

THE AGES DIGITAL LIBRARY  
**REFERENCE**

CYCLOPEDIA of BIBLICAL,  
THEOLOGICAL and  
ECCLESIASTICAL  
LITERATURE

**K - Kingsmill, Andrew**

*by James Strong & John McClintock*

*To the Students of the Words, Works and Ways of God:*

Welcome to the AGES Digital Library. We trust your experience with this and other volumes in the Library fulfills our motto and vision which is our commitment to you:

MAKING THE WORDS OF THE WISE  
AVAILABLE TO ALL — INEXPENSIVELY.

**AGES Software Rio, WI USA**  
**Version 1.0 © 2000**

# K

## Kaab

a celebrated Arabian poet, author of one of the seven poems which were suspended in the temple of Mecca, was originally a strenuous opponent of Mohammed, whose doctrines and person he satirized. He, however, recanted by writing a poem in honor of the prophet. As a reward, the prophet gave him his green mantle, which one of the descendants of Kaab sold for ten thousand pieces of silver. He died in 662.

## Kaaba

### Picture for Kabba

(Arabic 'A-Kaabah, "Square House," or, more properly, now *Beit-Allah*, "House of God") is the name of an oblong stone building inclosed in the great mosque at Mecca. From time immemorial tradition makes Mecca to have been a place of pilgrimage from all parts of Arabia "within a circuit of a thousand miles, interrupted only by the sea. The Kaaba, the Black Stone, and other concomitants of worship at Mecca have a similar antiquity" (Muir, *Mahomet*, i, 211). There are intimations of the Kaaba to be found in Herodotus and Diodorus Siculus. It certainly existed before the Christian aera (Sir W. Jones, *Works*, 10:356; M. C. de Percival, i 74; ii, 532). **SEE MECCA.**

*Origin and History.* — Mr. Muir (ii, 34) thinks the Kaaba to be of Yemen origin, and to have been connected with the systems of idolatry prevalent in the southern portion of the Arabian peninsula. The Mussulmans say that Adam first worshipped on this spot, after his expulsion from Paradise, in a tent sent down from heaven for this purpose. Seth substituted for the tent a structure of clay and stone, which was, however, destroyed by the Deluge, but afterwards rebuilt by Abraham and Ishmael. But this tradition may have arisen in connection with a traditional Jewish inscription found on a stone in the Kaaba about forty years before Mohammed, and which would suggest the possibility that some remote Abrahamic tribe acquainted with Syriac may have been at an early period associated with aboriginal Arabs in the erection of the Kaaba. Some have supposed it to have been devoted to

the worship of Saturn (Zohal). Certain it is that it has been the holy emblem at different periods of four different faiths. Sabaeen, Hindu, Gueber, and Moslem have all held it in veneration (Burton, 3:160). According to the Koran, it is "the ancient house," the first house built and appointed for God's worship (Sale's *Koran*, p. 276), and the guardianship of it was by express revelation given to Othman (Sale, p. 167).

It was originally without a roof, and, having suffered material damage by a flood, was considered to be in danger of falling. The treasures it contained were considered insecure, and some of them were alleged to have been stolen. In A.D. 605 Mohammed rebuilt the edifice, but in A.D. 1626 it was again destroyed by a great torrent, and in A.D. 1627 was rebuilt substantially after its present form.

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

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

*Black Stone.* — The most important feature of the Kaaba is the "Black Stone," which is inserted in the northeast corner of the building, at the height of four or five feet from the ground. It is in shape an irregular oval, about seven inches in diameter. There are various opinions as to the nature of this stone. Burckhardt supposes it to be a "lava" stone. Others suggest that it is an aerolite. Muir calls it "a fragment of volcanic salts sprinkled with colored crystals, and varied red feldspath upon a dark black ground like a coal, one protuberance being reddish." Burckhardt thinks it looks as if it had been broken into several pieces and cemented. He says, however, that it is difficult to determine the quality of it, because it is so worn by the millions of kisses and touches of the pilgrims. Muir says it is worn "until it is uneven, and has a muscular appearance." It is bordered all round with a large plate of silver about a foot broad. The part or angle exposed is

semicircular. So much of the merit of the Kaaba depends on this stone that at the time of the rebuilding of the edifice by Mohammed a great contest arose between the families of the Koreish for the honor of placing it in the new structure. Mohammed settled this dispute by placing it on his own mantle, and causing a chief of each tribe to lift it, and then put it-himself in its position in the Kaaba. *SEE KOREISH*. Pilgrims, on arrival at Mecca, proceeding to the Kaaba and making the circuit of it, start at the corner where the black stone is inserted.

Fabulous stories abound relative to the black stone, such as that it was originally white, but became black because of the silent and unseen tears which it wept on account of the sins of men. This, however, only affected its exterior. Others attribute its change of color to the innumerable touches and kisses of the pilgrims. It is one of the precious stones of Paradise, which came to earth with Adam, and was miraculously preserved during the flood, and brought back to Mecca by the angel Gabriel, and given to Abraham to build originally in the Kaaba. It was taken at one time by the Karmathians (q.v.), who refused to release it for five thousand pieces of gold, but they finally restored it.

*Veiling.* — There is a custom, very remote in its origin, of covering the outside of the Kaaba with a veil, which has at various times been made of Yemen cloth, of Egyptian linen, of red brocade, and of black silk. To supply it became at one time a sign of royalty, and it was accordingly furnished by the caliph of Egypt, and later by the Turkish sultan. There seems to be some conflict of authorities about some things pertaining to the custom of veiling. About one third from the top of the veil is a band about two feet in width, embroidered with texts from the Koran' in gilt letters (see Muir, ii, 32; Burton, ii, 295, 300).

*Admission.* — Since the ninth year of the Hegira an order has obtained that none but Islamites shall be admitted to the Kaaba. Formerly the General Assembly of Ocahd convened at Mecca. In it poets contested for a whole month for prizes, and those poems to which prizes were from time to time awarded were by public order written in letters of gold on Egyptian silk, and hung up in the Kaaba (Sale, p. 20).

*Other Features.* — In the south-east corner of the Kaaba is a smaller stone, less venerated than the above, being touched only, and not kissed, by those walking round the Kaaba. On the north side of the Kaaba is a slight hollow, large enough to admit three persons, where it is specially meritorious to

pray, it being the place where Abraham and Ishmael kneaded chalk and mud for the original structure. From the west side of the Kaabaa water-spout carries rain from the roof and pours it on the reputed grave of Ishmael, and pilgrims are not unfrequently seen "fighting to catch it." This water-spout is said to be of pure gold, and is four feet in length and about six inches in width. It is declared to have been taken to the Kaaba A.H. 981. The pavement round the Kaaba is a mosaic of many colored stones, and was laid in A.H. 826. There is on one side of the Kaaba a semicircular wall, which is scarcely less sacred than the Kaaba itself. The walk round the Kaaba is outside this wall, but the closer to it the better. This wall is entitled *El Hattim*, and is of solid stone, five feet in height and four feet in thickness. It is incased in white marble, and inscribed with prayers. The Kaaba has a double roof, supported by pillars of aloe-wood, and it is said that no bird ever rests upon it. The whole building is surrounded by an inclosure of columns, outside which there are found three oratories, or places of devotion for different sects; also the edifice containing the well Zem-Zem, the cupola of Abbas, and the Treasury. All these are further inclosed by a splendid colonnade, surmounted by cupolas, steeples, spires, crescents, all gilded and adorned with lamps, which shed a brilliant lustre at night. These surroundings, between which and the Kaaba run seven paved causeways, were first devised by Omar for the better preservation of the Kaaba itself. According to Biirckhardt, the same holy Kaaba is the scene of such indecencies as cannot with propriety be particularized; indecencies which are practiced not only with impunity, but publicly and without a blush. *SEE MOHAMMEDANISM.*

Since the second year of the Hegira the Kaaba has been for the Mussulman world the *Keblah*, or place towards which all Moslems turn in prayer. *SEE KEBLAH.*

See *Narrative of a Pilgrimage to El Medinah and Mecca*, by Richard F. Burton, vol. iii (Lond. 1855); Sale's *Koran*; Muir, *Life of Mahomet*, vol. ii and iii (London, 1858); Sprenger, *Life of Mahomet*, ii, 7; Ley, *De templi Meccani origine* (Berlin, 1840, 4to). (J. T. G.)

**Kaath.**

*SEE PELICAN.*

## Kabbaia.

SEE CABALA.

## Kabiler

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

## Kab'ziel

(Heb. *Kabtseil'*, **קַבְצֵיִל** *gathering of God*, i.e. perhaps *confluence of waters*; Sept. **Καβσεήλ** in Joshua, elsewhere **Καβασάηλ** v.r. **Καβεσεήλ**, etc.), a town on the extreme south of Judah, near Idumaea, and therefore probably included within the territory of Simeon (**קַבְצֵיִל** Joshua 15:21); the native place of Benaiah (son of Jehoiada), one of David's. chief warriors (**קַבְצֵיִל** 2 Samuel 23:20; **קַבְצֵיִל** 1 Chronicles 11:22). It was inhabited after the captivity under the similar name of JEKABZEEL (**קַבְצֵיִל** Nehemiah 11:25). Its locality can only be conjectured as being near the edge of the Ghor, south of the Dead Sea (see Masius, *Comment. on Joshua* ad loc.). The name and vicinity are probably still represented by the wady *El-Kuseib*, a small winter torrent running into the Dead Sea from the south (Robinson, *Researches*, ii, 497). Here the boundaries of Palestine, Edom, and Moab would converge, as is implied in the above Scripture references, and the region is still the resort of wild animals (Lynch, *Jordan*, p. 319; De Saulcy, *Dead Sea*, i, 298), and characterized by a deep fall of snow in winter (Burckhardt, *Syria*, p. 402), as is stated in the account of Benaiah's adventure with the lion.

## Ka'des

(**Κάδης**), a town of Palestine, apparently in the south (Judith i, 9); probably the same as KADESHBARNEA SEE *KADESHBARNEA* (q. V.).

## Ka'desh

(Heb. *Kadesh'*, **קַדֵּשׁ**; *holy*, perhaps as being the site of some ancient oracle [compare the early equivalent name "fount of judgment"], **קַדֵּשׁ** Genesis 14:7; 16:14; 20:1; **קַדֵּשׁ** Numbers 13:26; 20:1,14,16,22; 27:14; 33:36, 37; Deuteronomy i, 46; 32:51; **קַדֵּשׁ** Judges 11:16, 17; **קַדֵּשׁ** Psalm 29:8; **קַדֵּשׁ** Ezekiel

47:19; 48:28; Sept. Κάδης, but in <sup><3679></sup>Ezekiel 47:19, Καδής v. r. Καδήμ) or, more fully, KADESH-BARNEA (Hebrew *Kadesh'-Barne'i*, — [nrβi vdeq; the latter portion of the name being regarded by Simonis, *Lex. s.v.*, as compounded of rβi *open country*, and [hē'wandering; <sup><0638></sup>Numbers 32:8; 24:4; <sup><6002></sup>Deuteronomy 1:2,19; 2:14; 9:23; <sup><6004></sup>Joshua 10:41; 14:6, 7; 15:3; Sept. Κάδης [του̅] Βαρνή), a site on the south-eastern border of the Promised Land, towards Edom, of such interest as being the point at which the Israelites twice encamped (their nineteenth and thirty-seventh stations) with the intention of entering Palestine, and from which they were twice sent back the first time in pursuance of their sentence to wander forty years in the wilderness, and the second time from the refusal of the king of Edom to permit a passage through his territories. It is probable that the term "Kadesh," though applied to signify a "city," yet had also a wider application to a region, in which Kadesh-meribah certainly, and Kadesh-barnea probably, indicate a precise spot. Thus Kadesh appears as a limit eastward of the same tract which was limited westward by Shur (<sup><0018></sup>Genesis 20:1). Shur is possibly the same as Sihor, "which is before Egypt" (25:18; <sup><0638></sup>Joshua 13:3; <sup><3428></sup>Jeremiah 2:18), and was the first portion of the wilderness on which the people emerged from the passage of the Red Sea. **SEE SHUR.** "Between Kadesh and Bered" is another indication of the site of Kadesh as an eastern limit (<sup><0164></sup>Genesis 16:14), for the point so fixed is "the fountain on the way to Shur" (v, 7), and the range of limits is narrowed by selecting the western one not so far to the west, while the eastern one, Kadesh, is unchanged. Again, we have Kadesh as the point to which the foray of Chedorlaomer "returned"-a word which does not imply that they had previously visited it, but that it lay in the direction, as viewed from Mount Seir and Paran, mentioned next before it, which was that of the point from which Chedorlaomer had come, viz. the north. Chedorlaomer, it seems, coming down by the eastern shore of the Dead Sea, smote the Zuzims (Ammon, <sup><0145></sup>Genesis 14:5; <sup><0821></sup>Deuteronomy 2:20), and the Emims (Moab, <sup><0821></sup>Deuteronomy 2:11), and the Horites in Mount Seir, to the south of that sea, unto "El-Paran that is by the wilderness." He drove these Horites over the Arabah into the Et-Tih region. Then "returned," i.e. went northward to Kadesh and Hazazon Tamar, or Engedi (comp. <sup><0147></sup>Genesis 14:7; <sup><4302></sup>2 Chronicles 20:2). It was from Kadesh that the spies entered Palestine by ascending the mountains; and the murmuring Israelites, afterwards attempting to do the same, were driven back by the Amalekites and Canaanites, and afterwards apparently

by the king of Arad, as far as Hormah, then called Zephath (<sup><0437></sup>Numbers 13:17; 14:40-45; 21:1-3; <sup><0044></sup>Deuteronomy 1:41-44; compare <sup><0007></sup>Judges 1:7). There was also at Kadesh a fountain (EN-MISHPAT) mentioned long before the exode of the Israelites (<sup><0147></sup>Genesis 14:7); and the miraculous supply of water took place only on the second visit, which implies that at the first there was no lack of this necessary article. In memory of the murmurs of the Israelites, this fountain afterwards bore the name of "the Waters of MERIBAH" (<sup><0251></sup>Deuteronomy 32:51). The adjacent desert was called the "Wilderness of Kadesh" (<sup><0208></sup>Psalms 29:8). On the second visit to this place Miriam died there, and Moses sent messengers to the king of Edom, informing him that they were in Kadesh, a city in the uttermost part of his border, and asking leave to pass through his country, so as to continue their course round Moab, and approach Palestine from the east. This Edom refused, and the Israelites accordingly marched to Mount Hor, where Aaron died; and then along the Arabah (desert of Zin) to the Red Sea (<sup><0034></sup>Numbers 20:14-29). The name of Kadesh again occurs in describing the southern quarter of Judah, the line defining which is drawn "from the shore of the Salt Sea, from the bay that looked southward; and it went out to the south side of Akkrabbim, and passed along to Zin, and ascended up on the south side to Kadesh-barnea" (<sup><0651></sup>Joshua 15:1-3; compare <sup><0608></sup>Numbers 34:3,4). In <sup><0147></sup>Genesis 14:7 Kadesh is connected with Tamar, or Hazezon Tamar, just as we find these two in the comparatively late book of Ezekiel, as designed to mark the southern border of Judah, drawn through them and terminating seaward at the "river to," or "towards the great sea" (<sup><2679></sup>Ezekiel 47:19; 48:28). There is one objection to this view. The Kadesh from which the spies were sent was in *the wilderness of Paran* (<sup><0436></sup>Numbers 13:26); Kadesh-barnea was in the wilderness of Zin (20:1). This is easily removed. Paran was the general name for the whole desert west of the Arabah, extending from Palestine to Sinai (<sup><0121></sup>Genesis 21:21; <sup><0102></sup>Numbers 10:12; 12:16; <sup><0251></sup>1 Samuel 25:1). It even seems to have included the Arabah, reaching to the very base of Mount Seir (<sup><0146></sup>Genesis 14:6). Zin was a specific name for that part of the Arabah which bordered on Edom and Palestine (<sup><0432></sup>Numbers 13:21; 34:3, 4; <sup><0651></sup>Joshua 15:1-3). If Kadesh was situated on the western side of the Arabah, then it might be reckoned either to Paran or to Zin; or, if we agree with Keil, Delitzsch, and others (Keil *on Joshua* x), that Paran was the general name for the whole, and Zin the specific name of a portion, the objection is removed at once.-Kitto; Smith. *SEE KEDESH*, 1.



To meet these various indications, two places by the name of Kadesh, were formerly supposed to exist; but the editor of the *Pictorial Bible* has shown (note on <sup><0401></sup>Numbers 20:1) that a single Kadesh would answer all the conditions, if placed on the western border of the Arabah, opposite Mt. Hor. Accordingly, Dr. Robinson locates it at *Ain el-Webeh*; which he argues coincides with all the circumstances mentioned (*Researches*, ii, 538). But this is somewhat too distant from the pass es-Sufa, which is probably the Zephath where the Israelites encountered the Canaanites, and on this account Raumer has with greater plausibility fixed Kadesh at *Ain es-Hasb* (*Der Zug der Israeliten*, Leipz. 1843, p. 9 sq.). **SEE EXODE.** Mr. Rowlands, who travelled through this region in 1842, thinks he discovered Kadesh (as well as numerous other ancient localities in this vicinity) at a place which he calls *Ain Kudes* (Williams's *Holy City*, 2d edit.. i, 467). A writer in Fairbairn's *Dictionary* argues at length in favor of this position at *Ain Gades*, but all his reasoning-partakes, of the character of special pleading, and rests upon inconclusive grounds. His only real argument is that Kadesh appears to have lain between wady Feiran (Paran) and Engedi (Hazezon-tamar), on Chedorlaomer's route (<sup><0407></sup>Genesis 14:7); but that route is given so vaguely that we can lay no particular stress upon it. The other arguments even tell the other way; especially do the passages adduced go to show that Kadesh was at the extreme east from Shur (<sup><0201></sup>Genesis 20:1) and el-Arish (<sup><0445></sup>Numbers 34:5; <sup><0655></sup>Joshua 15:5), and the same was the case with Zin (<sup><0432></sup>Numbers 13:21; 33:36). This position also is avowedly not only inconsistent with the location of Huzeroth at Ain Hudheirah, but even requires us to enlarge the borders of Edom far to the west (<sup><0206></sup>Numbers 20:16), and actually to remove Mt. Hor from its well-defined traditional situation (Deuteronomy i, 2). Capt. Palmer has more lately visited the site thus assumed for Kadesh, and particularly describes it (*Quart. Statement of the "Palestine Exploration Fund,"* Jan. 1871, p. 20 sq.) as "consisting of three springs, or rather shallow pools, one of them overflowing in the rainy season ;" but his advocacy for the identity adds no additional argument. In fact, the agreement in the name is the only plea of any force. This is counterbalanced-by the scriptural notices of the position of the place.- See Dr. Robinson, in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1849, p. 377 sq.; also Palmer, *Desert of Exodus*, p. 286; comp. Kitto's *Scripture Lands*, p. 78-82; Ritter, *Erdkunde*, 14:1077-1089. Schwarz (*Palestine*, p. 23) endeavors, from Rabbinical authority, to locate Kadesh at a place named by him wady *Bierin*, about forty-five miles south of Gaza; but his whole theory is imaginary, besides indicating a position too far west for this

Kadesh, and requiring another for En-Mishpat (p. 214), which is stated by Eusebius and Jerome (*Onomast. s.v. Κάδης, Βαρνή*,. *Cades*) to have been in the vicinity of Mt. Hor. From this last statement Stanley (*Sinai and Palestine*, p. 95) unwarrantably infers that Kadesh was identical with Petra.

## Kadi

(Arabic) is among the Mohammedans the title of an assistant-judge of civil law, and like the judge himself (molla), is classed among the higher clergy, because all civil law of the Mussulman is based on the Koran. *SEE KORAN.*

## Kadkod.

*SEE AGATE.*

## Kad'miel

(Heb. *Kadmiel'*, *אֲמֵל* before God, i.e. his servant; Sept. *Καδμιάλ*), one of the Levites who returned with Zerubbabel from the captivity (<sup><1628></sup>Nehemiah 12:8), and assisted in the various reforms of that period, being always named in connection with Jeshua (<sup><1589></sup>Ezra 3:9; Nehemiahvii, 43; comp. <sup><1589></sup>Ezra 3:9); sometimes only as a descendant in common of Hodaviah (<sup><1584></sup>Ezra 2:40; <sup><1628></sup>Nehemiah 7:43; comp. <sup><1589></sup>Ezra 3:9), but once as a son (<sup><1628></sup>Nehemiah 12:24). The length of time over which these notices seem to extend (B.C. 536-410) leads to the suspicion that they relate to two individuals (perhaps a brother and also a son of the Levite Jeshua), one of whom may have been concerned in the earlier events, and the other in the later.

## Kad'monite

(Heb. *Kadmoni'*, *קַדְמוֹנִי* eastern, as in <sup><3619></sup>Ezekiel 10:19, etc., or former, as in <sup><1587></sup>Ezekiel 38:17, etc.; only once of a nation, collect. in the sing., Genesis 15:i9; Sept. *Κεδμωνίοι*, Vulg. *Cedmoncei*, A.V. "Kadmonites"), the name of a Canaanitish tribe, who appear to have dwelt in the north-east part of Palestine, under Mount Hermon, at the time that Abraham sojourned in the land, and are mentioned in a more than ordinarily full list of the aborigines of Canaan (<sup><1519></sup>Genesis 15:19). As the name is derived from *קַדְמָה*, *kedem*, "east," it is supposed by Dr. Wells and others to denote a people situated to the east of the Jordan, or, rather, that it was a

term applied collectively, like "Orientals," to all the people living in the countries beyond that river. At least it may be a term of contrast with the more western Zidonians. As the term likewise signifies *ancient*, it may designate the older or aboriginal races of that region in general, who were recognized as the earliest in origin. Both these explanations may be correct, as the Kadmonites are not elsewhere mentioned as a distinct nation; and the subsequent discontinuance of the term, 'in the assigned acceptation, may easily be accounted for by the nations beyond the river having afterwards become more distinctly known, so as to be mentioned by their several distinctive names. *SEE HIVITE*. The reader may see much ingenious trifling respecting this name in Bochart (*Canaan*, i, 19); the substance of which is that Cadmus, the founder of Thebes, in Boeotia, was originally a Kadmonite, and that the name of his wife, Hermione, was derived from Mount Hermon. By others the name Kadmonites has been extended as equivalent to "the children of the East" (μῆδαι, Ἰνδοί), i.e. those living beyond the Euphrates (Ewald, *Isr. Gesch.* i, 300) *SEE BENE-KEDEM*, and Reland (*Palaestina*, p. 94) has sought to identify them with the Nabathaeans of Arabia; but these were Ishmaelites. It was probably applied collectively to various tribes, like the Saracens of the Middle Ages or the Bedouins of modern times (Ritter, *Erdkunde*, 15:138). According to Dr. Thomson, the name is still preserved among the Nusariyeh north of Tripoli, who have a tradition that their ancestors were expelled from Palestine by Joshua, and who seem in physiognomy and manners to belong to the most ancient inhabitants of the country (*Land and Book*, i, 242). *SEE CANAANITE*.

### Kadroma

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

### Kaffres

(from the Arabic *Kafir*, infidel, i.e. non-Mohammedan), a people in south-eastern Africa, who received this name from the Moorish navigators of the Indian Ocean. When the Dutch colonists came in contact with the most southern tribe of the Kaffres, the Koosas, or Amakosa, the Moorish name

was given to them exclusively, and in this restricted sense it is commonly used by the Dutch and English colonists. It is, however, well ascertained that not only the tribes now commonly called Kaffres but the Tambookies, Mambookies, Zulus, Damaras, the inhabitants of Delagoa Bay, Mozambique, and the numerous Bechuana tribes who occupy the interior of the continent to an extent as yet unexplored, are but subdivisions of one great family, allied in language, customs, and mode of life. The Kaffre languages (in the wider sense of the word) are divided (by Fr. Miller) into an Eastern, Middle, and Western group. The former comprises,

1. the Kaffre languages (in the narrower sense of the word), embracing, besides the Kaffre proper, also the Zulu dialect;
2. the Zambesi languages, embracing the languages of the Barotse, Bayeye, and Mashona;
3. the languages of Zanzibar, embracing the languages of the Kisuahili, Kinika, Kikamba, and the Kihian.

The Middle group contains,

1. the Sechuana languages (Sesuto, Serolong, and Shlapi);
2. the Tekeza languages, embracing the languages of the Mancolosi, Matonga, and Maloenga.

The Western group contains,

1. the Bunda, Herero, and Londa languages;
2. the languages of Congo, Mpongwe, Dikele, Isuba, and Fernando Po.

The Kaffre languages are sonorous, flexible, and definite. The southern tribes have adopted the peculiar smacking sounds of the Hottentots, which frequently change the meaning of words. The government of the Kaffre tribes is feudal—an aristocracy of chiefs, acknowledging the supremacy of the sovereign, but, except on extraordinary occasions, acting independently of him. The general chief is the sovereign of the nation, and in a council of chiefs is very powerful, and is looked upon by all the nobles and people with unbounded respect. The kraals (hamlets) generally consist of a dozen low, conical huts, the diameter of which is no more than about ten feet, into which one has to creep through a low opening, closed during the night by trees. In the middle of the hut is a room for the cattle. Wars generally

arise out of the stealing of cattle. In personal appearance the Kaffres are a remarkably fine race of men. They are of dark brown color, have a beautiful and vigorous constitution, dark woolly hair, a lofty front, and bent nose like the Europeans, projecting cheek-bones like the Hottentots, thick lips like the negroes. Their beard is thin. The women are handsome and modest; their clothing consists of cloaks of skin, while the men are almost naked. They have no national religion; there are some traces of a belief in a supreme being and in subordinate spirits, but no kind of religious worship and no priests. They are very superstitious, and pay a high tribute to sorcerers. "They have no idea," says Philip (*South Africa, i*, 118), "of any man's dying except from hunger, violence, or witchcraft." Like many other savage tribes, they practice the worship of their ancestry, "They sacrifice and pray to their deceased relatives. although it would be asserting too much to say absolutely that they believe in the existence and the immortality of the soul. In fact, their belief seems to go no further than this, that the ghosts of the dead haunt for a certain time their previous dwelling-places, and either assist or plague the living. No special powers are attributed to them, and it would be a misnomer to call them deities (comp. Lubbock, *Primitive Condition of Man*, N. Y. 1871, 8vo, ch. iv sq.). They practice circumcision, but only as a custom, not as a religious rite. Polygamy is allowed, and as the heavy work is chiefly performed by the women, it has proved a great obstacle to the introduction of Christianity.

The various tribes of the Kaffre family are estimated by Rev. J. J. Freeman, secretary of the London Missionary Society, at 2,000,000, spread from the eastern frontier of Cape Colony beyond Delagoa Bay, and then across the whole continent, without break, to the Atlantic in latitude 20°. A part of the territory of the Kaffres, from which, in particular, constant raids were made into English territory, was annexed to the British dominions under the name of Queen Adelaide province, It was subsequently restored to the chiefs of the Kaffres; in 1847 it again became all English province, under the name of British Kaffraria, and King William's Town, on the Buffalo River, was made the capital and the military head-quarters. The capital has a population of 5169, the sea-port, East London, of 2134. The population of the towns consists chiefly of English and German settlers, while the country people are Kaffres. In 1857 the province numbered 3942 kraals, and had a population of 104,721, but a terrible famine, which was caused by a false prophet of the name of Umhlakasa, reduced it in 1858 to 1291 kraals, and a population of 52,186. In 1880 the province embraced about

3006 sq. miles, and a population of 122,159. The British influence more and more extends over Kaffraria proper, which is situated between British Kaffraria and Natal, and embraces about 1890 sq. miles and 543,000 inhabitants. North Natal and the Transvaal republic extends the land of other Kaffre tribes, the territory of which is estimated at 62,930 square miles, with a population of about 440,000. Cape Colony, according to the census of 1875, had a Kaffre population of 166,979.

As the Dutch government of Cape Colony was hostile to all Christian missions, the missions among the Kaffres did not begin until the government had passed under British rule. The Moravians, who then for the first time found the necessary protection for their re-established missions among the Hottentots, *SEE HOTTENTOTS*, extended in 1818 their labors also to the Kaffres, in particular to the tribes of the Fongus and Tambakis, whence in 1862 a station was established among the last. named tribe of Independent Kaffraria. The missionary Von der Kemp, who in 1798 was sent out by the London Missionary Society, laid the foundation of the missions of this society among the Kaffres. The Wesleyan missionaries have (since 1820) numerous-stations in all parts of the Kaffre territory. Their missionaries have for a long time been almost the only ones who ventured to penetrate into the uncultivated districts of the free Kaffres. The Free Church and the United Presbyterians of Scotland have a number of stations in British Kaffraria, and have begun to extend their labors to (independent) Kaffraria, among the natives whom the British government has induced to settle there. The Berlin missions have also, since 1834, established a number of stations in British Kaffraria. The Anglican Church, which has bishops at Capetown (1847), Grahamstown (1853), and in the Orange Free State (1863), has station's both in British and in Free Kaffraria, and is eagerly intent upon extending its work. The Dutch Reformed Church had done nothing for the Kaffres until the establishment of a special missionary board in 1863 (Synodale Zendings Commissie in Zuyd Africa), which displays a great zeal in the establishment of missions among the pagan population. More recently the German Baptists have sent out missionaries to British Kaffraria. The Roman Catholic Church has also a few stations in British Kaffraria. See Grundemann, *Missions atlas* (2d number, Gotha, 1867); Necomb, *Cyclopaedia of Missions*; Moffat's *Southern Africa* (Lond. 1842); T. B. Freeman's *Tour in South Africa* (Lond. 1857); Lichtenstein, *Travels in South Africa*; Burchell, *Travels in Southern Africa*. (A. J. S.)

## Kagbossum

is the name of a crow which the Hindus assert embodies the soul of one of their celebrated sages; some of them say even of Brahma himself. See Vollmer, *Worterb. d. Mythol.* p. 991.

## Kahanbarha

the Persian name for the period in which the world was created, and which in their cosmogony, as in that of the Christian dispensation, covers six days; but, like some of our theorists, they say that each day of creation corresponds in length to a period of one month. *SEE ZOROASTRIANISM.*

## Kahler, Johannes,

a Lutheran theologian of some note, was born at Wolmar, Hesse Cassel, Jan. 20, 1649, and was educated at the University of Giessen. He began his lectures at that university in 1673 on the Cartesian philosophy, and became one of its ablest exponents. — In 1677 he was called as extraordinary professor of metaphysics to Rinten, and shortly after was promoted to the full or ordinary professorship. In 1683 he became also professor of theology. He died May 17, 1729. Kahler was highly esteemed by his contemporaries, and enjoyed the confidence and good will of his colleagues to such a degree that he was chosen rector at six different elections. His writings, consisting mainly of dissertations on theology and philosophy, were collected and printed in 2 vols. 12mo. See *Allgenm. Hist. Lex.* vol. 3:s.v.; Jocher, *Gelehrten Lexikon*, vol. ii, s.v., gives a complete list of Kahler's productions.

## Kaisersberg.

*SEE GEILER.*

## Kaiserswerth.

*SEE FLIEDNER.*

## Kajomorts,

the Persian name for the first man, who they say was a direct descendant of a bull (Abudad), and was both man and wife at the same time. So sacred was his person that even angels worshipped him. Ahriman, however, was bent upon his destruction, and for thirty years he persecuted Kajomorts.

until successful in slaying him. But the seed of Kajomorts fructified the earth, the sun purified it, and after forty years a plant sprang up, which became a mighty tree, bearing, instead of fruit, ten human pairs, one of which, Meshia and Meshiane, became the ancestors of the human race (see Vollmer, *Worterb. d. Mythol.* p. 992). *SEE ORMUZD; SEE ZOROASTRIANISM.*

### Kakusanduis

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

### Kalasutra,

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

### Kalderon

(more accurately CALDERON), the most celebrated poet of Spain, born of a noble family at Madrid Jan. 1, 1601, was educated at the University of Salamanca, but at length went into the army, and fought in Milan and Flanders, until in 1651 he entered the priesthood. Already, as a soldier, he had devoted much time to the cultivation of his poetical talents; now, as a priest, he devoted most of his time to it, and it is for his influence on the religious poetry of Spain, for his relation to the history of Roman Catholic poetry, that we make room for a short sketch of this religious (Roman Catholic) Shakespeare. Shortly after his admission to the priesthood he took a chaplaincy at Toledo, but the king, with whom Kalderon was in special favor, soon gained the poet for his court by assigning Kalderon a lucrative position in the royal chapel. He died about 1681, perhaps somewhat later. He wrote no less than five hundred dramas, many of which have a religious tendency. and display most accurately the religious and moral character of his time and people. Those of his productions which have been preserved are divided into three different groups. The first contains his comedies of familiar life; the second, the heroic; and the third



embraces his religious pieces, or "Sacramental Acts" (*Autos Sacramentales*), and these only concern us here. They are compositions which bear a strong resemblance to the miracle-plays of the Middle Ages, and are, like them, deformed by fantastic extravagances of religious opinion and feeling. Some of them, however, are beautifully poetical. One of the most characteristic, held also by some critics to be the best, is "The Devotion of the Cross," a strange farrago of the wildest supernatural inventions, and the most impractically-motived exhibitions of human conduct, but breathing a poetic spirit which is wonderfully impressive. One of its main incidents is the legend of one dead man shriving another, which had been used by another poet. Another successful effort of his is "The steadfast Prince." Both of these have frequently been translated into English and other languages. See, however, Ticknor, *History of Spanish Literature* (new edition, 1871, with Index). One of the ablest Roman Catholic critics, professor Frederick Schlegel, thus speaks of Kalderon's position as a Christian poet: "The Christianity of this poet, however, does not consist so much in the external circumstances which he has selected, as in his peculiar feeling, and the method of treating his subject, which is most common with him. Even where his materials furnish him with no opportunity of drawing the perfect development of a new life out of death and suffering, yet everything is conceived in the spirit of this Christian love and purification, everything seen in its light, and clothed in the splendor of its heavenly coloring. In every situation and circumstance, Kalderon is, of all dramatic poets, the most Christian, and for that very reason the most romantic" (*History of Literature*, p. 280, 281). See also Eichendorff, *Geistliche Schauspiele von Don Pedro Kalderon de la Barca*; Schmidt, *Schauspiele Calderons* (Eberfeld, 1857); Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 7:218sq. (J.H.W.)

