is baptism (q.v.), and that all bodies of Christendom, except the so-called Baptists (q.v.), administer the rite to infants as well as to adults, the parents or friends of the former engaging, either formally or presumably, as sponsors (q.v.), the future assumption of the baptismal vows on the part of the children baptized, who meanwhile occupy a subordinate or preparatory stage of membership as catechumens (q.v.).

I. Basal Principles. —

1. Of an Ideal Character. — The Church of God, in its broadest sense, consists of all who, whether on earth. or in heaven, have been redeemed by Jesus Christ, and quickened by the Holy Spirit, and have not, by resistance of the Spirit, forfeited God's favor. The visible Church is the whole number of those who, on earth, participate, in some degree, in the common Christian life, faith, and organic fellowship. The conditions of church- membership will vary according as the visible Church, in the form it was designed to assume, be regarded as one, universal, unchangeable, and divine, or otherwise. Again, the Church may be viewed as uniform in its standard of ethical and spiritual life, but diverse in its dogmatic and organic fellowship. The dividing lines of membership must, therefore, depend largely upon the following ideals:

(1) The Christian Life. — What is it? When does it begin ? Here comes in the question of infant or adult membership. SEE PEDO-BAPTISM.

The term “life," like the term "death," is ambiguous, meaning both the hidden force which renders spontaneous action possible in a favorable environment, in forms of existence above the mineral, and the activity resulting from that force. When a man loves God and his neighbor he is said to be spiritually alive, but this must mean that he exhibits in action a force, the existence of which must have preceded the display of it. Unless we are Pelagians, we must attribute the origin of spiritual life, the capability of spontaneous religious activity, to the influence of God's Spirit on the human mind. Accurately to determine the moment when life begins is as difficult in the spiritual as in the physical realm: all that can be done is to fix a period beyond which it is not reasonable to believe that the life-giving contact is delayed. Put that period of ἄνωθεν γέννησις, or birth from  above, at baptism, and the conditions of membership will assume one aspect: put it at the moment of conscious self-surrender and faith, and they will assume another. "Life," however, means not merely capacity for spontaneous action, but, also, action itself living. He is alive who acts holily. He is dead who lives in sin.

On our conceptions of what the divine standard of living is, and of the time when and the means by which the transition from mere capacity for living to actual living, the moral change, renewal, or conversion, occurs, will depend the conditions of membership in: our churches. Is there such a divine and unchangeable standard ? Does it, if it exists, cover principles only, or overt acts alone, or motives also? How far are motives capable of being tested by Church authorities? Is the beginning of Christian living coincident with such faith as secures reverent obedience to known divine law, or with the faith that gives assurance of acceptance? To what extent is individual liberty in the application of fundamental principles of holy living admissible? If the relation of Christian love to amusements or business is doubtful, have Church authorities the right to excommunicate him in whom spiritual life may still exist, and whom God may still, in a measure, approve? A just separation from the Church of Christ is separation from Christ. Is it right to enforce, in what professes to be the Church of Christ, rules that would be legitimate only in a voluntary, club, organized for special purposes within the Church, but not coterminous with the Church? On the decision given here will greatly depend the conditions of membership in Christian organizations.

(2) The Ideal of Doctrine. — One department of church work is, by the application of truth, to lead into action the latent spiritual capability implanted by the Spirit of God. This implies the instruction of those formally enrolled in the organization. What shall they be taught? Has Christianity any one, universal, unchangeable, and divine standard of doctrine? If so, is it confined to facts, or does it embrace theories, also? What are the facts? How much, if any, of this code of doctrine must be demanded of members of the Church? On the answer to these questions will also depend the conditions of membership.

(3) The Christian Ideal of Organic Fellowship. — Is there a divinely authoritative standard of organic Church relations? Are divine blessings promised to Christians in their organic capacity, or in their individual capacity only? If a divinely approved standard of life and truth are universally imperative, and if failure to reach that standard is an object of mercy only when circumstances have rendered perfection impossible in him  who, nevertheless, sought conformity to that standard, can the preservation, propagation, and enforcement of life and truth in the world be left to purely voluntary religious organizations, guerilla warfare, and freelances? Or is there one visible organism, superior to all clubs and societies, the heir of special promises, so long as it is faithful to its obligations, and one, a just excision from which is excision from God? Though our Lord did not condemn him who cast out devils, even when he followed not the disciples, were not his preparatory instructions, his special commission, and his peculiar promises given to the disciples whom he was organizing? Let covenant blessings, with corresponding obligations, be attached, even if they are not exclusively so, to a visible organism; and introduction into that organism must bring at once, if they have not been received before, the promised blessings; and these blessings are then to be retained, not sought for, unless. after the reception of them, they have been forfeited. Let covenanted blessings be the inheritance of individuals only, apart from all organic connection, on the occasion of personal acts; then, prior to those acts, it cannot be assumed that such blessings are ever given, even when the individuals concerned are the infant children of believers; while the discredit thrown upon any organic connections possible prior to the personal actions must react on the conditions of membership assumed subsequently to these acts.

2. Principles of a Practical Character. —

(1) The terms of Church membership further depend upon the source whence we derive our knowledge of the constitution of the Christian Church. The life of one of the original apostles continued beyond the date of the "Acts of the Apostles," and of the Epistles must the form of the Church which existed. prior to the writing of these books be authoritative, and the form which history shows to have probably arisen with his sanction be ignored? Is the constitution of the Church one of cast-iron? When was it cast? At the close of the New-Test. canon? After the first three general councils? After the first seven? Or, is there a living Spirit, ever present with the Church, guiding it by Scripture, by reason and common-sense, by history and the evident necessities of spiritual life in changing circumstances? Is our knowledge of the constitution of the Church gained from the Bible alone, or from the Bible and something else? The conditions of membership will be determined by the answers given to these questions.

(2) These conditions are affected, also, by principles of Scriptural interpretation. What language did the Savior use? If he speaks of "water and the Spirit," is his word to be interpreted by Hebrew or by Greek analogies? If he uses the term βαπτίζω, or if his reporters use it in rendering the word he may have employed, must the Church limit her conduct by the latest edition of Lidglell and Scott? Or are the words of New-Test. Scripture to be regarded as so much the product of the Holy Spirit that all modifying human literary elements are eliminated from them? Is there a development of practice indicated even in the New Test., and must any given passage be interpreted as of perpetual obligation by etymology, apart from the light thrown upon it by this principle of development? Have we any right to say that the governing office of the apostolate was to be changed, but that the introduction of Christian families, as well as adult converts, into the Church was to lead to no. change? In a word, must the practices which are legitimate in the Church be limited by a system of interpretation based upon a bald literalism? Or may rites and ceremonies vary when interpretation judges of the obligation of such forms by the light thrown upon the Scriptures from the thousand avenues of a living, perpetually-speaking Providence, so long as the decision is not contrary to the spirit and principles of the New Test.? These questions will suggest the bearing of hermeneutics on membership in the Church.

II. Illustrations of these Principles in the Practice of Different Denominations. —

1. Ancient Episcopal Churches. These include the Greek or Eastern Church, with its various branches, the Roman Church, the English or British Church, and the National Churches of Denmark, Sweden, and Norway.

(1) The Greek or Eastern Church. — "Previous to baptism, the child, though not two months old, must be solemnly initiated into the Church, as a catechumen, through the medium of its sponsors, when exorcism.is used." Four prayers, with blowing on the child's mouth, forehead, and breast, and commands to the evil spirit to depart and return no more, precede the trine immersion or affusion of baptism. In Alexandria and the Syrian, or Jacobite, Church affusion exists. Among the Armenians both forms are united. The Copts, in exorcism, make the sign of the cross thirty- seven times. Chrism, or anointing with holy oil, follows immediately after  baptism, and answers to confirmation in the Western Church. Within seven days after this another washing occurs, followed by tonsure, or cutting the hair in the form of a cross. Confession four times in the year is prescribed, but is generally practiced but once, as is also communion. In the absence of a priest or a deacon, lay baptism is recognized, if it has been administered in the name of the Trinity. Chrism only is enforced where such baptism has taken place. The Montenegrin Church in South Albania, however, rebaptizes Roman Catholics. The popular impression that the Greek Church recognises the baptism of no other Church is denied by Archbishop Platon, in his supplement to M. Duten's OEuvres Melees, 2:170: "Baptismum aliarum ecclesiarum Christianarum non irritum esse putamus, et qui ex iis ad nos veniunt, non iterate baptismate, sed solo sacro chrismate inunctos, recipimus." ("We do not consider the baptism of other Christian churches invalid; and we receive those who come to us from them only by anointing them with the holy chrism, without repeating their baptism.") Submission to the faith of the Church is demanded. The communion is administered in both kinds, even to infants, bread and wine being mixed together, and given in a spoon by the officiating priest. Adult candidates then reverentially salute the clergy by hand-kissing and are congratulated by their friends as orthodox Christians. No Russian who has been educated in the Greek Church can lawfully depart from it.

(2) The Roman Church. — The leading conditions of membership in this Church are involved in her definition of the term "Church," as "the society of the faithful who are baptized and united, by the profession of the same faith, participation in the same sacraments and the same worship, to each other, and who are under one head in heaven, viz. Christ, and one head on earth, viz. the pope, his vicar." "The Church, though it consists of good and bad members, does not include heretics, schismatics, or (at least in the full sense of membership) persons severed from her unity by the greater excommunication." "Whether ‘pure schismatics' (i.e., persons holding the full faith of the Church, but separated by schism) may still be called members of the Church" is a question "agitated in the theological schools." Baptism is believed to be "the origin of spiritual life, and the door of entrance into the Church." The candidate is presented at the door of the church building, receives catechetical instruction, submits to exorcism, has salt put into his mouth, and the sign of the cross made upon different parts of his body, is touched on ears and nostrils with saliva, renounces Satan, his works and pomps, is anointed with oil, and makes profession of his  faith, by sponsors in the case of infants, before baptism. Baptism is by trine affision. Then follow chrism, robing in white, holding a burning light, and receiving a name of some saint. 'Confirmation with a chrism of olive-oil and balsam, in the form of a cross, with prayer and imposition of hands, in the name of the Trinity, follows either immediately or, as is usual, at from seven to twelve years of age. Confession at least once a year is imperative. The greater excommunication is reserved only for the most heinous offences.

(3) The Church of England. — This Church regards the spirit and principles of the Bible as forever binding; but she refuses not the guidance of subsequent Providential direction. Her terms of membership are founded upon the following principles. The Church's ideal of life, doctrine, and order, as given by Christ and his apostles, is divine and, wherever possible, imperative. Life is most important; and, while order is not indifferent, it may need to yield to the demands of truth and life. Hence she does not exclude from the pale of the Church those who, for the sake of truth and life, have believed themselves compelled to violate even her own historic order, but accepts their acts of baptism, if performed with water in the name of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and considers all thus baptized to be members of Christ's Church. Where the obstacles to truth and life which rendered the preservation of order morally impossible have been removed, she regards a return to the primitive apostolic order imperative for the maintenance of unity. Hence, while endeavoring to remove from herself those obstacles, when she sees them to be such, she abstains from such interchanges of membership as would imply that the division of the Church on diverse bases of life, doctrine, or order is normal or ordinarily legitimate. Her first condition of membership is baptism. In this, the sign of the cross is made on the forehead. It may be administered by lay hands, and in any of the various modes.

Before baptism, the divinely imparted capacity for spiritual action and enjoyment may, in her opinion, as truly exist as after it. but, inasmuch as the Christian covenant, in Mat 28:19-20, is regarded as given to Christians in their collective capacity, and not as individuals only, it is believed that, in baptism, the covenant blessing is surely given. This blessing of the vitalizing Spirit is called "regeneration," not because the moral change now commonly so called is therein wrought, but because the divine capacity for holy living, then, at least, certainly imparted; but impossible by mere human nature, is then, also, first openly manifested or declared, just as natural birth first openly manifests the life  which was before concealed. Hence, her second condition of membership, confirmation, is an opportunity given, after instruction, publicly to assume those responsibilities for which candidates are supposed to have been previously prepared by that faith which, working by love, brings the divinely imparted capacity into action, producing the moral change, renewal, or conversion demanded.