### Kaldi, Georg,

a celebrated Hungarian Jesuit, was born at Tyrnau (Hungary) in 1570. After filling various positions in the Jesuitical order, preaching at Vienna, and teaching theology at Olmutz, he became at last rector of the college at Presburg, and remained there until his death in 1634. He was the first Roman Catholic to furnish his co-religionists a Hungarian translation of the Bible. It was published at Vienna in 1626, folio (the Protestant translation, by Visoli, was made in 1589). A portion of Kaldi's sermons were published at Presburg in 1631.

## Kalendar.

*SEE CALENDAR.*

## Kali

(or KALEE) is the name of one of the many forms of *Doorgd*, so popularly and variously worshipped in Hindustan.

*Names and History.* — *Doorga* is the female principle in the production of the world who appears throughout the Hindu Shastras as *Prakriti* or *Bhagwati*. She is said to have had a thousand names, and to have appeared in a vast number of forms in different periods: thus, as *Sati*, she first became the wife of Siva, but renounced her life on hearing her father reproach her husband. She again appeared as "the mountain-born goddess" under the name of *Parwati*, and again married Siva. After giving birth to her sons Ganesh and Katik, she became renowned for her achievements in war against the giant enemies of the gods.

This goddess assumed the name of Kali on the occasion of a battle with a thousand-headed giant demigod whom she slew. In her excessive delight over her victory, she danced till she shook the foundation of the earth, and the gods were compelled to induce her husband Siva to influence her to stop, which, however, he found no means of doing till he resorted to the expedient of throwing himself among the bodies of the slain. Kali, observing herself dancing on the body of her husband, was shocked, and, protruding her tongue in her surprise, stood still. In this attitude she is represented in the images of her now made, and sold, and worshipped throughout Bengal.

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

Her most common image, however, is that of a black Or very dark blue-colored woman with four arms; the upper left arm holding a cimeter, the lower left a human head by the hair The other right arm is held up to indicate either that she is bestowing a blessing or the restoration of nature from the devastation which she has caused, and to which her lower right

hand is pointing. All her hands are bloody. In this form she is standing on the body of her husband, who is a white man, stretched at full length upon his back. Around her waist, as a covering, she wears a string of bloody human hands. She wears an immense necklace, reaching below her knees, which is composed of human skulls. In some images a pair of dead human bodies hang by the hair from her ears. Her tongue, as above set forth, protrudes from her mouth upon her chin.

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

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

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

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

The professional robbers and murderers so long known and dreaded throughout India, and notorious elsewhere as *Thugs*, are the special devotees of the four-armed Kali. In the hope of greater success in their work, they consecrate to her their instruments of death, and their victims

are held to be immolated in her honor. These men will join travellers, and accompany them for days, gaining their confidence if possible, under some disguise, until, watching their opportunity, they can administer drugs, or choke them with a small cord, and then rob them of all they possess. Formerly, it is supposed, the goddess rendered them much more assistance than of late, by putting out of the way the corpses of those slain; but, in consequence of one of their number looking behind him after a murder, she ceased to render them so certainly this assistance, as this was a violation of the express condition on which she kept secret all traces of their deeds. The accounts of the occasion of their losing her assistance in this particular are conflicting, and scarcely worthy of reproduction. Persons wishing to trace the matter may refer to *Illustrations of the History, and Practices of the Thugs* (Lond. 1837). **SEE THUGS. Ceremonies.**—Distinct from the great festival alluded to above in honor of Doorga as the "ten-armed goddess" is a famous and popular festival held in her service under the special form of Kali. It is observed with much the same form as the other. Annual sacrifices of sweetmeats, sugar, garments, rice, plantains, and pease are offered in great abundance. The first day ends with singing, dancing, and feasting, and with the lower classes in great debauchery and shameless licentiousness, the *arak*, an intoxicating liquor, being consecrated to the idol goddess. On the second morning images of all sizes representative of the goddess are made, and, after consecration by the Brahmans, are carried through the streets in procession to the Hooghly River, and there, carried out in boats, are thrown into it, and with this act terminate these wild and terrible orgies. Immense sums are expended by many of these devotees during these festivals. Mr. Ward estimates as much as £9000 sterling to have been expended annually at the single shrine in Calcutta, and narrates cases of individual offerings, at one time, of £10,000, comprising rich beds, silver plate, and food for the entertainment of a thousand persons.

*Temples.* — There are many buildings devoted to her worship. The greatest and most popular of these is that of Kali-Ghat, about three miles to the south of Calcutta. There are fifty other edifices in various parts of India devoted to Doorga under her variety of forms and names. All these are said to have originated in an incident connected with her history previous to her having assumed the shape of Parwati, when Vishnu severed her body into fifty-one separate pieces, which were strewn over the earth, and conferred a peculiar sanctity on the places where they happened to fall. All of these became sites of temples, in which an image of some one of her

thousand forms was set up. The, whole of the country to the south of Calcutta, including the spot known as Kali-Ghat, was thus rendered sacred, the toes of the right foot being deposited at the latter place. The temple at Kali-Ghat consists of one room, with a large pavement around it. The image of Kali is in this temple (Ward, ii, 157).

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

*Literature.*— *Journ. of the Asiatic Society's Researchs*, vol. v.; Coleman, *Mythology of the Hindoos*; Moor, *Hindoo Pantheon*; Ward, *Hindoo Mythology*; account of temple at Kali-Ghat in the *Calcutta Christian Observer*, Sept. 1833; Col. Sleeman, *Journey through Oudh*. (J. T. G.)

## Kali.

*SEE PARCHED CORN.*

## Kalighi

is the name of one (the tenth) impersonation of the Hindu god Vishnu. *SEE KRISHNA.*

## Kaliph

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

## Kalir, Eleasar Ha

one of the oldest Jewish poets of Italy, generally regarded as the founder of the synagogal poetry of the non-Sephardite Jews in Europe, flourished about the beginning of the 8th century. Of his personal history nothing further is known. He wrote some one hundred and fifty different sacred poems, many of which were inserted in the liturgies of the Babylonian, Italian, German, and French Jews. He was a disciple of Jannai, and was greatly admired by his contemporaries. See Gratz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, 5:181 sq.; Sachs, *Religiose Poesie d. Juden in Spanien*, p. 180 sq.; Zunz, *Synagogale Poesie d. Mittelalters*, p. 128 sq. **SEE LITURGY, JEWISH; SEE MACHSOR, SEE SYNAGOGUAL POETRY.**

## Kaliyuga,

or the KALI AGE, is the fourth or last age of the *Maha*, or great age, **SEE YUGA**, and bears some resemblance to the Iron Age of classical mythology. The Hindus, recognising, like all religionists of antiquity, that man by sin has fallen from his high estate, have divided the world's existence into four periods, which are marked by successive physical and moral decrements of created beings. They hold that the present period is the last one, that it consists of 432,000 solar sidereal years, and that the Kali Age began B.C. 3102. "In the Krita (or first) age," Manu says, "the (genius of) Truth and Right (in the form of a bull) stands firm on his four feet, nor does any advantage accrue to men from iniquity. But in the following ages, by reason of unjust gains, he is deprived successively of one foot; and even just emoluments, through the prevalence of theft, falsehood, and fraud, are gradually diminished by one foot (i.e. by a fourth part)." The estimate in which Kaliyuga, our present age, is held by the modern Hindus may be gathered from one of their most celebrated Puranas, the Padma-Purana. In the last chapter of one of the books (Kriyayogasara) of this Purana, the following account, which we take from Chambers, *Cyclopaedia* (s.v. Kaliyuga), is given of it: "In the Kaliyuga (the genius of) Right will have but one foot; every one will delight in evil. The four castes will be devoted to wickedness, and deprived of the nourishment which is fit for them. The Brahmans will neglect the Vedas, hanker after presents, be lustful and cruel. They will despise the Scriptures, gamble, steal, and desire intercourse with widows... For the sake of a livelihood, some Brahmans will become arrant rogues... The Sudras will endeavor to lead the life of the Brahmans, and, out of friendship, people will bear false

witness.... they will injure the wives of others, and their speech will be that of falsehood. Greedy of the wealth of others, they will entertain a guest according to the behest of the Scriptures, but afterwards kill him out of covetousness; they are indeed worthy of hell. The twice-born (i.e. the first three castes) will live upon debts, sell the produce of cows, and even their daughters. In this Yuga men will be under the sway of women, and women will be excessively fickle ... In the Kaliyuga the earth will bear but little corn'; the clouds will shed but little rain, and that, too, out of season. The cows will feed on ordure, and give little milk, and the milk will yield no butter'; there is no doubt of that. ... Trees, even, will wither in twelve years, and the age of mankind will not exceed sixteen years; people, moreover, will become grayhaired in their youth; women will bear children in their fifth or sixth year, and men will become troubled with a great number of children. In the Kaliyuga the foreigners will become kings; bent upon evil; and those living in foreign countries will be all of one caste, and out of lust take to themselves many wives. In the first twilight of the Kaliyuga people will disregard Vishnu, and in the middle of it no one will even mention his name." There is a remarkable identity of the Hindu belief with that of the Hebrew as to redemption from this sinful state by a Messiah. See Hardwick, *Christ and other Masters*, i, 303 sq., 329 sq.; Weber, *Indische Studien*, ii, 411; Wilson, *Asiatic Researches*, 10:27 sq.; Alger, *History of the Doctrine of a Future Life*, p. 111 sq.

## Kallah.

SEE TALMUD.

## Kal'lai

(Heb. *Kallay'*, *ḡlq̄p̄* *runner*; Sept. *Καλλαί*), ' a chief priest, son of Sallai, contemporary with the high-priest Joiakim (<sup>4620</sup> Nehemiah 12:20). B.C. post 536.

## Kalmucks

(Tatar *Khalimik*, i.e. apostates), also called *Olok or Eleutes*, a Mongolian tribe of nomads, a portion of whom live under Chinese rule, while the greater number, during the last two centuries, have settled in or belong to Russia. They are similar to the Mongols proper, but inferior to them in point of civilization. They are divided into nobles, people (serfs), and priests; the last have, in particular, a very great influence among the

Buddhistic Kalmucks. They are divided into tribes (Uluss), at the head of which are Tchaidas; and the tribes are subdivided into Aimaks (of from 150 to 300 families each), at the head of which are the Saisans. They call themselves *Derben Eret* (Dorbin-Oirat), i.e. the four allies, because, from time immemorial, they have been divided into four chief tribes:

- 1.** The Dsongars, after whom Dsongaria is called, formerly the most powerful of the tribes, but subsequently subdued by the Chinese, and now extant only in small number.
- 2.** The Koshotes (i.e. warriors); under princes from the family of Jenghis Khan, numbering from 50,000 to 60,000; they voluntarily placed themselves under the sceptre of Russia, and are loyal subjects; their favorite drink is the kumiss (fermented horse milk).
- 3.** The Derbets, living, in the 16th and 17th centuries, on the Volga and Ural, now on the Don and the Ili.
- 4.** The Torgots (Torga-Uten), or Kalmucks of the Volga, have, for the most part, left Russian territory; only the tribe Zoochor, under the prince Dundukor, a grand-uncle of the powerful khan Ayuka, remained. Dundukor himself was baptized, and, by order of Alexander I, the title passed over to his son-in-law Norkasov. Some of the Kalmucks live scattered in the government of Simbirsk (15,000 souls, all in connection with the Greek Church), others east of the Ural, on the Jhet River (professing Islamism), and in several commercial towns of Russia, altogether about 120,000 souls, of whom 73 per cent. live in the government of Astrachan. The majority of the Kalmucks are still Buddhists. They were all originally adherents of that form of Buddhism known as *Lanaism*, which the Mongols in general received from Thibet. In Dsongaria they have two celebrated temples; the one is situated on the Tekes, the other on the Ili. In the latter resides the Tchamba Lama in the winter, and with him a number of priests, who here teach reading and writing. They are joined by pious pilgrims and numerous Chinese merchants, who set up their shops around the temple. The chiefs of the Chinese Kalmucks used to receive from the mandarin the insignia of their rank, but of late the virtual independence of Dsongaria has severed the former relation of the Kalmucks to the Chinese government; and, after the occupation of Kultsha by the Russians in May, 1871, the Chinese Kalmucks generally declared their submission to the Russian government. The language of the Kalmucks is a branch of the Mongolian language;



grammars of the language have been published by Bobrovnikov (Kasan, 1849) and Zwieck (Donaueschingen, 1857). The literature consists almost exclusively of translations of Buddhistic writings from India. A collection of legends (Siddhi-Kur), with German translation, was published by *Jiilg* (Leipzig, 1866). (A. J. S.)

### Kalonymus Ben-Kalonymus,

a Jewish writer of some note, was born in Italy in 1287, but lived for some time in Southern France, and was there picked up by king Robert of Naples. He returned with the latter to his native land, and filled some important offices in his service. Kalonymus was an accomplished scholar, translated into Hebrew medical, astronomical, and philosophical works of the Arabians, wrote a number of satirical treatises on the low moral state of his contemporaries, and labored in this and other ways to ameliorate the miserable condition of his countrymen. He died about 1337. The best of his later works is *ʿj b ʿba*, or *The Stone of Weeping* (Naples, 1489; translated into Jewish German, Frkft. 1746). He also edited with great ability a part of the Arabian Encyclopaedia of the Sciences (known as "Treatises of the Honest Brethren") for the use of the Italian Jews. See Grattz, *Gesch. d. Juden*; 7:305 sq.; Zunz, in Geiger's *Zeitschrift*, ii, 313; 4:200 sq.; Fligel, *Zeitschrift der deutsch. Morgenland, Gesellsch.* 1859. (J. H.W.)

### Kalottinocracy

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

### Kalpa

designates in Hindu chronology the Brahminical period of one day and night, and corresponds to a period of 4,320,000,000 solar sidereal years, or years of mortals, measuring the duration of the world, and, according to many, including even the interval of its annihilation. The *Bhavishya-Purana* admits of an infinity of kalpas; other Puranas enumerate thirty. A great kalpa comprises not a day, but a life of Brahma. In Vedic literature, kalpa is a Vedanga (q.v.). See Hardy, *Manual of Buddhism*, p. 1 sq., 7 sq. **SEE KALPA-SUTRA.**

## Kalpa-Sutra

is, in Vedic literature, the name of those Sanscrit works which treat of the ceremonials usual at a *Vedic* sacrifice. *SEE VEDA*. In Jaina literature it is the name of the most sacred religious work of the *Jainas* (q.v.). It chiefly relates the legendary history of Mahavira, the last of their twenty-four deified saints, or Tirthankaras, but contains also an account of four other saints of the same class. The author of the work was Bhadra Bahu, and it was composed, Stevenson assumes, in the year A.D. 411. It is held in high respect by the Jainas, who, out of the eight days which, in the middle of the rains, they devote to the reading of their most sacred writings, allot no less than five to the Kalpa Sutra. See Stevenson, *The Kalpa-Sutra and Nava Tatva* (London, 1848).

## Kalteisen, Heinrich,

a celebrated Dominican of the 15th century, was born near Coblenz, and educated at Vienna and Cologne. In the latter city he was afterwards professor of theology, preaching at the same time. Later he removed to Mentz, and became general inquisitor of Germany. He was present at the Council of Basle, and took quite a prominent part in the deliberations against the Hussites. He was one of the four doctors on the Roman Catholic side who disputed with the Bohemians. *SEE HUSSITES; SEE BASLE, COUNCIL OF*. In 1443 pope Eugenius IV made him Magister sacri Palatii, and in 1452 pope Nicholas V created him archbishop of Drontheim. He died in 1465. Kalteisen's literary abilities are generally spoken of as moderate. He wrote much, but little has been published. See Basnage-Canisius, *Lect. Antiq.* 4:628 sq.; Quetif and Echard, *Script. Ord. Præd.* ii, 828; Schroch, *Kirchengesch.* 34:707; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* vi, 15.

## Kama

the Hindu *deva* or deity of Love, one of the most pleasing creations of Hindu fiction, is, in the Sanscrit poet of later periods, the favorite theme of descriptions and allusions. The genealogy of this deity is quite obscure; according to some Puranas, he was originally a son of Brahma; according to others, a son of Dharma (the genius of Virtue), by Sraddha (the genius of Faith), herself a daughter of Daksha, who was one of the mind-born sons of Brahma. The god Siva, being on one occasion greatly incensed at Kama, reduced him to ashes; but ultimately, moved by the affliction of Rati

(Voluptuousness), the wife of Kama, he promised her that her husband should be reborn as a son of Krishna, and he was accordingly born under the name of *Pradyumna*, who was 'the god of Love.' But when the infant was six days old it was stolen from the lying-in chamber by the terrible daemon Sambara; for the latter foreknew that Pradyumna, if he lived, would be his destroyer. The boy was thrown into the ocean, and swallowed by a large fish. Yet he did not die, for that fish was caught by fishermen, and delivered to Mayavati, the mistress of Sambara's household; and, when it was cut open, the child was taken from it. While Mayavati wondered who this could be, the divine sage Narada satisfied her curiosity, and counseled her to rear tenderly this offspring of Krishna. She acted as he advised her; and when Pradyumna grew up, and learned his own history, he slew the daemon Sambara. Mayavati, however, was later apprized by Krishna that she was not the wife of Sambara, as she had fancied herself to be, but that of Pradyumna-in fact, another form of Rati, who was the wife of Kama in his former existence. In the representations of Kama we find him holding in one hand a bow made of sugar-cane, and strung with bees, in the other an arrow tipped with the blossom of a flower which is supposed to conquer one of the senses. His standard is, agreeably to the legend above mentioned, a fabulous fish, called Makara; and he rides on a parrot or sparrow-the symbol of voluptuousness. His epithets are numerous, but easily accounted for from the circumstances named, and from the effects of love on the mind and senses. Thus he is called *Makaradhwaja*, 'the one who has Makara in his banner;' *Mada*, 'the maddener,' etc. 'His wife, as before stated, is *Rati*; she is also called *Kamakala*, 'a portion of Kama,' or *Priti*, 'affection.' His daughter is *Trisha*, 'thirst or desire;' and his son is *Aniruddha*, 'the irresistible.' See Muller, *Chips*, vol. ii, ch. i, especially p. 127-135; Vollmer, *Mythol. Worterbuch*, p. 1008.

## Kama.

SEE TALMUD.

## Kamawachara,

the Buddhist name of one of the three divisions of the *Sakwala* (q.v.), and refers to the worlds in which there is form, with sensual enjoyment. The Buddhist affirms that there are innumerable worlds, but only three kinds of them, viz.

- (1) worlds in which there is no perceptible form;
- (2) worlds in which there is form, but no sensual enjoyment;
- (3) and lastly, the *Kamawachara* explained above.

See Hardy, *Manual of Buddhism*, p. 3 sq.

**Kamenker.**

*SEE MEIR, MOSE.*

**Kami**

(or *Happy Spirits*) is the name given in Japanese mythology to certain spirits or divinities who founded the first terrestrial dynasty. All primitive mythologies are coupled with and made to rise out of cosmogony. Unfortunately, however, the cosmogony of the Japanese is not only of the wildest sort, but so mixed with that of the Chinese that it is very difficult to speak with any certainty of this ancient religion. From primeval chaos, say the Japanese, there sprung a selfcreated, supreme God, who fixed his abode in the highest heaven, and could not have his tranquillity disturbed by any cares. Next there arose two plastic, creative gods, who framed the universe out of chaos. The universe was then governed for myriads of years by seven gods in succession. They are called the Celestial Gods. The last of them was the only one that had a wife, and to him the earth we inhabit owes its existence. In what may be called the Genesis of the Japanese Bible the creation of the world is thus narrated:

"In the beginning there was neither heaven nor earth. The elements of all things formed a liquid and troubled mass, similar to the contents of an undeveloped egg, in which the white and the yellow are still mingled together. Out of the infinite space which this chaos filled a god arose, called the divine Supreme Being, whose throne is in the centre of heaven. Then came the celestial reason exalted above the creation; finally, the terrestrial reason who is the sublime spirit. Each one of these three primitive gods had his own existence, but they were not yet revealed beyond their spiritual natures. Then, by degrees, the work of separation went on in chaos. The tiniest atoms, moving in different directions, formed the heavens. The grosser atoms attaching themselves to each other, and adhering, produced the earth. The former, moving rapidly,

constructed the vault of the firmament which arches above our heads; the latter, being slowly drawn together in a solid body did not form the earth until at a much later period. When the earthly matter still floated as a fish that comes to the surface of the waters, or as the image of the moon that trembles on a limpid lake, there appeared between the heavens and the earth something similar to a piece of reed, endowed with movement, and capable of transformation. It was changed into three gods, which are: the August one, reigning perpetually over the empire; he who reigns by virtue of water; and he who reigns by virtue of fire. All three were of the male sex, because they owed their origin to the action of the divine reason alone. After the first three males there came three pairs of gods and goddesses, reigning over the elements of wood, metal, and earth. This second dynasty contained as many goddesses as gods, because the terrestrial united equally with the celestial reason in producing them. The first of the seven gods commenced the creation of the earth, and all together personify the elements of the creation. The sera of the celestial gods, commencing with the first and terminating with the last male and female pair, who were called Izanaghi and Izanami, continued for millions of millions of years.

"But the world, and, most important of all, the empire of Japan, was not yet created. The, account given, therefore, is very circumstantial. One day, when the god and goddess were sitting together on the arch of the sky, they happened to talk of the possible existence of an inferior world. "There should be somewhere," said zanaghi at length to his wife, " a habitable earth. Let us seek it under the waters that are seething beneath us." He plunged his spear into the water, and, as he withdrew it, some turbid drops trickled from the diamond point of his javelin, congealed, and formed a great island, upon which the pair descended, determined to make it the beginning of a grand archipelago. From out the waters Izanaghi raised the island of Awadzi, then the mountainous Oho-yamato, rich in fruits and with fine harbors; then the others in succession, until the empire of the eight great islands was completed. The smaller islands were then made, six in number; and the islets scattered here and there formed themselves afterwards from the mixture of the sea-foam and the deposits of the rivers. Eight millions of gods (genii) were then called into existence, and ten thousand kinds of things, out of which came everything that can be found

in the earth. Upon the completion of this work, Izanaghi and his wife made the earth their habitation, and became the progenitors of the five dynasties of terrestrial deities, who in turn governed the earth during two million and odd years. The last of these, having married a terrestrial wife, left a mortal son upon earth named Linmou-tenwou, the ancestor and progenitor of the races of men, the first of the mikados. *SEE MIKADO*. Born upon earth, Linmou-tenwou was -of course mortal. His parents, especially the tender Izanami, trembled at the thought that she must one day close the eyes of her children, and yet continue to enjoy immortality herself. They therefore conferred upon their terrestrial offspring the gift of immortality, the power of mediation between the gods and man-made them immortal kamis, happy spirits, worthy of divine honors. This is the point where the Japanese commence their history, and hence their doctrine, that the spirits of human beings survive the body, and, according to the actions of the individual in life, receive reward or punishment. When a man's life has been distinguished for piety, for patriotism, or for good works, the Japanese deify him, after death, as a kami, and thus the number of these demigods has become indefinite. Some of these spirits preside specially over the elements and powers of nature.

The worship of these demigods or Kami is called *Kami-no-mitsi*, or "the way of the Kami." It possesses some features which are found in the religious observances of no other race. There are chapels dedicated to the several Kamis in all parts of the empire, but they are most numerous and celebrated in the southern islands. "These chapels are called *mias*. They are always built in the most picturesque localities, and especially where there is a grove of high trees. Sometimes a splendid avenue of pines or cedars conducts to the sacred place, which is always approached through one or more detached portals, called *tors*, like the pyle of the Egyptian temples. The chapel is usually set upon a hill, natural or artificial, buttressed with Cyclopean walls, and with a massive stone stairway leading to the top. At the foot of the stairs there is a small building containing a tank of water for ablutions. The chapel itself is usually small, and very simple in its plan, much resembling the native dwelling-house. Three sides are closed, and one is open to sun and air. The woodwork is kept scrupulously clean, and the floor is covered with the finest matting. The altar, which stands alone in the centre, is ornamented with a plain disk of metal, but no statues or symbolical figures are to be seen, and very rarely emblems of any kind. Nevertheless, there are sometimes stationed at the

head of the staircase, outside of the chapel, sitting figures resembling dogs and unicorns, which are said to represent the elements of water and fire. The interior is generally hung with strips or ribbons of colored paper, the exact significance of which is not yet clearly understood. The chapels are also ornamented by their pious votaries with colored lanterns, vases of perfume, and of flowers or evergreen branches, which are renewed as fast as they wither. At the foot of the altar there is a heavy chest with a metal grating, through which fall the pieces of money contributed: it is hardly necessary to say that the priest carries a key to the box. These mias were originally commemorative chapels, erected in honor of Japanese heroes, like that of Tell by the lake of the Four Forest Cantons. The prince of the province which had given birth to the hero, or where his deeds had been performed, took upon himself the charge of keeping the chapel in repair; there was no priest to officiate at the altar of the kami; no privileged caste interposed between the adorer and the object of his worship. The act of adoration, in fact, performed before the mirror (representing that bequeathed by the goddess Izanami to her children), passed beyond the guardian spirit of the chapel, and reached the supreme god above him. The chapel, therefore, was open to all; the worship was voluntary, and offered as the individual might choose, no ceremonial being prescribed. With the introduction of Buddhism; however, an important change took place. The new faith was sufficiently incorporated with the old to transfer the chapels to the special charge of the priests [called *Kami-nusi*, or 'ministers of the spirits'], and to introduce, in place of the voluntary, formless worship of the people, a system of processions, litanies, offerings, and even of miracle-working images. Indeed, almost the only difference between this system and the worship of the saints in Catholic countries lies in the circumstance that the priests who officiate only put on their surplices for the occasion, and become secular again when they leave the chapel" (Bayard Taylor's *Japan*, p. 255 sq., in the excellent collection of Scribner's *Library of Wonders, Travels*, etc., N. Y., 1872, 12mo). Compare Humbert, *Sojourn in Japan*, transl. in *Ladies' Repository*, March, 1870, p. 184 sq.; Macfarlane, *Japan* (London, 1852, 8vo), p. 204 sq.; Siebold, *Aippon*, i, 3 sq.; ii, 51; Kampfer, *Japan*, in Pinkerton, 7:672 sq.; Tylor, *Primitive Culture* (London, 1871, 2 vols. 8vo), vol. ii (see Index) (J. H.W.)

**Kammon.**

**SEE CUMIN.**

## Kampanton, Isaac Ben-Jacob,

a Jewish rabbi of some note, was born in Castile in 1360. Of his personal history but little is known. He was gaon of Castile, and is particularly noted for his contributions to Talmudical literature, and his influence, through his pupils, on Jewish literature of the 15th century in the Spanish peninsula. He died at Penjafiel in 1463. One of his most important works is *dwml th rkrd* (*Ways of the Talmud*, first published at Mantua in 1596), an introduction to the study of the Talmud (really a methodology). See Gratz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, 8:152; Jost, *Gesch. d. Judenthums*, 3:87; Fiirst, *Biblioth. Jud.* i, 140. (J. H.W.)

## Kamsin.

SEE SIMOOM.

## Kamtchatka,

a peninsula in the extreme northeast of Asia, occupied by the Russians from 1696 to 1706, extends between the seas of Kamtchatka and Ochotzk, from latitude 51° to 61° N.,-and contains 20,800 square miles, and about 4500 inhabitants, one third of whom are Russians. The former principal place, Nishnei Kamtschatk, on the mouth of the Kamtchatka River, has hardly 200 inhabitants. Petropaulovsk, the present capital, is the seat of a Russo-American trading company, and has a population of about 1000. Until 1856 Kamtchatka was a separate district; at present it constitutes the district Petropaulovsk, of the coast district of Eastern Siberia. The Kamtchadales inhabit, besides Kamtchatka, also a part of the Kurile Islands. They belong to the Mongolian race, are small. have thick heads, and flat, broad faces, and small eyes, which are frequently inflamed by the snow. Though baptized, the Kamtchadales are still addicted to Shamanism (q.v.), and, in particular, practice sorcery. They are fond of hunting and fishing, good-natured, and hospitable. (A. J. S.)

## Kana

(Heb. *hnqh rps*), the name of one of the later cabalistic works treating of the religious rites of the Jews, has attained considerable notoriety on account of its decided opposition not only to all the Jewish ritual, to Talmudical interpretation; and to the Talmud itself, but for its fierce attacks even against Biblical Judaism. Its authorship is undecided, but of late most



Jewish critics lean to the opinion that Kana and another cabalistic work entitled *Pelia* (**hayl p**, published at Kores in 1784, and often), an interpretation of the first book of the Law (Genesis), were written by one and the same person, and belong to a Spanish Jewish heretic of the 15th century or thereabout. Dr. Jellinek (*Bet-tHa-Midrash*, iii; Einl. p. 38 sq.) thinks both the production of an Italian or Greek Jew. See, for further details, Grilitz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, 8:230 sq., 458 sq. See also CABALA. (J. H.W.)

## Ka'nah

### Picture for Kanah

(Heb. *Kanah'*, **חנן**; *reedy*; Sept. **Κανό** v. r. **Κανθόν**), the name of two places in Palestine.

**1.** A stream (**l j nj** *torrent* or wady, q. d. "the brook of reeds," as in the marg.) that formed the boundary between Ephraim and Manasseh, from the Mediterranean eastward to the vicinity of Tappuah (<sup>(0668)</sup>Joshua 16:8); lying properly within the territory of Manasseh, although the towns on its southern bank were assigned to the tribe of Ephraim (<sup>(0679)</sup>Joshua 17:9; see Keil, *Comment.* ad loc. prior.). **SEE TRIBE.** Schwarz says it is to be still found in the equivalent Arabic name *Wady al-Kazah* (valley of reeds), that rises in a spring of the same name, *Ain al-Kazah*, one mile west of Shechem, and, after flowing westerly, acquiring a considerable breadth, and irrigating fields on its way, finally falls into the Mediterranean south of Caesarea (*Palestine*, p. 51). Other travellers, however, do not speak of such a stream unless it be the *Nahr el-Kezib* (river of reeds) .spoken of in the *Life of Saladin* (p. 191, 193) as existing between Caesarea and Arroplu (Arsuf), and supposed to be represented by the Nahr-Arsuf (otherwise el-Kassah) which enters the Mediterranean due west of Sebestieh (Samaria). Dr. Robinson, in his last visit to Palestine, discovered a *Wady Kanah*, south-west of Shechem, which he describes as originating in a spring of the same name in the; plain el-Mukhna (south of Nablus), and running between deep and rugged banks westerly to the plain bordering the Mediterranean, near Hableh, where it is wide. and cultivated, and bears a different name (*Researches*, new edit., 3:135); from which it appears that it joins the Nahr el-Aujeh, as laid down on his map. This however, is too southern a position for the stream in question; for it would wholly cut off Ephraim from the sea-coast, and confine its territory within very narrow limits (Thomson,

*Land and Book*, ii, 259). In the absence of more specific information respecting this region, we may conclude that the name ".Brook of Reeds" is a designation of the sedgy streams that constitute the *Nahr Falaik* (comp. the *Arundinetis*, between Casarea and Apollonia, spoken of by Schultens, *Vita Saladini*, p. 191, 193), perhaps including its middle branch, called Wady Mussin or Sileh (on Van de Velde's *Map*). Dr. Thomson (*ut sp.*) thinks it is the present *Abu Zabura*; but this, again, seems rather too far north.

**2.** A town in the northern part of Asher, not very far from its eastern border, mentioned in connection with Hammon and Zidon (<sup>1692</sup>Joshua 19:22). Dr. Robinson identifies it with *Kana*, a large village on the brow of a valley not far south-east of the site of Tyre (*Researches*, 3:384). So also Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 192), Van de Velde (*Memoir*, p. 327), and Porter (*Handbook for Palestine*, p. 325, 442). About a mile north of the place is a very ancient site, strewn with ruins, some of them of colossal proportions; and in: the side of a ravine not very far distant are some singular figures of men, women, and children cut on the face of a cliff (Thomson, *Land and Book*, i, 298). Tristram (*Land of Israel*, p. 58) regards them as Phoenician. **SEE INSCRIPTIONS.**

### Kandekumaraio

another name for the Hindu deity known as KARTIKEYA **SEE KARTIKEYA** (q.v.).

### Kaneh.

**SEE REED.**

### Kanne, Johann Arnold

a German mystic, was born at Detmold in 1773, and educated at the gymnasium of his native city. While but a youth he attempt-' ed the restoration of the exceedingly marred text of Varro, *De Lingua Latina*. He studied theology at the University of Gottingen, where the rational exegesis of Eichhorn nearly stifled all his religious belief. From Gott'ingen he went to Leipsic, thence as a teacher to Halle, and finally to Berlin. In 1805 he wrote at Wuurtemberg a work on the mythology of the Greeks (Weimar, 1805). His study of this subject led him to read the Old Testament, and ultimately resulted in the publication of *Die erste Urkunde*

*der Geschichte*, with a Preface by Jean Paul (1808, 2 vols. 8vo). During the war with the French he joined the Prussian army, but was captured by the French, from whom he soon escaped, and then entered the Austrian-army. But, prostrated by disease, he was several times confined in the hospital at Linz, when, through the efforts of Jean Paul and president Jacobi, he was dismissed from the service. On Jacobi's recommendation, in 1809 he was called to the chair of history in the College of Science at Nuremberg. His sufferings in the army seemed to have accelerated his previous -religious decline, and his works published after his appointment at Nuremberg give evidence of his leaning towards extreme rationalism. He wrote in this period *Pantheon der altesten Naturphilosophie oder die Religion der Volker* (1811): *System der Indischen Mythe oder Kronus und die Geschichte des Gottmenschen* (1813). He was, however, soon afterwards induced to renounce his antichristian views laid down in these books. He made an attempt to derive all languages from one primitive language in his *πάγλωσστον*, but his request to king Alexander to aid his philological undertaking received no hearing. In Nuremberg his moral and spiritual condition was for a long time a turmoil of conflicting emotions, but the reading of religious writings and elevated conversation with distinguished Christians brought about a spiritual regeneration. In 1818 he was called to the chair of Oriental literature in the University of Erlangen. Here he withdrew from all society, and lived in seclusion from the world, wholly absorbed in contemplative mysticism. Doubtless his papers would have afforded a clear view of the state of his soul, but, according to his friends, towards the close of his life he destroyed all documents relating to this subject. He died Dec. 17, 1824. His other religious works are: *Sammlung wahrer und erwecklicher Geschichten aus dem Reiche Christi und für dasselbe* (1815-17, 2 vols.; 1822, 3 vols.) :- *Leben, und aus dem Leben merkwürdiger und erweckter Christen* (1816, 17, 2 vols.) :- *Fortsetzung* (1824) :- *Romane aus der Christenwelt aller Zeiten* (1817) :- *Christus im A.T. or Untersuchungen über die Vorbilder und messianischen Stellen* (1818, 2 vols. 8vo) :- *Biblische Untersuchungen oder Auslegungen mit und ohne Polemik* (1819-20, 2 vols. 8vo). He edited also the following: *Auserlesene christliche Lieder* (Erlang. 1818) :- *Weissagungen u. Verheissungen der Kirche Christi auf die letzten Zeiten. der f eiden.* - *Katholische Real-Encyklop.* 5:1036.

## Kanon

is one of the names by which the official list or register of the Church is known. It is also frequently spoken of as **κατάλογος ἱερατικός**, *list of the priesthood*, and hence spiritual persons were denominated **κανονικοί**, *canonici*, and **οἱ τοῦ κανόνος**, *men of the canon*, because their names were entered in the list. The word **κανών** had also other significations. The assent of the catechumens to a summary of the leading articles of the Christian faith was required, and this creed was variously designated; sometimes **κανών**, *the rule*, sometimes **πίστις**, *the faith*, and *symbolum*, a badge or token (see Riddle, *Christian Antiquities*, s. y.). **SEE CANON.**

## Kanouse, Peter,

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Boonton, N. J., August 20, 1784, of German descent; was educated for the ministry under Drs. Armstrong and Richards, and was licensed and ordained in 1822. He successively preached at Suckasunna, N. J.; Newark, N. J.; Wantage, N. J.; Newark, N. J.; Poughkeepsie, N. Y.; again at Wantage, N.J., and then as a home missionary in Dane Co., Wisconsin. He died May 30, 1864. "He was an able and impressive preacher of the Gospel.. bearing the 'fruits of the Spirit,' and instrumental in the conversion of many souls."-Wilson, *Presbyterian Hist. Almanac*, 1866, . 216.

## Kansa,

in Hindu mythology, is the name of a king of the race of Bhoja-considered also a daemon (Kalanemi) in human shape, and notorious for his enmity towards the god Krishna, **SEE VISHNU**, by whom he was ultimately slain.

## Kant, Immanuel,

designated by De Maistre" the philosopher of nebulous memory," acquired enduring renown as the author of the *Critical Philosophy*, as the father of the recent German or transcendental speculation, and as the most acute and profound metaphysician of the closing 18th century. The importance of his philosophical career is evinced by his furnishing the link of connection between the schools of Leibnitz, Locke, Berkeley, and Hume, and those of Hegel, Schellilg, and Comte. He closes one great and brilliant era of metaphysical inquiry; he commences another with singular fulness of knowledge, breadth of comprehension, perspicacity of discernment, and

logical subtlety and precision. He exposed inveterate errors of procedure; he improved, sharpened, and refined the methods of investigation; he surveyed and plotted out the boundaries of metaphysical research; and he rendered more distinct and precise the nature of the inquiry, the subject with which it is concerned, and the instruments at our command for its investigation. These are inestimable services, the benefits of which are experienced even in the midst of the errors that have sprung from the system by which they were rendered.

*Life.* — Kant was born at Königsberg April 22, 1724, and spent his whole life there or in its immediate neighborhood, never having journeyed more than forty miles from his native place. He ended his tranquil life in the city of his birth, February 12, 1804. He was of Scotch origin. His father, John George Cant, removed from Tilsit, where his immigrant grandfather first settled, to Königsberg, and followed the saddler's trade with little worldly success. His pinched fortunes were ennobled by stern and unostentatious integrity. All accounts commemorate the high character, intelligence, and austere piety of Anna Regina Reuter, the philosopher's mother—virtues affectionately attested by her illustrious son, who ascribes all that was best in himself to her example and instructions, and to the purifying influences of his childhood's home. He lost his mother when he was eleven years of age, his father in his twenty-second year (1746). They lived long enough to, transmit to him the memory of their virtuous example—'twas all they had to bequeath. After receiving the first rudiments of education at the charitable schools of the city, he was sent to the Frederick College in 1734, at the expense of his uncle, a substantial shoemaker. Here he remained for seven years under the care of Dr. Schultz, an eminent adherent of Wolf, at the time when the Wolfian philosophy was a subject of acrimonious controversy. He devoted himself chiefly to the classics and mathematics, the essential foundation of all thorough instruction, and had Ruhnken for his fellow-student. From the *Collegium Fredericianum* he passed in 1740 to the University of Königsberg, and entered upon a course of theology; but his ill success in preaching discouraged him, and he attached himself to the mathematical and physical sciences, in the former' of which his first distinction was gained. During the latter period of his university career he supported himself by teaching in the humblest grades, in consequence of the increasing penury of his father, whose death in 1746 compelled him to withdraw from the university, and to seek a living from his own exertions alone. For the nine following years he was employed as a private teacher in

or near Königsberg, and finally in the noble family of Kayserling, by whom his merits were appreciated, and in whose society he acquired that polish of manner which distinguished him through life. He changed his family name of Cant to the more Germanic appellation Kant, but he did not thus divest himself of the Scotch characteristics of mind and morals. In the second year of his engagement in private tuition he published his first work, *Gedanken von der wahren Schätzung der lebendigen Kräfte* (*Thoughts on the true Measure of Living Forces*, 1747), which was esteemed a valuable contribution to the famous controversy on the subject. In 1754 he discussed the question proposed for a prize by the Berlin Academy, *Whether the Earth had undergone any change consequent upon its revolution upon its Axis*. This essay facilitated his acquisition of the master's degree, in the next year. At this time he returned to the university as *privat-docent*, and maintained an uninterrupted connection with it thenceforth till the closing years of his life. He inaugurated his lectures by the composition of two theses: the first, *De Igni*; the second, *Dissertatio de Principiis Primis Cognitionis Illuminatione*, which was the first manifestation of the direction of his mind to metaphysical inquiry, and also showed that he had fixed on the central point of all philosophy. While employed in private teaching he had diligently prosecuted his encyclopaedical studies, and had acquired the English language by his own exertions, in order to master the speculations of Locke, Berkeley, and Hume. Another kindred treatise belongs to this year—*Principiorum Primorum Cognitionis Metaphysicae Nova Dilucidatio*, as also his *Allgemeine Naturgeschichte und Theorie des Himmels* (*Universal Natural History and Theory of the Heavens*). The last work was issued anonymously, with a dedication to Frederick the Great. It is remarkable for its bold views, and for announcing the probable resolution of the nebulae into stars, and the probable discovery of new planets—scientific predictions fulfilled in much later years by Herschel and Leverrier. This production occasioned a correspondence with Lambert (1761), the singularly profound president of the Berlin Academy, who espoused similar opinions. For fifteen years (1755–1770) Kant lectured to private classes in the university. His courses treated "peene de omni scibili," but were marked by a special addition to the physical sciences, and, after 1757, to physical geography, a novel branch of knowledge which he continued to expound annually till the close of his academical career. A life so retired as Kant's, and so exclusively occupied with study and the duties of instruction, scarcely offers any events for biography beyond the development of opinions, the

publication of the treatises in which such opinions are set forth, and the academic distinctions attained. The chronicler finds little to report more exciting than Dr. Primrose's migrations "from the blue chamber to the brown," and hence is compelled to mark the critical *moments* of his career by the notice of the principal works as they appeared. Such indications, however, have a value of their own, as they reveal the growth of speculations which have moulded the intelligence of the world, and mark the times and modes in which the revolutions of thought have been effected. In 1762 appeared Kant's criticism of the Aristotelian logic, in a treatise entitled *Die falsche Spitzfindigkeit der vier syllogistischen Figuren* (*False Subtlety of the Syllogistic Figures*).

The censors of Aristotle have usually misapprehended Both his doctrines and his aims, and have imagined to be erroneous dogmas which the Stagyrite had meditated more profoundly, and had treated with a juster regard to practical convenience than themselves. In the course of the next year, 1763, Kant gave to the public his *Der einzig mögliche Beweissgrund zu einer Demonstration des Daseyns Gottes* (*Ontological Demonstration of the Being of God*), in which he repudiated alike the deductions *a priori* of Anselm, Des Cartes, and Clarke, and the inductions *a posteriori* of the natural theologians, and regarded the conception of the possibility of God as attesting the reality of his existence. This treatise still bears the impress of the dominant Wolfian philosophy, which he had imbibed from his early teacher Schultz. In this year he contended for the prize offered by the Berlin Academy, his treatise on the *Principles of Natural Theology and Morals* (*Untersuchung über die Deutlichkeit der Grundsätze der natürlichen Theologie und Moral*) receiving the second honors, while the first were adjudged to Moses Mendelssohn. Three years more elapsed before he received his first public appointment as underkeeper of the Royal Library, with the scant salary of fifty dollars., In this year he exposed the pretensions of Swedenborgianism, being always ready to assail new-fangled delusions, whether stimulated by enthusiasm or by imposture. At length, when approaching the end of his forty-seventh year, he was promoted to the chair of logic and metaphysics in his own university, with a stipend of three hundred dollars. He had suffered two previous disappointments. He had failed to obtain the professorship extraordinary of logic in 1756, and the ordinary professorship in 1758, and had declined the professorship of poetry in 1764, from distrust of his aptitudes and

acquirements. He had refused invitations from Erlangen and Jena, from reluctance to abandon his people and his native home.

Custom demanded an inaugural dissertation from the professor elect. Kant's subject was *De Mundi Sensibilis atque Intelligibilis Forma et Principiis*. This essay contained the first distinct anticipations of his characteristic system, though his philosophy did not receive form or coherent development for many ensuing years. The remainder of his life was, however, consecrated to its definite constitution and exposition. It early began to assume shape, for in 1772 he smoothed the way for a fuller discussion by his *Scheme of Transcendental Philosophy*. No desire of change, no temptation of worldly advancement and honor could seduce him from his calm lucubrations. He refused to go to Halle, though a double salary was offered him. After eleven years of patient meditation he produced in 1781 his *Critique of the Pure Reason* (*Kritik der reinen Vernunft*), which proclaimed a new philosophy, and ushered in a new cycle of speculation—*novus ordo sceclorum metaphysicorum*. The work was modified in a second edition in 1787, to obviate the imputation of idealism and idealistic infidelity objected to it as to the previous system of Wolf. It long seemed as if this remarkable production—a revolution itself, and the parent of revolutions—would never reach a second edition. For six years it lay so unheeded on the publisher's shelves that he contemplated disposing of it as waste paper, when a sudden demand relieved his anxieties, and rendered a republication expedient. This timely interest in the book was scarcely due to Kant's *Prolegomena to Metaphysics* (*Prolegomena zu einer jeden kunfigen Metaphysik, die als Wissenschaft wird auftreten können*, 1783), but may be attributed to striking notices of the doctrine in prominent German magazines. In 1785 the practical side of his system 'was exposed in his *Metaphysics of Ethics* (*Grundlegung zur Metaphysik der Sitten*), and in the following year its extension to physical speculation was attempted in his *Metaphysics of Natural Science* (*Metaphysische Anfangsgründe der Naturwissenschaft*). In 1788 the positive aspect of his philosophy was presented in the *Critique of the Practical Reason* (*Kritik der praktischen Vernunft*), which treats of the principles and objects of the moral law, and constructs ethics on the formula, Act so that your principle of action may serve as a universal law. The foundation is narrow, and has the cold rigidity of Stoical pretension, but it was a stern and strict rule in the conception of its propounder, and was borrowed from his own line of conduct, and from the austere virtues of his parental home, as much as



from the dictates of his reason. The defects of this canon will be indicated hereafter. The outline of the new philosophy was completed in 1790 by the *Critique of the Practical Judgment (Kritik der Urtheilskraft)*, which is in some respects the most satisfactory work of the series. It is designed to unite the practical with the theoretical reason, the freedom of the will with the law of existence, by regarding the whole order of creation as a system of means effectually adapted to the attainment of beneficent aims. It is thus a tractate of teleology or of final causes. It is principally occupied with the theory of the beautiful and the sublime, and is in great measure a development of the *Observations on the Beautiful and the Sublime (Beobachtungen uber das Gefühl des Schönen und Erhabenen, 1764)*, and the *Metaphysics of Ethics (1785)*.

Kant's metaphysics had thus been exhibited by himself in all its principal applications. It had attracted general notice; it had gathered around it numerous and enthusiastic disciples; it had secured for its author profound respect and earnest admiration. Distinguished men flocked to his lectures; princes and sovereigns commissioned learned scholars to hear his teachings and to report his doctrines. His life was surrounded with ease, and his days were crowned with honor. His salary had been increased, and had given what was wealth to one of his simple tastes and frugal habits. He had been twice appointed rector of the university. His industrious and meditative career had passed its grand climacteric, and was stretching serenely to its close. Just when the aims of life appeared to have been won, Kant was plunged into the only serious troubles which disturbed his tranquil existence. He became involved in a grave religious controversy by some articles in a Berlin magazine, afterwards reproduced in a volume under the title of *Religion within the Limits of Pure Reason (Die Religion inner halb der Grenzen der blossen Vernunft, 1793)*. There was a ferment in the religious circles of Germany at this time, and Kant's philosophy had early excited alarms which appeared now to be justified. A doctrine which rejected the accepted arguments for the being of God, the validity of revelation, the immortality of the soul, and the creation of the world, offended too many convictions, unsettled too many inveterate habits of thought, and substituted too shadowy and too abstract speculations for accredited precepts and dogmas, not to produce discontent and censure. Nor were the alarms entertained unreasonable, as was shown by the subsequent developments of the transcendental philosophy. The agitation excited by Kant's theological innovations was partially allayed by a royal

mandate directing him to observe silence on religious topics. The king's interference is supposed to have been induced by Kant's sympathies with the French Revolution, despite of the Reign of Terror. On the death of the king in 1797 he resumed his expositions, considering his engagement as a personal one with that monarch. But before this time he had narrowed the sphere of his activity. In 1794 he withdrew from general society; in 1795 he discontinued all his instructions except in logic and metaphysics, and he closed his academic labors altogether two years afterwards. In 1798 he composed his *Strife of the Faculties* (*Der Streit der Facultaten*), reviving the religious dispute in which he had been entangled; and he bade farewell to the public in his *Pragmatical View of Anthropology* (*Anthropologie in pragmatischer Hinsicht*). The last work from his own pen was a protest against Fichte's doctrine, which gave to the new philosophy the subjective or idealistic cast, against which his own efforts had always been strenuously directed. In this paper were manifested his own failing powers, and his incapacity to appreciate other systems than his own - a natural consequence of his habitual disregard of the history of speculation. His pupils published several other works from his notes and papers during the last years of his life. That life was not long extended after his retirement. His constitution gradually broke up; his health, so remarkably maintained, began to decline; appetite, teeth, strength, sight, voice, memory, all failed, and his pure, laborious, and honorable existence was terminated by an apoplectic attack, Feb. 12, 1804, when he had nearly completed his eightieth year. His death produced profound emotion throughout Germany. The whole city of Königsberg put on mourning; multitudes flocked to his funeral, and his remains were escorted to the grave by a solemn procession. A characteristic medal was struck to commemorate his fame. It bore an emblem and a motto appropriate to his doctrine, "Altius volantem cbercuit." He was worthy of such honor. He left to his countrymen the example of a career rich in wholesome fruits - simple, sincere, upright, laborious; devoted singly to the promotion of truth, and to the removal of error in the highest and most perilous regions of speculation, illustrated by seventy years of unbroken industry, and by half a century faithfully given to the instruction of successive generations of the young in various branches of learning, from the humblest rudiments of knowledge to the most recondite metaphysical research. Humble, modest, and true, his life was a nobler crown to his memory than all the honors that men could bestow.

In person, Kant was small and delicately built. His blue eyes expressed benevolence, but his features were rugged, and seamed with the lines of habitual thought. Lavater mistook his portrait for that of a noted highwayman. His manners were kindly and courteous. He was very genial in company, full of mirth and innocent wit, and scrupulously abstinent of learned or metaphysical discourse. As a lecturer he was easy and attractive, displaying nothing of the repulsive aridity and elaborate awkwardness of his philosophical treatises. He was a reverential observer of all truth, and rigid in the practice of all justice. The like precise propriety regulated all his habits. He was plain in his tastes, abstemious in eating and drinking, chary of indulgences, frugal in his expenditures, methodical in every arrangement. "Early to bed and early to rise" was the rule of his life. His hour for rising was four in summer and five in winter; for bed, ten in summer and nine in winter. By this regularity and moderation he reached fulness of years with health, cheerfulness, and perfect serenity. He seems to have been deficient in poetic sensibility and poetic imagination. To this defect may be ascribed several imperfections in the exposition of his philosophy, and his total want of religious sentiment. Shortly before his death he declared that he had no determinate notion of a future state, but was inclined to believe in metempsychosis. This was the flaw in his mental and moral constitution which produced many flaws in his speculation.

Like his illustrious contemporary Hume, whom he survived nearly thirty years, Kant was never married. He gave no "hostages to fortune," but illustrated Bacon's *dictum*, that "the best works, and of greatest merit for the public, have proceeded from unmarried or childless men." Of the works constituting Kant's bequest to posterity, the most noted and important are those that expound the "Critical Philosophy," and of this philosophy a brief notice remains to be given.

*Philosophy.* — Kant's scheme of speculation is so comprehensive, so extensive, so intricate, so systematic, so full of divisions and subdivisions, that it is impossible to attempt any complete summary of it within the limits allowed by this article. Not the fullest, but the most compact mode of exposition is required. Hence the notice of the numerous treatises not directly employed in the construction of the "Critical Philosophy" has been introduced into the biographical sketch. Hence, too, the reader who desires a formal outline of the system must be referred to some of the numerous synoptical views presented in German, French, English, and Latin. All that can be aimed at here will be to give a cursory account of the distinctive

peculiarities of Kant's scheme. To do this, it may suffice to explain his relation to previous philosophy, to point out his characteristic method, and to note the chief developments and applications of that method.

To show the exact relation of Kant to antecedent and contemporary modes of speculation would require a detailed account of the fortunes of philosophy from Bacon, and Gassendi, and Des Cartes. This is more than has been attempted by Rosenkranz. It must suffice to state that in the middle of the 18th century the Wolfian development and systematization of the philosophy of Leibnitz was predominant in Germany; the scepticism of Hume perplexed and alarmed Britain; and the materialism of D'Alembert, Diderot, and Condillac was fashionable in France. The philosophy of Leibnitz was an effort to escape the pantheistic tendencies of Cartesianism as evolved in the idealism of Spinoza and the theosophism of Malebranche. Hume's philosophy was the sceptical evolution of the sensationalism of Locke, generated by the collision between the *mechanicism* of Hartley and the Pyrrhonism of Berkeley. The infidel doctrine of the school of the French Encyclopaedia was the superficial deduction of the French intellectual anarchists from the partial appreciation of the tenets of Locke, whose own principles were vague and incoherent. The problem presented for solution was to find some ground of conciliation between all these divergent opinions, to detect and expose the fallacies on which they rested, to avoid the mischiefs caused or portended by them, and to discover a trustworthy and intelligible basis for human knowledge. The situation was in many respects analogous to that which characterized the Hellenic world at the time of Socrates. Kant undertook the investigation of this arduous and urgent problem, and, like Socrates, he proceeded by the critical investigation of the nature of knowledge and of the intellectual faculties of man. By this procedure he was gradually led to the determination of the conditions of the problem, and to the discovery of a solution partially true, and which appeared to himself complete and irrefragable. In metaphysics the method is the philosophy, and Kant's method gave to his system the appropriate name of the Critical Philosophy.

It must be remembered that Kant's early guide was Schultz, an earnest partisan of Wolf; that Kant proceeds from, the Wolfian, that is, from the methodical Leibnitzian School; 'that he slowly emerges from the Wolfian circle, and that Wolfian characteristics may be traced throughout the whole construction of his scheme.

The response made by Leibnitz to the th(sis of Locke -" Nihil est in intellectu quod non prius in sensu"-a dogma by no means Aristotle's, and only virtually Locke's -furnishes the key-note to the whole philosophy of Kant. "Nisi intellectus ipse," replied Leibnitz; thus distinguishing the faculty of thought from the impressions it receives, and offering a refutation at once of both the sceptical and the materialistic followers of Locke. The same just discernment may be found in Aristotle, though it has been little noticed (*Analyt. Post.* ii, xix). What was required was the discovery of some principle of intelligence, some interpretation of the process of human thought, which would withdraw the mind of man from the arbitrary government of a Providential compulsion, a blind necessity, or a mechanical regulation by material constitution or by external chance. Kant sought this principle in the constitution and limitations of the human mind. He analyzed the products and the processes of thought. He found that in every perception, in every judgment, in every generalization, the mind communicated, something of its own to what was presented as the object of knowledge; that in every apprehension, what was apprehended was moulded and determined by the intelligence which apprehended it. To use the language of the school, the form of knowledge was necessarily imposed by the constitution of the cognizant mind. This seems to have been the doctrine of Aristotle (τὴν ψυχὴν εἶναι τόπον εἰδῶν, *De Anim.* 3:iv), and was deduced from his teachings by his scholiast, Asclepius.

It was slowly that Kant reached this conclusion, which became very prolific in his hands. He tells us that it was due to the examination of Hume's denial of any *nexus* between cause and effect, which of course reduced the universe to a disconnected dream, and rendered all knowledge the mere aggregate of impressions fortuitously succeeding each other. He found that the same difficulty which -had been exposed by Hume in regard to cause and effect existed in the case of all synthetic judgments *a priori*, or those which unite two unconnected conceptions in one proposition. Truth was thus deprived of all validity, and experience became fallacy. How could a firm foundation be attained? Was experience as hollow, and spectral, and delusive as it had been represented by Hume? Three questions presented themselves for solution, each corresponding to a distinct branch of metaphysical inquiry: " What an I know?" "What ought I to do ?" "What may I hope for?" The answer to the first question; which was the investigation of the nature of knowledge and of the nature of the mind, was given in the *Critique of the Pure Reason*. The answer to the second, which

embraced the theory of duty, was propounded in the *Critique of the Practical Reason*. The answer to the third, which contemplated the *summum bonum* under a peculiar aspect, was presented in the *Critique of the Judgment*—a very ambiguous designation. This distinction of subjects and division of treatises sprung from the distribution of the matter of philosophy then prevalent in Germany. The distribution had itself descended from Aristotle (θεωρητικὴ γὰρ καὶ πρακτικὴ καὶ ποιητικὴ λέγεται scil. ἐπιστήμη. — *Top.* 6:6; comp. *Metaph.* 5:1; 11:7; 12:9).

(1) *The Critique of the Pure Reason* contains the essence of Kant's philosophy. It exhibits his method, illustrates his procedure, and presents his fundamental conclusions; The conception of the Pure Reason is in great measure his own, though both the name and what is denoted by the name are found in previous systems (Plotinus, *Ennead.* 5:3, 3; Leibnitz, *Theod.* § 1; *Nouv. Ess.* ii, 4:§ 3). The pure reason is reason in its essential constitution — ἐν δυνάμει, not ἐν ἐνεργείᾳ —the thinking faculty in its adaptation to thought—empty of the matter of thought, and distinct from its experiences. It is the mill without the grain which is to be ground by it. In analyzing the principle of thought, Kant detects an active as well' as a passive factor. In every act of thought there is the reception of the impression from the object of thought, and the subjective reaction thereby excited, which reaction communicates the rational form to the *conclusum*, and differentiates τὸ νοούμενον, the subject of thought, from τὸ φαινόμενον, the object of thought.

Kant distinguishes the agencies which supply the materials of knowledge into three—sense, understanding, reason. The distribution of the faculties of the mind is always hazardous, and often beguiling. The mind is one and complete. In the perceptions of sensation, the elements derived from the mind, and not from the impression, are space and time. Such elements are called *transcendental* because they transcend, precede, and formulate the experience. They are consequently the forms or conditions of sensations. They are not supplied by the sensation, but they are added to it by the mind in the act of perception. There are indications of this doctrine in Plotinus (*Ennead.* ii, 7,9), Leibnitz (*Nouv. Ess.* liv. ii, chap. v), and in other writers. It is intimated, indeed, by Aristotle, and is a natural deduction from the Ideas of Plato. It is singularly corroborated by recent expositions of the physiology of nervous action. In Kant's theory the phenomena of the external world are all subject to the conception of space, the phenomena of

the mind to the conception of time. The sensationalist is thus refuted, as space and time are not obtained from sensation. The dogmatic idealist is refuted, as the matter of knowledge must be supplied by external impressions.

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

|               | Logical                                   | Transcendental                       |
|---------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| I. Quantity   | Universal, Particular,<br>Singular        | Unity, Plurality,<br>Totality        |
| II. Quality   | Affirmative, Negative,<br>Indeterminate   | Reality, Negation,<br>Limitation     |
| III. Relation | Categorical, Hypothetical,<br>Disjunctive | Substance, Cause,<br>Reciprocity     |
| IV. Modality  | Problematical, Assertory,<br>Apodeictic   | Possibility, Existence,<br>Necessity |

All judgments are framed by the mind under the influence of these categories, four of them—one from each class—being inevitably applied. in every instance. As, however, things are thus seen, not as they are, but as the intellectual predispositions make them appear to be knowledge is purely relative to the human mind—objective truth is not attainable, and all

our experiences or knowledge have only a subjective validity. The mind cannot think except so far as it has been provoked by objective stimulation, therefore there is a real objective existence of things. It thinks under the control of the categories of the understanding, therefore knowledge is subjective in form, is moulded by the recipient mind, and cannot be known to correspond to the reality of things. The image is reflected from the mirror, but the object represented may be magnified or diminished, or strangely distorted by the character of the mirror, without being altered in itself. The image is all that constitutes-knowledge; there is, accordingly, no assurance of agreement between the image and the object. Thus all knowledge is conditional only-conditioned by the forms of the understanding, which mould it into the form in which it is received. Some principle was required to give coherence, unity, confidence to the relative knowledge obtained through such mental experiences. This was supposed to be given by the consciousness of personality which bounded, adunated, and harmonized all the qualified judgments that could be entertained.' It seems a misapprehension on the part of Kant, and at variance with his system, to claim any necessary truth for judgments formed in this manner. There can be nothing more than a relative or contingent necessity-an impossibility of thinking otherwise than the constitution of the mind necessitates.

In the highest region of the mind-the reason or the faculty of ideas — there is also subjection of the matter of knowledge to transcendental forms. But the functions of the reason pass beyond the limits of experience, and are only regulative. In this branch of the subject, which is designed to explain the combination of the judgments of the understanding into ratiocinative. conclusions, Kant introduces three *pure ideas*, which are deemed to be analogous to the three forms of the syllogism-categorical, hypothetical, and disjunctive. These ideas are,

1. Absolute unity, or simple being, the soul, which gives origin to *Rational Psychology*;
2. Absolute totality, the aggregate of phenomena in space and time, the world, which is the basis of *Cosmology*; and,
3. Absolute reality, supreme existence, the First Cause, which is the subject of *Theology*. From this point the later German schools diverge by ascribing a real and not simply a subjective validity to the forms of the absolute. With Kant they are merely postulates of reason, having no assured



objective existence. Rational psychology only exhibits the phenomena of mental consciousness without guaranteeing anything in regard to the essential nature of the mind or to the immortality of the soul. Rational cosmology is equally unable to attain to any positive knowledge in regard to the creation. It lands us finally in four pairs of transcendental ideas, each pair producing twin contradictions.

These are Kant's celebrated *antinomies*:

- 1.** In quantity, it may be proved that the world is both limited and unlimited;
- 2.** In quality, that its elements are ultimately simple and infinitely divisible;
- 3.** In relation, that it is caused by free action, and by an infinite series of mechanical causes;
- 4.** In modality, that it has an independent cause, and that it is composed of interdependent members. Whichever of these alternatives be asserted, it cannot be exclusively maintained, for it results in hopeless paralogsms. Both must be in some sense true, yet both cannot be simultaneously entertained, because they are contradictory. Hence no certainty, no complete comprehensive knowledge can be attained. Metaphysics is simply inquisitive, speculative, critical, showing the limitations of the human mind, and the impossibility of knowing the reality of things, but at the same time furnishing glimpses of a reality which the mind can not compass-of existence and truth beyond the range of finite comprehension. It is the confession, if not the demonstration of the intellectual weakness of man. The same negative result is reached in rational theology. The ontological argument for the being of God-that of Anselm and Des Cartes, derived from the notion of perfect and independent existence-the cosmological argument of Clarke, which proceeds from the conception of contingent to that of necessary being-and the physicotheological argument of the natural theologians, which infers a supreme intelligent Designer from the evidences of design in the creation, are all equally inconclusive. "Thus the soul, the world, and God are left by Kant's speculative philosophy as problems not only unsolved, but demonstrably unsolvable." To furnish a positive support for convictions on this subject indispensable for human guidance, and to give an authoritative rule for action, Kant constructed his ethical systems.

(2) *Critique of the Practical Reason*. — Neither the name nor the conception of the practical reason was a novelty; both occur in Aristotle (*De Anim.* 3:10; ὁ μὲν γὰρ θεωρητικὸς νοῦς οὐθὲν νοεῖ πρακτόν, *ibid.* c. ix). They are found in Aquinas (*Summn. Theol.* ii, 1, 90, and especially 91,3), in Roger Bacon (*Opus Majus*, p. 35, 44), and in most philosophers, medieval and modern, who have accepted the Aristotelian doctrine. Whatever systems have recognised a moral sense, whatever theories have admitted a sustaining and guiding illumination of the conscience, whatever schemes acknowledge the inworking spirit, and whatever expositions of the mysteries of man assume an abiding faith as the foundation of moral action, entertain substantially the same fundamental doctrine as Kant's, though it is differently expanded and applied by them. The characteristic feature of Kant's ethical system is what he terms the "*Categorical Imperative*." Speculative philosophy affords neither absolute truth nor certain guidance. Practical philosophy rests upon the enlightened conscience-enlightened by its own indwelling light. The "categorical imperative" is a rule of action—a moral law deriving its authority from itself-intuitively received determining action by the idea-governing by the rational form, not by the matter—thus advancing to the realm of the absolute, the unconditional, the *noumenal*, and passing from the shadows of speculation to the realities of action and duty. The formula of this "categorical imperative" is, Act so that your action may be applied as a universal rule. It is obvious that a precept so vague and so abstract may represent an essential characteristic or property of right conduct, but cannot be accepted as its principle. It is indefinite, and it wants the authority of sovereign command. It would require the omniscient comprehension of all contemporaneous relations, and all possible consequences for the regulation of every act, and at best would result in transcendental utilitarianism. It is too abstruse to be promptly and habitually applied to all the occurrences of life, and by all grades of men. It is limited to finite intelligences, and is sufficiently elastic to allow each one's ignorance or obtuse conscience to be alleged as the individual rule of right. It might easily be stretched so as to sanction the Donatist thesis, "Quicquid libet, licet." On such a scheme, to employ the expression of Lyly's Euphues, "*it is the disposition of the mind that altereth the nature of the thing.*" Our morals would be shifting and casuistical. The wish would continually be the father to the thought; and all enthusiasm, all fanaticism, all monomania might be presented as the canon of order. The conception of duty is the touchstone and stumbling-block of philosophy, and against it

is shattered every scheme which does not rest upon the acceptance of revelation, and the acknowledgment of God, in whom we live, and move, and have our being." There is no other mode of passing the chasm which separates the negative results of speculative inquiry from the positive requirements of practical action. Speculative philosophy discusses the boundaries of the mind; practical philosophy is concerned with actions which are infinite in their consequences, and whose effects "wander through eternity."