Church membership is, therefore, a home privilege, with spiritual power believed to be graciously conferred prior to all personal choice, to counteract inherited tendencies of evil, and to enable the child, from the beginning, to see and discharge the duties of Christian faith and love, a privilege to be retained, and not first to be sought after a period of alienation more or less prolonged. Provision is made' for the admission of adults by baptism, if this has not been previously given, and by confirmation. She imposes upon candidates no dogmatic theories, but only the facts embodied in the Apostles' Creed. Her moral demands cover no "doubtful disputations," but only the faith and love which are essential to Christianity. Her ceremonial demands enforce no more than attendance upon prayer, the word and the two sacraments of our Lord. Her law of discipline for the punishment and exclusion of lay offenders is, unfortunately, so greatly obstructed by legal considerations as to have become almost obsolete. Believing that she represents, not a voluntary society, but the Church of God, having maintained her historic connection in all essentials with the Church of apostolic times, she considers those baptized by her as hers until they die or are formally excluded or dismissed.

(4) On the principle that the majority of the members of a Church, in their corporate action, are and remain the same Church, the established churches of Denmark, Sweden, and Norway may be classed among ancient episcopal churches, though called Lutheran. In their terms of membership they do not essentially differ from other episcopal churches.

2. Modern Episcopal Churches, and Quasi-Episcopal Churches, Originating since the Reformation, and Committing the Rights of Ordination and Supervision to One Man, Assisted by Others. —

(1) The Scottish Episcopal Church. — The origin of this may be dated from the revival of episcopacy by Charles II, in 1661. Its terms. of membership are similar to those of the English Church.

(2) The Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States. — This was founded as a separate body in 1784,. and has the same conditions of  admission as the English Church; but an intention to be confirmed as soom as possible suffices, in certain cases, to secure membership. The use of the sign of the cross in baptism may, on request, be omitted. Letters of transfer to other denominations are sometimes given.

(3) Moravians (European, origin, 1727; American, 1800). — In Europe, baptism, with laying on of hands, introduces children into the Church as catechumens, among whom, prior to admission as full members, aeultr converts take their place. In America, full membership involves a profession of faith in the Bible as the word of God, confidence in the forgiveness of the candidate's sins, determination to follow holiness and! to obey the Church, and reception in open congregations by the pastor, after opportunity has been given for the, statement of objections to the reception. Retention of membership depends upon obedience to laws, some:. of which forbid the sale or use of intoxicants, or the renting of property to liquor-dealers, or signing petitions, favoring them, and union with secret societies. Exchlsion is by a vote of the class, or congregation, after admonition and examination. Transfer to other bodies may take place by a vote of the charger and a certificate signed by the pastor.

(4) The English Wesleyans. — To be members of the society, persons are required to desire salvation, to meet in class, to avoid evil and do good, according to the denominational standard of evil and good, and attend "the ordinances of God." The communion is not refused to godly persons, though they belong to the congregation only, and not to the society. Baptized childrens are not members of the Wesleyan organism, and are sometimes sent, for confirmation, to the Church of England.

(5) The Methodist Episcopal Church of the United States of America. — The conditions of membership in this Church are less affected than ill other Methodist churches by the transition from a voluntary society of adults formed for a special purpose to a self-governing Church. Membership begins by reception as a probationer, on giving evidence of desire for salvation from sin. After six months, on recommendation of the leaders and stewards, baptism having been received, and satisfactory assurances of faith and loyalty having been given to the preacher in charge before the Church, full membership is conferred. Members of other bodies are received, on recommendation from the proper authorities, and on assurance of loyalty to the principles and practices of the M.E. Church. Baptized children of Methodist parents, though regarded as in visible  covenant relation with God, and as objects of the Church's care, do not seem to be in any sense members of the Methodist Church until, after having attended class for six months, they are publicly received in regular form. After reception into full membership, attendance upon class-meeting, while strongly recommended, is no more imperative than attendance upon other useful services. For crimes duly proved, members may be expelled; after removal to parts unknown, the name may be dropped; on transference by certificate to another denomination, and on withdrawal while character is unimpeached, membership ceases.

(6) The Methodist Church of Canada. — This conforms to the conditions of membership among the English Wesleyans, attendance upon class- meeting being essential, dancing and similar amusements being forbidden, and children, though baptized, not being members of the organization.

(7) The Wesleyan Methodists of the United States (dating from 1842). — This adds to the usual Methodist conditions of membership special rules against secret societies, as Freemasons, Odd-Fellows, etc., intoxicants and tobacco.

(8) Apostolic Catholic Church (dating from 1832). In addition to baptism, "the conditions under which any person can become a member of one of the congregations gathered under the restored apostleship" are "that he should fully and heartily recognise the authority of this apostleship, so that he can sincerely work with it, submit to the commandments of the apostles, recognise the grace of Christ in them, and all the ministries authorized by them. Should any, after more or less time, lose their confidence in these restored ministries, and separate themselves from the congregations, they are still remembered and prayed for as negligent or lapsed members, and their names are kept on a separate register."

(9) Reformed Episcopal Church. — Baptism and confirmation admit to this Church persons born of parents within its pale. Communicants of other denominations are received by letter or other satisfactory evidence of membership, confirmation being optional with them. As no discrimination between denominations is made, there seems to be no guarantee that even baptism has been duly received. Assent to the principles, doctrine, discipline, and worship of the Church is demanded. Membership may cease during life by presenting a written statement of intention to withdraw, or by exclusion by the Church courts for offence. Some differences of practice exist in different localities.

3. Presbyterian Churches, ins which the Right of Ordination Resides in a Body of Presbyters. — These churches are governed by principles which do not differ fundamentally, though they differ in details and in verbal expression, from those of episcopal churches. "The basis of Church membership is the covenant of grace which Christ condescends to make with his people, of which covenant faith is the essential condition, and baptism the visible sign; and, as infants cannot in their own person exercise faith, their membership must in the first instance rest upon the faith of their parents, until they come to an age intelligently and voluntarily to embrace and profess Christ themselves." "Every child of believing parents is by his birth a citizen of God's kingdom and an heir of its privileges, subject to the condition of subsequent personal faith." One parent, at least, or one guardian, in the absence of parental custody, if "presumptively believing," must make "an express engagement to train the child to godliness."

Children are to be taught the Catechism, the Apostles' Creed, and the Lord's Prayer, to pray and to obey Christ. Baptized children are under the government of the Church. In baptism, there is a grace "conferred by the Holy Ghost;" yet the grace of regeneration is not necessarily connected with baptism, but is so in the case of "such as that grace belongeth unto." "The first element in the process of regeneration is the quickening power of the Holy Spirit exerted directly on the soul." These principles differ not substantially from those of the Church of England, which can be properly understood only when viewed in their relation to Pelagianism. Hooker defines regeneration as "that infused divine virtue of the Holy Ghost which gives to the powers of the soul their first disposition towards future newness of life;" and he says that "grace is not absolutely tied to sacraments," but that, in sacraments, " God imparts the saving grace of Christ to all that are capable thereof."

Though differences of opinion may exist as to the appropriateness of words to the representation of facts, yet, on the facts themselves, both Presbyterians and the Church of England seem very nearly to agree. Among Presbyterians, unbaptized adults are received on profession of faith in Christ and on baptism. The enforcing of doctrinal conformity to the theological standards is not necessary or universal. The faith in Christ demanded is not necessarily such as brings. assurance of forgiveness. Proper letters from other evangelical churches admit to membership. Censures are given for offences against lawful authority, nature, and Christianity, and excommunication awaits contumacy. These principles generally apply to Presbyterian churches in all lands, the Reformed Presbyterian Church, the Associate Reformed  Presbyterians Church, the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, etc. The Dutch Reformed Church makes confirmation the public reception ofn members after examination in Bible and Church history and doctrines. Presbyterian Lutherans consider confirmation to be the public reception of candidates, with the blessing of the minister, after a doctrinal examination; but variety of practice arises from the large congregational liberty allowed. The United Presbyterians of the United States prescribe rules against the use of hymns, secret societies, and open communion.

4. Congregational Churches, or those in which each Congregation is Supreme over its own Affairs. —

(1) Orthodox Pedobaptist Churches. — Credible personal faith in Christ and consecration to his service are the sole conditions of entrance, the individual Church being the judge of such credibility. Children, prior to personal faith and consecration, are in no sense members, but are to be watched over, that they may become such. Opinions and practice differ as to what children are eligible for baptism, whether those of members only, or others. Absence for a year in parts unknown, transfer to other churches, and, in some instances, resignation without transfer, lead to erasure of the name from the church roll; and contumacious offences lead to exclusion by the Church. The Evangelical Union, or Morisonians, differ from other Congregationalists chiefly in the Arminian doctrines professed, and in making saving faith, on which members are accepted, to be such that it is not only invariably accompanied by assurance of acceptance, but that it renders prayer before it, and for it, an offence.

(2) Orthodox Antipedobaptist Churches. — "The Baptist theory is that the Church should consist of persons in whom the divine life has been begun by regeneration, and who have been baptized on profession of their faith in Christ as their Saviour." Hence, on profession and immersion, if the profession satisfies the local Church, membership is conferred. Excision is similar to that in pedobaptist churches. Some Baptists in England do not regard baptism with water as essential to membership. Free-Will Baptists receive baptized persons of other evangelical churches on testimony of a letter of recommendation by vote of the local Church. Seventh-Day Baptists add to the usual conditions of membership a trine immersion, with laying on of hands and prayer, and the observance of the seventh day of the week, instead of the first. "Disciples of Christ" demand immersion on profession of faith in Christ, and acceptance of the Bible as the rule of faith  and morals. Exclusion is the act of the congregation, on conduct judged by them intolerable. Mennonites baptize none before eleven or twelve years of age, and then by pouring water on the head. Strict Mennonites prohibit head-ornaments, fine clothing, and rich furniture, and advocate the separation of the excommunicated from social intercourse.

(3) Unitarians. — These are generally Congregationalists, though in Transylvania they are Episcopal, and in Ireland Presbyterian. In the United States the authority that receives into membership is, in many cases, a circle of persons known as the "Church," inside of a larger organization known as the "Society" or parish. Baptism, and the signification to the pastor of a wish to join, with, in some churches, a public recognition by giving "the hand of fellowship," usually admits to membership; but intimation to the pastor of a desire for membership, and consent of his advisers, it is probable, would admit to fellowship, even without baptism or public reception. In many congregations the renting of a sitting, and qualifying for a vote in parish business by accepting the by-laws of the congregation, entitle to all the privileges of membership. There is no form of exclusion. Simple forms of covenant sometimes exist. "An unformulated consensus of opinion, a fidelity in public worship, a reverential support of the Lord's Supper, a deep interest both in piety and ethics, and a readiness in benevolent work," are not always absent from even such loose bonds of union.

(4) Universalists. — Persons, whether baptized in Universalist churches or not, of years of discretion, usually sixteen, are received by a majority vote of the congregation, after application has been made one month previously, in open meeting of the Church, in person, by a friend, or by letter. Strangers must present evidences of Christian faith and character. The only profession of faith authorized by the whole body is given in three articles, which recognize

(a) the Bible, as containing a revelation of God's character, and man's duty, interest, and destiny;

(b) one God of love, revealed in one Lord, Jesus Christ, by one Holy Spirit of grace, who will finally lead all men through holiness to happiness; and

(c) the obligation of good works arising from the inseparable connection of holiness and happiness.