**(3) *The Critique of the Judgment (Urtheilskraft — Faculty of Judgment).***- This is the third of the systematic treatises devoted to the construction of the critical philosophy. The designation is infelicitous and ambiguous. The *Imagination* would be more appropriate, but would scarcely be applicable without some violence to the whole scope of the inquiry proposed. The department corresponds to the ἐπιστήμη ποιητική, or constructive science of the peripatetic distribution of knowledge and connects the domain of the pure with that of the practical reason. The imagination is the faculty of conciliation-of recreation-uniting in emotional delight the obligations of action with the highest discoveries of speculation. In Kant's critique of the judgment are included the doctrine of the beautiful and the sublime, or esthetics, and the doctrine of final causes, or teleology. His theory of beauty accords in substance with that of Plato, or rather that of Plotinus, but from his own singular defect of imagination, and consequent limitation of view, it is denied the completeness, splendor, and fulness of far-reaching suggestion which illustrate that magnificent exposition of the grandest and most recondite subject of metaphysical speculation. In beauty, Kant contemplates only the latent beneficent design, the harmony of means and ends, without dwelling upon the more significant conception of the primordial plan, the archetypal perfection, from which the whole creation has declined, but towards which man's ideal ever strives to return. The terms in which the doctrine is expounded are often confused and indistinct, but the essential principle of beauty, which is not in things, but in the mind, is the intuitive perception of the concord between the ideal perfection suggested and the order of the universe observed. The principle of the sublime is the intuition of the discrepancy between the finite powers of man and the infinite towards which he aspires, producing pain from the sense of limitation, but exaltation from yearning towards the limitless, beyond sense and conception, which is felt to be his natural home, his ultimate destination. In the discussion of teleology proper Kant en' deavors to

restore some efficacy to that reasoning from final causes which in earlier treatises he had repudiated. This part of the subject is inadequately unfolded, but it presents many vast and suggestive views, and in some sort prepares the way for the last of Kant's treatises which can be specially noticed here.

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

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

*Literature.*-The bibliography of Kant's philosophy would make the catalogue of an extensive library, and would include nearly everything in

the highest branches of metaphysics which has appeared since the publication of the Critique of Pure Reason. In all the general histories of modern speculation, much space is of course conceded to this subject. The following treatises may be examined with advantage. Kant, *Werke*, of course. The best editions are that of Hartenstein (Leipzig, 1838-9, 10 vols.), and that of Rozenkranz and Schubert (Leipzig, 1840-42, 11 vols.), including a full biography of the philosopher by Schubert, and an elaborate appreciation of the relations and influences of the philosophy by Rosenkranz. It gives also a chronological catalogue of Kant's multifarious writings. Recent translations into English are those of his *Critik of Pure Reason*, by Hayward (Lond. 1848, 8vo), and by Meiklejohn (Lond. 1856, 8vo); of his *Metaphysics of Ethics*, by Semple (Lond. 1856, 8vo); of his *Theory of Religion*, by the same (Lond. 1858, 8vo). There are biographies by Borowsky (1804 : this was revised by Kant); by Wasiansky, his private secretary, giving an account of his last years (1804); by Jachmann (1804); by Hasse (1804); and the ablest by Kunotischen of Jena (1860). For the appreciation of the doctrine the following works may be consulted: Nitzsch, *General and Introductory View* (Lond. 1796); Schmidt-Phiseldek, *Expositio Philosoph. Crit.* (Hafn. 1796); Mellin, *Encyclop. Dict. of the Kantian Philosophy* (1797, 6 vols.); Willich, *Elements of the Critical Philosophy* (London, 1798); Villers, *Philosophie de Kant* (Metz, 1801); Degerando, *Hist. Comp. de Philosophie* (Paris, 1804); Wirgman, *Principles of the Kantesian Philosophy* (London, 1824—a recomposition of an able article contributed to the *Encyclopaedia Londinensis* in 1812); Cousin, *Legons sur la Philosophie de Kant* (Paris, 1842; translated by A. G. Henderson, Lond. 1871, 8vo); Murdoch, *Sketches of Modern Philosophy* (1842); Barchou de Penhon, *Hist. de la Phil. Allemande depuis Leibnitz jusqu'a Higel* (Paris, 1837, 2 vols.); Erdmann, *Gesch. der neueren Philosophie*; Michelet, *Geschichte des letzten Systems*; Willm, *Histoire de la Philosophie Allemande* (Paris, 1847, 4 vols.); Morell, *Philosophy of the 19th Century* (1848); Chalybseus, *Histor. Entwicklung d. spekulativen Philosophie von Kant his Hegel* (4th edit. Leipz. 1848); E. Remhold, *Gesch. d. Philos.* (4th ed. Jena, 1854), vol. iii; Lewes, *History Philos.* (3d ed. 1871, 2 vols. 8vo), vol. ii; Hurst's Hagenbach, *Church Hist. 18th and 19th Cent.* (N. York, 1870, 2 vols. 8vo), lect. 4: sq.; Farrar, *Crit. Hist. of Free Thought*. Very instructive notices of Kant and his philosophy are contained in the *North British Review*, vol. 10: the *Encyclopedica Britannica*, and in Appleton's *American Cyclopedica*. The criticisms of

Dugald Stewart in the *Supplement to the Encyclop. Britannica* are wholly unsatisfactory. (G. F. H.)

### Kantoplatonism

the French term for a new mode of philosophizing which inclines to *Idealism* (q.v.). The Kantoplatonists are considered an offspring of the Platonic and Kantian schools of philosophy. The representative of Kantoplatonism is Cousin (q.v.).

### Kanute.

*SEE DENMARK.*

### Kaphar.

*SEE KEPHAR.*

### Kapharnaites.

*SEE LORDS SUPPER; SEE TRANSUBSTANTIATION.*

### Kapila

the reputed author of the *Sankhya* (q.v.), one of the philosophical systems of the Hindus. As to the origin of Kapila, Hindu tradition is rather vague. Among his followers he is by some described as a son of Brahma, and by others, especially his later followers, as an incarnation of Vishnu. He is also recounted to have been born as the son of Devahiti, and, again, is identified with one of the agnis or fires. Finally, it is said that there existed, in fact, two Kapilas—the first an embodiment of Vishnu; the other, the igneous principle in human disguise. The probability is that Kapila was simply, like the great majority of his educated countrymen, a Brahman. Spence Hardy (*Manual of Buddhism*, p. 132) quotes a legend by which it may be shown that the Hindus regarded Buddha as a later existence of our Kapila, and that therefore Buddhism is the Sankhya philosophy modified; but professor Max Müller rejects this theory, and says that he has looked in vain for any similarities between the system of Kapila, as known to us in the Sankhya-satras, and the Abhidharma, or the metaphysics of the Buddhists. He adds, however, that if any similarity of the two systems could be established, such proofs would be very valuable. "They would probably enable us to decide whether Buddha borrowed from Kapila, or Kapila from Buddha,

and thus determine the real chronology of the philosophical literature, of India, as either prior or subsequent to the Buddhist sera." See Professor J. E. Hall, *Bibliotheca Indica, Sankhyapr.* p. 14 sq.; Ballantyne, *Lecture on the Sankhya Philosophy* [Mirzapore, 1850]; Hardwick, *Christ and other Masters*, i, 208 sq.; Max Muller, *Chips from a German Workshop*, i, 223 sq. *SEE SANKHYA.*

### Kapitorists,

a sect of the Russian Church. *SEE RUSSIAN CHURCH.*

### Karaites

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

*Origin.* — Up to our own day it has been impossible to determine the age in which the Karaites originated; certain it is that they existed before the 8th century, to which their origin was formerly assigned. The Karaites themselves claim to be the remains of the ten tribes led captive by Shalmaneser. The Rabbins (e.g. Aben Ezra, Maimonides, etc.) unjustly assert that this sect is identical with the Sadducees (comp. Rule, *Karaites*, p. viii), and that they were originated by Ahnan (about A.D. 640), because the latter was ignored in the election of a new *Resh-Gelutha* (q.v.); but the investigations of our day lead us to believe that the Karaites must have originated immediately after the return of the Jews from Babylonian captivity, although they did not organize into a distinct sect until after the collection of oral tradition, and that for this, and no other reason, we find no mention of them as such in the New-Test. writings, nor in those of Josephus and Philo. Upon the completion of the Talmud it is well known that a great agitation prevailed in the Jewish community, especially in the western synagogues, and particularly at Constantinople, where, on the ides of February, A.D. 529, Justinian was obliged to interfere, and actually prohibited the reading of the Mishna in the synagogue. In the conversion of the Khazars (q.v.) to Judaism, the Karaites, as we learn from the Sepher Chozri, *SEE JUDAH HALEVI*, already appear as a distinct sect. From inscriptions collected and examined by Abraham Firkovitch, the celebrated Russian Jew, within the last twenty years, there are indications that in the

Crimea at least Karaites may have flourished as early as the first half of the 4th century (compare Rule, p. 83; N. Y. *Nation*, June 7, 1866). The external unity, however, of the Jewish Church was not broken apparently until the time of Ahnan ben-David. It is true, even in the days of Christ, the internal peace of the Jewish fold was much disturbed; synagogues differed greatly from each other, but ostensibly these differences were provoked only by ignorance of the Hebrew, and the introduction of Greek and other foreign idioms; on doctrines and discipline there seemed to reign universal harmony. Not so after the publication of the Talmud. There were many who inclined to pay strict deference only to the inspired writings of the O.T.; and when, in the middle of the 8th century, a Luther in the form of Ahnan ben-David arose in the Jewish midst and declared his opposition to the Rabbinites, a party was formed in his favor at Jerusalem itself, which soon extended throughout Palestine, and even far away through all the East, as well as towards the West. The personal history of this great Jewish reformer is rather obscured by the fables of Arabs, and the calumnies of some Rabbinites; and it remains to be settled whether, as the Karaites assert, he was born at Beth-tsur, near Jerusalem (and of the lineage of king David), or in Beth-tsur (Bazra) on the Tigris, and consequently imbibed his reformatory notions from the Arabian or Persian dissenters from Mohammedanism known as *Mutazilites* (q.v.). Certain it is, however, 'that at the time of the election of a new *Resh-Gelutha* Ahnan must have enjoyed some distinction, or he could never have presented claims for the office of "leader in Israel." In the year 761 we find him at Jerusalem in a synagogue of his own, expounding the new doctrine, and, after kindling great enthusiasm among a host of disciples who had quickly gathered about him, sending forth from this centre of Judaism "letters of admonition instruction, and encouragement to distant congregations, with zealous preachers who proclaimed everywhere the supreme authority of the Law, and the worthlessness of all that, in the Talmud or any other writings, was contrary to the law of Moses" (comp. Pinsker, *Likute Kadmonioth*, or *Zur Geschichte u. Liter. des Karaismus*, Append. p. 33 and 90). Ahnan died in 765, yet within that astonishingly brief period the Karaites had spread over Palestine, Egypt, Greece, Barbary, Spain, Syria, Tartary, Byzantium, Fez, Morocco, and even to the ranges of the Atlas, and by all the Karaites in these distant lands his death was mourned as the loss of a second Moses. Under Rabbi Salomon .ben-Jerukhim (born in 885) they prospered greatly in the 9th century, and even up to the 14th they seem to have increased, but thereafter their condition becomes obscure, and light first again breaks



upon the Karaites' history with the opening of the present century (see below).

The reason why so little is yet known about the Karaites is that their writings are not generally accessible. Towards the close of the 17th century Protestant theologians interested themselves in their behalf, and in 1690 Peringer (then professor of Hebrew at the university at Upsala) was sent to Poland by the king of Sweden to make inquiries into their history. In 1698 Jacob Trigland (professor at Leyden) went thither for the same purpose, and the results of his investigations, which remain of great value to this day, were published in the *Thesaurus of Sacred Oriental Antiquities*. Trigland says that he had learned enough to speak of them with assurance. He asserts that, soon after the prophets had ceased, the Jews became divided on the subject of works and supererogation, some maintaining their necessity from tradition, whilst others, keeping close to the written law, set them aside, and that, thus Karaism commenced. He adds that, after the return from the Babylonian captivity, on the re-establishment of the observance of the law there were several practices found proper for that end, and' these, being once introduced, were looked upon as essential, and as appointed by Moses. This was the origin of Pharisaism, while a contrary party, who continued to adhere to the letter, founded Karaism. Wolfius, the great Hebrew bibliographer, depending on the *Memoirs of Mardachai ben-Nissan*, a learned Karaite (published by Wolf under the title of *Notitia Kareorum*, Hamburg and Leipzig, 1714, 4to), refers their origin to a massacre among the Jewish doctors under Alexander Janneus, their king, about a hundred years before Christ, because Simon, son of Shetach, and the queen's brother, making his escape into Egypt, there forged his pretended traditions, and, on his return to Jerusalem, published his visions, interpolating the law after his own fancy, and supporting his novelties from the notices which God, he said, had communicated by the mouth of Moses, whose depositary he was. He gained many followers, and was opposed by others, who maintained that all which God had revealed to Moses was written. Hence the Jews became divided into two sects, the Karaites and Traditionists. Among the first, Juda, son of Tabbai, distinguished himself; among the latter, Hillel (q.v.). In later history he agrees with what has been said above. It remains only to be stated that Wolfius reckons not only the Sadducees, but also the Scribes, in the number of Karaites. But such a classification is wholly inconsistent with our present knowledge of the Sadducees and the Scribes. Karaism cannot be regarded as in any sense a

product of Sadduceeism; the two are the opposites both in principle and tendency, or, as Rule has it, " Sadduceeism and Karaism are just as contrary the one to the other as unbelief and faith."

*Doctrines and Usages.* — Although the Karaites are decidedly opposed to assigning any authority to tradition, they by no means reject altogether the use of the Talmud, etc. Quite to the contrary, they gladly accept any light that they can get in their investigation of the O.T. Scriptures, but it is only as exegetical aids that they are ready to accept Jewish traditionary writings. Selden, who is very express on this point, observes, in his *Uxor Hebraica*, that besides the mere text, they have also certain interpretations which they call hereditary, and which they consider proper traditions. Their theology seems to differ only from that of the Rabbinites in being purer and free from superstition, as they give no credit to the explications of the Cabalists, chimerical allegories, nor to any constitutions of the Talmud. In short, they accept only what is conformable to Scripture, and may be drawn from it by just and necessary consequences. The Karaites, in distinction from the Rabbinites, have their own Confession of Faith, which consists of ten articles. They are (as translated by Rule, p. 128) as follows:

- 1.** That all this bodily (or material) existence, that is to say, the spheres and all that is in them, is created.
- 2.** That they have a Creator, and the Creator has his own soul (or spirit).
- 3.** That he has no similitude, and he is one, separate from all.
- 4.** That he sent Moses, our master (upon whom be peace !).
- 5.** That he sent with Moses, our master, his law, which is perfect;
- 6.** For the instruction of the faithful, the language of our law, and the interpretation, that is to say, the reading (or text), and the division (or vowel pointing).
- 7.** That the blessed God sent forth the other prophets.
- 8.** That God (blessed be his name!) will raise the sons of men to life in the day of judgment.
- 9.** That the blessed God giveth to man according to his ways, and according to the fruit of his doings.

**10.** That the blessed God has not reprobated the men of the captivity, but they are under the chastisements of God, and it is every day right that they should obtain his salvation by the hands of Messiah, the Son of David.

A comparison of this confession with the thirteen articles of the Rabbinites *SEE JUDAISM*, makes it evident that the Karaitic confession was framed later than that of the Rabbinites, with intent to put in bold relief the peculiar doctrines of Karaism. Prayer, fasting, and pilgrimages to Hebron (evidently inspired by the Mohammedan pilgrimage to Mecca) are points of religious practice to which they pay particular attention. They are eminently moralists (revering greatly Leviticus 19 and 20), very conscientious in their dealings with their fellow-men, temperate and simple in food and dress, although far from being ascetics. In distinction from the Rabbinites, they make the heads of their phylacteries round instead of square, and their prohibition of marriage among persons of affinity extends to degrees almost of infinity. Instead of facing their synagogues towards the east, as do the Rabbinites, they face them north and south, arguing that Shalmaneser brought them northward, so that in praying they must turn to the south in order to face Jerusalem.

*Number and Present Condition.* — The number of the present adherents to Karaism has been variously estimated; nothing, however, can be definitely or even approximately given until more shall be known of the Jews of Asia. They are strongest, according to modern accounts, in the Crimea, where there are over 4000 of them; but, with Rule (p. 112), we believe that there are many Jews, ostensibly adherents of the Rabbinites, who are truly believers in Karaism; certainly the Reformed schools of Judaism are nothing else than *Rationalistic Karaites*.

Under the Russian and Austrian governments the Karaites enjoy greater privileges than the Rabbinites; in many respects they are on an equality with the adherents to the state religion of these respective countries. Fortunately for the Rabbinites, however, it is not any want of morality in them, but the excesses of the *Chasidim* (q.v.) who belong to their number, that has deprived them of the favors which are so freely bestowed on the Karaites. Strangely enough, the Karaites contend that the Messiah will issue from their tribe, and that their princes were once the sovereigns of Egypt.

*Literature.* — The Karaites have, ever since the days of Ahnan, produced writers of great excellence and distinction. Unfortunately, we have thus far

succeeded in wresting from oblivion, comparatively speaking, only a few works, but these evince that Karaism has not failed to be active in urging its adherents to literary activity. They have produced an extensive special Hebrew literature of their own, chiefly consisting of works on theology, philosophy, mathematics, astronomy, etc. The greatest number of these are deposited in the Imperial Library at St. Petersburg. So long as they lived principally under Mohammedan rule they wrote in *Arabic*, but when they unfolded a -literary activity in the Crimea and among the Tartars they originated a language peculiar to themselves—a mixture of Tartar and Turkish. Some of their principal later authors are little known to us, e.g. Joseph b. Noah, Jeshua, Jehudah Hadassi, Aron b.-Joseph, Aron b.-Elijah, the celebrated opponent of Moses Maimonides; Eliah Beshitzi, Kaleb, Moses Beshizi, Mardochai b.-Nissan, Salomo b.-Abram Traki, Simcha b.-Isaac b.-Moses, etc.

See Furst, *Gesch. d. Karderthums* (Leipz. 1869, 5 vols. 8vo).; Beer, *Gesch. d. judisch. Sekten*, vol. i (Leipz. 1822, 8vo); Jost, *Gesch. d. Judenthums*, vol. ii (see Index in vol. iii); Gratz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, ii, 497 sq., and later volumes; and the compendium of Rule, *History of the Karaite Jews* (Lond. 1870, 8vo). (J. H. W.)

## Kare'ah

(Heb. *Kare'dch*, **קרע**; *bald*; Sept. **Κάρης** v. r. **Καριέ** or **Καρπέ**; in <sup>1273</sup>2 Kings 25:23, **Καριέ** v. r. **Καρήθ**, Auth. Vers. Careah?), the father of Johanan and Jonathan, who attached themselves for a time to the loyal party under Gedaliah, the Babylonian governor of Jerusalem (Jeremiah xl, 8, 13, 15, 16; 41:11, 13 14 16; xlii, 1, 8; xliii, 2, 4, 5). B.C. ante 588.

## Karena

(also *Carena*, *Quarena*, *Carentana*) is the .name of an ecclesiastical fast formerly observed in the Roman Catholic Church, forty days in length, and was generally imposed by bishops or monastic authorities for various venial sins. The Karenist was confined to bread and water, and deprived of all other temporal conveniences and enjoyments, as well as all association with the world. See Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lex. iii*, 689.

## Karens,

the name of a people of India, occupying various portions of Burmah between 280 and 10° N. latitude, and 990 and 930 E. longitude. The name *Karen* is of Burmese origin, and designates a class of the Mongolian family of tribes who call themselves *Pgah Kenzau*, a term meaning *man*. They first became known to Europeans in A.D. 1824-7. They appear to be identical with the *Kakhyens*, which Kincaid thinks to be only another name for Karen. He says that all these tribes, through the whole extent of the Shan country, and farther north, are called Kakhyens. They are found from the Martaban Gulf inward as far as the Burman population has ever extended. They are numerous about Rangoon and Ava, and are known to extend at least two hundred and fifty miles east of Ava. These tribes are supposed to number about five millions.

*Origin.* — There is much doubt as to their origin. There are amongst them many distinct traditions which would point to a Thibetan source. Mason (in his *Tennasserin*) says that they regard themselves as wanderers from the north, and as having crossed "a river of running sand," by which name he says Fa Hian, the Chinese pilgrim who visited India about the 5th century, constantly speaks of the great desert to the north of Burmah, and between China and Thibet. Bruce says that they are of Turanian stock, and allied with the Tamulians of India and the inhabitants of Thibet (p. 145, 147). A portion of northern Burmah and Yunnan has been suggested as the probable original seat of the Karen race. Many authorities consider them as the aborigines of much of Burmah. Amongst the reasons assigned for this view are the following:

- (1) They received from the Burmese their name of *Karen*, which *means first* or aboriginal.
- (2) Their habits are much more primitive than those of the Burmese, and they dislike their subjugation to the latter.
- (3) They have traditions distinctly fixing their early location on the eastern side of a body of water which they call *Kaw* or *Kho*, which is so ancient a term that they have lost the meaning of it altogether, but the tradition itself shows that this was the Bay of Bengal.
- (4) **The Moans** or Talaings, a people who are older residents than the Burmese in Farther India, say the Karens were in the country when

they first entered it, and were known as Beloos or wild men by their forefathers (*Journ. American Oriental Society*, vol. iv).

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

It is the southern section of these tribes, however, which is best known, especially those designated as *Sgau* and *Pgho* Karens. The latter are called by the Burmese *Talaing Karens*, and are a vigorous people, robust, full-chested, with large limbs, square cheek-bones, thick and flattened nose, but not specially prominent lips. The *Sgau*, or pure Karens, are smaller, with a complexion lighter than others surrounding them, and with a general languor about their movements. Mr. Judson in 1833 wrote of them as "a meek, peaceful race, simple and credulous, with many of the softer virtues and few flagrant vices, greatly addicted to drunkenness, extremely filthy, indolent in their habits, their morals in other respects being superior to many more civilized races, though he was told that they were as untamable as the wild cow of the mountains" (Wayland, *Judson*, i, 542 sq.).

*Religious Traditions.* — They have amongst them a great number of religious traditions which bear a marked analogy to Biblical history. The tradition respecting the creation specifies that man was created from the earth, and woman from one of man's ribs. The Creator said, "I lose these, my son and daughter. I will bestow my life upon them," and he then breathed a particle of his life into their nostrils, "and they came to life and were men." God made food and drink; rice, fire, and water; cattle, elephants, and birds. Traditions concerning man's primitive state and first transgression, very similar to the Bible narrative, are also preserved amongst them. *Naukplau*, who answers to the serpent of Genesis, is variously impersonated as sometimes male and sometimes female: man is located in a garden, with seven different kinds of fruits of which he should eat, with one exception. *Nauk'plau* meets him and tells him the character of all the fruits, and assures him that the forbidden one is the most delicious of all. He prevails on the woman first to taste this fruit. She gives it to her

husband, etc. On the morrow Ywah (on this name, see below, under *Religious Views*) comes, etc. The very detail of the narrative is preserved to a marvellous degree.

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

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

*Spirit Worship.* — Besides the Ywah and the daemons above alluded to, they believe in many other spiritual beings known as *Kelah*, or, speaking more definitely, every object has a *kelah*, whether men, trees, or plants, and even inanimate objects, such as axes and knives. The grain growing has its *kelah*, and when it does not flourish it is because the *kelah* is leaving it, and it must be called back by invocation. The human *kelah* is not the soul, nor

is the responsibility of human actions lodged in it, nor any moral character attached to it. All this is attributed to the Thah. The kelah is the author of dreams; it is that nature which pertains to life, the sentient soul, the animal spirits. It can leave the body at will. When it is absent disease ensues; when yet longer away, death results. Kelah seems to signify *lift*, or existence in the abstract, or of the individual. It is more apt to forsake feeble persons and children. The kelah of one person may accompany that of another in going away, hence children are kept away from a corpse, and the house where a person dies is abandoned. Great efforts are made to induce a departed kelah to return. Tempting food is placed on the public wayside or in the forest, and various ceremonies and rituals are gone through, which sometimes are thought to be successful in securing the return of the kelah. One might almost wonder that its return should be considered desirable when we are further told that the kelah has seven separate existences in one, which endeavor to superinduce madness, recklessness, shamelessness, drinking propensities, anger, cruelty, violence, murder, and are constantly bent on evil. But along with the kelah we learn of *Tso*, which means *power*, and seems to be a personification of *reason*. If the tso becomes heedless or weak; or is unfortunately circumstanced, then the kelah can do mischief, but otherwise it is powerless for evil.

There are other spiritual beings, such as *Kepho*, a species of vampire, which is the stomach of a wizard, and in the form of the head and entrails of a human being goes out at night to seek food. It destroys human kelahs. *Therets* are spirits of those who have died by violence, as by tigers or other wild beasts, by famine, or sword, or starvation. These can neither go to the upper region (Mukhah), nor to that of the Plu, where men are punished, but must remain on earth, causing mortal sickness. Offerings and supplications are made to them. *Tahmus* or *Tah-kas* are spectres of those who have been dreadfully wicked in this life. They appear as apparitions only, in form of horses, elephants, dogs, crocodiles, serpents, vultures, ducks, or colossal men. *Sekhahs* are spirits of persons left unburied, and of infants or aged persons who have become infirm because the tso has left them. *Plupho* are inhabitants of the infernal region, and are spirits; of all who go naturally to their proper place, and renew their earthly employments, building houses, cutting rice, etc. The location is undeclared, but is above the earth, or below it, or beyond the horizon. It is presided over by king Cootay or Theedo. At his call the kelahs must go, and men die.. Under his dominion they serve, as in an intermediate state, a



probation, and if good go to heaven, if bad to hell or Lerah, which has two gradations of punishment, one being more severe than the other. *Tahnahs* or *Nahs* are the spirits of two sorts of fiends which take the form of any animals they please, and prey upon men. The Lord of men created them as a punishment in consequence of a disobedience on the part of men to one of his commands. They have a king who was the great tempter of man in the garden. *Miikhahs* are the ancestors of the Karens who inhabit the upper region, and are the creators of the present generation. Sometimes they work imperfectly, and, as a consequence, ill-favored, and imperfect persons are found. They preside over births and marriages, mingling together the blood of two persons. They are worshipped with offerings. The *Kelepho* create the winds; the *Tah Yoorniu* cause eclipses; the *Cooda and Lauphoo* preside over the wet and dry seasons.

*Priesthood.* — There are amongst the Karens a class of people who serve as prophets, and assume conditions of mind and body much like those affected by the "medicine-men" amongst North American Indians. What with writhing of the body, rolling on the ground, foaming at the mouth, etc., they are presumed to attain a state of clairvoyance favorable to the prediction of coming events. The prophecies uttered by these which are retained in tradition mostly pertain to the deliverance of the Karens from the oppression of the Burmese. These prophets are of two classes. The *wees* compose ballads and other poetry, and have great power in calling back departed kelahs. The other class are known as *bookhos*, and are rather priests than prophets, taking the lead in the religious ceremonies of the people, instructing them in their religious obligations, and are a more respectable class, being heads of communities, though not hereditary chiefs.

*Missions.* — Missionary work was commenced amongst these tribes about 1828, by Messrs. Boardman and Judson, who were succeeded by Messrs. Wade, Mason, and Kincaid. Twenty-five years after that the Karen apostle Ko-thau-Bu, a native convert, met with wonderful success amongst these people. Associated prominently with this great movement was Rev. Mr. Vinton, who "in six years planted forty churches, opened forty-two houses of worship and thirty-two school-houses, and saw between eight and nine thousand Karens raised to the level of Christian worshippers. In 1852 alone he received five hundred Karens into the Church. In 1868 the Baptist Mission report showed that they had amongst this people sixty-six native ordained pastors and evangelists; three hundred and forty-six native

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

*Literature.* — *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, vol. iv; Wayland, *Life of Judson*; Brace, *Races of the Old World*; Whitney, *Language and the Study of Language*; Latham, *Elements of Comparative Philology*; Anderson, *Foreign Missions* (N. Y. 1869); Mullen, *Ten Years of Missionary Work in India*; Mrs. Mason, *Civilizing Mountain Men, or Sketches of Mission Work among the Karens* (1862); Mrs. Wylie, *Gospel in Burmah*. For a full history of the mission work amongst the Karens, see Mason, *Gospel in Burmah; Report of American Baptist Mission Union for 1868*. A comparative vocabulary of the Sgau and Pwo dialects of the Karen language, by the Rev. Dr. Nathan Brown, Baptist missionary, now of New York City, may be found in the *Jour. of the American Oriental Society*, vol. iv. **SEE BURMAH** (II. *Missions*). (J. T. G.)

### Kare-Patrepandaron

the name of a class of Hindu ascetics, beggars of the Brahminic order, who have vowed eternal silence. Wholly naked, with only a sacred string, generally a snake's skin, over their shoulders, they make their home under large shade-trees. When they enter a house they manifest their presence by the clapping of their hands, and generally share with the inmates the best of their dainties, for a Brahmin considers himself highly honored by such a visit.-Vollmer, *Worterb. d. Mythol.* p. 1020.

### Karg, Georg

(the "*Parsimonious*"), a German theologian, was born at Heroldingen in 1512. In 1538 he was ordained for the ministry by Melancthon, and became pastor first at Oettingen, later at Schwabach; and finally, in 1553, settled at Anspach, and became general superintendent of the churches of the duchy of Baireuth. He died in 1576. Karg acquired great notoriety during the difficulties concerning the *Formula Concordice* by maintaining that it was only by passive obedience that Christ made atonement for us:

for active obedience (*obedientia activa*) he was bound to give as man; the law binds - us either to obedience or to punishment, but not to both together. Christ, while suffering the punishment for us, rendered obedience on his own account. What he has paid remains no longer for us to pay (i.e. the punishment); obedience, however, we are bound to render, as he rendered his, in order to be a pure and perfect offering unto God. **SEE IMPUTATION.** He defended these opinions in 1563, but, as they provoked a great controversy, he finally retracted them in 1570. The same opinions were afterwards maintained by John Piscator, professor at Herborn, and by John Camero of Saumur. See Walch, *Streitigkeiten innerh. d. luth. Kirche*, 14:360; Schrockh, *Kirchengesch. seit d. Reformation*, 5:358; Dollinger, *D. Reformation*, 3:564; Schweizer, *Centraldogmen*, ii, 16,17; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 7:379.

### Karigites,

or SEPARATISTS, is the name of a Mohammedan sect who oppose all government, both ecclesiastical and spiritual. They hold that the person who is to preside in spiritual affairs should be a man of supernatural birth and altogether of a spiritual character. **SEE MOHAMMEDANS;** comp. **SEE KARMATHIANS.**

### Karim

**SEE CAREM.**

### Kar'kaa

or, rather, KAR'KA (Hebrew *Karka'*, [q̄r̄h̄] *afloor*, as in <sup><04517></sup>Numbers 5:17, etc.; with art. and *h* directive in pause, *h*[,\* q̄r̄h̄] *hak-Karka'd*; Sept. Ἀκκαρκά v. r. τὴν κατὰ δυσμὰς Κάδης; Vulg. *Carcaa* y, r. *Cariatha*), a place situated at a bend in the southern boundary of Judah (i.e. Simeon or Palestine), between Adar and Azmon (<sup><04518></sup>Joshua 15:3); probably about midway between the Dead Sea and the Mediterranean, perhaps near the well marked as Bir Abu-Atreibd on Zimmermann's map. **SEE TRIBE.**

### Karkaphensian Version.

**SEE SYRIAC VERSIONS.**

## Karkom

SEE SAFFRON.

## Kar'kor

(Heb. *Karkor'*, קרקור *foundation*; . Sept. Καρκάρ v. r. Καρκά, Vulg. *requiescebant*), a place beyond Jordan whither the Midianitish princes Zeba and Zalmunna had retired with their remaining army after the first rout by Gideon, who pursued and routed them again in its vicinity (<sup>(-0780)</sup>Judges 8:10). From the context it appears to have been situated not far beyond Succoth and Penuel, towards the south, in a naturally secure spot east of Nobah and Jogbehah; indications that point to a locality among the southern openings of Jebel Zurka, north-east of Rabbath Ammon. Schwarz supposes (*Palest.* p. 223) that *el-Kerah* is meant, a place a few miles south-east of Draa or Edrei, in the Hauran; but this is too far distant north-easterly. Eusebius's comparison of the castle (φρούριον) *Carcaria* (Καρκαρία, *Onomast.*), one day's journey distant from Petra, is equally foreign; and this may be the modern Kerak of Moab. SEE *KENATH*.

## Karl-Borromaeus Union,

a Roman Catholic association in Rhenish Prussia, formed for the purpose of effecting in Roman Catholic society the same results for which the Gustavus Adolphus Society of the Protestant Church was founded. Perhaps, in a measure, it was intended to oppose any inroads of the Protestant association among the Roman Catholics. It originated in 1844, and makes it its special object to circulate at large the literary productions of Roman Catholics. The society publishes a monthly journal, and occasionally works of a religious character written in popular form. See *Katholische Real-Encyklopadie*, 11:835.

## Karlowitz, Christoph Von

SEE MAURICE OF SAXONY.

## Karlstadt, Andreas Rudolph Bodenstein.

SEE CARLSTADT.

## Karlstadt, Johannes.

SEE DRACONITES.

## Karmathians

(so called from Abu Said Al-Jena- bi, surnamed *Al-Karmatha*) is the name of a Mohammedan sect which originated in the 9th century, under the caliphate of Al-Mohammed. Strictly speaking, the Karmathians were Shiites, q.v.; *SEE ISMAIL*, for Karmatha, their founder, was one of the missionaries in the province of Kufa. appointed by one of the apostles (Hussein Ahwagi) of Ahmed, the successor of Abdallah Ibn-Maimun, who flourished about the middle of the 2d century, and who first gave character to the Ismailite schism. It was he likewise who projected and prepared the way for a union of the Arabic. conquerors, and the many races that had been subjected since Mohammed's death, and the enthronement of what later was called "Pure Reason" as the sole deity for worship. With an extraordinary knowledge of the human heart and human weakness, he found a way to attract the high and the low. To the believer he offered devotion; liberty, if not license to the "free in spirit " philosophy to the "strong-minded;" mystical hopes to the fanatics; miracles to the masses. To the Jews he offered a Messiah, to the Christians a Paraclete, to the Moslems a Mahdi, and to the Persian and Syrian "pagans" a philosophical theology. The results of his exertions, so practical in tendency, were truly wonderful, and at one time it seemed as if Mohammedanism was doomed. He was soon persecuted by the authorities, and, driven from place to place, he finally died in Selamia, in Syria, leaving the work he had so successfully begun to his son 'Ahmed. This Ahmed, profiting by 'the experience of his father, carried on the work of conversion somewhat secretly; at least he did not dare to assume publicly the claims of an imam, as his father had done. He sent missionaries, however, to different parts of the country to gain adherents for this extreme Rationalistic movement, and one of the converts made was our Karmatha, who gave new life to this undertaking. He quickly gathered about him a large number of converts, and, successful in securing their confidence, he soon made them the blind instruments of his will. He advocated, according to some authorities, absolute communism, not only of property, but 'even of wives, and founded one particular colony, consisting of chosen converts, around his own house at Kufa. (See below, *Religious Belief*.)

From this place, called the "House of Refuge," thereafter the whole religious movement of the Karmathians was conducted. Missionaries were created and sent to different parts of the earth to convert the nations, and gather them into the fold of Karmathianism. Among these converts was

one Abu Said, whose success in Southern Persia, and afterwards at Bahrein, in the Persian Gulf, deserves special notice here. The inhabitants of this country, formerly a province of Persia, adhering partly to the Jewish, partly to the Persian faith, had been subjected by Mohammed, but had been allowed to retain their own creed. After the prophet's death they had at once shaken off the unwelcome yoke, which, however, had again been put upon them by Omar. In the interior of this country lived certain Arabs, highly disaffected against Islam, the innumerable, precepts of which they intensely disliked, and among these Abu Said made the most marvellous strides in his conversions, until he finally gained the confidence of the Bahreinites generally, and in less than two years he brought over a great part of the people of Bahrein. To suppress this proselytism, an army of 10,000 men was dispatched in 282 (Hegira) against him and his followers, but the Karmathians were victorious, and Abu Said now became undisputed possessor of the whole country, destroyed the old capital Hajar, and made Lahsa (his own residence) the capital of the country. In other parts of the Saracenic possessions the Karmathians also warred for a time successfully against the caliphate of Bagdad, and threatened its very existence, until, in a battle fought in the 294th year of the Hegira, the caliph's general, Wasif, won a decisive victory, and greatly crippled the military strength of the Karathians. Both Karmatha (of whose personal history after this time we lack all information) and Abu Said became-by what means is matter of great obscurity faithless to their own creed; but they continued to have followers, and when Abu Said was killed, together with some of his principal officers, in the bath in his own castle at Lahsa, in 301 of the Hegira, by one of his eunuchs, his-son, Abu Tahir, became his successor, and the struggle was continued. In 311 he seized the town of Basra. In the next year he pillaged the caravan which went to Mecca, and ransacked Kufa. In 315 he once more appeared in Kufa and in Irak, and gained so decided a victory over the caliph's troops that Bagdad began to tremble before him. In 317. (A.D. 930) the great and decisive blow against the caliphate, or, rather, against Mohammedanism itself, was struck. "When the great caravan of pilgrims for the annual pilgrimage had arrived at Mecca, the news suddenly spread that Abu Tahir, the terror of Islam, had appeared at the head of an army in the holy city itself. All attempts to buy him off failed, and a massacre of the most fearful description ensued. With barbarous irony, he asked the victims what had become of the sacred protection of the place. Every one, they had always been told, was safe and inviolable at Mecca. Why was he allowed thus easily to kill them the race

of donkeys? According to some, for six days; to others, for eleven or seventeen, the massacre lasted. The numbers killed within the precincts of the temple itself are variously given. The holy places were desecrated, almost irredeemably. But, not satisfied with this, Abu Tahir laid hands on the supreme palladium, the black stone itself. Yet he was apparently mistaken in his calculations. So far from turning the hearts of the faithful from a worship which God did not seem to have defended, the remaining Moslems clung all the more fervently to it. God's decree had certainly permitted all these indignities to be put upon his house, but it was not for them to murmur. The stone gone, they covered the place where it had lain with their kisses." Whenever Abu Tahir did not prevent them by force, the caravans went on their usual annual pilgrimage, and Abu Tahir was finally persuader to conclude a treaty permitting the pilgrimage on payment of five denars for every camel. and seven for every horse. But the black stone, notwithstanding all the efforts on the part of the court of Bagdad, he never returned. (See below.) Abu Tahir himself was a man of great daring, and so infatuated were his men with the personal bravery and divine calling of their leader that they blindly obeyed any demands he made upon them.

Abu Tahir died in 332 of the Hegira, master of Arabia, Syria, and Irak. It was not until seven years later (A.D. 950), under the reign of two of his brothers who had succeeded him, that the "black stone" was returned to Mecca for an enormous ransom, and fixed there, in the seventh pillar of the mosque called *Rahmat* (God's mercy). But with the death of Abu Tahir the star of the Karmathians began to wane. Little is heard of them of any import till 375, when they were defeated before Kufa an event which seems to have put an end to their dominion in Irak and Syria. In 378 they were further defeated in battle by Asfar, and their chief killed. They retreated to Lahsa, where they fortified themselves; whereupon Asfar marched to Elkatif, took it, and carried away all the baggage, slaves, and animals of the Karmathians of that town, and retired to Basra. This seems to have finally ruined the already weak band of that once formidable power, and nothing further is heard of them in history, although they retained Lahsa down to 430, and even later. To our own day there still exists, according to Palgrave, some disaffected remnants of them at Hasa (the modern name of their ancient centre and stronghold), and other tracts of the peninsula; and their antagonism against Mohammedanism, which they have utterly abrogated among themselves, so far from being abated, bids fair to break out anew into open rebellion at the first opportunity. Indeed, some of the

most trustworthy writers on Eastern history assert that the modern Druses owe the origin of their religious belief to the Karmathians (comp. Madden, *Turkish Empire*, ii, 210).

The *religious belief* of the Karmathians, so far as it has been preserved to us, seems in the beginning-before Ismailism became a mixture of "naturalism" and "materialism" of whilom Sabaism, and of Indian incarnations and transmigrations of later days-to have only been a kind of "reformed" Islam. Their master Karmatha, this sect maintained, had evinced himself to be a true prophet, and had brought a new law into the world. By this many of the Mohammedan tenets were altered, many ancient ceremonies and forms of prayer were changed, and an entirely new kind of fast introduced. Wine was permitted, as well as a few other things which the Koran prohibited, while many of the precepts found in that book were made mere allegories. Prayer was but the symbol of obedience to their imam, and fasting the symbol of silence, or, rather, of concealment of the religious doctrine from the stranger. They also believed fornication to be the sin of infidelity, and the guilt thereof to be incurred by those who revealed the mysteries of their religion, or failed to pay a blind obedience to their chief, or to contribute the fifth part of their property as an offering to the imam (compare Sale, *Preliminary Discourse to the Koran*).

For further details, see Weil, *Gescichte'd. Chalifen*; *idem*, *Geschichte der islamitischen Volker* (Stuttg. 1866, 8vo), p. 197 sq.; De Goeje, *Memoire sur les Carmathes*, etc.; Silvestre de Sacy, *Religion des Druses*; Sale, *Koran*; Taylor, *Hist. Mohammedanism*, p. 223 sq.; Madden, *Turkish Empire*, ii, 164 sq.; Chambers, *Cyclopedia*, 10:586 sq. **SEE SHIITES.**

### Karn, Aaron Jakob

a Lutheran minister, was born in London Co., Virginia, August, 1820. In his youth he dedicated himself to the service of the Lord, and, with a view to enter the Christian ministry, became a student in the institution at Gettysburg in the autumn of 1837, and was graduated from Pennsylvania College in 1842, and from the theological seminary in 1844. After his license to preach he accepted a call to the Lutheran Church at Pine Grove, Pa.; thence he removed to Canton, Ohio. In 1848 he took charge of the English Lutheran Church in Savannah, Georgia. Here he labored, enjoying the confidence of his people and the respect of the whole community, till his physical strength gave way, and advancing disease compelled him to suspend the exercise of his office. His congregation suggested a trip to



foreign lands. They provided the expenses for the journey, and supplies for the pulpit during his absence. He travelled through France, Italy, Germany, and Switzerland, but his impaired health derived no advantage from the tour, and he returned to his native country only to close his life surrounded by the tender sympathies of loved ones at home. He died at Chicago, Ill., Dec. 19, 1860. Karn was an able preacher and an excellent man. His ministry was fruitful in good results. During the prevalence of the yellow fever in Savannah in 1854 and 1858, he continued at his post, exhausting his time and his strength in ministering to the suffering and the dying, not only of his own congregation, but to others who were not in connection with any Church, amid scenes the most distressing and heart-rending, in his offices of kindness to the sick and in the burial of the dead. It is supposed his physical constitution sustained an injury from the influences of the epidemic from which he never recovered. (M. L. S.)

### Karnaim.

*SEE ASHTAROTH-KARNAIM.*

### Karnkowski, Stanislaus,

a celebrated Roman Catholic prelate, was born in Bland in 1526. Of his early life nothing is known to us. In 1563 he was made bishop of Wadislaw, and became coadjutor to the archbishop of Gnesen in 1577, and in 1581 sole occupant of the archbishopric and primate of Poland. In the civil history of Poland Karnkowski played no unimportant part. King Stephen (Beteri) was crowned by him (May 1, 1576), and on the death of the king Karnkowski himself assumed the reins of government until a royal successor was found in the person of the Swedish crownprince Sigismund, whom he also crowned. It is generally supposed that Karnkowski belonged to the Jesuitical order. In Kalisch he built a college for the Jesuits: he also founded two schools for the theological training of Roman Catholics. Under his protection the celebrated Jesuit Jacob Wujek translated the Bible into Polish, a work which to this day remains the only authentic edition in the Polish (Roman Catholic) Church. Karnkowski died May 26, 1603. He published *Constitutiones synodales dioceses cum catechesi: — Sermones ad parochos: — De ecclesia utraque; etc.* See Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, 12:632.

## Karo, Joseph Ben-Ephraim,

a Jewish Rabbi, one of the most celebrated characters in Rabbinic literature, was born in Spain in 1488, of a family of note.' Amid the great persecutions which the Spanish Jews suffered in the early part of the 16th century, the Karo family were exiled, and settled finally at Nicopolis, in European Turkey. His early Talmudical education Joseph received under the instruction of his own father, and the youth quickly evinced, in the ready acquisition of Talmudic lore, a particular liking for tradition. The Mishna text, it is said, he had learned by heart, and before he had reached the age of twenty-five he was accepted as a Talmudical authority. From Nicopolis Joseph removed successively to Adrianople and Salonica. While a resident of these places (about 1522-35) he became acquainted with the great cabalistic fanatic Salomo Molebo of Portugal. and he was finally induced to remove to Safet (q.v.), in Palestine, the great cabalistic centre in the East in the 16th century. In Safet he studied much with the Rabbinical authorities of Palestine, and during the controversy on the Jewish gaonate, **SEE JACOB BERAB**, Joseph Karo was one of the four disciples whom Jacob Berab ordained when forced by Levi ben-Chabib to quit the country. **SEE ORDINATION, JEWISH**. Previously infatuated with the Cabalists' Messianic notions, and now (Jacob Berab died January, 1541, shortly after quitting Palestine) one of the four Rabbis ordained by the only authority competent to perform the sacred rite, he became satisfied that he was divinely chosen for some important mission, perhaps even the Messiahship itself. (He believed, says Gratz [see below], that he would die and be again raised up to become the leader of his nation.) Ever since 1522 he had been engaged in writing an extensive religious and ritual codex, entitled **אֲשֶׁר** **תְּבַרְךָ** *Beth Yoseph*, first published at Sablonets, 1553, 4 vols. folio), a revision, correction, and enlargement of a like work by Jacob ben Asher; he now hastened the completion of this gigantic undertaking in the hope that its publication would lead his people to assign him at once the place to which he believed himself divinely called. He completed the work in 1542, but it gained for him only the recognition of being one of the ablest rabbis of Safet. Unremittingly he continued his labors, determined to bring about the result which he believed to be his mission the union of Israel-and with it hasten the days of the Messiah. In the 16th century the Talmud was extensively studied among the Jews. Every important congregation sustained not only a rabbi, but a college. Thus many lucrative positions were open to men inclined to study, and there resulted a general interest in

the study of the Talmud. But many students imply many interpreters, and thus it came that, after a time, each congregation, and sometimes even each member of a college, had their own interpretation of the Talmudical precepts, and Jewish orthodoxy was at a loss how to judge rightly. Joseph, comprehending the danger of a general division and a loose interpretation, determined to meet the case by a compilation of rabbinical law and usage, i.e. by the publication of the interpretations which the Talmud had received at the hands of the most distinguished teachers in Israel. At first he simply subjected his former work to a general supervision, which he completed after twelve years of hard labor. Finding, however, that this did not quite accomplish the desired result, he set about writing a new work, and after nine years of intense application presented his people with a compendium of rabbinical law and usage, entitled *Šulchan Aruk*, first published at Venice, 1565), which to this day remains a rabbinical authority. His name now became celebrated in all lands where Jews made their abode, and at Safet itself (which really meant all Palestine) he was cheerfully accorded the place of first authority, as a worthy successor of Jacob Berab. See, however, the article *SEE MOSES DE TRANI*. He died in 1575. One result Karo's labors had at least effected—the harmony of all Israelites in expounding the law through the Talmud—the establishment of Rabbinic Judaism—after all, a very different religion from that revealed through Moses at Mount Sinai, foretold by the prophets, and taught by Moses Maimonides. For a long time the *Šulchan Aruk* was the text-book in all the Jewish schools, the accepted interpretation among all that people, and many are the editions that have been published of it, legions the scholars who have commented upon it. Karo's other work of note which deserves mention here is *Cheseph Mishne*, a commentary on Maimonides's *Jad Hachazaka*, which has frequently been published with the latter work. See Gratz, *Geschichte der Juden*, 9:319 sq.; Zunz, *Zur Geschichte u. Literatur*, p. 230 sq.; Jost, *Gesch. d. Judenthums*, 3:129; Furst, *Biblioth. Jud.* ii, 172 sq. (J. H.W.)

**Karpas.**

*SEE GREEN; SEE COTTON.*

**Kar'tah**

(Heb. *Kartah'*, *hTrḥj* city; Sept. *Καρθάν* v. r. *Κάδης*), a town in the tribe of Zebulun, assigned, with its suburbs, as one of the places of

residence for the Levites of the family of Merari (<sup><1234></sup>Joshua 21:34). It is there mentioned between Jokneam and Dimnah, the fourth city named being Nahalal; but the parallel passage (<sup><1357></sup>1 Chronicles 6:77) gives but two cities, and these different, namely, Rimmon and Tabor, the first of these being probably a preferable reading for Dimnah, and the latter a collective for two others, Jokneam being in the same connection (ver. 68) separately attributed to the Kohathites along with other places on Mt. Ephraim, near which it lay. Kartah is doubtless identical with the KATTATH elsewhere spoken of in the same association (<sup><1915></sup>Joshua 19:15). Van de Velde suggests (*Memoir*, p. 327) that it is possibly the same with *elHarte*, a village with traces of antiquity on the banks of the Kishon," not very far from its junction with wady Melek; the ruins being on the tell *Harteyeh*, on the opposite side of the river (*Narrative*, i, 289).

### Kar'tan

(*Heb.* *Kartan'*, <sup>Ⲁ</sup>Ⲯⲣⲏⲓ double city, an old dual from *trq*; Sept. *Καρθάν* v. r. *Θεμμών* and *Νοεμμών*), a town of Naphtali, assigned to the Gershonite Levites, and appointed to be one of the cities of refuge (<sup><1213></sup>Joshua 21:32). In the parallel passage (<sup><1356></sup>1 Chronicles 6:76) it is called by the equivalent name of KIRJATHAIM. The associated names suggest the probability of some locality near the north-western shore of the Sea of Tiberias, perhaps the ruined village marked as *el-Katanah* on Van de Velde's map, on wady Furam, about midway between Lake Tiberias and the Huleh.

### Kartikeya

is the name of the Hindu Mars, or god of war, who is represented by the Puranic legends as having sprung from Siva after a most miraculous fashion. The germ of Kartikeya having fallen into the Ganges, it was on the banks of this river, in a meadow of Sara grass, that the offspring of Siva arose; and as it happened that he was seen by six nymphs, the Krittikas (or Pleiades), the child assumed six faces, to receive nurture from each. Grown up, he fulfilled his mission in killing Taraka, the daemon-king, whose power, acquired by penances and austerities, threatened the very existence of the gods. He accomplished, besides, other heroic deeds in his battles with the giants, and became the commander-in-chief of the divine armies. Having been brought up by the Krittikas, he is called *Kartikeya*, or *Shanmatura*, the son of six mothers; and, from the circumstances adverted

to, he bears also the names of *Gangeya*, the son of the Ganges; *Sarabhu*, reared in Sara grass; *Shanmukha*, the god with the six faces, etc. One of his common appellations is *Kumara*, youthful, since he is generally represented as a fine youth; and, as he is riding on a peacock, he receives sometimes the epithet of *Sikhivahana*, or "the' god whose vehicle is the peacock."

### Kasimir, St.,

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

### Kaspi.

*SEE IBN-CASPI.*

### Katan.

*SEE HAKKATAN.*

### Katerkamp, Johann Theodor Hermann,

an eminent Roman Catholic theologian, was born at Ochtrup, near Munster, Germany, Jan. 17, 1764; studied theology at Munster, and subsequently (1809) became professor of Church History in his alma mater. He had been ordained priest in 1787, and in 1823 he was appointed canon, and in 1831 dean of the cathedral at Munster. He died July 8, 1834. Katerkamp's principal work is his *Kirchengesch.* (of which the introduction' was published in 1819; and five volumes, bringing the work down to the second Crusade, from 1823-34, 8vo). He also wrote *Ueber d. christl. Leben u. d. Geist d. gottesdienstl. Versammlungen* (Munster, 1830, 8vo):- *Denkwurdigkeiten aus d. Leben d. Furstin Galiczin* (ibid. 1828; 2d ed. 1838). See Herzog, *Real-Encyklopadie*, 7:459; Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 12:637.

## Katharinus, Ambrosius.

SEE CATHARINUS.

## Kathenotheism

(Καθ' ἑνὸς θεός, *each one a god*) is a term devised by Prof. Max Müller (*Rig Veda*, i, 164, 460) to designate the doctrine of divine unity in diversity as unfolded in the sacred writings of the Hindus. He rejects the term *polytheism* on the ground that the Hindus, in their worship, ever ascribe to one god the attributes of all the others. Thus in one hymn, ascribed to Manu, the poet says, "Among you, O gods, there is none that is small, none that is young; you are all great in deed."... "And what more could human language achieve," asks the professor, "in trying to express the idea of a divine and supreme power?... This is surely not what is commonly understood by polytheism. Yet it would be equally wrong to call it monotheism. If we must have a name for it, I should call it *Kathenotheism*" (*Chips*, i, 28). See also Tyler, *Primitive Culture* (Loud. 1871, 2 vols. 8vo), ii, 321. (J. H.W.)

## Kathismata

(καθίσματα, *sittings*) is a name which, in the early Church, according to Suicer, was applied to certain parts of holy Scripture, because, during the reading of them, the people *sat*. Other portions of Scripture were entitled *στάσεις* (*standings*), because, during the reading of them, the people *stood*. It was usual in the early Church for all worshippers to stand during the: reading of the gospels and the singing of the psalms.

## Katona, Emeric,

of Abaujvar, a Hungarian Protestant controversialist, was born at Uifalon in 1572. He became rector of the college of Szepesi in 1593, but resigned in 1595 to study theology at Wittenberg and Heidelberg for two years and a half, and then returned to his country. He became successively rector of Patak (in 1599), preacher at the court of George Ragoczi, prince of Transylvania, pastor of Szepesi, Goenczin, and Karextur, and died Oct. 22, 1610. He wrote *De Libero Arbitrio, contra theses Andrece Sarofi; Antipapismus; Tractatus de Patrum, conciliorum et traditionum Auctoritate circa fidei dogmata, cultus idem moresque vivendi* (Francfort, 1611, 8vo, with a Life of the author by Pareus). See Czvittinger, *Specimen*

*Hungariae Literatae*, p. 199; Horanyi, *Nova Memoria Hungarorum*, ii, 304.

## Katon Moed.

*SEE TALMUD.*

## Kat'thath

(Heb. *Kattath'*, תִּפְתִּי *small*, for תִּנְפְתִּי Sept. Καττάθ v. r. Κατανάθ), one of the cities of Zebulun, mentioned first in a list of towns apparently along the southern border from Mount Tabor westerly (<sup>-01915</sup>Joshua 19:15); and (notwithstanding the slight difference in radicals) probably the same with the KARTAH *SEE KARTAH* (q.v.) of <sup>-02134</sup>Joshua 21:34; perhaps also with KITRON (<sup>-00103</sup>Judges 1:30). Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 172), by a tortuous derivation. through the Talmud, seeks to identify it with *Cana* of Galilee.

## Katyayana

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

## Kautz, Jacob,

an eminent German theologian, prominent in the Anabaptist movement of the 16th century, was born at Beckenheim, Hesse Cassel, about 1500. He was a preacher at Worms when, in 1527, he identified himself with the Denk-Hetzer movement in forming a strong opposition against infant baptism. Previously to this time, Kautz had estranged himself from the Lutheran reformers by his anti-Trinitarian heresies; now he openly broke with them, and warmly welcomed the Strasburg preachers. *SEE ANABAPTISTS*. He published seven theses in defence of his peculiar views (comp. Arnold, *Ketzekhistorie*, i, 63), and for the day of Pentecost invited the Lutheran ministers to public disputation. Although yet a young man, he had already obtained great celebrity as a public speaker, and no doubt took this course in order to increase the number of his followers. But the theses of Kautz were so decidedly opposed to Lutheran christology and dogmas that the authorities interfered, incarcerated him, and finally obliged him to Quit Worms. Wandering about from place to place, we find him in July at

Augsburg, later at Rothenburg, and in 1528 finally at Strasburg. Here he succeeded for a time in preaching his heretical doctrines, but in 1529, so great had his fanatical excesses become, that the city authorities felt obliged to interfere, and he was arrested and compelled to leave the city. After losing sight of him for a time, we find him in 1532 again knocking at the gates of the city of Strasburg, and vainly seeking admission. From this time all traces of him are lost, and neither the time nor the place of his death is known. Kautz was quite intimate with Capito, the eminent coadjutor of the Reformers (Ecolampadius and Bucer, and at one time it was even asserted by the Anabaptists that he had succeeded in winning him to their side. Capito, however, does not deserve this reproach. On the contrary, he did all in his power to restrain Kautz in his fanaticism. See Trechsel, *Antitrinitarier*, i, 13 sq.; Keim, in the *Jahrb. f. deutsche Theol.* i, 2, 271 sq.; *Stud. und Krit.* 1841, p. 1080 sq. **SEE DENK**; **SEE HETZER**. (J. H. W.)

### Kay, James

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

### Kaye, John (1), D.D.,

an English divine, was born at Hammersmith, London, in 1783, and was educated at Christ's College, Cambridge (graduated in 1804 with high honor and distinction). In 1814 he was elected master of his college, and afterwards filled the office of vice-chancellor. In 1816 he was chosen regius professor of divinity, and in 1820 became bishop of Bristol; was translated to Lincoln in 1827, and died in 1853. Besides his professional labors, Kaye did a great deal of literary work. Many of his writings are of special value. Characterized as they are by clearness and precision, by



accuracy and fairness, combined with the necessary flexibility, no thinking mind can fail to be enriched by them. His principal writings are: *The Ecclesiastical History of the 2d and 3d Centuries, illustrated from the Writings of Tertullian* (Camb. 2d ed. 1826, 8vo; 3d ed. 1845): — *Some Account of the Writings and Opinions of Justin Martyr* (Lond. 2d ed. 1836, 8vo; 3d ed. 1853): *A Charge delivered at the primary Visitation in 1828* (Camb. 1828, 8vo): — *A Charge to the 'Clergy, delivered at the triennial Visitation in 1843* (London, 1843, 8vo). He also published some anonymous *Remarks on Dr. Wiseman's Lectures*, and a *Reply to the Travels of an Irish Gentleman* (a Roman Catholic polemical work). See Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, s.v.; *London Gentleman's Magazine*, 1853 (April, May, and August). (J. L. S.)'

**Kaye, John (2).**

*SEE CAJUS.*

**Kayits**

*SEE FRUIT.*

**Kazin**

*SEE ITTAH-KAZIN.*

**Keach, Benjamin,**

an eminent English Baptist divine, was born at Stokehaman, Buckinghamshire, Feb. 29, 1640. He does not appear to have followed any regular course of study; his parents were poor, and could not aid him in a collegiate education. He paid particular attention to the Scriptures. In 1658 he became a preacher, and in 1668 was chosen pastor of a congregation in Southwark, of which he had for three years previously been a member. After the Restoration he suffered in common with all nonconformists, and fled from the country, where the persecutions were unbearable, to the metropolis. Here he became pastor of a small society, which met in a private house in Tooley Street. Successful as a minister, he soon moved his fast increasing flock (which numbered at one time over 1000) to a large new church in Horsley Down, Southwark. He died July 18, 1704. Keach belonged to the Particular or Calvinistic Baptists, and was considered a man of great piety and learning. His principal works are, *Tropologia, or Key to open Scripture Metaphors* (Lond. 1682; best edition 1779, fol. very

scarce; and reprinted in 1856, 8vo): — *The Marrow of true Justification, or Justification without Works* (Lond. 1692, 4to): *The Axe laid to the Root, or one more Blow at the Foundation of Infant Baptism and Church-membership* (London, 1693, 4to): *Light broke forth in Wales* (Lond. 1696, 8vo; an answer to Mr. James Owen's book, entitled *Children's' Baptism from Heaven*): *The Display of glorious Grace, in 14 Sermons* [on <sup>2540</sup>Isaiah 54:10] (Lond. 1698, 8vo): — *Gospel Mysteries Unveiled, or an Exposition of all the Parables*, etc. (Lond. 1701, fol.; 1856, royal 8vo. "Mingled with unquestioned reverence for the divine Word, and. much good material, of which the judicious student may avail himself with advantage, there is a large amount of fanciful exposition and of unwise spiritualizing" [Kitto]): — *A Golden Mine opened, or the glory. of God's rich Grace displayed in the Mediator*, etc. (Lond. 1694, 4to): — *The French Impostor detected, or Zach. Housel tried by the Word of God*, etc. (Lond. 1703, 12mo): — *Believer's Baptism*, wherein the chief arguments for infant baptism are collected and coinbated (London, 1705, 8vo): *Travels of True Godliness, and Travels of Ungodliness*, after the manner of Bunyan's (often reprinted); also with Notes and Memoirs of the author, by the Rev. Howard Malcolm (N. Y. 1831, 18mo): — *Exposition of the Parables* (Lond. 1704, fol.). Keach also figured in his day as a hymnologist, but his sacred songs were rather mediocre. See Stoughton, *Eccles. History of Engl.* ii, 465 sq.; Crosby, *Hist. of the Baptists*; Wilson, *Hist. of Dissenting Churches*; Allibone, *Dict. Engl. and American Authors*, s.v.; Kitto, *Cyclop. Bibl. Lit.* s.v. (J. i. W.)

### Keating, Geoffrey

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

### Keblah

is a term by which the Mohammedans designate the direction towards which they are command-. ed to turn their faces in their devotions. "At first," says Sale (*Koran*, p. 17), "Mohammed and his followers observed no particular rite in turning their faces towards any certain place or quarter

of the world when they prayed, it being declared to be perfectly indifferent. Afterwards, when the prophet fled to Medina, he directed them to turn towards the temple of Jerusalem [probably to ingratiate himself with the Jews], which continued to be their Keblah for six or seven months; but, either finding the Jews too intractable, or despairing of otherwise gaining the pagan Arabs, who could not forget their respect to the temple of Mecca, he ordered that prayers for the future should be towards the east. This change was made in the second year of the Hegira, and occasioned many to fall from him, taking offence at his inconstancy." *SEE KAABA.*

### Keble, John

" the sweetest and most Christian poet of modern days," was born in Fairford, in Gloucestershire, April 25, 1792. His father was fellow of Corpus Christi College, and for fifty years vicar of Coln, St. Alwins, and lived until his ninetieth year. His mother was the daughter of a clergyman. Thus on both sides he came of a pastoral stock; and it is worthy of note that his only surviving brother, Thomas, like himself became a clergyman (rector of Bisley), that that brother's son also took orders, and that Mr. Keble himself, like his father, married a clergyman's daughter. Young Keble was prepared for college by his father, and entered the University of Oxford, and there greatly distinguished himself by a remarkable display of talent and application. When only eighteen, full four years below the customary age for graduating, John Keble won the highest intellectual rank the university can bestow that of a "double-first classman," his name appearing in the first class of classics as well as in the first class of mathematics. This distinction had never been achieved up to that time except in the case of Robert Peel. April 20, 1811, wanting a few days of the completion of his nineteenth year, he was elected probationer fellow of Oriel, and took his place at the high table, and in the senior common room of that celebrated college. Whately entered it with him, and these two were the *duumviri* to whom all paid an almost obsequious deference. In 1812 he won the prizes for both the bachelors' essays -the English on Translation from Dead Languages, the Latin a comparison of Xenophon and Julius Caesar as Military Chroniclers. In the annals of Corpus twice only has such a triumph been won, one instance that of young Keble, and the other no less a man than Henry Hart Milman, the late celebrated dean of St. Paul's Cathedral. At the unprecedented age of twenty-two-indeed, some months short of it-he was appointed by the University of Oxford one of its public examiners. Thus did Keble attain a success which we believe has never

been equalled for its precocious ability. In 1815 he was ordained deacon, the following year priest, and soon after left the university, and never again-permanently resided there. He became his father's curate; and lived with him in that capacity nearly twenty years. He turned aside from the numerous paths of ambition which were open to him, and gave himself to parochial work as the employment of his life. In 1835 Keble's father died. He was now offered and accepted the vicarage of Hursley, and married. His parish was obscure, thirty miles from Oxford. There was not, it is said, a single cultivated family in his charge, so that his labors were altogether among the humbler and poorer classes, but under his indefatigable ministrations it became one of the model parishes of England. It is, however, as the poet of the "Christian Year" and the "Lyra Innocentium" that Keble will be most widely and permanently known. The former was published in 1827. It is probable that most of the poem was written at Fairford. Its success was certainly most remarkable. More than one hundred editions have been sold. Of course Keble might have realized a fortune from the sale of this extraordinary book; but in this, as in everything else, he showed his disinterestedness. When, in 1835, Keble came to Hursley, he found a church not at all to his mind. It is described as a plain and anything but beautiful building of flint and rubble. He at once determined to have a new one built, and, in order to care out his project, he employed the profits of the many editions of *The Christian Year*; and when the building was finished, his friends, in token of their regard for him, filled all the windows with stained glass. On Friday, the 6th of April, 1866, he was buried in the church-yard of Hursley, where he had officiated a minister for nearly thirty years. It was on the day before Good Friday, viz. on the 29th of March, that he died. On the eve of a great Christian observance, he, the singer of Christian observances, passed away to his rest. The character of Keble's poetry may be surmised from his life and opinions; it is gentle, sweet, devotional, and highly cultivated; it translates religious sentiment out of the ancient and exclusively Hebrew dialect into the language of modern feeling. A deep tone of home affection runs through all his poems. The highest culture of which man is capable, and the most refined thought in him, had not weakened, but only made natural affection more pure and intense. Never, perhaps, except in the case of George Herbert, has a character of such rare and saintly beauty concurred with a poetic gift and power of poetic expression of the highest order. John Keble is noted also as the leader of the original band of Oxford scholars and divines who began the so-called "Puseyite" movement in the English

Church. He contributed to the famous *Tracts for the Times* (1834-1836), and it is to Keble's influence over Newman that the latter ascribes his conversion to Romanism, dating it from July 14, 1833. when Keble preached his sermon on *National Apostasy*. He was also one of the editors of the *Bibliotheca Patrum Ecclesiae Catholicae* (begun in 1838). His works are, *On Translation from the Dead Languages* (an Oxford Prize Essay, 1812; Oxf. 1812): — *The Christian Year: thoughts in verse for the Sundays and holy-days throughout the year* (1827, 2 vols.; 36th ed. 1852, 8vo): — *The Child's Christian Year* (4th edit. 1841, 18mo): *Primitive Tradition recognised in Holy Scripture; a Sermon* (on <sup>sc114</sup>2 Timothy 1:14; 4th ed., with a Postscript and Catena Patrum [No. 3 of the *Tracts of the Times*], 1839, 18mo; originally published [in 1837] as No. 78 of the [Oxford] *Tracts for the Times*): — *The Psalter, or Psalm s of David, in English Verse* (1839, sm. 8vo; 3d edit. 1840, 18mo): — *Selections from Richard Hooker* (1839, 18mo; 2d edit. 1848, 18mo): — an edition of *Hooker's Works: Praelectiones Academicæ Oxonii Habitæ* (1832-41, 2 vols. 8vo; 1844-1846, 2 vols. 8vo):- *Lyra Innocentium: Thoughts on Verse, on Children, their Ways and their Privileges* (1846. sm. 8vo, Anon.): — *Sermons Academical and Occasional* (1847, 8vo; 2d edit. 1848, 8vo): — *A very few plain Thoughts on the proposed Addition of Dissenters to the University of Oxford* (written from his position as High-Church polemic, 1854). See Coleridge, *Memoirs of the Rev. J. Keble* (1869, 2 vols. 8vo); Sharp, *Memoir* (in *Studies in Poetry and Philosophy*); Allibone, *Dict. of Authors, s.v.*; *Church Review*, Oct. 1866, art. i; *Amer. Ch. Review*, April, 1870, art. i. (E. de P.)