5. Miscellaneous. —

(1) European Protestant Churches.

i. National Reformed Churches of France and Switzerland. —

(a) Children, after baptism, are first instructed, then examined before the pastor, or the presbyterial assembly (conseil presbyteral), or consistory, then received publicly, often after profession of personal faith, and finally admitted to communion at Easter.

(b) Adults from without, on introduction, declare to the assembly and the pastor adhesion to the general principles of the Church, bear a share in the expenses, and, unless in the case of foreigners, must enjoy civil and political rights. Excommunication is pronounced from the pulpit, in general terms, without a particular application.

ii. Lutheran National Church. — Nearly the same system exists here.

iii. Free Churches. — Admission is said to be by public profession of faith. Uniformity of practice does not exist among the Reformed churches. In some cases, in Free churches, rebaptism of converts exists, generally by affusion, but, in the case of Baptists, by immersion.

(2) New Church, or Swedenborgians. — Baptized infants receive full membership by confirmation on arriving at years of discretion. Members coming from without are usually baptized, though opinions and practice on rebaptism are not uniform. In excluding members, in addition to the directions in Mat 18:17, the following principle prevails: "He who differs in opinion from the minister ought to be left in peace, so long as he makes no disturbance; but he who makes disturbance ought to be separated."

(3) Friends, or Quakers. — Membership for persons native to the body is a birthright, but it confers rights of work and service on committees only after proved steadfastness. Admission of persons from without is by request, examination by a committee of similar sex with the candidate, and acceptance by the following monthly meeting. Excision is only after contumacious resistance of official efforts for reform, the final one of which is the presentation of a written "testification" before the monthly meeting. This follows a failure of two official interviews between the  offender and the committee appointed in the case. Only after a second failure to secure reform is official record made of offences.

(4) Plymouth Brethren. — Application must first be made through one of the brethren to a Saturday meeting of the leaders of the various assemblies of the place. The candidate is then visited by leading men, and rigidly examined on doctrines and separation from all other Christian bodies. Satisfactory examination results in recommendation to the Saturday meeting; and, if approved, the person enters next Lord's Day by communing. The mode of baptism is an open question. Fellowship or excision, among "Close Brethren," relates not to one assembly, but to all in the world. From decisions of the Saturday meeting there is no appeal. The chief and most influential Saturday meeting is that of London, England. Among "Open Brethren," individual assemblies are not bound by the excisions of others. "Brethren" avoid the use of the term "members," as of an organization.

(5) The Reformed Church in America. — This demands baptism, profession of faith before the consistory, composed of pastor, elders, and deacons, or a letter of recommendation from some other church.

(6) The Evangelical Association. — This body holds, in addition to the ordinary rules of admission to Methodist churches, that traffic in liquor is unlawful.

(7) The "Church of Christ." — This adopts, as necessary terms of membership, belief that Jesus is the Son of God, repentance and a righteous life, profession of faith by word of mouth, and immersion in the name of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

(8) The "Church of God." — This body, believing that immortality and incorruptibility arise from the likeness of Christ's resurrection, which, with. them, means being immersed, make immersion, with the ordinary demands of Congregational churches, imperative for membership.

(9) "Christians" (or the Christian Connection).This demands no more than a profession of Christian faith and a corresponding life, the congregation being the judge of the life, and the person himself of the faith.

This list of organizations, calling themselves, as a whole, or in part, the Church of Christ, is by no means complete; but a sufficient number has been given to show on what comparatively unimportant grounds the  majority of sectarian differences are based, and to suggest the question whether, in our reaction from corporate intolerance, we have given due weight to the calm statements of Christ, and the earnest pleadings of St. Paul, on the subject of the unity of Christ's body, the Church. For further particulars, see each religious body in its alphabetical place. (J.R.)

## Memento Mori[[@Headword:Memento Mori]]

             remember death. It was God himself who first gave this admonition to fallen Adam (Gen 3:19). Such admonitions we find in the Old and New Testament, and that very frequently, no doubt with intent to remind us constantly of the final day, of the end of life. Philip, king of Macedon, it is said, ordered lis attendant to remind him of his death every morning by saying, “King, thou art a mortal being; live in the thought of death.” Human beings are but too apt to forget the “Memento mori” when called to high places of honor. An exception, however, was a certain general who, when holding his triumphal processions, had a servant advance to him and cry out -repeatedly, “Do not forget that you are a mortal man.” We  should be mindfil that every one of us is but a mortal being. Even to this day the sinister thought of this is impressed upon the pope at his coronation, when the master of the ceremony advances toward the holy father with a silver staff, on which is fastened a tift of oakum; this is lighted by a candle borne by a clerical, who bends his knee, and, holding up the burning oakum, exclaims, “Holy father, be reminded that all earthly existence will be extinguished like this tuft of oakum.” Another occasion the Romanists furnish in their liturgy, so especially solemn on Ash Wednesday, where the sentence occurs, “Memento homo, quia pulvis es, et in pulverem reverteris.” There are two ecclesiastical orders, the Carthusians and Trappists, whose members, on meeting a person, utter aloud the words “ Memento mori.” The Trappists always keep in their gardens an open grave, surely a good warning and constant reminder of the uncertainty of earthly existence. SEE DEATH.

## Memling, Hans Or Jan[[@Headword:Memling, Hans Or Jan]]

             a celebrated Flemish painter, was born at Constanz in 1439, according to Dr. Boisseree, but other authorities, among whom may be cited Mrs. Heaton, assert positively that his birthplace was Bruges, and that he was born in 1430. There was for a long time a fierce controversy as to this painter's name, some writers insisting that it should be written Hemling or Hemmelinck, and that he was of German origin; there is, however, very little reason for doubting that Memling was the real name of the painter whose works adorn the Chapel of St. John at Bruges. There is but little known of his life; he appears to have lived some years in Spain, and is supposed to have visited Italy and Germany-certainly Cologne; he is also said to have served Charles the Bold of Burgundy, both as. painter and as warrior. He was admitted, wounded and destitute, into the Hospital of St. John at Bruges, a religious institution, in which none but inhabitants of Bruges were entered (which fact is also given to prove that he was born in Bruges), and, upon recovering, painted, from gratitude at his kind treatment, the beautiful picture of Sibyl Zambeth. There are a number of works of art in this hospital by Memling, prominent among which is the history, in minute figures, of St. Ursula, the virgin saint of Cologne, and her companions, exquisitely painted in oil in many compartments, upon a relic case of Gothic design, known as La Chasse de Ste. Ursule. Memling painted also during his stay at this hospital the Adoration of the Magi, the large altar-piece of the Marriage of St. Catharine, the Madonna and Child, and a Descent from the Cross. Nine pictures by Memling are in the  Munich Gallery, among which the greatest are, Israelites collecting Manna, St. Christopher carrying the infant Christ, Abraham and Melchizedek, the Seizure of Christ in the Garden, a Saicta Veronica or Face of Christ, the Joys and Sorrows of the Virgin, and the Journey of the three Kings of the East. Rathgeber enumerates over one hundred works which are attributed to Memling, but few of them, however, can be authenticated. He also decorated missals and other books of Church service, one of which is in the Library of St. Mark at Venice. Memling probably died in the year 1499, as an authentic document preserved in the records of the town of Bruges, dated in 1499, speaks of him as “ the late Meestre Hans.” See Mrs. Heaton, Masterpieces of Flemish Art (Lond. 1869, 4to); Kugler's Hand-book of Painting, transl. by Waagen (Lond. 1860, 2 vols. 12mo); Mrs. Jameson, Legends of the Madonna, p. 19, 89, 105, 202, 304.

## Memmi, Simon[[@Headword:Memmi, Simon]]

             an eminent Siennese painter, was born in 1285. Vasari says he was a pupil of Giotto; Lanzi, however, claims him as a scholar of the Siennese maestro Mino. He was a close imitator of the style of Giotto, whom he accompanied to Rome. After his master's death he painted a Virgin in the portico of St. Peter, also two figures of St. Paul and St. Peter upon the wall between the arches of the portico on the outer side. He then' returned to Sienna, where he was appointed by the Signoria to paint one of the halls of their palace in fresco, the subject being a Virgin, with many figures around her. He painted three other pictures in the same palace, one of which, an Annunciation, was afterwards removed to the gallery -of the Uffizi. The other represented the Virgin holding the Child in her arms, and was destroyed by the earthquake of 1798. He was invited to Florence by the general of the Augustines, where he painted a very remarkable Crucifixion. Vasari says, “In this painting the thieves on the cross are seen expiring, the soul of the repentant thief being joyfully borne to heaven by angels, while that of the impenitent departs, accompanied by devils; and roughly dragged by these daemons to the torments of hell” (Lives of the Painters, 1:184). He also painted three of the walls of the chapter-house of Santa Maria Novella. On the first wall, over the entrance, is the Life of San Domenico; on that which is nearest the church he represented the Brethren of the Dominican Order contending against the Heretics; on the third, which is where the altar stands, was depicted the Crucifixion of Christ. Many other works are attributed to him jointly with his brother Lippo  Memmi, who also practiced the art of painting with great success. About 1342 the two brothers returned to Sienna, where Simon commenced a work of vast extent, being a Coronation of the Virgin, with an extraordinary number of figures. He died before its completion at Avignon, in July, 1344. See Vasari, Lives of the Painters, transl. by Foster. (Lond. 1850, 5 vols. 8vo), 1:181; Lanzi's History of Painting, transl. by Roscoe (Lond. 1847, 3 vols. 8vo), 1:278; Mrs. Jameson, Legends of the Madonna (Lond. 1857, 8vo), p. 172, 273.

## Memmi, Simone[[@Headword:Memmi, Simone]]

             (called also Martini), an eminent Italian painter, was born at Siena in 1285, and was probably a pupil of Giotto. He was invited by the pope to Avignon to do some work for him. His great picture in St. Peter's has perished, but there are several of his works in the churches at Florence, Pisa, and Siena. In the Campo Santo of Pisa are several frescos of the history of St. Ranieri, and the far-famed Assumption of the Virgin and a Choir of Angels. His large pictures may be seen at Florence, among. which are several of Christ, of St. Peter the martyr, and St. Domenico. There are some more of this class of pictures in the churches of Siena. Memmi died at Avignon in 1344. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.; Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, s.v.

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

             (Κόϊντος Μέμμιος), one of' the Roman ambassadors sent to the Jews by Lysias (2. Macc. 11:34) about BC. 163-2. SEE MANLIUS.

## Memorial[[@Headword:Memorial]]

             is the name

(1) of a prayer of oblation; the prayer in the order of the communion beginning “O Lord and heavenly Father,” which follows the communion of the faithful.

(2) The tomb of a martyr, or a church dedicated to his memory.

(3) The commemoration of a concurrent lesser festival by the use of its collect.

(4) Exequies, an office for the dead said by the priest in the 14th century in England.

## Memory[[@Headword:Memory]]

             that faculty of the mind which enables us to recall past impressions, whether of external facts or internal consciousness. It applies to sensations, perceptions, creations of the fancy, matters acquired by learning, in short, to anything, actual or imaginary, which has previously occupied the mind. It is the great mental storehouse of knowledge. The clearness of the impression so recalled depends, other things being equal, upon. the strength and vividness of the original impression, and this largely depends upon the degree of attention given to the object of it at the time. Other conditions are, chiefly, length of interval since the first impression, frequency of its reiteration, variety of intervening and confusing impressions, etc. There are two accessory ideas usually included in the  definition of memory namely, the power of retaining as well as recalling previous impressions, and an accompanying consciousness that the impressions recalled relate to the past. But both these are logically involved in the definition above given; for the power of retention is only indicated and measured by the facility or ability of recalling, and the past character of the thing remembered is implied in its being re-called rather than conceived, perceived, or originated. Memory is thus a definite act, which serves as the exponent or index of the faculty by virtue of which it is performed; and the power itself is estimated and characterized according to the ease, rapidity and completeness of the function.