### Keckermann, Bartholomeus

a reformed German theologian, was born at Dantzic in 1571, and educated at Wittenberg, Leipsic, and Heidelberg. In the last place he became professor of the Hebrew language about 1592. In 1602 he accepted the rectorate of the' gymnasium at Dantzic, where he died August 25, 609. Keckermann wrote many theological and philosophical works, the most important of which are *Systema Theologiao* (Berlin, 1615, 4to), and *Rhetorica Ecclesiasticæ* (Hanau, 1600, 1613, 8vo). These are circulated very extensively, and prove him to have been a writer of great originality and ability. He argued in behalf of a separation of philosophy and theology, to prevent any further mischief to Christianity such as scholasticism had caused, and in his *Systema Ethices* (ibid. 1610, 8vo) he pleads for the separation of ethics, as a philosophical science, from theology; the latter,

he argues, must confine itself to the inner religious life, the former to the "*bonum civile*" (*Opp.* ii, 233 sq.). In view of these, his own teachings, it is unjust to classify this writer, as some have done, among the originators of Protestant scholasticism. Of value, also, are Keckermann's speculations on the Trinity (comp. Baur, *Dreieinigkeitslehre*, 3:308 sq.). His works have been published entire (*Opera Onnia*) at Geneva in 1614. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklopedie*, 7:463.

## Ke'dar

(Heb. *Kedar'*, רדקֶד dark-skinned; Sept. Κηδάρ), the second son of Ishmael, and founder of the tribe that bore his name (<sup><0253></sup>Genesis 25:13). B.C. post 2061. The name is used in Scripture as that of the Bedouins generally, whose characteristic traits are ascribed to them (<sup><2105></sup>Song of Solomon 1:5; <sup><2116></sup>Isaiah 21:16; 42:11; 60:7; <sup><2120></sup>Jeremiah 2:10; 49:28; <sup><2121></sup>Ezekiel 27:21); more fully, "sons of Kedar" (רדקֶדֶי, <sup><2117></sup>Isaiah 21:17); in <sup><8015></sup>Psalms 120:5, Kedar and Mesech are put for barbarous tribes. Rabbinical writers expressly identify them with the Arabians (Pseudojon. on Genesis 25, and the Targum on Psalm 120; comp. the Jewish expression "tongue of Kedar" for the Arabic language), and the Arabs acknowledge the paternity (Pococke, *Spec.* 46). The *Kedarenes* (as they were called in later times) do not appear to have lived in the immediate neighborhood of Judaea (<sup><2120></sup>Jeremiah 2:10; comp. <sup><8015></sup>Psalms 120:5). Jerome (*Onomast. s. v. Μαδιάν*) places them in the Saracenic desert, on the east of the Red Sea, which identifies them with the *Cedrei* of Pliny (v, 12) as neighbors of the Nabatheans (comp. <sup><2107></sup>Isaiah 40:7). Stephen of Byzantium reckons them (Κεδρανῖται) as inhabitants of Arabia Felix; but Theodoret (on Psalm 109) assigns them a locality near Babylon (see Reland, *Palcest.* p. 86 sq.). Ptolemy calls them *Darrce* (*Geog.* 6:7), evidently a corruption of the ancient Hebrew; and Forster supposes that it is the same people Arrian refers to as the *Kanraitce*, which he thinks should be read *Kadraitce* (*Geogr. of Arabia*, i, 247). A very ancient Arab tradition states that Kedar settled in the Hejaz, the country round Mecca and Medina, and that his descendants have ever since ruled there (Abulfedae *Hist. Anteislamica*, ed. Fleischer, p. 192). From Kedar sprung, the distinguished tribe of Koreish, to which Mohammed belonged (Caussin, *Essai*, i, 175 sq.). Of the history of the head of the tribe little is known, but his posterity are described as being rich in flocks of sheep and goats, in which they traded with the Syrians (<sup><2121></sup>Ezekiel 27:21; <sup><2108></sup>Jeremiah 49:49), as dwelling in tents of

black hair (Cant. i, 5), though some of them occupied cities and villages ( $\mu\upsilon\rho$  [ and  $\mu\upsilon\rho\chi\jmath$  ; <sup><2361></sup>Isaiah 43:11) in the midst of the wilderness of Arabia, apparently in a mountainous and rocky district, and as being skilful in the use of the bow (<sup><2217></sup>Isaiah 21:17); particulars which eminently agree with all descriptions of the manners and mode of life of the nomade Arabs bordering Palestine on the east, from the Red Sea to Asia Minor (Wellsted, *Travels in Arabia*, ii, 231 sq.; Wallin, in the *Journ. of R. Geog. Soc.* vols. xx and xxiv). *SEE ARABIA*.

### Ked'emah

(Heb. *Ked'mah*,  $\text{hmd}\eta\epsilon$  eastward; Sept.  $\text{Κεδμό}$ , but in Chronicles v. r.  $\text{Κεδάμ}$ ), the last named of the sons of Ishmael, and probably head of an Arab tribe called by the same title (<sup><0255></sup>Genesis 25:15; <sup><1303></sup>1 Chronicles 1:31) B.C. post 2061.

### Ked'emoth

(Heb. *Kedemoth'*,  $\text{t}/\text{md}\epsilon\jmath$  beginnings; Sept.  $\text{Κεδμώθ}$ ,  $\text{Κεδημώθ}$ , but in Chronicles  $\text{Καδμώθ}$  v. r.  $\text{Καμηδώθ}$ ), a city in the tribe of Reuben, assigned with its suburbs ("villages"), to the Levites of the family of Merari (<sup><638></sup>Joshua 13:18; 21:37; <sup><1359></sup>1 Chronicles 6:79; in all which passages it is mentioned between Jahazah and Mephaath), with a desert ( $\text{rBd}\eta\alpha\epsilon$  open pasture-grounds) of the same name adjacent, whence Moses despatched the messengers requesting of Sihon a peaceable passage through his dominions; which the Israelites were now entering, having crossed the river Arnon (<sup><6125></sup>Deuteronomy 2:26). These indications fix its locality not far northeast of Dibon-gad, possibly at the ruined village *ed Duleitat* (Robinson, *Researches*, 3, Append. p. 170), east of Medeba (Van de Velde, *Map*).

### Ke'desh

(Heb. *id.*,  $\text{vd}\epsilon\jmath$ , sanctuary; Sept.  $\text{Κέδες}$ , but  $\text{Κάδες}$  in <sup><612></sup>Joshua 21:32;  $\text{Κάδης}$  in <sup><7016></sup>Judges 4:6, v. r. 9:  $\text{Κεδεέ}$  v. r. in <sup><1162></sup>1 Chronicles 6:72), the name of three towns in Palestine.

**1.** A city in the extreme southern part of the territory originally assigned to Judah (<sup><653></sup>Joshua 15:23, where it is mentioned between Adadah and Hazor), and doubtless included in the portion afterwards set off to Simeon (<sup><680></sup>Joshua 19:1-9). As the associated places seem to indicate a position

towards the Dead Sea, we may conjecture that it was the same as KADESH-BARNEA (the names being the same in Heb.), which lay there, and is not mentioned in either of the foregoing lists, although it certainly was included within the district indicated.

2. A Levitical city of the tribe of Issachar (<sup><1367></sup>1 Chronicles 6:72), otherwise called KISION (<sup><1680></sup>Joshua 19:20; "Kishon," 21:28).

3. A "fenced city" of Naphtali (<sup><1687></sup>Joshua 19:37, where it is mentioned between Hazor and Edrei), hence also called KEDESH-NAPHTALI (i.e. Kadesh of Naphtali, <sup><1046></sup>Judges 4:6); appointed as one of the cities of refuge (<sup><1697></sup>Joshua 19:7, where it is located on Mt. Naphtali), being a Levitical city assigned to the Geshonites (<sup><1612></sup>Joshua 21:32; <sup><1366></sup>1 Chronicles 6:76). It was one of the original Canaanitish royal cities, whose chieftains were slain by Joshua (<sup><1622></sup>Joshua 12:22). and was reckoned as a Galilsean town (<sup><1697></sup>Joshua 19:7; 21:32; <sup><1366></sup>1 Chronicles 6:76). It was the residence of Barak (<sup><1046></sup>Judges 4:6), and there he and Deborah assembled the tribes of Zebulun and Naphtali before the conflict (ver. 9,10). Near it was the tree of Zaananim, where was pitched the tent of the Kenites Heber and Jael, in which Sisera met his death (ver. 11). It was probably as its name implies, a "holy place" of great antiquity, which would explain its selection as one of the cities of refuge; and its being chosen by the prophetess as the spot at which to meet the warriors of the tribes before the commencement of the struggle "for Jehovah among the mighty." It was one of the places depopulated by Tiglath-pileser (<sup><1259></sup>2 Kings 15:29). Josephus calls it *Kedesa* (ἡ Κέδεσσα, *Ant.* 5:1, 18, and 24) or *Cydisa* (*Ant.* 9, 11, 1), and places it under the name of *Cedasa* (Κεδάσα), on the border between Galilee and Tyre (*Ant.* 13:5, 6), to the latter of which it adhered in' the final struggle (*War*, 3, 18, 1). It was here that Jonathan the Maccabee gained the victory over the princes of Demetrius (Κάδης, 1 Macc. 11:63,73). It is probably the same with the *Cydis* (Κύδις ἡ Νεφθαλί) mentioned as the birthplace of Tobit (i, 1). Eusebius (*Ononzast.* s.v. Κεδές) mentions it by the name of *Cydossos* (Κυδοσσός, Jerome *Cidissus*), as lying in the neighborhood .of Paneas, about 20 Roman miles from Tyre. It is also probably the same with the strongly-fortified place in this district called *Cydyssi* by Josephus (Κυδυσσοί, *War*, 4:2, 3). Kedesh was situated near the "plain" of Zaanaim, on. the route taken by Barak (who was a native 'of the place) in the pursuit of Sisera, and hence must have been beyond Mt. Tabor, in the direction from the Kishon (<sup><1046></sup>Judges 4:6, 9,10, 11). The indications correspond very well to the position of the modern village of



*Kedes*, discovered by Dr. Robinson on the hills west of the lake el-Huleh (*Researches*, 3:355; *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1843, p. 11). and fully described by Rev. E. Smith (*Bibl. Sac.* 1849, p. 374, 375) as being a small place romantically situated on a hill in a rich and beautiful plain,- abundantly supplied with water, and containing extensive ruins apparently of Roman origin (see also Robinson's *Researches*, new edit., 3:366-369; Van de Velde, *Narrative*, ii, 417). From the 12th century (Benj. of Tudela, in Bohl's *Early Travels*, p. 89) it has been reputed to possess the graves of Deborah, Barak, Ahinoam, Jael, and Heber (Schwarz, *Palest.* p. 183; comp. p. 91). Porter, in 1858, saw close by the site the black tents of nomads pitched under the terebinths (*Handbook for Palest.* p. 443), like those of Heber the Kenite (~~τοπι~~Judges 4:11.).

"In the Greek (**Κυδίως**) and Syriac (*Kedesh de Naphtali*) texts 'of Tob. 1:2 though not in the Vulgate or A.V. — Kedesh is introduced as the birthplace of Tobias. The text is exceedingly corrupt, but some little support is lent to this reading by the Vulgate, which, although omitting Kedesh, mentions Safed-post *viam quae ducit ad Occidentem, in sinistro habens civitatem Saphet*.

"The name Kedesh exists much farther north than the possessions of Naphtali would appear to have extended, attached to a lake of considerable size on the Orontes, a few miles south of Hums, the ancient Emessa (Thomson, in Ritter, *Damascus*, p. 1002 sq.). The lake was well known under that name to the Arabic geographers (see, besides the authorities quoted by Robinson [iii, 594, new ed.], Abulfeda in Schultenis's *Index Geogr.*, 'Fluvius Orontes,' and 'Kudsum'), and they connect it in part with Alexander the Great. But this and the origin of the name are alike uncertain. At the lower end of the lake is an island which, as already remarked, is possibly the site of Ketesh, the capture of which by Sethos I is preserved in the records of that Egyptian king" (Smith).

## Kedron.

SEE KRIDRON.

## Keel

(**τρόπις**, as being that which *turns* the vessel), the longitudinal projection on the bottom of a ship (Wisd. 5:10).

### Keeler, Sylvanus,

was the earliest native Methodist itinerant in Canada. He first appears in the Minutes of 1795 on the Bay of Quinte Circuit. "He proved," says the Canadian chronicler of the Church, "a good and faithful minister of Christ." He labored about twelve years in the itinerant work, and then retired into the local ranks, compelled by the growing necessities of his family to resort to other means of support. He did not, however, abandon his Sabbath labors, but continued to preach all his days. After his family grew up and were able to provide for themselves, he extended his efforts to greater distances from home, carrying the Gospel into the distant settlements of immigrants beyond the Rideau. He died in the faith. Keeler had no advantages of early education; he had, however, endowments, natural and of divine bestowment. His person was commanding, and his voice clear, melodious, and strong. His spirit and manners were the most bland and engaging, and his zeal and fervor knew no bounds and suffered no abatement Stevens, *Hist. M. E. Church*, 3:192; 4:274.. (J. L. S.)

### Keeling, Isaac

an English Wesleyan minister of note, was born in the latter half of the last century, and entered the ministry in 1811, but it was not until after many years of hard labor that he rose to any prominence. In 1845 he was elected president of the Conference; shortly after his health began to fail,, and he was obliged to take a supernumerary elation. He died in 1869. "Mr. Keeling was sagacious, discriminating, cautious, profound, and intensely original. His sermons were models of pure diction, exact thought, luminous arrangement, careful definition, and varied instructiveness. He was a man of retiring habits and cold exterior, but he had a warm heart, and a keen relish of the pleasures of friendship."

### Keene, Edmund, D.D.,

an English prelate, and a native of Lynn, Norfolk, was born in 1713. He became master of Peter House in 1748, bishop of Chester in 1752, and was thence transferred to Ely in 1770. He died in 1781. He published five *Occasional Sermons* (1748,1753, 1755,1757,1767).

## Keeper,

in its widest sense, corresponds to the Heb. **רמֵן**, *shomer'*, Gr. **τηρῶν**; in a special sense to **רִפְאֵן** or **רִחֵן**, a *watchman*, as often rendered; **ה[ֵר]**, is a *shepherd*; while **רִצִי פֹדֵלֶצֶ**, is a *guard* over prisoners. These words are of frequent occurrence, besides others in certain peculiar senses or combinations, the meaning being clear from the connection.

## Kehel'athah

or, rather, KEHE'LAH (Heb. *Kehelah'*, **הִל הֶעָ**] *assembly*, only with **ה** paragogic, **הִל הֶעָ**] *Kehela'thah*; Septuag. **Μακελλάθ**, *Vulg. Ceelatha*), the twenty-third station of the Israelites in the desert, between Rissah and Mt. Shapher (<sup>(4822)</sup>Numbers 33:22, 23); perhaps at the mouth of wady el-Hasana, west of Jebel Achmer. *SEE EXODE.*

## Keil, Karl August Gottlieb,

an eminent German theologian, was born at Grossenhain, near Dresden, Saxony, April 23, 1754, and was educated at Leipzig University. Three years after graduation he obtained a privilege as tutor at his *alma mater*, and at once opened a course of lectures on exegesis and hermeneutics. In 1785 he was appointed professor extraordinary of philosophy, in 1788 professor extraordinary of theology, and in 1793 was finally promoted to the full or ordinary professorship. He died at Leipzig April 22, 1818. His works are *Systematisches Verzeichniss derjenigen theologischen Schriften d. Kenntniss allgemein nothig und nitzlich ist* (Stendel, 1783, 1792, 8vo): *-De exemplo Christi recte imitando Dissert.* (Lpz. 1792, 4to): — *De Doctoribus veteris Ecclesias culpa corruptae per Platonicas sententias theologice liberandis* (Lpzg. 1793, 1816, 4to), consisting of twenty-two dissertations, which were to be followed by others. They were afterwards printed in his *Opuscula Acad.*, of which they form the second part. It is a very valuable work: *-Ueber d.'historische Erklärungsart d. heiligen Schrift u. deren Nothwendigkeit* (Lpz. 1798, 8vo; Latin by Hempel): — *Lehrbuch der Elermeneutik d. N.T. nach Grundsätzen d. grammatisch-historischen Interpretation* (Leipzig, 1810, 8vo; Latin translation by C. A. G. Emmerling, Lpz. 1811, 8vo), a very useful and important contribution' to the department of hermeneutics, which he made his specialty, and in which he has justly become very celebrated. After his death his occasional writings were collected by J. D. Goldhorn, and published under the title of

*Opuscula academica ad N.T. interpretationem grammatico-historicam et theologice Christianae origines pertinentia* (Lpzg. 1821, 2 vols. 8vo).

Besides treatises on topics of hermeneutical interest, this volume contains several exegetical essays, and an elaborate dissertation, *De Platonicis philosophiis ad theolog. (Christ. apud vet. eccles. scriptores ratione.* "Keil," says Prof. W. L. Alexander (in Kitto, *Bibl. Cyclop.* vol. ii, s.v.), "is a perspicuous writer, and his works, though cold and formal, are full of good sense and solid learning." In connection with H. G. Tzschirner, Keil also published a theological journal under the title *Analektenf. d. Studium d. exegetischen u. systematischen Theologie* (Leipzig, 1812-18, 4 vols. 8vo). See Hofer, *Nouv. Biog. Gener.* 20:503; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 7:504.

## Kei'lah

(Heb. *Keilah'*, **הַלְיָאֵל** [in <sup><0215></sup>1 Samuel 23:5, **הַלְיָאֵל**, prob. *citadel*; Septuag. **Κεῖλά** or **Κεῖλᾶ**, v. r. in Chronicles and Nehemiah **Κεεῖλά**), a city in the plain of Judah (<sup><0548></sup>Joshua 15:44), bordering on the southern portion of the highlands (see Keil's *Comment.* ad loc.). It appears to have been founded by Naham the Garmite, brother of Hodiah, one of the wives of Mered (<sup><0419></sup>1 Chronicles 4:19). "The Philistines had fallen upon the town at the beginning of the harvest (Josephus, *Ant.* 6:13, 1), plundered the corn from its threshing-floor, and driven off the cattle (<sup><0210></sup>1 Samuel 23:1). The prey was recovered by David (ver. 2-5), who remained in the city till the completion of the ingathering. It was then a fortified place, with walls, gates, and bars (<sup><0217></sup>1 Samuel 23:7, and Josephus). During this time the massacre of Nob was perpetrated, and Keilah became the repository of the sacred ephod, which Abiathar the priest, the sole survivor, had carried off with him (ver. 6). But it was not destined long to enjoy the presence of these brave and hallowed inmates, nor indeed was it worthy of such good fortune, for the inhabitants soon plotted David's betrayal to Saul, then on his road to besiege the place. Of this intention David was warned by divine intimation. He therefore left (<sup><0217></sup>1 Samuel 23:7-13). It will be observed that the word *Baali* is used by David to denote the inhabitants of Keilah in this passage (ver. 11, 12; A.V. 'men'), possibly pointing to the existence of Canaanites in the place" (Smith). **SEE BAAL.** Keilah was so considerable a city in the time of Nehemiah as to have two praefects, who are mentioned as assisting in the reconstruction of the walls of Jerusalem (<sup><0617></sup>Nehemiah 3:17, 18), and existed in the days of Eusebius and Jerome, who place it eight (the former, s.v. **Κηλά**, less correctly, seventeen) Roman miles from

Eleutheropolis, on the road to Hebron (see Reland, *Palcest.* p. 488, 698). Josephus calls it *Cilla* (Κίλλα, *Ant.* 6:13,1). The prophet Habakkuk is said to have been buried here (Sozomen, *Hist.* 7:29; Nicephorus, *Hist.* 12:48); but **SEE HUKKOK**. The above notices all point to a locality at a fork of wady el-Faranj, a little N. of Idhna (Jedna), " where on a projection of the right-hand mountain stands a ruined tower" (*Robinson, Researches*, ii, 427), which Van de Velde learned at Hebron was still called *Kilah* (*Memoir*, p. 328). This is confirmed by Tobler (*Dritte Wanderung*, p. 150 sq.), although he remarks (p. 467) that Van de Velde, on the first edition of his *Map*, had placed it too  $\hat{p}$ 'far south (S.E. of Idhna). A writer in Fairbairn's *Dictionary* (s.v.) argues in favor of the locality of *Khuweilifeh* **SEE RIMMON**, but this is utterly out of the required region, being in the Simeonitish portion of the tribe. **SEE JUDAH**

### Keir, John, D.D.

a Presbyterian minister, was born at Bucklyvie, Stirlingshire, Scotland, Feb. 2, 1770, educated at the University of Glasgow, studied theology under Rev. A. Bruce, professor of theology in the General Associate Synod, and was licensed at Glasgow in 1807. In 1808 he was appointed missionary to Nova Scotia, B. P., whither he immediately proceeded. In the spring of 1809 he preached at Halifax and Merigomiah, and later took charge of the societies at Princetown and St. Peter's, Prince Edward Island. and in June, 1810, was ordained and installed as pastor, which position he held for nearly fifty years.. In addition to his pastoral duties he filled the position of professor of theology in the Presbyterian Church of Nova Scotia, to which he was appointed in 1843. He died Sept. 22, 1858. "Mr. Keir, as a lecturer, left upon the minds of the students a deep impression of the duties and responsibilities of the sacred office." — *Wilson's Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1859-60 p. 234.

### Keith, George

the noted leader of a faction of the Quakers, was born of Presbyterian parentage, in Aberdeen, Scotland, in 1638. He was a man of superior intellect, who had enjoyed the advantages of a splendid training , not only in the schools of the national Church of Scotland, but also at the University of Aberdeen. In the year 1664 he came as a minister from the south of Scotland to his friends in Aberdeen, and, adopting the views of the Quakers, was involved in confiscations and imprisonment, together with

others of that persecuted people. He wrote and published several treatises in vindication and explanation of the principles of that respectable body of Christians, and in 1675 was engaged with the celebrated Robert Barclay in a dispute with the students of the University of Aberdeen in defence of the Quaker doctrines. He also, about this time, with William Penn, George Whiting, and Stephen Crisp, engaged in a discussion with the Baptists in London. About the year 1682 he removed to England, and took charge of a school at Edmonton, established by the Society of Friends. He was soon persecuted, however, for preaching and teaching without a license, and, refusing to take the oath, was committed to jail. In 1684 he removed to London, but was imprisoned five months in Newgate for nonconformity. After his liberation he emigrated to New Jersey, and was there appointed surveyor general, and employed in determining the boundary-line between East and West Jersey. In 1689 he removed to Philadelphia, where he took charge of a Friends' school, with a liberal salary, but resigned his position at the end of the school year, and travelled in New England, visiting meetings and holding disputations with the religious professors. He is noted for his defence at this time of the Quaker tenets against Increase and Cotton Mather. On his return to Philadelphia he became involved in a controversy with his own denomination, on various points of discipline and doctrine. He charged them with doing away, by allegory, with the narrative of the real sufferings of Christ, and consequently the doctrine of a real atonement. He also suspected them of being infected with the spirit of Deism.. Penn, being at this time in London, addressed a letter to Turner, a justice in Philadelphia, in which he defends "honest Geo. Keith and his Platonic studies," but afterwards, becoming acquainted with the merits of the dispute, decided against Keith. Keith returned to London, where he soon came in collision with Penn himself. Penn having spoken from the text, "The blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin," his exposition being strictly orthodox on their principles, namely, that "the blood is the life, and the life is the light within them," Keith took up the subject, and showed that "sin was cleansed by the blood of the true Christ actually shed on Calvary." Penn is reported to have started from his seat, and, as he himself afterwards stated in the annual meeting, being "so transported by the power of God that he was carried out of himself, and did not know whether he was sitting, or standing, or on his knees," he thundered forth this anathema: "I pronounce thee an apostate, over the head of thee." The great body followed Penn, and Keith was condemned by an edict of the annual meeting. He was not slow, however, in his own

defence, but denounced the society as Deists, and entered into an able and labored argument to prove it (see Keith's *Deism of William Penn*, and Mosheim, vol. 5:cent. 17:ch. 4:sect. ii, part ii), and formed a society of his own, known as *Christian Quakers, Baptist Quakers, or Keithians* (q.v.). Still dissatisfied, he finally entered the Church of England, and became a regular priest. In the years 1702,1703,1704, he performed an important and successful mission on the American continent, under the care of the *Episcopal Society for propagating the Gospel in Foreign Parts*.

He was especially successful in Pennsylvania and New Jersey. Seven hundred Quakers were through his instrumentality converted from Quakerism and baptized (see Humphry's *History of the Quakers*, Lond. A.D. 1730; *Christian Observer*, April, 1816). Returning to England, in 1706 he was appointed rector of Edburton, in Sussex, and there died about 1715. Bishop Burnet, who was educated with Keith at the University of Aberdeen, in his *History of his Own Times* (1700, ii, 144), says that Keith "was esteemed the most learned man that ever was in that sect; he was well versed both in the Oriental tongues, in philosophy and mathematics." Keith wrote a great many theological tracts, principally directed against the Quakers, for a list of which see Watts, *Bibl. Brit.* The most important of all is *The Standard of the Quakers examined* (Lond. 1702, 8vo), which is a refutation of Barclay's *Apology*. See Janney, *History of the Friends* (Philad. 1867, 4 vols. 12mo), 3:71 sq. (E. de P.)

### Keith, Isaac Stockton, D.D.,

a Congregational minister, was born at Newton, Pa., Jan. 20, 1755, graduated at Princeton College in 1775, entered the ministry in 1778, and was ordained pastor of the Presbyterian church in Alexandria in 1780. In 1788 he went to Charleston, S. C., as colleague pastor of the Congregational church, in which position he labored until his death, Dec. 14, 1813. A memoir of his life and a few sermons were published in a volume in 1816. Sprague, *Annals*, ii, 166.

### Keith, Reuel, D.D.

a Protestant Episcopal minister in America, was born at Pittsford, Vt., in 1792, and passed A.B. in Middlebury College in 1814. After teaching for some time, he became an assistant at St. John's, Georgetown, D. C., and, in 1820, professor of humanity and history in Williamsburgh, Va. A theological seminary having been established soon after in Alexandria, he

became professor of pulpit eloquence and pastoral theology there, and in 1827 was made D.D. by his alma mater. For upwards of twenty years he continued to discharge his duties, when his mind became unstrung in regard to his salvation, and the cloud was removed by death Sept. 3, 1842. He published a *Translation* (from the German) of *Hengstenberg's Christology of the Old Testament* (Alexandria, D. C., 1836, 3 vols. 8vo). See Sprague, *Annals*, 5:625.

### Keith, Robert

primus bishop in the Scotch Episcopal Church, was born at Uras, Kincardineshire, in 1681. He studied at the University of Aberdeen, and in 1713 became pastor of a congregation in Edinburgh. In 1727 he was ordained bishop of Caithness, Orkney, and the Isles, and in 1733 became bishop of Fife. He died in 1757. His principal works are, *History of the Affairs of Church and State in Scotland from the beginning of the Reformation to the Retreat of Queen Mary into England, anno 1568* (Edinb. 1734, fol.); *-Historical Catalogue of the Scottish Bishops down to the Year 1688, etc.* (Edinb. 1755, 4to; new ed. 1824, 8vo). -Chambers and Thomson's *Biog. Dict. of Eminent Scotsmen*, 3:305; Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* 6:397.

### Keith, William

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Easton, Mass., Sept. 15, 1776, entered the itinerancy in 1798, withdrew from the connection in 1801, but returned in 1803, and in 1806 re-entered the itinerancy. In 1809 he was stationed in New York, where he died, Sept. 7, 1810. He was a man of fine abilities, of comprehensive mind, and logical power. His piety was 'deep and sincere, and his preaching talents often eloquent and always *useful*. - *Minutes of Conferences*, i, 193.

### Keithians

a party which separated from the Quakers in Pennsylvania in the year 1691. They were headed by the famous George Keith (q.v.), from whom they derived their name. Those who persisted in their separation, after their leader deserted them, practiced baptism, and received the Lord's Supper. This party were also called *Quaker Baptists*, because they retained the language, dress, and manner of the Quakers.



## Kelah.

*SEE KARENS (Spirit Worship).*

## Kelai'ah.

(Heb. *Kelayah'*, *hyl qerperh.* *despised by Jehovah*; Sept. **Κωλία** v. r. **Κωλαα**), one of the Levites who divorced his Gentile wife after the captivity, otherwise called KELITA (<sup><151023></sup>Ezra 10:23).

## Keleb.

*SEE DOG.*

## Keleusma

(**κέλευσμα**, *call*). *SEE CALL.*

## Keli.

*SEE TALMUD.*

## Kel'ita

[some *Keli'ta*] (Hebrew *Kelita'*, *afyl æþ* *dwarf*; Sept. **Κωλίτας**, **Καλλίτας**, **Καλιτάν**), one of the Levites who assisted Ezra in expounding the law to the people (<sup><14087></sup>Nehemiah 8:7), and joined' the sacred covenant (<sup><14000></sup>Nehemiah 10:10); he was also one of those who had divorced their heathen wives (<sup><151023></sup>Ezra 10:23, where it is stated that his name was likewise KELAIAH). B.C. 459-410.

## Kell, John

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

regard to himself, towards others he was indulgent."-Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1863, p. 387.

### **Keller, Benjamin, D.D.**

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

### **Keller, Emanuel**

a Lutheran minister, was born at Harrisburg, Pa., Sept. 30, 1801. Blessed with pious and faithful parents, his thoughts and desires were early turned to the Christian ministry. His classical studies were pursued at Dickinson College, Carlisle, and the study of divinity under the instruction of his pastor, Rev. Dr. Geo. Lochman. In 1826 he was inducted into the sacred office. He labored in the ministry successively at Manchester, Md., and Mechanicsburg, Pa.; at the latter place he died, April 11, 1837. In his death the Church mourned for one of her most useful and devoted ministers. Through his direct and personal instrumentality a large number of individuals were introduced into the ministry. (M. L. S.)

### **Keller, Ezra, D.D.,**

an eminent minister of the Lutheran Church, was born in Middletown Valley, Md., June 12, 1812. Influenced by an unquenchable desire to preach

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

### Keller, Frederick Augustus Muhlenberg

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

### Keller (Cellartus), Jacob

a German Jesuit, was born at Sackingen, in Swabia, in 1568, and entered the Jesuitical order when only twenty years old. He gained an unenviable notoriety by his controversies with Protestants; most prominent among them is his public dispute with Jacob Heilbrunner. The Jesuits claim that Keller silenced the Protestant, but evangelical writers all deny the truth of this assertion. Be this as it may, Keller himself became a great favorite in his order, and was honored with a professorship of theology at Regensburg, and later with the rectorate at Munich. He was in great favor also with the duke of Bavaria. Klose (in *Herzog, Read-Encyklop.* 7:508)

accuses Keller of having contributed, both by pen and by word of mouth, towards the feeling of hatred which divided Protestants and Romanists just before the Thirty Years' War. Keller died Feb. 23, 1631.

### Kellerman, Georg,

a celebrated Roman Catholic, was born Oct. 11, 1776, near Munster (Germany), and was educated at the University of Munster and in the Roman Catholic seminary of that place. He was ordained priest Aug. 2, 1801, but did not hold any priestly office until 1811, filling up to this time the position of private tutor, in the family of the celebrated count of Stolberg, and to Kellerman, no doubt, is due the strong Roman Catholic tendencies of the Stolberg family. In 1826 Kellerman assumed, besides his priestly duties, those of the professorship of New-Testament exegesis in the Roman Catholic theological school at Munster, which in 1836 he exchanged for those of pastoral theology. December 13, 1846 he was elected bishop of Munster, but he died shortly after, March 29, 1847. He published *Predigten* (Munster, 1830, 3 vols 8vo; 1831, and 1833): *-Gesch. d. A. und N. Test.* (an abridgment of the large work of Overberg, and extensively used as a text-book in Roman Catholic schools); and edited several works of 'others.-Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 12:641.

### Kelley, Chas. H.,

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Logan Co., Ky., 1821; emigrated to Indiana in 1829; was converted in 1836; entered the Indiana Asbury University in 1845, but his health soon failed, and he left; entered the Indiana Conference in 1846; was transferred to the Missouri Conference in 1849, and appointed to St. Joseph station; in 1850 was stationed at St. Louis; in 1851 at Independence; and in 1852 at Lagrange Mission. While on this work he was arrested, on Feb. 13, 1853, by a band of ruffians, on a pretended suspicion of his identity with Chas. F. Kelley, who had recently escaped from the state-prison at Fort Madison. Thither he was forced on a stormy winter night, and though the state officers instantly set him at liberty, the outrages and exposure of the eighteen hours he was in the hands of the mob threw his feeble system into sickness, and he died shortly after, Sept. 17, 1853. He was a good man, an able and faithful preacher, and much lamented by his *brethren.*-*Minutes of Conf.* 5:481.' (G. L. T.)

## Kells

(originally *Kenlis*) is the name of an ancient Irish town in which a very important synod was held A.D. 1152. It was convoked by Papyrio (Paparo?), cardinal priest, and the pope's (Eugenius III) legate, for the formal reception of the Irish Church into the see of Rome. The Church of Ireland, which had been founded. A.D. 432, remained until the close of the 9th century, and even later, almost entirely isolated from the rest of Christendom. Through these long years, bishop Usher says (iv, 325), "All the affairs of the bishops and Church of Ireland were done at home... the people and the kings made their bishops." All this while the Irish Church, in her isolation and poverty, grew from infancy to maturity, following the plain scriptural teachings of her unlettered founder, without perhaps knowing anything of the refinements and innovations which were arising on the Continent. The irruption of the Danes in A.D. 787 had brought the Irish, and with them the Church, into more general communication with continental Europe; and, when, towards the close of the 9th century, many of the colonists in Ireland embraced Christianity, their clergy applied to the English, whom they claimed as their kindred, for ordination, and in A.D. 1085, Lanfranc, archbishop of Canterbury, ordained for them Donatus as the bishop of Dublin. On his consecration Donatus made the following declaration: "I Donatus, bishop of the see of Dublin, in Ireland, do promise canonical obedience to you, O Lanfranc, archbishop of the holy Church of Canterbury, and to your successors" (*Illust. Men of Ireland*, i, 235). This was the first promise of fealty on the part of any church in Ireland, and it was made by a foreigner (no native had ever made such a pledge), and gave rise to two Church organizations, the old one founded by St. Patrick, and the new Dano-Irish Church started by this action of the archbishop of Canterbury. The Synod of Kells was called to bring about a union of the two branches, or, at least, to establish on a permanent basis the claims of Romanism. We cannot tell who composed this celebrated synod at Kells, for from this time forward all the records were in the keeping of the new organization; those of the old were either accidentally or intentionally lost. It is not, however, very probable that the old Irish government of nearly seven hundred years' standing would at once dissolve itself and merge into the new one, whose purposes they had so long resisted. Besides, nearly twenty years afterwards, in A.D. 1170, we find the old Synod of Armagh still in existence, deploring and protesting, against the slaughterings and devastations of the English under Henry II, whom the

popes had then sent over to Ireland to bring their Church "to canonical conformity." Papyrio clearly recognised it as his task to establish a hierarchy where none had ever existed before, and for this purpose he attempted to suppress most of the former Irish bishops, and to create four great archiepiscopal sees-those of Armagh Cashel, Dublin, and Tuam-by instituting a system of tithes, claiming Peter's pence, and requiring conformity in all Church matters " to the one catholic and Roman office." He brought also with him the palliums or investitures from the pope for the four newly-created archiepiscopal sees; the reception of these was regarded as so many pledges of fealty and obedience to the popes of Rome. The public presentation and reception of these badges had long been an object of great solicitude on the part both of Rome and of several of the prominent bishops in England and Ireland; for, in their estimation, until this was done, there seemed to have been something wanting in regard to a full and complete union. All of these measures, as we have seen, were, however, inaugurated and carried forward by the Dano-Irish and a small Romanizing party in Ireland. The native clergy, with few exceptions, would have actively opposed them had they not looked upon the Danes as mere colonists. To, their sorrow, the Irish learned, when too late, that the Roman hierarchy had been successfully established in Ireland by the action of the Synod of Kells. See Malit, *History of the Irish Church*, p. 6. **SEE IRELAND.** (D. D.)

### Kelly, John

a minister of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, was born at Rocky Creek, Chester District, S. C., in 1772, and was educated abroad (at Glasgow College, Scotland), as was the custom and necessity in his' day.. His theological studies he pursued under the direction of the Rev. Dr. McMillan, of Stirling, Scotland. He returned to 'South Carolina' in 1808, and in June, 1809, was licensed to preach. Two years later he was ordained and appointed missionary in the Western States and Territories, and settled finally at Beech Woods, Butler Co., Ohio. He was released from active service in 1837, but continued preaching up to the time of his death, Nov. 6, 1842. "His life was one of most untiring activity, and under his faithful ministry many a spot in the wilderness was seen to bud and blossom as the rose." -Sprague, *Annals*, ix (Ref. Presb.), p. 63.

## Kelly, Thomas

was born in Queens County, Ireland, about 1769, and was the son of Judge Kelly, of Kellyville. He graduated at the Dublin University with the highest honors, with a view of studying law. He entered at the Temple, London, and while there enjoyed the friendship of his celebrated countryman, Edmund Burke, but before the completion of his legal studies, his mind having been strongly exercised on the subject of religion, he entered upon a course of theological reading, and in 1793 was ordained a clergyman of the Established Church. Kelly became one of the most popular preachers in Dublin, and crowds flocked to his church Sunday after Sunday to listen to his fervent appeals; incurring, however, the displeasure of his superiors in the Church, he was induced at length to leave the Establishment, though he never dissented from its doctrines. He continued to labor in Dublin for more than sixty years, and it was a common remark concerning him that he never seemed to waste an hour. He was possessed of abundant means, a rare thing among clergymen, and devoted a large portion of it to the building of churches. He was a man of varied learning, versed in the Oriental languages, and an excellent Biblical critic. He was also skilled in music, and composed a volume of airs for his hymns which were remarkable for their simplicity and sweetness. In October, 1854, while preaching to his own congregation, he was seized with a slight stroke of paralysis, which gradually lessened his strength, till he died May 14, 1855. Mr. Kelly was the author of *Andrew Dunn*, a controversial work against Romanism, and of a pamphlet entitled *Thoughts on Imputed Righteousness*, but as a writer he is best known as the author of *Hymns on various Passages of Scripture* (the last edition, published in Dublin, 1853, contains seven hundred and sixty-five hymns).

## Kelpies

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

## Kelsey, James

a Methodist Episcopal minister, born at Tyringham, Mass., Oct. 1, 1782, was converted in 1796, entered the Philadelphia Conference in 1806, and labored with great success. He died in 1840 (?). James Kelsey was a good

man, and through a long service was intent on the work of saving the souls of men. -*Minutes of Conferences*, 3:146..

### Kelso, George W.,

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Louisa County, Va., in 1815, and emigrated while young to Tennessee. He was educated at the Nashville University, joined the Tennessee Conference in 1835, was transferred to the Virginia Conference in 1842, and died Aug. 10, 1843. Kelso was a faithful and very successful minister, not brilliant, but sound and equable, and very trustworthy in all *things*. -*Minutes of Conferences*, 3:460.

### Kemp, James, D.D.

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

### Kemp, Thomas William

a minister of much promise in the Lutheran Church, was born in Frederick Co.. Md., Dec. 2, 1833. Under the influence of faithful Christian nurture his religious principles were successfully developed, and the foundation of his character laid. His childhood and youth were' characterized by an exemption from everything vicious, by unusual sprightliness, and an eager desire for study. For four years he was a pupil of St. Mary's (Catholic) College, Baltimore. He subsequently entered Pennsylvania College, and



graduated in 1853. He commenced his theological studies under the direction of Drs. Morris, Seiss, and Webster, at the time pastors in Baltimore, and completed them at the seminary in Gettysburg. He was licensed to preach in 1855. For a brief period he was associated with Dr. Stork in the pastoral work in Philadelphia. He subsequently took charge of a Mission Church in Chicago, Illinois, but the climate proving unfavorable to his health, he was obliged to retire from the field. He visited foreign lands, but returned from his pilgrimage to die amid the scenes of his childhood and' the embrace of loved ones at home. He passed peacefully away Sept. 15,1861. (M. L. S.)

### Kemp, Van Der, John Theodore

a Dutch missionary, was born at Rotterdam in 1748, and studied Oriental languages and theology at the University of Leyden, but after graduation he entered the army in a regiment of dragoons, in which he soon attained the grade of lieutenant. He left the army, however, and turned to the study of medicine at Edinburgh, and in 1791 commenced practicing at Dort; but, in the end, he turned again to theology. The loss of his wife and daughter, who were drowned together, so affected him that he devoted himself exclusively to the service of his divine Master. About this time he wrote a work on St. Paul's theodicy (published. in 1798), and later he went as a missionary to the Hottentots. Arriving at the Cape of Good Hope, he obtained leave from a Kaffire king to settle in his states, but was subsequently driven away by the jealousy of the Dutch settlers. Retained at the Cape by governor Janssens until 1806, he was then permitted by the English governor Baird to settle at Bethelsdorp. The official report of his mission, which he drew up in 1809, does not show him to have been particularly successful in his attempts to civilize the natives. He died at the Cape Dec. 7,1811. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 27:539. (J. N. P.)

### Kempe, Stephan

one of the leaders in the German Reformation of the 16th century, the founder of Protestantism in the city of Hamburg, his native place, was born towards the close of the 15th century. He was educated at Rostock, and became a Franciscan monk in 1523; but, while on business for his order at Hamburg, he became acquainted with. the reformer Joachim Sliiter, and soon was himself one of the most enthusiastic preachers of the new religion. To Kempe belongs the glory, indeed, of the evangelization of

Hamburg. One of his ablest assistants in the glorious work was Ziegenhagen (q.v.). In 1528 they had so far gained the upper hand that the Roman Catholics were obliged. to leave the city altogether in their hands. In Luneburg, also, Kempe aided the good cause of the Lutherans; in fact, wherever, in the immediate neighborhood of the Hanse cities, his assistance was needed to further the reformatory movement, it had not to be asked for twice. He died at Hamburg October 23, 1540. He wrote a narrative of the Reformation in Hamburg which was published by Mayer in *Das Evangelische Hamburg* (Hamburg, 1693, 12mo).

### **Kemper, Jackson, D.D., LL.D.**

first missionary bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States. was born at Pleasant Valle, in Dutchess County, New York, Dec. 24, 1789. When about twelve years of age he was sent to the Episcopal Academy at Cheshire, Conn., and remained there two years; after that he was put under the charge of Rev. Dr. Barry, a graduate of Trinity College, Dublin, at that time one of the most distinguished classical teachers in the country; entered Columbia College in 1805, and graduated in 1809. He began the study of theology under the care of bishop Moore and the clergy of Trinity parish, there being no theological seminaries in those days. As soon as he had reached the canonical age of twenty-one years, he was ordained deacon at the hands of bishop White, in St. Peter's Church, Philadelphia, on the second Sunday in Lent, 1811. He was immediately called to the assistantship under bishop White, and held this position till June of 1831, when he accepted the rectorship of St. Paul's Church, Norwalk, Conn. In 1835 he was elected the first missionary bishop of the American Church. His jurisdiction comprised "the North-west." Out of it have been formed the dioceses of Missouri, Indiana, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, Kansas, and Nebraska. Early in the winter of this year bishop Kemper reached St. Louis, where he took up his residence until he removed to Wisconsin in 1844. Meanwhile (about 1838) he had been elected to the bishopric of Maryland, but this honor he declined, preferring the more burdensome but not less honorable position of missionary bishop. In 1847, Wisconsin having been organized into a diocese, the Primary Convention elected bishop Kemper diocesan. This was also declined; but in 1854, being again unanimously elected, he accepted, only upon condition that his acceptance should allow him to remain missionary bishop still. At the General Convention of 1859 he resigned his office as missionary bishop, and from that time until his death, May 24, 1870, his labors were

confined to the diocese of Wisconsin. He was active in the establishment of a theological seminary within the bounds of his diocese, and when, in 1843, it was founded at Nashotah, Wisconsin, the bishop took up his residence on a farm adjoining.

### Kempis, John a

a German monk, brother of Thomas a Kempis (q.v.), was born at; Kempen, near Cologne, in 1365. About 1380 he came to Deventer, and was admitted by Gerard Groot among the Brethren of the Common Life. He became successively one of the first members of the Canons Regular of Windesheim in 1386; prior of the Convent of Mariabrunn, near Amhelm, in 1392; and of the new Convent of Mount St. Agnoes near Zwoll, in 1399. Here he remained nine years, during which he caused the buildings, etc., of the convent to be finished. He subsequently directed four other establishments of his order, and died at Bethany, near Arnheim, Nov. 4, 11.32. It was John a Kempis who drew up the rules of the chapter of Windesheim, the central establishment of his order. Gerson pronounced his eulogy in the Council of Constance. See Buschius, *Chronicon Windesenense*; Rosweide, *Vita Joh. a Kempis (Appendix ad Thomae a Kempis Chronicon Montis S. Agnetis)* Mooren, *Nachrichten uber Thom. a Kempis*, p. 134.-Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Gener.* 27:542. (J. N. P.)

### Kempis, Thomas A

(so called from his native place, *Kempen*, a village in the diocese of Cologne; his family name was *Haimerken* [Latinized *Malleolus*, Little Hammer]), one of the most celebrated mystics and forerunners of the Reformation of the 16th century, was born about 1380. Thomas's parents were poor, and could ill afford the aspiring youth any superior advantages of education, but, trained by a pious mother, he had early inclined to the priesthood, and, aware of the advantages afforded young persons by the monastic brotherhood known as the *Brethren of the Common Life* (q.v.), he quitted his parental roof at the age of thirteen to seek further educational advantages than he had enjoyed at his home, under the instruction of the celebrated John Boehme, then at the head of a school at Deventer, superintended by the "Brethren of the Common Life." While here at school he was brought to the notice of Florentius, one of the principal disciples of Gerhard Groot and the superintendent of the brotherhood, whose protection Thomas was enjoying. Florentius, not slow

to discover in Thomas abilities of a high order, embraced every opportunity to draw the pious youth closer to his side, and in 1396 finally offered him a home at his own house, the head-quarters of the brethren, to study and watch more closely the character and inclinations of the youthful stranger. Surrounded by pious comrades, among whom we meet Arnold of Schoonhoven (q.v.), with whom he shared a little chamber and bed, Thomas was soon inclined to a life of asceticism. "Examples," says Thomas a Kempis himself, "are more instructive than words" (*Vall. litor.* 24:1, p. 95). Possessed of a boding mind, and animated by a piety so fervent as to presume always the best of others, such was the effect produced upon him by the brethren's whole manner of life, that the seven years he spent in the zealous exercise of piety and the prosecution of his studies at the school and brother-house of Deventer were to him seven years spent in an actual paradise. About 1400 he petitioned father Florentius for a recommendation to admit him into the convent of Mount St. Agnes, near Zwoll, of which his brother John h Kempis (q.v.) was then prior, and with a hearty welcome he entered this monastery as a novice among the regular canons. "Strangely as the mind of Thomas was bent upon his vocation, and although both nature and previous education had perfectly adapted him for it, he did not plunge into it without consideration. Deliberate even in his youthful zeal, he spent five years of novitiate, assumed the monastic dress in the sixth, and did not until the year following take the vow, which he then, however, kept with inviolable fidelity" (Ullmann, *ut infra*, ii, 124). It was not until about 1413 that he was ordained to the priesthood. Before this ordination he had buried himself, like all worthy disciples of the brotherhood, in the copying of MSS. and in the performance of religious exercises. Now that he was a priest, his chief occupation became the delivery of religious discourses and the duties of the confessional. He continued, however, copying religious MSS. Thomas a Kempis, indeed, applied himself with vigor to this labor, to which he brought a quick eye and a skilful hand. He copied out the whole Bible, a missal, and a multitude of other works, which the monastery of St. Agnes preserved; but, in performing this office, he also practiced the advice of one of the ancients, who, in writing out books, did not only seek by the labor of his hands to gain food for his body, but also to refresh his soul with heavenly nourishment. He was humble, meek, ready to give consolation; fervent in his exhortations and prayers; spiritual, contemplative, and his efforts in this direction finally resulted in the composition of an original treatise, which to this hour remains one of the most perfect compositions in religious literature, by

many considered the most beautiful uninspired production—the *Imitation of Christ* (see below). In 1425 Thomas was appointed subprior, an office which intrusted to his care the spiritual progress of the brethren and the instruction of novices. A difficulty having occurred between the pope on the one side, and the chapter and nobility of Utrecht on the other, about the election of Rudolph of Diephold as archbishop, the diocese was put under interdict, and the canons left Mount St. Agnes in 1429 to retire to Lunekerke, in Friesland, but returned in 1432, when Thomas became procurator of the convent. But, as the duties of this office appeared to abstract him too much from meditation and his more profitable labors as an author, he was, about 1449, reposed in the subpriorate, and continued in this office until his death, July 26, 1471. "From the nature of the case, we have little to say of Thomas's cloisteral life. Without any considerable disturbance, it flowed on like a limpid brook, reflecting on its calm surface the unclouded heavens. Quiet industry, lonely contemplation, and secret prayer filled up the day, and every day was like another." Among his contemporaries Thomas was eminently distinguished for sanctity and ascetic learning.

*Works.* — The reputation of a Kempis, however, rests not upon his ascetic character, but rather on the productions of his pen — his sermons, ascetical treatises, pious biographies, letters, and hymns—and from these only one need be selected to claim for him the mastery as a religious writer—his *De Imitatione Christi* — standing, as no one doubts, and as even its effects have demonstrated it to do, in point of excellence far above all the rest, the purest and most finished production of Thomas;" a work which, next to the sacred Scriptures only, has had the largest number of readers of which sacred literature, ancient or modern, can furnish an example. In its pages, says Milman (*Latin Christianity*, 6:482), "are gathered and centred all that is elevating, passionate, profoundly pious in all the older mystics. No book, after the holy Scripture, has been so often reprinted; none translated into so many languages, ancient and modern," extending even to Greek and Hebrew, or so often retranslated. Sixty distinct versions are enumerated in French alone, and a single collection, formed at Cologne within the present century, comprised, although confessedly incomplete, no fewer than 500 distinct editions. Indeed, it may be somewhat of a surprise to some to learn that this book has had an important influence on the mind of John Wesley and on the origin of Methodism. Wesley published a translation of it, entitled *The Christian's Pattern*. It was one of the earliest volumes issued

by the Methodist Book Concern, and is still on their catalogue. "It should be," says one of the most distinguished American Methodists, "in the hands of every Methodist."

Strange, indeed, it seems that the authorship of a work so popular and so widely noted, and of comparatively recent origin, should ever have been a subject of doubt and long controversy. Shortly after the decease of Thomas *h* Kempis a violent dispute arose between the Canons Regular of St. Augustine and the Benedictines, the former claiming *De Imitatione Christi* as the work of Thomas a Kempis, the latter asserting it to have been the production of the celebrated John Gerson (q.v.), chancellor of the University of Paris, who died in 1429. These two persons were generally cited as its authors until the beginning of the 17th century, when the Spanish Jesuit Manriquez discovered a MS. which credited it to John Gersen, or Gesen, abbe of Verceil in the early part of the 13th century. Since that time (1604) three competitors have divided the voices of the learned-not alone individuals, but public bodies, universities, religious orders, the Congregation of the Index, the Parliament of Paris, and even the French Academy; and the assertors of these respective claims have carried into the controversy no trifling amount of polemical acrimony. So much has been written on the theme, especially by French and Netherland antiquaries, that its pamphlets and books would make up quite a little library. Among the French writers the tendency of opinion has been to give the merit of this celebrated production to John Gerson. "Kempis," argued Iessieurs Barbier and Leroy, "was an excellent copyist; his copy of the Bible-the labor of fifteen years was thought a masterpiece of calligraphic art; and so he was merely employed in transcribing the work of Gerson," basing their inference mainly on the name and date of an ancient MS. of the *De Imitatione* preserved in the library at Valenciennes. German writers, on the other hand, have always been decidedly in favor of assigning the work to Thomas a Kempis, and since the discovery by bishop Malon of a MS. in the library at Brussels, bearing the name of Thomas a Kempis as author, the Belgians have joined the Germans. The proofs in favor of Thomas a Kempis are thus stated by M. Ernest Gregoire (in Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog.* ~~1275~~ *Genesis* 27:545 sq.).

#### A. *The direct Testimony of his Contemporaries.*

**1.** John Buschius, canon regular of the monastery of Windesheim (1420-79), positively declares in his *Chronicle* of that convent that Thomas wrote

the *Imitation*.' As he: knew him intimately, and had often occasion to see him, his testimony is important. They were of the same congregation, and Buschius was in the principal convent, where was held the general chapter, in which Thomas, as subprior, took part. Moreover, he resided there for fifty-one years, only one league and a half from Mount St. Agnes, where Thomas lived at the same time. It was said by some that the passage referring to Thomas was afterwards added in the chronicle; but a well-authenticated deed, drawn up in 1760, testifies that the MS. of the chronicle written by Buschius's own hand contains the passage written in the same hand, with the same ink, and in full, without erasure, insertion, or parenthesis. The same has been proved concerning a MS. copy of the *Chronicle of Windesheim*, written in 1477, and another written in 1478, which was sold at Cologne in 1823.

**2.** Hermann of Ryd, who wrote in 1454 a description of the convents belonging to the Canons Regular of Windesheim, states as positively as Buschius that Thomas, with whom he was personally acquainted, wrote the *Imitation*.

**3.** Gaspard Pforzheim, at the end of his German translation of the first three books of the *Imitation*, written in 1448, declares that it' was the work of Kempis.

**4.** The author of an anonymous biography of Kempis, written before the year 1488, counts: the *Imitation* among the works of Thomas. His testimony is the more valuable, as he had expressly gone to Mount St. Agnes to learn all the particulars concerning Kempis from those who had lived with him.

**5.** Albert of Hardenberg, a disciple of the celebrated Wessel, who was himself a disciple of Thomas, wrote the following decisive passages: "The reputation of the excellent brother Thomas a Kempis attracted many people to him. About that time he was writing the book of the *Imitation of Christ*, commencing *Qui sequitur me*. Wessel used to say that this book first rendered him zealously pious, and decided him to become better acquainted, and even familiar, with master Thomas, so that he actually embraced monastic life in the same convent of St. Agnes;" again: "The monks of Mount St. Agnes have shown me several writings of the very pious Thomas i Kempis, of whom they have preserved, among others, the truly estimable work of the *Imitation of Jesus Christ*, to which Wessel owed his taste for theology. The reading of this work had decided him,

while yet quite young, to go to Zwoll to study belleslettres, and to enjoy the friendship of the pious Thomas a Kempis, who was then canon of St. Agnes. Wessel had the highest regard for him, and preferred dwelling there rather than anywhere else."

**6.** John Mauburne, a canon regular, who was a novice of Mount St. Agnes under Renier, which latter had lived there six years with Thomas a Kempis, quotes, in his *Rosetum spiritalium exercitorum*, printed in 1491, three passages of the *Imitation*, naming Kempis as its author. In his *Catalogue des hommes illustres de la congrégation de Windesem* (Windesheim) he names three books of the *Imitation*, separately, as the work of Thomas.

These various testimonies are all derived from learned and trustworthy men, all of whom with the exception of one, were personally acquainted with Thomas a Kempis, or with persons who lived with him. They are, moreover, given with a simplicity which shows that they did not consider the question as one at all likely to give rise to controversy. They appear so, conclusive that it is hardly necessary to mention other writers of the 15th century who testified to the same effect. Trithemius (*De Script. Eccles.* c. 707) informs us that in his day Kempis was universally considered as the author of the *Imitation*; and though after 1441 some MSS. and subsequently some editions bore the name of John Gerson, every time the question as to the authorship arose in the 15th century it was decided in favor of Kempis. Thus Peter Schott, canon regular of Strasburg, in the preface to his edition of the works of John Gerson in 1488, says: "Some treatises are attributed to John Gerson, though well known to have been written by other parties; such, for instance, is the work *De Contemptu Mundi*, which is proved to have been written by a canon regular called Thomas a Kempis." The publisher of the French translation of the *Imitation* (Paris, 1493) expressly states that Thomas a Kempis was the author. The publisher of the Nuremberg edition, 1494, does the same. Finally, Francis of Tholen, successor of Thomas as subprior of Mount St. Agnes, gives the MS. copies of the *Imitation* in Thomas's own handwriting as a proof against Gerson.

**B.** *Indirect Proofs from the various MSS. and Editions.* — The oldest MS. of the *Imitation* we now possess is that known as Kirchheim's (in the Bourgogne Library, Brussels, as No. 15,137); it contains only the first three books. At the bottom of the first page is a note saying, "Be it remarked that this treatise is the work of a pious and learned man, master



Thomas of Mount St. Agnes, and canon regular of Utrecht, called Thomas a Kempis. It was copied from the author's autograph in the diocese of Utrecht in the year 1425, in the central house of the province." Another MS. of the same period was discovered in 1852 [by. bishop Muller, of Munster], in the gymnasium of Gadesdonk, near Goch: it contains the first four books of the *Imitation*: the first he copied in 1425, and the last in 1427. It does not give the name of the author, but a very significant fact is that it belonged originally to the Canons Regular of .Bethlehem, near Dottingheim, in the neighborhood of Mount St. Agnes. Among the other MSS. we notice, in the first place, that belonging to the Jesuits of Anvers, which played an important part in the controversy respecting the authorship. It is now in the Bourgogne Library, Brussels, as No. 5855-5861. It is all in Thomas's own handwriting, and, besides the first four books of the- *Imitation*, it contains some other treatises of Kempis. It closes with these words: "Finitus et completus Anno Domini' 1441 per manus fratris Thomae Kempensis in Monte S. Agnetis prope Zwollas." :Some have considered this as a proof that he only copied it, for he used the same formula concerning the. copies of the missal aild Bible which he wrote in 1417 and 1438; but pit has been ascertained that he used it also in all copies of his own original works. The Bourgogne Library, Brussels, preserves as No. 4585-4587 a MS. of Thomas ia Kempis containing a collection of his essays, and which ends as follows: "Anno 1446 finitus et scriptus per manus fratris Thomae Campensis," without otherwise naming Thomas as. the author. This formula, therefore, proves nothing either for or against the claims of Kempis. But it is worthy of notice that the authorship of the ascetic treatises contained in the Anvers MS. after the four books of the *Imitation* has always been unanimously ascribed to Kempis, and he would certainly not have put at the head of them the work of another which he had merely copied, or he would be open to the charge of deception. There are other MSS., dated 1441,1442,144.5, 1447, and 1451, as also seven between 1463 and 1488, which name Kempis as the author of the *Imitation*. Among the many MSS. of the 15th century which bear no precise date, but testify to this authorship, we shall mention only that of Dalhem, copied by a priest who said a mass for Kempis two months after the latter's death, and that of the canons of St. Martin of Louvain, which they received in 1570 from the last remaining members of the congregation of Mount St. Agnes., It is in Kempis's own handwriting, and contains the first draft of the fourth book of the *Imitation* the first he prepared in composing the work. Among the many editions of the

*Imitation* published in the 15th century, twenty-three at least consider Kempis as the author; and among these we find the oldest of all, published by Zainer (Augsb. 1468-1472).

**C.** *Proofs drawn from the Doctrines held and the Expressions used in the Imitation.* — The principles advanced in the *Imitation* are in perfect accordance with those held by the founders of the congregation of the *Brethren of the Common Life*, Gerhard Groot, Florentius Radewins, and John van Heusden. It may even be considered only as a commentary or exposition of their doctrines. In judging it thus, criticism, however, does not detract from the value of this masterpiece of the second half of the fourteenth century. Buschius said of its author, "Verus his novissimis temporibus hujus nostrae terrae apostolus, primus hujus. nostrae reformationis et totius modernae devotionis origo." The word *devotio* came to be used to designate the kind of piety Groot sought to develop among his disciples, and the latter took the name of *devoti*. Now, in the *Imitation* we find some ten passages where the expression *devotus* is used to designate a particular class of persons, who applied themselves zealously and ceaselessly to the practice of religious exercises, and to which the author himself belonged. Some eleven other passages, and a whole chapter even, show, moreover, that the book was written for a religious community of which the author was also a member, a fact quite incompatible with the opinion which considers Gerson as the author. We can quote here only three of the most conclusive passages: "Saepe sentimus, ut meliores et puriores in initio conversionis nos fuisse inveniamus, quam post multos annos professionis" (lib. i, ch. 11). "O quantus fervor omnium religiosorum in principiis suae sancte institutionis!... temporis et negligentiae status nostri, quod tam cito declinamus a pristino fervore" (lib. i, ch. 18). "Suscepi, suscepisti de manu tua crucem; portabo et portabo: earn usque ad mortem, sicut imposuisti mihi. Vere vita boni monachi crux est; sed dux paradisi. Eia fratres, pergamus simul; Jesus erit nobiscum. Propter Jesum suscepimus hanc crucem; propter Jesum perseveremus in cruce" (lib. iii, ch. 56). Another and strong proof in favor of Kempis is the fact that the principles advanced in those of his treatises the authorship of which has not been contested are precisely the same as are advocated in the *Imitation*. More than twenty chapters in these various treatises have almost the identical headings of some of the *Imitation*. Some have accounted for this on the ground of his familiarity with *De Imitatione* by copying; but this theory falls to the ground when we consider that in all his other treatises,

more than forty in number, he nowhere refers to or quotes the *Imitation*, which he would not have failed to do if it were the production of some other writer. Next to the general resemblance of these productions with regard to their tenor and tone, we must notice their similarity of style. The *Imitation* consists wholly of a series of separate maxims, pious reflections, advice, axioms, without any special connection of the several parts. 'A number of MS. copies bore the title *Liber sententiarum de Imitatione Christi*, or *Admonitiones ad spiritualia trahentes*. But this is exactly Thomas a Kempis's style. The writer's own description of his manner of writing is evidently that of the author of the *Imitation*: "Vario etiam sermonum genere, nunc loquens, nunc disputans, nunc orans, nunc colloquens, nunc in propriapersona, nunc in peregrina, placido stylo textum praesentem circum flexi" (Prolog. *Solilouiti Anirma*). Some object to Kempis on the ground that he was a mere copyist, who spent his life peaceably in a convent, and could not have known so intimately and accurately the yearnings, the sublime outbursts of the human heart which fill every page of the *Imitation*. We must remark, however, that the Canons Regular were not mere copyists, as the word is understood in our time, but rather intelligent publishers of the works they copied, and often men of great learning. They compared and corrected the works which came out of their hands by the aid of the best authorities, and, according to Thomas, their principal occupations were *orare, meditare, studere, scribere*. Thomas, as we have seen, was especially intrusted with the instruction of the novices, and, it seems, preached on all special occasions, drawing large crowds by his eloquence. He who seriously studies his own heart, moreover, does not need to go abroad in the world to become thoroughly acquainted with human nature, with its varied struggles, emotions, and yearnings. "I have," says Kempis himself, "everywhere sought rest, and found it only in solitude and among books" (*De Imitat. Christi*, i, 22, 6; 23, 1 sq.; 3:54, 1-8). "The *Imitation*," says a writer in the *Revue Chretienne* (Feb. 1861) "is a great and good book.. One breathes in it the most perfect love of God. The author, whoever he may be, has sounded the depths of this abyss of love, and the abyss attracts instead of frightening him. In this faith resting on God one feels a passionate casting aside of the 'things of this world, and a fervent yearning for the realities of a future life." Another great reason for assigning the work directly to German ground, and therefore also to Kempis, are the many Germanisms occurring in the *Imitation*. We shall mention only five, but these are sufficient to show that the writer was thoroughly conversant with German idioms:

*Cadere super*, in the sense of caring for a thing; *jacere in*, for to depend on; *gravitas*, for difficulty; *leviter*, for easily; and, finally, *scire exterius*, for to know by heart. This last is a literal translation of the German idiom (unintelligible in any other), and should have been *memoriter scire*. Some have, on the other hand, pointed to several Gallicisms in the *Imitation*, but the University of Paris was at that time the centre of theological knowledge; and it is no wonder if some French idioms became current expressions in the schools, while this could not be the case with German.  
*SEE GERSON.*

The other works of Thomas a Kempis, which are all of an ascetic character with the exception of two, have been collected in several editions, none of which, however, is quite complete. Among the most important editions are those of Ketelaer, published at Utrecht a few years after Kempis's death; of Paris (1493, 1520, 1521, 1523, 1549), Nuremberg (1494), Venice (1535, 1568, 1576), Antwerp (1574). That published at the same place in 1600 by the Jesuit Sommalius is considered the best, though it is not complete; it was reprinted at Antwerp (in 1607 and 1615), at Douay (1635), Cologne (1660, 1728, 1754), etc. A German translation of Kempis's complete works was published by Silbert (Vienna, 1834, 4 vols. 8vo). One of the latest editions was prepared by Krans, *Opera Omnia* (Treves, 1868, 16mo), but the most remarkable modern edition is a Heptaglot, printed at Sulzbach (1837), containing, besides the original, later versions in Italian, Spanish, French, German, English, and Greek. As for the *De Imitatione*, it has continued in print to the present time in nearly all the languages of the civilized world.