Memory can hardly be said to be voluntary, yet the will may assist it indirectly. The recurrence of the past impression depends upon what is called the association of ideas, i.e. the connection. in which the impression was first made; and this furnishes the link for retrieving it. This association differs greatly in different minds, and, indeed, with almost every occasion. By attentively fixing the mind upon something connected with the matter sought to be recalled, the train of thought may often be recovered; yet, when it does at last recur, it is spontaneous. Hence memory has been distinguished into simple remembrance, or passive memory without effort, and recollection, or active memory accompanied by a mental endeavor. Memory of a particular point may be clear or faint. Memory in general may be either weak or strong. In some individuals these last characteristics are constitutional. The memory, however, may be greatly improved by habit. Artificial helps are called mnemonics. Memory may also be weak in one respect, and strong in another. Hence the distinction of verbal memory, etc. Names and numbers are proverbially difficult to remember. Yet some remarkable instances of these species of memory are on record. Singular instances also of disordered memory, either excessively acute or defective in some peculiar respects, have been observed. It is held by many that nothing is absolutely lost by the memory; and some are of the opinion that this faculty will furnish the conscience with the whole catalogue of past sins at the final judgment. SEE MIND.

## Memphis[[@Headword:Memphis]]

             (Μέμφις, Herod. 2:99, 114, 136, 154; Polyb. v. 61; Diod. 1:50 sq.), a very ancient city, the capital of Lower Egypt, standing at the apex of the Delta, ruins of which are still found not far from its successor and modern  representative, Cairo. In the following account of it, we shall of course mainly have in view the Scripture relations and notices of this important ancient site, but at the same time we shall introduce whatever illustration seems pertinent from profane and monumental sources. SEE EGYPT.

I. The Name. — Memphis occurs once in the AV., in Hos 9:6, where the Hebrew has Moph (מֹ, Sept. Μέμφις, Vulg. Memphis). Elsewhere the Hebrew name appears as Noph (נֹ), under which form it is mentioned by Isaiah (Isa 19:13), Jeremiah (Jer 2:16; Jer 46:14; Jer 46:19), and Ezekiel (Eze 30:13; Eze 30:16). These two forms are contractions of the ancient Egyptian MEN-NUFR or MEN-NEFRU, whence the Coptic Menfi, Memfi, Membe (Memphitic forms), and Memfe (Sahidic), the Greek name, and the Arabic Menf. The Hebrew forms were probably in use among the Shemites in Lower Egypt, and perhaps among the Egyptians, in the vulgar dialect.

The ancient Egyptian common name (as above) signifies either “the good abode,” or “the abode of the good one.” Plutarch, whose Egyptian information in the treatise De Iside de Osiride is generally valuable, indicates that the latter or a similar explanation was current among the Egyptian priests. He tells us that some interpreted the name the “haven of good ones,” others, “the sepulchre of Osiris” (καὶ τὴν μὲν πόλιν οἱ μὲν ὅρμον ἀγαθῶν ἑρμηνεύουσιν, οἱ δ᾿ [ἰδί] ως τάφον Ο᾿σίριδις, c. 20). “To come to port” is, in hieroglyphics, MENA or MAN, and in Coptic the long vowel is not only preserved but sometimes repeated. There is, however, no expressed vowel in the name of Memphis, which we take therefore to commence with the word MEN, “abode,” like the name of a town or village MEN-HeBi “ the abode, or mansion, of assembly,” cited by Brugsch (Geographische Inschriften, 1:191, No. 851, tab. 37). “The good abode” is the more probable rendering, for there is no preposition, which, however, might possibly be omitted in an archaic form. The special determinative of a pyramid follows the name of Memphis, because it was the pyramid-city, pyramids having perhaps been already raised there ‘as early as the reign of Venephes, the fourth king of the first dynasty (Manetho, ap. Cory, Anc. Frag. p. 96, 97; comp. Brugsch, Geogr Inschr. 1:240).

The sacred name of Memphis was HA-PTAH, PA-PTAH, or HA-PTAH- KA, or HA-KA-PTAH. “the abode of Ptah,” or “of the being of Ptah” (Brugsch, 1:235, 236, Nos. 1102, 1103, 1104,1105, tab. xlii).

II. Geographical Position. — Memphis was well chosen as the capital city of all Egypt. It stood just above the ancient point of the Delta, where the Pelusiac, Sebennytic, and Canopic branches separated. It was within the valley of Upper Egypt, yet it was close to the plain of Lower Egypt. If farther north it could not have been in a position naturally strong; if anywhere but at the division of the two regions of Egypt, it could not have been the seat of a sovereign who wished to unite and command the two. Where the valley of Upper Egypt is about to open into the plain it is about five miles broad. On the east, this valley is bounded almost to the river's brink by the light yellow limestone mountains which slope abruptly to the narrow slip of fertile land. On the west, a broad surface of cultivation extends to the low edge of the Great Desert, upon which rise, like landmarks, the long series of Memphite pyramids. The valley is perfectly flat, except where a village stands on the mound of some ancient town, and unvaried but by the long groves of date-palms which extend along the river, and the smaller groups of the villages. The Nile occupies the midst with its great volume of water, and to the west, not far beneath the Libyan range, is the great canal called the Bahr Yfisuf, or “Sea of Joseph.” The scene is beautiful from the contrast of its colors, the delicate tints of the bare desert-mountains or hills bright with the light of an Egyptian sun, and the tender green of the fields, for a great part of the year, except when the Nile spreads its inundating waters from desert to desert, or when the harvest is yellow with such plenteous ears as Pharaoh saw in his dream. The beauty is enhanced by the recollection that here stood that capital of Egypt which was in times very remote a guardian of ancient civilization; that here, as those pyramids-which triflers in all ages have mocked at-were raised to attest, the doctrine of a future state was firmly believed and handed down till revelation gave it its true significance; and that here many of the great events of sacred history may have taken place, certainly many of its chief personages may have wondered at remains which in the days of Abraham were the work of an older and stronger generation.

But for the pyramids it would now be difficult to ascertain the precise site of Memphis, and the pyramids, extending for twenty miles, do not minutely assist us. No lofty mounds, as at Bubastis and Sais, mark the place of the great city; no splendid temples, as at Thebes, enable us to recall its magnificence. The valley between the Libyan Desert and the Nile is flat and unmarked by standing columns, or even, as at neighboring Heliopolis, by a solitary obelisk. Happily a fallen colossal statue and some trifling remains  near by, half buried in the mud, and annually drowned by the inundation, show us where stood the chief temple of Memphis, and doubtless the most ancient part of the city, near the modern village of Mit-Rahinel (fully Minyet Rahineh; comp. Robinson, Researches, 1:40, 41). This central position is in the valley very near the present west bank of the river, and three miles from the edge ot the Great Desert. The distance above Cairo is about nine miles, and that above the ancient head of the Delta about sixteen. The ancient city was -no doubt of great extent, but it is impossible, now that its remains have been destroyed and their traces swallowed up by the alluvial deposit of the Nile, to determine its limits, or to decide whether the different quarters mentioned in the hieroglyphic inscriptions were portions of one connected city; or, again, whether the Memphis known to classical writers was smaller than the old capital, a central part of it, from which the later additions had, ill a time of decay, been gradually separated. In the inscriptions we find three quarters distinguished: The “ White Wall,” mentioned by the classical writers (λενκὸν τεῖχος), has the same name in hieroglyphics, SEBT-HET (Brugsch, ut sup. 1:120, 234, 235; 1 tab. xv, Nos. 1091-1094; tab. xii). That Memphis is meant in the name of the nome appears not only from the circumstance that Memphis was the capital of the Memphitic Nome, but also from the occurrence of HA-PTAHKA or HA-KA-PTAH, as the equivalent of SEBT-HET in the name of the nome (Brugsch, ibid. i, tab. xv; 1:1; 2:1, etc., and Nomen aus dem neuen Reiche, p. 1). The White Wall is put in the nome-name for Memphis itself, probably as the oldest part of the city. Herodotus mentions the White Wall as the citadel of Memphis, for he relates that it held a garrison of 120,000 Persians (iii. 91), and he also speaks of it by the name of the Citadel simply (τὸ τεῖχος, p. 13, 14). Thucydides speaks of the White Wall as the third, and, as we may infer, the strongest part of Memphis, but he does not give the names of the other two parts (i. 104). The Scholiast remarks that Memphis had three walls, and that whereas the others were of brick, the third, or White Wall, was of stone (ad loc.). No doubt the commentator had in his mind Greek towns surrounded by more than a single wall, and did not know that Egyptian towns were rarely if ever walled. But his idea of the origin of the name white, as applied to the citadel of Memphis, is very probably correct. The Egyptian forts known to us are of crude brick; therefore a stone fort, very possible in a city like Memphis, famous for its great works in masonry, would receive a name denoting its peculiarity. It is noticeable that the monuments mention two other quarters, “The two  regions of life” (Brugsch, ibid. 1:236, 237, Nos. 1107 sq., tab. 42, 43), and AHI or PER-AMHI (ibid. p. 237, No. 1114 a, tab. 43).

III. History. —

1. The foundation of the city is assigned to Menes, the first king of Egypt, head of the first dynasty (Herod. il, 99). The situation, as already observed, is admirable for a capital of the whole country, and it was probably chosen with that object. It would at once command the Delta and hold the key of Upper Egypt, controlling the commerce of the Nile, defended upon the west by the Libyan mountains and desert, and on the east by the river and its artificial embankments. The climate of Memphis may be inferred from that of the modern Cairo about ten miles to the north -which is the most equable that Egypt affords. The city is said to have had a circumference of about nineteen miles (Diod. Sici. 50), and the houses or inhabited quarters, as was usual in the great cities of antiquity, were interspersed with numerous gardens and public areas.

The building of Memphis is associated by tradition with a stupendous work of art, which has permanently changer the course of the Nile and the face of the Delta. Before the time of Menes the river, emerging from the upper valley into the neck of the Delta, bent its course westward towards the hills of the Libyan Desert, or at least discharged a portion of its waters through an arm in that direction. Here the generous flood, whose yearly inundation gives life and fertility to Egypt, was largely absorbed in the sands of the desert or wasted in stagnant morasses. It is even conjectured that up to the time of Menes the whole Delta was an uninhabitable marsh. The rivers of Damascus, the Barada and ‘Awaj, now lose themselves in the same way in the marshy lakes of the great desert plain south-east of that city. Herodotus informs us, upon the authority of the Egyptian priests of his time, that Menes, “by banking up the river at the bend which it forms about a hundred furlongs south of Memphis, laid the ancient channel dry, while he dug a new course for the stream half-way between the two lines of hills. To this day,” he continues, “the elbow which the Nile forms at the point where it is forced aside into the new channel is guarded with the greatest care by the Persians, and strengthened every year; for if the river were to burst out at this place, and pour over the mound, there would be danger of Memphis being completely overwhelmed by the flood. Men, the first king, having thus, by turning the river, made the tract where it used to run dry land, proceeded in the first place to build the city now called Memphis, which  lies in the narrow part of Egypt; after which he further excavated a lake outside of the town, to the north and west, communicating with the river, which was itself the eastern boundary” (Herod. 2:99). From this description it appears that-like Amsterdam diked in from the Zuyder Zee, or St. Petersburg defended by the mole at Cronstadt from the Gulf of Finland, or more nearly like New Orleans protected by its levee from the freshets of the Mississippi, and drained by Lake Pontchartrain-Memphis was created upon a marsh reclaimed by the dike of Menes and drained by his artificial lake. The dike of Menes began twelve miles south of Memphis, and deflected the main channel of the river about two miles to the eastward. Upon the rise of the Nile, a canal still conducted a portion of its waters westward through the old channel, thus irrigating the plain beyond the city in that direction, while an inundation was guarded against on that side by a large artificial lake or reservoir at Abusir. The skill in engineering which these works required, and which their remains still indicate, argues a high degree of material civilization, at least in the mechanic arts, in the earliest known period of Egyptian history. The manufactures of glass at Memphis were famed for the superior quality of their workmanship, with which Rome continued to be supplied long after Egypt became a province of the empire.

The environs of Memphis presented cultivated groves of the acacia-tree, of whose wood were made the planks and masts of boats, the handles of offensive weapons of war, and various articles of furniture (Wilkinson, 3:92, 168).

Sir Gardner Wilkinson observes, “The dike of Menes was probably near the modern Kafr el-Eiyat, fourteen miles south of Mit-Rahineh, where the Nile takes a considerable bend, and from this point it would (if the previous direction of its course continued) run immediately below the Libyan mountains, and over the site of Memphis. Calculating from the outside of Memphis, this bend agrees exactly with the hundred stadia, or nearly eleven and a half English miles Mt. Rahlneh being about the centre of the old city. No traces of these dikes (sic) are now seen” (Rawlinson's Herod. 2:163, note 6). That the dike has been allowed to fall into neglect, and ultimately to disappear, may be accounted for by the gradual obliteration of the old bed, and the cessation of any necessity to keep the inundation from the site of Memphis, which, on the contrary, as the city contracted, became cultivable soil and required to be annually fertilized. But are we to suppose that Menes executed the great engineering works attributed to him? It is  remarkable that the higher we advance towards the beginnings of Egyptian history, the more vast are the works of manual labor. The Lake Mceris, probably excavated under the 6th dynasty, cast into the shade all later works of its or any other kind executed in Egypt. The chief pyramids, which, if reaching down to this time, can scarcely reach later, increase in importance as we go higher, the greatest being those of El-Gizeh, sepulchres of the earlier kings of the 4th dynasty. This state of things implies the existence of a large serf population gradually decreasing towards later times, and shows that Menes might well have diverted the course of the Nile. The digging of a new course seems doubtful, and it may be conjectured that the branch which became the main stream was already existent.

The mythological system of the time of Menes is ascribed by Bunsen to “the amalgamation of the religion of Upper and Lower Egypt;” religion having “already united the two provinces before the power of the race of This in the Thebaid extended itself to Memphis, and before the giant work of Menes converted the Delta from a desert, checkered over with lakes and morasses, into a blooming garden.” The political union of the two divisions of the country was effected by the builder of Memphis. “Menes founded the Empire of Egypt by raising the people who inhabited the valley of' the Nile from a little provincial station to that of a historical nation” (Egypt's Place, 1:441; 2:409).

2. It would appear from the fragments of Manetho's history that Memphis continued the seat of government of kings of all Egypt as late as the reign of Venephes, the third successor of Menes. Athothis, the son and successor of Menes, built the palace there, and the king first mentioned built the pyramids near Cochome (Cory's Anc. Frag. 2d ed. p. 94-97); pyramids are scarcely seen but at Memphis, and Cochome is probably the name of part of the Memphitic necropolis, as will be noticed later. The 3d dynasty was of Memphitic kings, the 2d and part of the 1st having probably lost the undivided rule of Egypt. The 4th dynasty, which succeeded about BC. 2440, was the most powerful Memphitic line, and under its earlier kings the pyramids of El-Ghizeh were built. It is probable that other Egyptian lines were tributary to this, which not only commanded all the resources of Egypt to the quarries of Syene on the southern border, but also worked the copper mines of the Sinaitic Peninsula. The 5th dynasty appears to have been contemporary with the 4th and 6th, the latter being a Memphitic house which continued the succession. At the close of the latter Memphis  fell, according to the opinion of some, into the hands of the Shepherd kings, foreign strangers who, more or less, held Egypt for 500 years. At the beginning of the 18th dynasty we once more find hieroglyphic notices of Memphis after a silence of some centuries. During that dynasty and its two successors, while the Egyptian empire lasted, Memphis was its second city, though, as the sovereigns were Thebans, Thebes was the capital.

3. After the decline of the empire, we hear little of Memphis until the Persian period, when the provincial dynasties gave it a preference over Thebes as the chief city of Egypt. Herodotus informs us that Cambyses, enraged at the opposition he encountered at Memphis, committed many outrages upon the city. He killed the sacred Apis, and caused his priests to be scourged. “He opened the ancient sepulchres, and examined the bodies that were buried in them. He likewise went into the temple of lHephuestus (Ptah), and made great sport of the image.... He went also into the temple of the Cabiri, which it is unlawful for any one to enter except the priests, and, not only made sport of the images, but even burned them” (Herod. 3:37). Memphis never recovered from the blow inflicted by Cambyses. With the Greek rule, indeed, its political importance somewhat rose, and while Thebes had dwindled to a thinly-populated collection of small towns, Memphis became the native capital, where the sovereigns were crowned by the Egyptian priests; but Alexandria gradually destroyed its power, and the policy of the Romans hastened a natural decay.

4. At length, after the Arab conquest, the establishment of a succession of rival capitals, on the opposite bank of the Nile-El-Fustat, El-Askar, El- Kata-e, and El-Kahireh, the later Cairo-drew away the remains of its population, and at last left nothing to mark the site of the ancient capital but ruins, which were long the quarries for any who wished for costly marbles, massive columns, or mere blocks of stone for the numerous mosques of the Moslem seats of government. The Arabian physician, Abd- el-Latif, who visited Memphis in the 13th century, describes its ruins as then marvellous beyond description (see De Sacy's translation, cited by Brugsch, Histoire d'Egqypte, p. 18). Abulfeda, in the 14th century, speaks of the remains of Memphis as immense; for the most part in a state of decay, though some sculptures of variegated stone still retained a remarkable freshness of color (Descriptio ,AEgypti ed. Michaelis, 1776). At length, so complete was the ruin of Memphis that for a long time its very site was lost. Pococke could find no trace of it. Recent explorations, especially those of Messrs. Mariette and Linant, have brought to light many  of its antiquities, which have been dispersed in the museums of Europe and America. Some specimens of sculpture from Memphis adorn the Egyptian hall of the British Museum; other monuments of this great city are in the Abbott Museum in New York. The dikes and canals of Menes still form the basis of the system of irrigation for Lower Egypt; the insignificant village of Mit-Rahineh occupies nearly the centre of the ancient capital.

IV. Edifices, Ruins, and Monuments.-Of the buildings of Memphis, none remain above ground; the tombs of the neighboring necropolis alone attest its importance, It is, however, necessary to speak of those temples which ancient writers mention, and especially of such of these as are known by remaining fragments.

1. Herodotus states, on the authority of the priests, that Menes “built the temple of Hephaestus, which stands within the city, a vast edifice, well worthy of mention” (ii. 99). The divinity whom Herodotus thus identifies with Hephuestus was Ptah, “the creative power, the maker of all material things” (Wilkinson, in Rawlinson's Herod. 2:289; Bunsen, Egypt's Place, 1:367, 384). Ptah was worshipped in all Egypt, but under different representations in different names; ordinarily “as a god holding before him with both hands the Nilometer, or emblem of stability, combined with the sign of life”' (Bunsen, 1:382). But at Memphis his worship was so prominent that the primitive sanctuary of his temple was built by Menes: successive monarchs greatly enlarged and beautified the structure by the addition of courts, porches, and colossal ornaments. Herodotus and Diodorus describe several of these additions and restorations, but nowhere give a complete description of the temple, with measurements of its various dimensions (Herod. 2:99, 101; 108-110, 121, 136, 153, 176; Diod. Sic. 1:45, 51, 62, 67)'- According to these authorities, Mceris built the northern gateway; Sesostris erected in front of the temple colossal statues (varying from thirty to fifty feet in height) of himself, his wife, and his four sons; Rhampsinitus built the western gateway, and erected before it the colossal statues of Summer and Winter; Asychis built the eastern gateway, which” in size and beauty far surpassed the other three;” Psammetichus built the southern gateway; and Amosis presented to this temple “‘a recumbent colossus seventy-five feet long, and two upright statues, each twenty feet high.” The period between Menes and Amosis, according to Brugsch, was 3731 years; according to Wilkinson only about 2100 years; but upon either calculation the temple, as it appeared to Strabo, was the growth of many centuries. Strabo (xvii. 807) describes this temple as “built  in a very sumptuous manner, both as regards the size of the Naos and in other respects.” The Dromos, or grand avenue leading to the temple of Ptah, was used for the celebration of bull-fights, ai sport pictured in the tombs. But these fights were probably between animals alone-no captive or gladiator being compelled to enter the arena. The bulls having been trained for the occasion; were brought face to face and goaded on by their masters, the prize being awarded to the owner of the victor. But though the bull was thus used for the sport of the people, he was the sacred animal of Memphis.

This chief temple was near the site of the modern village of Mit-Rahineh. The only important vestige of this great temple, probably second only, if second, to that of Amen-ra at Thebes, now called the temple of El-Karnak, is a broken colossal statue of limestone representing Rameses II, which once stood, probably with a fellow that has been destroyed, before one of the propyla of the temple. (See cut, p. 72.) This statue, complete from the head to below the knees, is the finest Egyptian colossus known. It belongs to the British government, which has never yet spared the necessary funds for transporting it to England.

2. Near this temple was one of Apis, or Hapi, the celebrated sacred bull, worshipped with extraordinary honors at Memphis, from which the Israelites possibly took the idea of the golden calf. Apis was believed to be an incarnation of Osiris. The sacred bull was selected by certain outward symbols of the indwelling divinity his color being black, with the exception of white spots of a peculiar shape upon his forehead and right side. The temple of Apis was one of the most noted structures of Memphis. It stood opposite the southern portico of the temple of Ptah; and Psammetichus, who built that gateway, also erected in front of the sanctuary of Apis a magnificent colonnade, supported by colossal statues or Osiride pillars, such as may still be seen at the temple of Medinet Abu at Thebes (Herod. 2:153). Through this colonnade the Apis was led with great pomp upon state occasions. Two stables adjoined the sacred vestibule (Strabo, 17:807).

The Serapeum, or temple of Serapis, or Osirhapi, that is, Osiris-Apis, the ideal correspondent to the animal, lay in the desert to the westward, between the modern villages of Abu-Sir and Sakkarah, though to the west of both. Strabo describes it as very much exposed to sand-drifts, and in his time partly buried by masses of sand heaped up by the wind (xvii. 807).  The sacred cubit and other symbols used in measuring the rise of the Nile, were deposited in the temple of Serapis. Near this temple was the burial- place of the bulls Apis, a vast excavation, in which they were sepulchred in sarcophagi of stone in the most costly manner. Diodorus (i. 85) describes the magnificence with which a deceased Apis was interred and his successor installed at Memphis. The place appropriated to the burial of the sacred bulls was a gallery some 2000 feet in length by twenty in height and width, hewn in the rock without the city. This gallery was divided into numerous recesses upon each side; and the embalmed bodies of the sacred bulls, each in its own sarcophagus of granite. were deposited in these “sepulchral stalls.” A few years since this burial-place of the sacred bulls was discovered by M. Mariette, and a large number of the sarcophagi have already been opened. These catacombs of mummied bulls were approached from Memphis by a paved road, having colossal lions on either side.

3. At Memphis was the reputed burial-place of Isis (Diod. Sic. 1:22); it had also a temple to that “myriad named” divinity, which Herodotus (ii. 176) describes as “a vast structure, well worthy of notice,” but inferior to that consecrated to her in Busiris, a chief city of her worship (ii. 59).

Herodotus describes “a beautiful and richly-ornamented enclosure,” situated upon the south side of the temple of Ptah, which was sacred to Proteus, a native Memphitic king. Within this enclosure there was a temple to “the foreign Venus” (Astarte?), concerning which the historian narrates a myth connected with the Grecian Helen. In this enclosure was “the Tvrian camp” (ii. 112). A temple of Ra or Phre, the Sun, and a temple of the Cabiri, complete the enumeration of the sacred buildings of Memphis.

4. The necropolis of Memphis has escaped the destruction that has obliterated almost all traces of the city, partly from its being beyond the convenient reach of the inhabitants of the Moslem capitals, partly from the unrivalled massive solidity of its chief edifices. This necropolis, consisting of pyramids, was on a scale of grandeur corresponding with the city itself. The “city of the pyramids” is a title of Memphis in the hieroglyphics upon the monuments. The great field or plain of the pyramids lies wholly upon the western bank of the Nile; and extends from Abu-Roish, a little to the northwest of Cairo, to Meydum, about forty miles to the south, and thence in a south-westerly direction about twenty-five miles farther, to the pyramids of Howara and of Biahmu in the Fayum. Lepsius regards the “pyramid fields of Memphis” as a most important testimony to the  civilization of Egypt (Letters, Bohn, p. 25; also Chronologie der Aegypter, vol. i). These royal pyramids, with the subterranean halls of Apis, and numerous tombs of public, officers erected on the plain or excavated in the adjacent hills, gave to Memphis the pre-eminence which it enjoyed as “the haven of the blessed.”

The pyramids that belong to Memphis extend along the low edge of the Libyan range, and form four groups -those of El-Ghizeh, Aba-Sir, Sakkarah, and Dahshur -all so named from a neighboring town or village. The principal-pyramids of El-Ghizeh-those called the First or Great; Second, and Third-are respectively the tombs of Khufu or Shufu, the Cheops of Heroddtus and Suphis I of Manetho, of the 4th dynasty; of Khafra or Shafra, Cephren (Herod.), of the 5th? and of Menkaura, Mycerinus or Mencheres of the 4th. The Great Pyramid has a base measuring 733 feet square, and a perpendicular height of 456 feet, having lost about twenty-five feet of its original height, which must have been at least 480 feet (Mr. Lane, in Mrs. Poole's Englishwoman in Egypt, 2:121, 125). It is of solid stone, except a low core of rock, and a very small space allowed for chambers and' passages leading to them. The Second Pyramid is not far inferior to this in size. . Next in order come the two stone pyramids of Dahshfir. The rest are much smaller. In the Dahshar group are two built of crude brick, the only examples in the Memphitic necropolis. The whole number that can now be traced is upwards of thirty, but Lepsius supposes that anciently there were about sixty, including those south of Dahshfir, the last of which are as far as the Faiyum, about sixty miles above the sice of Memphis by the course of the river. The principal pyramids in the Memphitic necropolis are twenty in number, the pyramid -of Abu- Roesh, the three chief pyramids of El-Ghizeh, the three of Abui-Sir, the nine of Sakkarah, and the four of Dahshfur. The “pyramids” built by Venephes near Cochome may have been in the groups of Abdu-Sir, for the part of the necropolis where the Serapeum lay was called in Egyptian KEMKA or KA-KEMI, also KEM or KEMI, as Brugsch has shown, remarking on its probable identity with Cochome (ut sap. 1:240, Nos. 1121, 1122, 1123, tab. xliii).

The pyramids were tombs of kings, and possibly of members of royal families. Around them were the tombs of subjects, of which the oldest were probably in general contemporaneous with the king who raised each pyramid. The private tombs were either built upon the rock or excavated, wherever it presented a suitable face in which a grotto could be cut, and in  either case the mummies were deposited in chambers at the foot of deep pits. Sometimes these pits were not guarded by the upper structure or grotto, though probably they were then originally protected by crude brick walls. A curious inquiry is suggested by the circumstance that the Egyptians localized in the neighborhood of Memphis those terrestrial scenes which they supposed to symbolize the geography of the hidden world, and that in these the Greeks found the first ideas of their own poetical form of the more precise belief of the older race, of the Acherusian Lake, the Ferry, Charon, and the “Meads of Asphodel,” but this captivating subject cannot be here pursued (see Brugsch, 1:240, 241, 242). SEE PYRAMIDS.

V. Biblical Notices. — The references to Memphis in the Bible are wholly of the period of the kings. Many have thought that the land of Goshen lay not very far from this city, and that the Pharaohs who protected the Israelites, as well as their oppressors, ruled at Memphis. The' indications of Scripture seem, however, to point to the valley through which ran the canal of the Red Sea, the Wadi-t-Tumeylat of the present inhabitants of Egypt, as the old land of Goshen, and to Zoan, or Tanis, as the capital of the oppressors, if not also of the Pharaohs who protected the Israelites. A careful examination of the narrative of the events that preceded the Exodus seems indeed to put any city not in the easternmost. portion of the Delta wholly out of the question. SEE GOSHEN. ‘

It was in the time of the decline of the Israelitish kingdom, and during the subsequent existence of that of Judah, that Memphis became important to the Hebrews. The Ethiopians of the 25th dynasty, or their Egyptian vassals of the 23d and 24th, probably, and the Saites of the 26th, certainly, made Memphis the political capital of Egypt. Hosea mentions Memphis only with Egypt, as the great city, predicting of the Israelitish fugitives, “Mizraim shall gather them up,. Noph shall bury them” (Hos 9:6). Memphis, the city of the vast necropolis, where Osiris and Anubis, gods of the dead, threatened to overshadow the worship of the local divinity, Ptah, could not be more accurately characterized. No other city but Abydos was so much occupied with burial, and Abydos was far inferior in the extent of its necropolis. With the same force that personifies Memphis as the burier of the unhappy fugitives, the prophet Nahum describes Thebes as. walled and fortified by the sea (Nah 3:8), as the Nile had been called in ancient and modern times, for Thebes alone of the cities of Egypt lay on both sides of the river. SEE NO-AMMON.

Isaiah, in the wonderful Burden of Egypt,  which has been more marked and literally fulfilled than perhaps any other like portion of Scripture, couples the princes of Zoan (Tanis) with the princes of Noph as evil advisers of Pharaoh and Egypt (Isa 19:13). Egypt was then weakly governed by the last Tanitic king of the 23d dynasty, as ally or vassal of Tirhakah; and Memphis, as already remarked, was the political capital. In Jeremiah, Noph is spoken of with “Tahapanes,” the frontier stronghold Daphnse, as an enemy of Israel (Jer 2:16). It is difficult to explain the importance here given to “Tahapanes.” Was it to warn the Israelites that the first city of Egypt which they should afterwards enter in their forbidden flight was a city of enemies? In his prophecy of the overthrow of Pharaoh-Necho's army, the same prophet warns Migdol, Noph, and “ Tahpanhes” of the approach of the invader (xlvi. 14), as if warning the capital and the frontier towns. When Migdol and “Talpanhes” had fallen, or whatever other strongholds guarded the eastern border, the Delta could not be defended. When Memphis was taken, not only the capital was in the hands of the enemy, but the frontier fort commanding the entrance of the valley of Upper Egypt had fallen. Later he says that “Noph shall be waste and desolate, without an inhabitant” (Jer 2:19). And so it is, while many other cities of that day yet flourish-as Hermopolis Parva and Sebennytus in the Delta, and Lycopolis, Latopolis, and Syene, in Upper Egypt; or still exist as villages, like Chemmis (Panopolis), Tentyra, and Hermonthis, in the latter division-it is doubtful if any village on the site of Memphis, once the most populous city of Egypt, even preserves its name. Latest in time, Ezekiel prophesies the coming distress and final overthrow of Memphis. Egypt is to be filled with slain; the rivers are to be dried and the lands made waste; idols and false gods are to cease out of Noph; there is to be “no more a prince of the land of Egypt.”

So much is general, and refers to an invasion by Nebuchadnezzar. Noph, as by Hosea, is coupled with Egypt the capital with the state. Then more particularly Pathros, Zoan, and No are to suffer; Sinand No again; and with more vivid distinctness the distresses of Sin, No, Noph, Aven, Pi-beseth, and “Tehaphnehes” are foretold, as if the prophet witnessed the advance of fire and sword, each city taken, its garrison and fighting citizens,” the young men, slain, and its fair buildings given over to the flames, as the invader marched upon Daphnas, Pelusium, Tanis, Bubastis, and Heliopolis, until Memphis fell before him, and beyond Memphis Thebes alone offered resistance, and met with the like overthrow (30:1-19). Perhaps these vivid images represent, by the force of repetition and their climax-like arrangement, but one series of calamities: perhaps  they represent three invasions — that of Nebuchadnezzar, of which we may expect history one day to tell us; that of Cambyses; and last, and most ruinous of all, that of Ochus. The minuteness with which the first and more particular prediction as to Memphis has been fulfilled is very noticeable. The images and idols of Noph have disappeared; when the site of almost every other ancient town of Egypt is marked by colossi and statues, but one, and that fallen, with some insignificant neighbors, is found where once stood its greatest city.

VI. Literature. — The chief authorities on the subject of this article are Lepsius, Denkmaler aus Aegypten end Aethiopien; Brugsch, Geographische Inschrijten; Colossians Howard Vyse, Pyramids of Gizeh, fol. plates, and 8vo text and plates; Sir J. G. Wilkinson, Modern Egypt and Thebes, and Hand-book to Egypt; and Mrs. Poole, Englishwoman in Egypt, where the topography and description of the necropolis and the pyramids are by IMr. Lane. See further, Fourmont, Descript. des Plaines d'Heliop. et de Memphis (Par. 1755); Niebuhr, Trav. 1:10 ; Du Bois Aymd, in the Descript. de l'Egypte, 8:63; Prokesch, Erinner. 2:38 sq.; also Gesenius, Thes. Heb. p. 812; Smith's Dict. of Class. Geogr. s.v. SEE NOPH.

## Memra[[@Headword:Memra]]

             (the Word), a name employed in the Targum of Onkelos, and later Hebrew books, for the expression of the name of the deity in all his relations to man. SEE WORD.

## Memucan[[@Headword:Memucan]]

             (Hebrews Memukan', מְמוּכָן, of unknown but prob. Persian origin; Sept. Μουχαῖος, Vulg. Mamuchan), the last named of the seven satraps or royal counsellors at the court of Xerxes, and the one at whose suggestion Vashti was divorced (Est 1:14; Est 1:16; Est 1:21). BC. 483. “They were wise men who knew the times' (skilled in the planets, according to Aben-Ezra), and appear to have formed a council of state; Josephus says that one of their offices was that of interpreting the laws (Ant. 11:6,1). This may also be inferred from the manner in which the royal question is put to them when assembled in council; ‘According to law what is to be done with the queen Vashti?' Memucan was either the president of the council on this occasion, or gave his opinion first in consequence of his acknowledged wisdom, or from the respect allowed to his advanced age. Whatever may have been the cause of this priority, his sentence for Vashti's disgrace was approved by the king and princes, and at once put into execution. The Targum of Esther identifies him with ‘Haman, the grandson of Agag.' ‘The reading of the Kethib, or written text, in Est 1:16, is מומכן.”

## Men Of Understanding[[@Headword:Men Of Understanding]]

             a religious sect which seems to have been a branch of the Brethren and Sisters of the Free Spirit, has already been considered under the heading SEE HOMINES INTELLIGENTLE.

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

             area class of persons who occupy a somewhat conspicuous place in the religious communities of Northern Scotland, chiefly in those parts of it where the Gaelic language prevails, as in Ross, Sutherland, and the upland districts of Inverness and Argyle. ‘Large and undivided parishes, a scanty supply of the means of grace, patronage, and other causes peculiar to such localities, seem to have developed this abnormal class of self-appointed instructors and spiritual overseers, who sustain in the Church of Scotland a relation very similar to that of our lay-preachers. They are designated “Men” by way of eminence, and as a title of respect, in recognition of their superior natural abilities, and their attainments in religious knowledge and personal piety. There is no formal manner in which they pass into the rank or order of Men, further than the general estimation in which they are held by the people among whom they live, on account of their known superior gifts and religious experience. If they are considered to excel their neighbors in the exercises of prayer and exhortation, for which they have abundant opportunities at the lyke-wakes, which are still common in the far Highlands, and at the meetings for prayer and Christian fellowship, and if they continue to frequent such meetings, and take part in these religious services, so as to meet with general approbation, they thus gradually gain a repute for godliness, and naturally glide into the order of “The Men.”

There are oftentimes three or four “Men” in a parish; and as, an communion occasions, Friday is specially set apart for prayer and mutual exhortation, these ‘lay-workers have then a public opportunity of exercising their gifts by engaging in prayer, and speaking on “questions bearing on religious experience. This, in many parts of the Highlands, is considered as the great day of the communion season, and is popularly called the “Men's day;” and, as there may be present twenty or thirty of these “Men” assembled from the surrounding parishes, the whole service of the day is, so to speak, left in their hands-only the minister of the parish usually presides, and sums up the opinions expressed on the subject under consideration. Many of the “Men” assume on these occasions a peculiar garb in the form of a large blue cloak; and in moving about from one community to another, they are treated with great respect, kindness, and hospitality. The influence which was thus acquired by the “Men” over the people was very powerful, and no wonder that some of them grievously abused it. Yet there can be no doubt that, in many parishes in the Highlands, where the ministers have been careless and remiss in the  performance of their duties, these lay-workers have often been useful in keeping spiritual religion alive. It is not to be wondered that the heads of some of them were turned, and that the honor in which they were held begat spiritual pride in them. But these are always said to have been the exception. Since the period of the disruption, when the Highlands have been furnished with a more adequate supply of Gospel ordinances, and spiritual feudalism has been broken, it has been observed that the influence of the “Men,” for the most part connected now with the Free Church, has been gradually on the wane. See Auld. Min. and Men of the Far North (1868), p. 142-262. (J. HW.)

## Men-Stealer[[@Headword:Men-Stealer]]

             (ἀνδραποδιστής), one who kidnaps or decoys a free person into slavery, an act condemned by the apostle among the highest crimes (1Ti 1:10). The seizing or stealing of a free-born Israelite, either to treat him as a slave or sell him as a slave to others, was by the law of Moses punished with death (Exo 21:16; Deu 24:7), which the Jewish writers inform us was inflicted by strangling (see Wetstein, ad loc.). The practice was likewise forbidden among the Greeks (see Smith's Diet. of Class. Ant. s.v. Andrapodismou Graphe), and was condemned by law among the Romans (see Adams's Roman Antiq. p. 24). SEE SLAVE.

## Menachem Ben-Jacob[[@Headword:Menachem Ben-Jacob]]

             SEE SARUK.

## Menachem Ben-Jehuda Loxsano[[@Headword:Menachem Ben-Jehuda Loxsano]]

             SEE LOSSANO.

## Menachem Ben-Salomo[[@Headword:Menachem Ben-Salomo]]

             of France, a rabbi who lived in the 12th century, is the author of אֶבֶן בֹחֵן, a dictionary of the Hebrew language, written about 1143. Specimens of this lexicon were published by Dukes in קבוֹ על יד (Esslingen, 1846). He also wrote a commentary on the Pentateuch, entitled שכל טוב, a specimen of which, under the title תוכחת מגלה, was published at Hamburg in 1784 (in a Latin translation by Delitzsch, in his Jeshurun sive Isagoge [Grimmna. 1838], pages 184-188). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 2:353; De' Rossi, Dizionario Storico (Germ. transl.), page 218; Zunz, Zur Geschichte und Literatur, page 71 sq., 108. (B.P.)

## Menachem Da Nola[[@Headword:Menachem Da Nola]]

             SEE NOLA.

## Menachem Di Fano[[@Headword:Menachem Di Fano]]

             SEE FANO, MENACHEM.

## Menachem Di Recanate[[@Headword:Menachem Di Recanate]]

             SEE RECANATI.

## Menachoth[[@Headword:Menachoth]]

             SEE TALMUD.

## Menaea[[@Headword:Menaea]]

             (or Μεναῖον), apart of the liturgy of the Eastern Church, containing all the changeable parts of the services used for the festival days of the Christian year. It is usually arranged in twelve volumes, one for every month, but the whole is sometimes compressed into three volumes. The Mencea' f the Eastern Church nearly answers to the Breviary of the Western Church, omitting, however, some portions of the services which the latter contains, and inserting others which are not in it. See Zacharius, Bibliotheca Rit.; Neale, Eastern Church, p. 829. SEE BREVIARY.

## Menage, Matthieu[[@Headword:Menage, Matthieu]]

             a French theologian, was born about 1388, in Maine, near Angers. He studied at the University of Paris, and there received the degree of MA. in 1408, and was called to the chair of philosophy after 1413. The success he obtained caused him to be elected vice-chancellor in 1416, and rector of the university in 1417. He afterwards established himself at Angers, where he taught theology. In the year 1432 he was sent by the Church of Angers, with Guy of Versailles, to the Council of Basle, and'by the council to pope Eugene IV at Florence. He did not return to Basle until 1437. In 1441 he  received the functions of a theologian. He died Nov. 16,1446. His biography has been written by Gilles Menage. See Hoefer, Nouv, Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Menageot, Francois Guillaume[[@Headword:Menageot, Francois Guillaume]]

             an eminent historical painter, was born in London, July 9, 1744, and was instructed under Deshays, Boucher, and Vien. He carried off the grand prize of painting in 1766, and visited Rome with the royal pension. In 1780 he was chosen an academician, and afterwards appointed professor. In 1800 he returned to Paris, and became professor of the Academy of Painting. He has a fine picture in the sacristy of the Church of St. Denis. He died October 4, 1816. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.; Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, s.v.

## Menahem[[@Headword:Menahem]]

             (Hebrews Menachem', מְנִחֵם, comforting [comp. Manaen, Act 13:11; Sept. Μαναήμ, Vulg. Manahem; Josephus, Μανάημος, Ant. ix, lj, 1), the seventeenth separate king of Israel, who began to reign BC. 769, and reigned ten years. He was the son of Gadi, and appears to have been one of the generals of king Zachariah. When he heard the news of the murder of that prince, and the usurpation of Shallum, he was at Tirzah, but immediately marched to Samaria, where Shallum had shut himself up, and slew him in that city. He then usurped the throne in his turn, and forthwith reduced Tiphsah, which refused to acknowledge his rule. He adhered to the sin of Jeroboam, like the other kings of Israel. His general character is described by Josephus as rude and exceedingly cruel (Ant. 9:11, 1). The contemporary prophets, Hosea and Amos, have left a melancholy picture of the ungodliness, demoralization, and feebleness of Israel; and Ewald adds to their testimony some doubtful references to Isaiah and Zechariah. (For the encounter with the Assyrians, see below.) Menahem died in BC. 759, leaving the throne to his son Pekahiah (2Ki 15:14-22). There are some peculiar circumstances in the narrative of his reign, in the discussion of which we follow the most recent elucidations. SEE ISRAEL, KINGDOM OF.

(1.) Ewald (Gesch. Isr. 3:598), following the Sept., would translate the latter part of 2Ki 15:10, “And Kobolam (or Keblaam) smote him, and slew him, and reigned in his stead.” Ewald considers the fact of such a king's existence a help to the interpretation of Zec 11:8; and he accounts for the silence of Scripture as to his end by saying that he may have thrown himself across the Jordan, and disappeared among the subjects of king Uzziah. It does not appear, however, how such a translation can be made to agree with the subsequent mention (Zec 11:13) of Shallum, and with the express ascription of Shallum's death (Zec 11:14) to Menahem. Thenius excuses the translation of the Sept. by supposing that their MSS. may have been in a defective state, but ridicules the theory of Ewald. SEE KINGS.

(2.) In the brief history of Menahem, his ferocious treatment of Tiphsah occupies a conspicuous place. The time of the occurrence and the site of  the town have been doubted. Keil says that it can be no other place than the remote Thapsacus on the Euphrates, the northeast boundary (1Ki 4:24) of Solomon's dominions; and certainly no other place bearing the name is mentioned in the Bible. Others suppose that it may have been some town which Menahem took in his way as he went from Tirzah to win a crown in Samaria (Ewald); or that it is a transcriber's error for Tappuah (Jos 17:8), and that Menahem laid it waste when he returned from Samaria to Tirzah (Thenius). No sufficient reason appears for having recourse to such conjectures where the plain text presents no insuperable difficulty. The act, whether perpetrated at the beginning of Menahem's reign or somewhat later, was doubtless intended to strike terror into the hearts of reluctant subjects throughout the whole extent of dominion which he claimed. A precedent for such cruelty might be found in the border wars between Syria and Israel (2Ki 8:12). It is a striking sign of the increasing degradation of the land, that a king of Israel practiced upon his subjects a brutality from the mere. suggestion of which the unscrupulous Syrian usurper recoiled with indignation. SEE TIPHSAH.

(3.) But the most remarkable event in Menahem's reign is the first appearance of a hostile force of Assyrians on the. north-east frontier of Israel. King Pul, however, withdrew, having been converted from an enemy into an ally by a timely gift of 1000 talents of silver, which Menahem exacted by an assessment of fifty shekels a head on 60,000 Israelites. This was probably the only choice left to him, as he had not that resource in the treasures of the Temple of which the kings of Judah availed themselves in similar emergencies. It seems, perhaps, too much to infer from 1Ch 5:26 that Pul also took away Israelitish captives. The name of Pul (Sept. Phaloch or Phalos) appears, according'to Rawlinson (Bampton Lectures for 1859, Lect. iv, p. 133), in an Assyrian inscription of a Ninevite king, as Phallukha, who took tribute from Beth Kumri (=the house of Omri=Samaria), as well as from Tyre, Sidon, Damascus, Idumaea, and Philistia; the king of Damascus is set down as giving 2300 talents of silver, besides gold and copper, but neither the name -of Menahem, nor the amount of his tribute, is stated in the inscription. Rawlinson also says that in another inscription the name of Menahem is given, probably by mistake of the stonecutter, as a tributary of Tiglath- pileser. SEE NINEVEH.

## Menahem (Ben-Zerach) Of Estella[[@Headword:Menahem (Ben-Zerach) Of Estella]]

             a Jewish savant, was born in 1306 at Estella, whither his father had fled after the expulsion of the Jews from France. In 1328, six years after his marriage to the daughter of Benjamin Abiz, the rabbi of Estella, the Navarrese massacre occurred, in which his father, mother, and four younger brothers were murdered, while he himself, severely wounded, was left for dead. A soldier riding by, late in the night, heard him groan, and lifted the unfortunate Jew upon his horse, bound up his wounds, clothed him, and secured a physician's care for him. Thus preserved, Menahem repaired to Toledo, and studied the Talmud for two years. Thence he went to Alcala, where he joined R. Joshua Abalesh in his studies.: Upon the death of the latter in 1350, Menahem succeeded as ruler of the college, and held this place till 1368. Having lost all his property during the civil war, Don Samuel Abarbanel, of Seville, liberally supplied him during the remainder of his life, which he spent at Toledo, where he died in 1374. To this benefactor he dedicated his book on Jewish rites and ceremonies, in 327 chapters, entitled Provision for the Way, לְאָרְחָא צֵרָה לִדֶּרֶךְ וּזְוָדָא (Ferrara, 1554). Comp. Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden (Leipsic, 1873), 7:312; Jost, Gesch. d. Judenthums u. s. Sekten,. 3:86; Zunz, Zur Gesch. u. Literatur (Berlin, .1845), p. 415; Dessauer, Gesch. d. Israeliten (Breslau, 1870), p. 323 sq.; First, Bibl. Judaica, 2:353; Lindo, History of the Jews of Spain and Portugal (London, 1848), p. 157 sq.; Finn, Sephardim, or the History of the Jews in Spain and Portugal (London, 1841), p. 307; Etheridge, Introd, to Hebr. Literature, p. .265; Manasseh ben-Israel, The Conciliator, transl. by E. H. Lindo (London, 1842), p. xxx; Zunz, Literaturgeschichte der synagogalen Poesie (Berlin, 1865), p. 506. (B. P.)

## Menahem OF Merseburg[[@Headword:Menahem OF Merseburg]]

             a rabbi of great distinction among Jewish scholars of the 14th century, and one of the representatives of truly German synagogal teachers, flourished about 1360. He lived in very troublesome times, and because the literary remains of this period were scanty, it was called the דוֹר יָתוֹם, “ the destitute generation.” To the prominent literati of that period, who left some monuments of their learning, belongs Menahem of Merseburg, who wrote annotations on Rabbinical decisions, entitled נַמּוּקַים, reprinted in Jak. Weit's שו8ת, “questions and answers” (Vened. 1549; Hanau, 1610). Comp. Gratz, Geschichte der Juden, 8:149; Jost, Geschichte des  Judenthums u. s. Seten, 3:116; Zunz, Zur Geschichte u. Literatur (Berlin, 1845), p. 193; Fiirst, Bibl. Judaica, 2:352.

## Menan[[@Headword:Menan]]

             or rather MAINAN (Μαϊναν [with much variety of readings], of uncertain signification), a person named as the son of Mattatha and father of Melea, among the private descendants of David and ancestors of Christ (Luk 3:31); but of doubtful authenticity (Meth. Quart. Revelation 1852, p. 597). SEE GENEALOGY OF JESUS CHRIST.

## Menandrians[[@Headword:Menandrians]]

             one of the most ancient branches of the Gnostics, received their name from their leader, Menander. He was a Samaritan by birth, and is said to have received instruction from Simon Magus. This supposition is not well founded, however, and has arisen, no doubt, from the similarity which existed, to some extent, between his teachings and those of Simon, as well as from the erroneous idea that all the Gnostic sects sprung from the Simonians. Menander aspired to the honor of being a Messiah, and, according to the testimonies of Irenseus, Justin, and Tertullian, he pretended to be one of the aeons sent from the pleroma, or celestial regions, to succor the souls that lay groaning under bodily oppression' and servitude, and to maintain them against the violence and stratagems of the daemons that hold the reins of empire in this sublunary world. One of the conditions of salvation was baptism in his name, according to a peculiar form instituted by him. He claimed also the power to make his followers immortal. His daring pretensions and fanatical teachings should cause him to be ranked as a lunatic rather than the founder of a heretical sect. The influence of the Menandrians continued through several minor sects until some time in the 6th century. They were often confounded, by those not well informed on the subject, with the orthodox followers of Christ. See Eusebius, Hist. Ecclesiastes 3:26,; 4:22; Irenaeus, Adv. haeres. 1:21; Justin M., Apolog. 1:26; Schaff, Ch. Hist. 1:235; Gieseler, Ecclesiastes Hist. 1:56; Mosheim, Commentary on Ecclesiastes Hist.; Wetzer und Welte, Kirchen-Lexikon, vol. vi, s.v.; Walch, Hist. der Ketzereien, 1:185 sq., 276, 284; Schrockh, Kirchen-Gesch. 2:244. SEE ALSO GNOSTICS; SEE MAGUS, SIMON.

## Menard, Claude[[@Headword:Menard, Claude]]

             a French theologian, was born at Angers in 1580. He began his career as a barrister, and was made a lieutenant-general of the provostship. Becoming depressed in mind by the loss of his wife, he forsook his calling, and intended to retire from the world. His friends prevented his entering a cloister, but he embraced the ecclesiastical profession, and showed his interest in monastic institutions by contributing to the erection of several convents. He applied himself to researches in the antiquities of his province with so much success that his compatriot Menage calls him “Le pere de l'histoire d'Anjou.” He died Jan. 20,1652. He is noted for the -following works: Les deux premiers livres de St. Augustin contre Julien (Paris, 1617, folio and 8vo) :-S. Hieronymi endiculus de Hceresibus Judasorum (ibid. 1617, 4to). Menard published this history from a manuscript which he had found at Lasal. He added different Latin treatises of the same age, and notes, in which he showed much judgment and erudition. Menard's edition served as a basis for that of Ducange, in which the notes and observations of the former are upheld :-Itinerarium B. Antonini martyris, cum annotationibus (Angers, 1640, 4to):-Recherches et avis sur le corps de St. Jacques le Majeur (Angers, 1610). In this work he maintains, against general opinion, that the relics of this apostle are kept in StMaurille's Church at Angers. To Menard is also attributed L'histoire de l'ordre du Croissant, a MS. in the library at Paris. See Biographie Universelle, s.v.

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

             a French ecclesiastic and writer, was born at Nantes Sept. 23,1650. He studied law at Paris, and met with great success at Nimes as a pleader. But, influenced by conscientious scruples, he entered the Seminary of Saint-  Magloire in 1675 as a student of theology, and, after receiving orders at Paris, returned to his native place to devote himself to the furtherance of true Christianity. Believing that an ascetic life of the very strictest sort is required of all devout Christians, he determined to give himself entirely to works of charity and kindred offices. He refused the canonship to Sainte- Chapelle, and also the bishopric of Saint-Pol de Leon, preferring the humble position of warden of the seminary at Niimes, where he labored with great satisfaction for more than thirty years. He died at Nimes April 15, 1717. Menard is the author of a Catchisme (Nimes, 1695, 8vo); which has been approved by many prelates. His memory for some time was the object of a kind of worship, and his tomb, it is said, was a place of miracles and wonderful cures.

## Menard, Leon[[@Headword:Menard, Leon]]

             a French antiquary, was born Sept. 12, 1706, at Tarasgon. After having studied successfully at the college of the Jesuits at Lyons, he took his degree in law at Toulouse, and succeeded his father in the position of counsellor to the inferior court of Ninmes. After 1744 he resided almost continually at Paris, whither he had been sent in the interest of his clients. Largely devoted to the study of history and antiquity, he made himself known by his History of the Bishops of Nimes, the success of which opened to him in 1749 the doors of the Academy of Inscriptions. He also became a member of the academies of Lyons and of Marseilles. In 1762 he went to Avignon, and, at the express invitation of the magistrates, he spent two years in collecting the materials necessary for a history of that city; but, his health failing, he was obliged to desist from this work. He died Oct. 1, 1767, at Paris. Menard wrote, Histoire des Eviques de Nimes (La Haye [Lyons], 1737, 2 vols. 12mo); revised in the Histoire of that city :- Histoire civile, ecclesiastique, et litteraire de la Ville de Nimes, avec des Notes et les Preuves (Paris, 1750-58, 7 vols. 4to). The only fault of this learned work is its excessive prolixity. An abridgment of it has appeared, continuing as far as -1790 (Nimes, 183133, 3 vols. 8vo):-Refutation du Sentiment de Voltaire qui traite d'Ouvrage suppose le “Testament du Cardinal Richelieu” (anonymous, 1750, 12mo). Foncemagne joined Menard in sustaining the authenticity of a writing that -Voltaire persisted in declaring apocryphal:-Pieces fugitives pour servir a l'Histoire de, France avec des Notes historiques et geographiques (Paris, 1759, 3 vols. 4to). This valued collection, published in cooperation with the marquis D'Aubois, contains a number of researches respecting persons, places,  dates, etc., from 1546 to 1653 :-Vie de Flechier, at the head of an edition of the works of that prelate, but of which only the first volume appeared (1760, 4to). Menard is also the author of several dissertations, which have been printed in' the Memoires de I'A;cademie des Inscriptions. See Le. Beau, Eloge de Menard, in the Mem. de l'A cad. des Inscript. vol. xxxvi; Necrologe des Hommes illustres de la France (1770).

## Menard, Nicolas Hugues[[@Headword:Menard, Nicolas Hugues]]

             a French theologian, was born at Paris in 1585. Having finished his studies at the college of the cardinal Le Moine, Hugues Menard joined the Benedictines in the Monastery of St. Denis, Feb. 3, 1608 . He at first devoted himself to preaching, and was very successful in the principal pulpits of Paris. Finding the discipline not sufficiently severe in the Abbey of St. Denis, he repaired to Verdun, to enter the reformed Monastery of St. Vanne. Later he taught rhetoric at Cluni, and finally went to St. Germain- des-Pres, where he terminated his laborious career, Jan. 20,1644. He wrote, Martyrologium SS. ord. S. Benedicti (Paris, 1629, 8vo), a work that is still read: -Concordia Regularum, auctore S. Benedicto, Aniance abbate, with notes and learned observations (Paris, 1628, 4to):-D. Gregorii papce, cognomento Magni, Liber Sacramentorum (Par. 1642, 4to) :-De unico Dyonisio, Areopagitica Athenarum et Parisiorum episcopo (Paris, 1643, 8vo), against the canon of Launoy — S. Barnabce, apostoli, Epistola catholica (Paris, 1645, 4to), an epistle taken by ‘H. Menard from a MS. of Corbie; and published after his death by D'Achery. See Niceron, Memoires, vol. xxii; Ellies Dupin, Bibl. des Aut. eccles. du dix-septieme siecle: Hist. litt. de la Cong. de Saint-Maur, p. 18 sq.

## Menart, Quentin[[@Headword:Menart, Quentin]]

             a French prelate, was born at Flavigny, diocese of Autun, about the beginning of the 15th century. He was successively treasurer to the chapel of Dijon, provost of St. Omer, counsellor to the duke Philippe de Bourgogne, and his ambassador to the kings of France, England, and Germany. The letters of pope Eugenius IV, who afterwards promoted him to the metropolitan see of Besandon, bear the date of Sept. 18, 1439. He made his entrance into that city Aug. 1, 1440. There was at that time no kingdom or republic whose administration was more difficult than that of the Church of Besancon. The archbishop pretended, by virtue of ancient titles, to be temporal lord of the city; but the citizens contested these  assumed rights, and reserved to themselves unqualified freedom, which they did not hesitate to defend at all times even at the point of the sword, so that between the archbishop and his people there was continual war. Quentin Menart had just taken possession of his see as his procurator had arrested a citizen whom he accused of heresy, and caused to be condemned by the ecclesiastical judge. The citizens declared that this crime of heresy was only a pretext, and came to the archbishop's palace bringing a complaint which greatly resembled a menace.

The latter was obliged to yield, blamed the conduct of his procurator, and restored liberty to the condemned heretic. Very soon other tumults arose. On the heights of Bregille the archbishop possessed a castle, which overlooked and irritated the city of Besancon. A pretext offering itself, the citizens repaired to Bregille, and entirely demolished not only the castle, but the adjacent houses also. Menart complained in his turn, but they scarcely listened to him. He then retired to his castle of Gy, with all his court, and hurled against the city a sentence of interdiction. The citizens of Besanvon, however, were not superstitious enough to fear this punishment, and submitted without a murmur to the suffering inflicted by the resentment of the archbishop, and refused to yield in order to obtain a repeal of the interdict. Menart proceeded to Rome, and invoked the authority of the pope; the pope delegated the affair to a cardinal, who even aggravated the sentence pronounced upon the rebels. But the people carried the cause before the tribunal of the emperor, and the latter sent many of his counsellors successively to Besanvon-Didier of Montreal, Hartung of Cappel-who in their turn declared Quentin Menart accused and guilty of rebellion. At last, in April, 1450, this great lawsuit was terminated, Menart coming forth victor. The castle of Bregille was reconstructed at the expense of the citizens. Then the archbishop of Besangon returned to his city and to his palace, where he (lied, Dec. 18, 1462. See Dunod, Hist. de l'Eglise de Besangon, vol. i; L'Abbe Richard, Hist. des Dioc. de Besanfon et de SaintClaude,.