*Doctrines.* — Supposing, then, that Thomas a Kempis, of whose life and principal work we have just treated, actually flourished in the 14th century, it remains to be seen in how far his doctrinal views entitle him to prominence in the Christian Church, and to a place among the forerunners of the great Reformation. "It is true that with him (Kempis), in common with all eminent men, a few governing thoughts constitute the kernel of his intellectual being... but then... what we find in him is practical wisdom . . . sustained by a determinate general tendency of life and spirit." It must be confessed, also, that Thomas's whole theory of Christian life and faith, in so far as we see it developed in his writings, cannot be properly called original, for "he draws continually from the great traditionary stream." "But," says Ullmann (ii, 132), "even though the material be not to any great extent original, it yet acquires through the individuality of Thomas,

compacting it into a beautiful unity, a new soul, something peculiarly lovely, amiable, and fresh, a tone of truth, a cheerfulness, and gentle warmth of heart, by virtue of which it produces quite a peculiar effect."

For a decided inclination to asceticism we always look in characters of the age to which Thomas a Kempis belonged; we do not, therefore, make room here for a delineation of this part of his character, but will treat hastily only his peculiar views *on fellowship with God*. "Where," asks he, "can man find that which is truly good, and which enduringly satisfies? Not in the multitude of things which distract, but in the *One* which collects and unites. For the one does not proceed out of the many, but the many out of the one. That one is the one thing needful, the chief good, and nothing better and higher either exists or can even be conceived. ... Compared with him the creature is nothing. and only be-: comes anything when in fellowship with him. Whatever is not God is nothing, and should be counted as nothing" (*De Imit. Christi*, 3:32, 1). Here we find Thomas agreeing in words with Eckart of the Brethren of the Free Spirit. Both say God is all and man nothing. But with what difference. of meaning! Eckart understands the proposition metaphysically; Thomas understands it morally. "According to Eckart, man only requires to bear in mind his true and eternal nature in order to be himself God; according to Thomas, God, as himself the most perfect person, in the exercise of free grace, and from fulness of the blessings that reside in him, is pleased to impart personality to men in order that, although, . morally considered, they are themselves nothing, they may through him, and in voluntary fellowship with him, attain to true existence and eternal life. To enter into fellowship with God, the chief good and fountain of blessedness, and *to become one with him*, is the basis of all true contentment. But how can two such parties, God and man, the Creator and the creature, be brought together? God is in heaven and man on earth; God is perfect, and man sensual, vain, and sinful. There must, therefore, be mediation-some way in which God *comes* to man, and man to God, and both unite. This union of man with God depends upon a twofold condition, one negative and the other positive. The negative is that man shall wholly renounce what can give him no true peace. He must forsake the world, which offers to him such hardship and distress, and whose very pleasures turn into pains; he must detach himself from the creatures, for nothing defiles and entangles the heart so much as impure love of them; and only when a man has advanced so far as no longer to seek consolation from any creature does he enjoy God, and find

consolation in him; he must, in fine, deny himself, and wholly renounce be dead to selfishness and self-love, for whoever loves himself will find, wherever he seeks, only his own little, mean, sinful self, without being able to find God. This last is the hardest of all tasks, and can only be attained by deep and earnest self-acquaintance. But whosoever strictly exercises self-examination will infallibly come to recognise himself in his meanness, littleness, and nonentity, and will be led to the most perfect humility, entire contrition, and ardent longing after God. For only when man has become little and nothing in his own eyes can God become great to him; only when he has emptied himself of all created things can God replenish him with his grace.... Having condensed his whole doctrine into the short rule, '*Part with all, and then find all,*' he immediately subjoins, 'Lord, this is not the work of a day, nor a game for children. These few words include all perfection.' Here, accordingly, an efficacy must intervene which is superior to human strength. This efficacy is divine love imparting itself to man, and becoming the mediatrix between God and him, between heaven and earth. Love brings together the holy God who dwells in heaven and the sinful creature upon earth, uniting that which is most humble with that which is most exalted. It is the truth that makes man free, but the highest truth is love. Divine love, imparting and manifesting itself to man, is grace. God sheds forth his love into the heart of man, who thereby acquires liberty, peace, and ability for all good things; and, made partaker of this love, man reckons as worthless all that is less than God, loving God only, and loving himself no more, or, if at all, only for God's sake... He who has true and perfect love does not seek himself in anything, but only desires that God may be glorified. He cares not to have joy in himself, but refers all to God, from whom, as their source, all blessings flow, and in whom, as their final end, all saints find a blissful repose'" (Ullmann, ii, 140 sq.).

Naturally enough, Thomas a Kempis shares the notion of his day of almost the whole mediaeval period in reckoning monachism the highest stage of the Christian life, and the monk the perfect Christian. But this is due, first of all, to the high ideal which Thomas had of monachism, and of which he was himself no mean example. Asceticism, therefore, characterizes all he writes. Indeed, even a taint of the Pelagianism of the medieval theology fastens also upon him, and is especially manifest in those of his writings which are devoted to the delineation and recommendation of the monastic life, where the notion of *merit* plays a not unimportant part, and the centre of Thomas's whole religious system constitutes, not justification by faith,

but *reconciliation by love*. It is even true that "Thomas was a strict Catholic, and directly impugned nothing which had received the sanction of the Church," and that "he practiced with great zeal the whole divine worship as it then obtained, and which, as such, appeared to him just what it ought to be. He insists with particular urgency upon what is so characteristically Romish, prayers for the dead offered through the medium of the mass, especially the adoration of the saints, among whom he chiefly worships the patron saints of his own monastery, and, most of all, the service of Mary, to whom he ascribes so important a share, in the divine government of the world as to say of her, 'How could a world which is so full of sin endure unless Mary, with the saints in heaven, were daily praying for it?' (*De Discip. Claust. cap. xiv* ;: comp. *Sermon. ad Novit. 3:4*, p.,\$4; and see also Trithemius, *Je Script. eccl. c. 707*, p. 164; *Specul. Exemplar. Dist. 10:§ 7*). He no less acknowledges the existing hierarchy and ecclesiastical constitution in their whole extent, together with the priesthood in its function of mediating between God and man;" but, if he does not attack, *neither does he defend* or establish any, while, in many respects, he may be said, by his negative position, to have not only actually destroyed the influence of the Church, but really to have paved the way for reform. However true it be that "Thomas is not *intentionally* a reformer... he nevertheless is a reformer, for he desired the selfsame objects as Luther;" for the former, like the latter, everywhere insists upon the Christian principles of spirituality and freedom which formed the very basis of the Lutheran Reformation. In the 12th century mysticism was the defender of the Church, but not so the practical mysticism of the 15th century, as exhibited by the Brethren of the Common Life, and especially by Thomas. By this time the tables had turned completely. The position once occupied by scholasticism was now assumed, in a measure, by mysticism, and it became, though perhaps only covertly and unintentionally, the opponent of the Church; it founded or gave life to the institutions which sent forth the most influential precursors-the very leaders of the great German reform-and in many other respects "directly or indirectly exercised a positive influence upon the Reformation." For did not the Brethren of the Common Life labor in many new ways to prepare the way for the great reforms of the 16th century? Who but they afforded religious instruction to the people in their mother tongue, and sought their improvement by every means-educated the young, and circulated the Bible? "And, inasmuch as a Kempis also belongs to that side, inasmuch as he is manifestly antischolastical, gives prominence to the religious and

moral import of the dogma, and applies it almost exclusively to the use of the mystical and ascetical life, we must, from a regard for his edifying character, ascribe to him a real, although an indirect influence on the dissolution of the creed" (Ullmann, ii, 158).

See Brewer, *Thomas a Kempis Biographia*; Ullmann, *Reformers before the Reformation*, ii, 114 sq.; Bahring, *Thomas a Kempis nach seinem ausseren u. inneren Leben dargestellt* (Berlin, 1854, 8vo); Mooren, *Nachrichten ii. Thomas a Kempis* (Crefeld, 1855, 12mo); Rosweyde, *Vindicice Kempenses*; J. Fronteau, *Kempis Vindicatus!*; Hesper, *Dioptra Kempensis*; Th. Carre, *Thomne a Kempis a seipso restitutus*; Eus. Amort, *Plena Informatio de statu. controversice quae de auctore libelli de Imitatione Christi agitatur*, etc.; Delprat, *Verhandeling over het Broederschap van G. Groot* (Leyden, 1856); Scholz, *Dissertatio qua Thomae a Kempis sententia de re Christiana exponitur*, etc. (Groning. 1839); Malou, *Recherches historiques et critiques sur le veritable auteur du livre de l'Imitation de Jesus Christ* (Louvain, 1849)-the most recent and best account of the details of the discussion on the authorship of the *Imitation*; Herzog, *Real-Encyclopadie*; Schrockh, *Kirchengesch.* 34:302; Erhard, *Gesch. des Wiederaufbliihens*, i, 263; Gieseler, *Kirchengesch.* ii, 4, p. 347; Hodgson (William), *Reformers before the Reformation* (Philada. 1867, 12mo), chap. x; Kuhn, in the *Rev. Chret.* Aug. 1857; *Contemp. Rev.* Sept. 1866; *Meth. Quart. Rev.* Oct. 1856, p. 642; *Am. Presb. Review*, Jan. 1863, p. 164; *Jahrb. deutsch. Theol.* 10:1. (J. H. W.)

## Kemu'el

[some *Kem'uel*] (Heb. *Kemuel'*, **קִמּוֹעַל**) perhaps *helper of God*, otherwise *assembly of God*; Sept. **Καμουήλ**), the name of three men.

**1.** The third son of Abraham's brother Nahor, and father of six sons (<sup>-0221</sup>Genesis 22:21), all unknown except the last, Bethuel, who was the father of Laban and Rebekah (<sup>-0245</sup>Genesis 24:15). B.C. cir. 2090. As the name of. Aram, the first-born, is also the Hebrew name of Syria, some commentators have most strangely conceived that the Syrians were descended from him; but Syria was already peopled ere he was born, Laban (<sup>-0285</sup>Genesis 28:5,) and Jacob (<sup>-0345</sup>Deuteronomy 26:5) being both called "Syrians," although neither of them was descended from Kemuel's son Aram. The misconception originated with the Septuagint, which in this



case renders **μπαῖς**" father of Aram," by **πατέρα Σύρων**, "father of the Syrians." *SEE ARAM.*

**2.** Son of Shiptan and phylarch of Ephraim, appointed commissioner on behalf of that tribe to partition the land of Canaan (<sup><06B></sup>Numbers 34:24).

B.C. 1618.

**3.** A Levite, father of Hashabiah, which latter was one of the royal officers under David and Solomon (<sup><37></sup>1 Chronicles 27:17). B.C. 1014.

### **Ken, Thomas, D.D.,**

bishop of Bath and Wells, a distinguished nonjuror divine, was born at Berkhamstead, Hertfordshire, in July, 1637. He was educated at Winchester School and New College, Oxford. About 1666 he entered the Church, and became chaplain to bishop Morley, Who in 1669 secured for him a prebend in Westminster. In 1674 he visited Rome, and on his return in 1679 was made D.D. About the same time he was appointed to the household of the princess of Orange; but the strictness of his moral and religious principles having displeased prince William, he soon left Holland, and accompanied lord Dartmouth in his expedition against the pirates of Tangier. On the recommendation of the latter, he was, on their return in 1684, appointed chaplain to Charles II, and knew how to maintain the dignity of his office unspotted in the midst of that monarch's licentious court. It is said that once, as the king was on a visit to Winchester, Ken refused to receive the favorite, Eleonora Gwynn, into his house; the king, however, praised highly the dignity of the prelate's character instead, of resenting this refusal, and only remarked, "Mistress Gwynn will find other lodgings." In the very same year (1684) Ken was promoted to the bishopric of Bath and Wells. During the reign of James II, when the Church of England seemed threatened with inroads from the papacy, bishop Ken stood forth one of the most zealous guardians of the national Church, stoutly opposing any attempts to introduce popery into Great Britain. He did not, indeed, take an active part in the famous popish controversy which agitated the reign of king James II so briskly, but he was far from being unmindful of the danger, and while others worked by their pen, he as actively labored in the pulpit, and boldly took every occasion to refute the errors of Romanism; nor did he hesitate, when the danger of the hour seemed to require it, to set before the royal court its injurious and unmanly politics in ecclesiastical affairs. Some have asserted that bishop Ken was at

one time won over to the .papal side, either at this time or later in life, but against this assertion speaks his decided stand in 1688, when he protested energetically against the Edict of Tolerance, and his refusal, when the Declaration of Indulgence was strictly commanded to be read, by virtue of a dispensing power claimed by the king, to comply with the demand of his king. Bishop Ken was one of the seven bishops who signed a petition to the king protesting against the tact, and who were imprisoned in the Tower for their insubordination. After the Revolution, however, he proved his steadfastness to his' royal master by his refusal to take the oath of obedience to William of Orange, and thereby lost his bishopric. Even his political adversaries, however, could not but respect such conduct, and queen Mary, whose chaplain he had been, provided for him by pension. He retired to Longleate, in Wiltshire, and there died, March 19, 1711. 'Ken was an eminently pious man, and possessed great learning and talents. While in the bishopric he published an *Exposition of the Church Catechism* (Lond. 1686, 8vo), and *Prayers for the Use of Bath and Wells* (Lond. 1686, 12mo, and often). Later he composed a *Manual of Prayers* (Lond. 1712, 12mo) — *Exposition of the Creed* (Lond. 1852, 12mo), etc. He also wrote much poetry, which remains popular to this day. His works were first published at London in 1721, in 4 vols. 8vo; also *Prose Works* (London, 1838,' 8vo). See W.L. Bowles, *Life of Thomas Ken* (Lond. 1830-31, 2 vols. 8vo); *Life of Thomas Ken, by a Layman* (Lond. 1851, 8vo); Hawkins, *Life of Ken* (1713); Duyckinck, *Life of Bishop Thomas Ken* (N.Y. 1859); Burnet, *Own Times*; *Gentleman's Magazine*, vol. 84; Stoughton, *Eccles. Hist. of the Engl. Church of the Restoration* (Lond. 1870, 2 vols. 8vo), ii, 87, 97, 141 sq., 278, 469; Darling, *Cyclopaedia Bibliographica*, ii, 1713; Allibone, *Dict. of English and American Authors*, ii, s.v.; Strickland (Agnes), *Lives of the Seven Bishops* (Lond. 1866, 12mo), p. 234 sq. (J. H. W.)

## Ke'nan

(<sup><1300></sup>1 Chronicles 1:2). *SEE CAINAN*.

## Ke'nath

(Heb. *Kenath'*, תנח] *possession*; Sept. Κανάθ), a city of Gilead, captured, with its environs, from the Canaanites by Nobah (apparently an associate or relative of Jair), and afterwards called by his name (<sup><0632></sup>Numbers 33:42; compare <sup><0781></sup>Judges 8:11); although in the parallel passage (<sup><1323></sup>1 Chronicles

2:23) the capture seems not to be distinguished from' the exploits of Jair himself, a circumstance that may aid to explain the apparent discrepancy in the number of villages ascribed to the latter. *SEE JAIR*. Eusebius and Jerome (*Onomast.* s.v.) call it *Kanatha* (Καναθά), and reckon it as a part of Arabia (Trachonitis). -It is probably the *Canatha* (Κάναθα) mentioned by Ptolemy (v, 15, and 23) as a city of the Decapolis (v, 16), and also by Josephus (*War*, i, 19, 2) as being situated in Coele-Syria. In the time of the latter it was inhabited by Arabians, who defeated the troops led against them by Herod the Great. In the Peutinger Tables it is placed on the road leading from Damascus to Bostra, twenty miles from the latter (Reland, *Pal.* p. 421). It became the seat of a bishopric in the 5th century (*id.* p. 682). All these notices indicate some locality in the Hauran (Auranitis) (Reland, *Palest.* p. 681), where Burckhardt found, two miles northeast of Suweidah, the ruins of a place called *Kunawat* (*Trav. in Syria*, p. 83-6), doubtless the same mentioned by Rev. E. Smith (Robinson's *Researches*, 3 Append. p. 157) in the Jebel Hauran (see also Schwarz, *Palest.* p. 223). This situation, it is true, is rather distant north-easterly for Kenath, which lay not far beyond Jogbehah (<sup>(~~Q1818~~)</sup>Judges 8:11), and within the territory of Manasseh (<sup>(~~Q1839~~)</sup>Numbers 33:39-42), but the boundaries of the tribe in this direction seem to have been quite indefinite. *SEE MANASSEH, EAST*. The suggestion that *Kenawat* was Kenath seems, however, to have been first made by Gesenius in his notes to Burckhardt (A.D. 1823, p. 505). Another Kenawat is marked on Van de Velde's map about ten miles farther to the west. The former place was visited by Porter (*Damascus*, ii, '87-115), who describes it as "beautifully situated in the midst of oak forests, on the western declivities of the mountains of Bashan, twenty miles north of Bozrah. The ruins, which cover a space a mile long and half a mile wide, are among the finest and most interesting east of the Jordan. They consist of temples, palaces, theatres, towers, and a hippodrome of the Roman age; one or two churches of early Christian times, and a great number of massive private houses, with stone roofs and stone doors, which were probably built by the ancient Rephaim. The city walls are in some places nearly perfect, In front of one of the most beautiful of the temples is a colossal head of Ashteroth, a deity which seems to have been worshipped here before the time of Abraham, as one of the chief cities of Bashan was then called Ashterotli-Karnaim (<sup>(~~Q1145~~)</sup>Genesis 14:5). Kunaw't is now occupied by a few families of Druses, who find a home in the old houses" (*Handbook for Palest.* p. 512 sq.; comp. Ritter, *Pal. and Syr.* ii, 931-939; Buckingham, *Travels among the Arab Tribes*, p. 240).

## Ke'naz

(Heb. *Kenaz'*, זנִיָּז] *hunter*; Sept. Κενέζ, but in 1 Chronicles i, 36 v. r. Κεζεζ), the name of three or four men.

**1.** The last named of the sons of Eliphaz, Esau's firstborn; he became the chieftain of one of the petty Edomitish tribes of Arabia Petrsea (<sup><0331></sup>Genesis 36:11, 15; <sup><1036></sup>1 Chronicles 1:36). B.C. post 1905. "The descendants of Esau did not settle within the limits of Edom. The Ituraeans migrated northward to the borders of Damascus; Amalek settled in the desert between Egypt and Palestine; Teman went westward into Arabia. We are justified, therefore, in inferring that Kenaz also may have led his family and followers to a distance from Mount Seir. Forster maintains (*Geography of Arabia*, ii, 43) that the tribe of Kenaz, or Al-Kenaz with the Arabic article prefixed, are identical with the *Lcekeni* or *Lceeni* of Ptolemy, a tribe dwelling near the shores of the Persian Gulf (*Geog.* 6:7), and these he would further identify with the AENEZES (properly *Anezeh*), the largest, and most powerful tribe of Bedawin in Arabia. It is possible that the Hebrew *Koph* may have been changed into the Arabic *Ain*; in other respects the names are identical. The Inezes cover the desert from the Euphrates to Syria, and from Aleppo on the north to the mountains of Nejd on the south.. It is said that they can bring into the field 10,000 horsemen and 90,000 camel-riders, and they are lords of a district some 40,000 square miles in area (Burckhardt, *Notes on the Bedouins and Wahabys*, 1 sq.; Porter, *Handbook for Syria and Palest.* p. 536 sq.)" (Kitto). **SEE KENIZZITE.**

**2.** Successor of Pinon, and predecessor of Teman among the later Edomitish emirs ("dukes"), who appear to have been contemporary with the Horite kings (<sup><0362></sup>Genesis 36:42; <sup><1035></sup>1 Chronicles 1:53). B.C. considerably ante 1658. **SEE ESAU.**

**3.** The younger brother of Caleb and father of Othniel (afterwards judge), who married Caleb's daughter (<sup><0357></sup>Joshua 15:17; Judges i, 13); he had also another son, Seraiah (<sup><1043></sup>1 Chronicles 4:13). B.C. post 1698. On account of this double relationship Caleb is sometimes called a KENEZITE (<sup><0332></sup>Numbers 33:12; <sup><0346></sup>Joshua 14:6, 14), whence some have maintained that he was the son rather than brother of Kenaz.

4. Son of Elah, and grandson of Caleb, the son of Jephunneh (~~כנז~~1 Chronicles 4:15, where the margin understands "even Kenaz," כנזִי, as a proper name *Uknaz*), B.C. post 1618.

### Kendal, Samuel

a Congregational minister, was born at Sherburne, Mass., July 11, 1753, of humble parentage. Young Kendal labored hard to secure for himself the advantages of a thorough education, with a view to entering the ministry. When about ready to go to college the Revolution broke out, and he entered the army. He finally went to Cambridge University when 25 years old, and graduated in 1782; studied theology under the shadow of the same institution, and settled over the Congregational Church at Weston, Mass., as an ordained pastor, Nov. 5, 1783. In 1806 Yale College conferred the degree of D.D. on Mr. Kendal. He died Feb. 15, 1814. He published many of his *Sermons* (from 1793-1813). Dr. Kendal "stood high among the clergy of his day, and was ... an acceptable preacher." Of his religious opinions, Dr. James Kendal says (in Sprague, *Annals*, 8:180), "he was classed with those who are denominated 'liberal' and was probably an Arian, though I think he was little disposed either to converse or to preach on controversial subjects."

### Kendall, George (1), D.D.,

an English Calvinistic divine, who flourished about the middle of the 17th century, was prebend of Exeter and rector of Blisland; Cornwall, at the Restoration, when, on account of nonconformity, he was ejected. He died in 1663. He is noted as the author of an able treatise on the Calvinistic faith, entitled *Vindication of the Doctrine of Predestination* (Lond. 1653, fol.). Another noted work is his reply to John Goodwin, *Defence of the Doctrine of the Perseverance of the Saints* (1654, fol.). See. Aliibone, *Dict. of Amer. and Engl. Authors*, ii, s.v.

### Kendall, George (2)

a Methodist minister, was born about the year 1815, was converted at the age of 16, and joined the Methodist Episcopal Church. In 1845 he joined the Southern Church. He was licensed to preach about 1858, and upon the reorganization of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Georgia after the war, he was among the first to return to the Northern Church. He was ordained deacon by bishop Clark at Murfreesborough, Tenn., and continued to labor

as a missionary among his people until the organization of this Conference, when he was received on trial and appointed to Clayton Circuit. In 1868 he was appointed to Clark Chapel, Atlanta, and in 1869 and 1870 to White Water Circuit. He died there April 12, 1871. His dying words, "The gates are open and I must go," give assurance that he passed away as one of the fathers, after a useful and happy life, to the rest that remaineth to the people of *God.*-*Minutes of Conferences*, 1871, p. 278.

### **Kendall, John**

a prominent Quaker, was born in Colchester, England, in 1726; entered the ministry when 21 years old, and in 1750 accompanied Daniel Stanton on a religious visit through the northern parts of England. He was active in the work for over sixty years, and encouraged many "to the exercise both of civil and religious duties." He died Jan. 27, 1815.-*Janney, Hist. of the Friends*, 4:44 sq.

### **Kendrick, Bennett**

an early Methodist Episcopal minister, was a native of Mecklenburg Co., Va.; entered the itinerancy in 1789; was stationed at Wilmington in 1802; at Charleston in 1803-4; at Columbia in 1805; presiding elder on Camden District in 1807, and died April 5 of that year. The date of his birth is not given, but he died young. He was a man of much gravity, piety, and intelligence, and was a studious and skilful preacher of the Word. His ministry was very useful, and his early death was a loss to his Conference and the Church.-*Min. of Conferences*, i, 156. (G. L. T.)

### **Kendrick, Clark**

a Baptist minister, was born in Hanover, N. H., Oct. 6, 1775. After teaching school for a time, he finally turned his attention to preaching, and became pastor of the Baptist Church at Poultney, Vt., where he was ordained, May 20, 1802. He had in 1810 been appointed a delegate to the Vermont Association, of which he remained a member all his life. He also made several missionary tours, aside from his regular pastoral duties. Mr. Kendrick had early interested himself in the subject of foreign missions, and when, in 1813 the Baptist General Convention for the Promotion of Missions was established, he immediately advocated an auxiliary in his own state, and it was formed. He was elected first vice-president, and in 1817 became its corresponding secretary, which office he held until his death. In

1819 he received the honorary degree of M.A. from the Middlebury College. He was chiefly instrumental in forming the Baptist Education Society of the State of Vermont, of which he was chosen president, and afterwards appointed agent. In this connection he co-operated with the Baptists of Central and Western New York for the benefit of Madison University, Hamilton. He died Feb. 29, 1824. Mr. Kendrick published a pamphlet entitled *Plain Dealing with the Pedo-Baptists*, etc., and some occasional *Sermons*.-*Sprague, Annals*, 6:379.

### Kendrick, Nathaniel, D.D.

a Baptist minister of note, was born in Hanover, N. H., April 22, 1777. His early education was limited, and he was at first engaged in agricultural pursuits. Having joined the Baptist Church in 1798, he felt called to preach, and, after studying with that view, was licensed in the spring of 1803. He supplied for about a year the Baptist society in Bellingham, Mass. was ordained pastor of the church at Lansingburgh, N.Y., in Aug., 1805; and from thence removed in 1810 to Middlebury, Vt. In 1817 he became pastor of the churches of Eaton, N. Y., and in 1822 he was elected professor of theology and moral philosophy in Madison University, N.Y., with which institution he remained connected until his death, Sept. 11, 1848. In 1823 he was made D.D. by Brown University, and in 1825 one of the overseers of Hamilton College. Dr. Kendrick published two or three occasional *Sermons*. See *Sprague, Annals*, 6:482; *Appleton, American Cyclopedia*, 10:185.

### Ken'ezite

(<sup><0622></sup>Numbers 32:12; <sup><0646></sup>Joshua 14:6,14). *SEE KENIZZITE*.

### Ken'ite

[some *Ke'nite*] (<sup>yn̄p̄e</sup>*Keyni'*, prob. from <sup>Wq</sup>, to work in iron, <sup><0159></sup>Genesis 15:19; <sup><0621></sup>Numbers 24:21; <sup><0716></sup>Judges 1:16; 4:11, 17; 5:24; <sup><0156></sup>1 Samuel 15:6; :30:29; written also <sup>yn̄p̄e</sup>*Kenī'*, <sup><0270></sup>1 Samuel 27:10; and plural, <sup>μyn̄p̄a</sup>*Kinim'*, <sup><1325></sup>1 Chronicles 2:55; Sept. <sup>Κεναῖοι</sup>, <sup><0159></sup>Genesis 15:19; <sup>Κεναῖος</sup>, <sup><0621></sup>Numbers 24:21; <sup><0711></sup>Judges 4:11, 17; <sup>Κιναῖοι</sup>, <sup><1325></sup>1 Chronicles 2:55; <sup>Κιναῖος</sup>, <sup><0716></sup>Judges 1:16; 5:24; <sup><0156></sup>1 Samuel 15:6; <sup>Κεῖ</sup> v. r. <sup>Κεβεζι</sup>, <sup><0270></sup>1 Samuel 27:10; 30:29; Vulg. *Cincei*, <sup><0159></sup>Genesis 15:19; <sup><1325></sup>1 Chronicles 2:55; *Cinceus*, <sup><0621></sup>Numbers 24:21; <sup><0716></sup>Judges 1:16; 4:11,

17; 5:24; <sup>(0156)</sup>1 Samuel 15:6; *Ceni*, <sup>(0270)</sup>1 Samuel 27:10; 30:29; Auth. Vers. "Kenites," <sup>(0159)</sup>Genesis 15:19; <sup>(0422)</sup>Numbers 24:21; <sup>(0741)</sup>Judges 4:11; <sup>(0156)</sup>1 Samuel 15:6; 27:10; 30:29; <sup>(0155)</sup>1 Chronicles 2:55; "Kenite," <sup>(0716)</sup>Judges 1:16; 4:17; 5:24; sometimes written <sup>(0741)</sup>קַיִן *Ka'yin*, <sup>(0422)</sup>Numbers 24:22, Septuag. *νοσσιὰ πανουργίας*, Vulg. *Cin*, Auth. Vers. "Kenite;" <sup>(0741)</sup>Judges 4:11, last clause, Sept. *Κενᾶ*, Vulg. *Cincei*, Auth. Vers. "Kenites"), a collective name for a tribe of people who originally inhabited the rocky and desert region lying between Southern Palestine and the mountains of Sinai adjoining and even partly intermingling with the Amalekites (<sup>(0422)</sup>Numbers 24:21; <sup>(0156)</sup>1 Samuel 15:6). In the time of Abraham they possessed a part of that country which the Lord promised to him (<sup>(0159)</sup>Genesis 15:19), and which extended from Egypt to the Euphrates (verse 18). At the Exodus the Kenites pastured their flocks round Sinai and Horeb. Jethro, Moses's father-in-law, was a Kenite (<sup>(0716)</sup>Judges 1:16); and it was when Moses kept his flocks on the heights of Horeb that the Lord appeared to him in the burning bush (<sup>(0118)</sup>Exodus 3:1, 2). Now Jethro is said to have been "priest of Midian" (ver. 1), and a "Midianite" (<sup>(0409)</sup>Numbers 10:29); hence we conclude that the Midianites and Kenites were identical. It seems, however, that there were two distinct tribes of Midianites, one descended from Abraham's son by Keturah (<sup>(0121)</sup>Genesis 25:2), and the other an elder Arabian tribe. *SEE MIDIANITE*. If this be so, then the Kenites were the older tribe. They were nomads, and roamed over the country on the northern border of the Sinai peninsula, and along the eastern shores of the Gulf of Akabah. This region agrees well with the prophetic description of Balaam: "And he looked on the Kenites, and said, Strong is thy dwelling place, and thou puttest thy nest (<sup>(0741)</sup>קַעֲקַעִן, alluding to their name) in a rock" (<sup>(0422)</sup>Numbers 24:21). The wild and rocky mountains along the west side of the valley of Arabah, and on both shores of the Gulf of Akabah, were the home of the Kenites. The connection of Moses with the Kenites, and the friendship shown by that tribe to the Israelites in their journey through the wilderness, had an important influence upon their after history. Moses invited Jethro to accompany him to Palestine; he declined (<sup>(0409)</sup>Numbers 10:29-32), but a portion of the tribe afterwards joined the Israelites, and had assigned to them a region on the southern border of Judah, such as fitted a nomad people (<sup>(0716)</sup>Judges 1:16). There they had the Israelites on the one side, and the Amalekites on the other, occupying a position similar to that of the Tartar tribes in Persia at the present day. One family of them, separating themselves from their brethren in the south, migrated away to Northern Palestine, and pitched their tents beneath the oak-trees on the



upland grassy plains of Kedesh-Naphtali (<sup><07011></sup>Judges 4:11, where we should translate: "And Heber the Kenite had severed himself from Kain of the children of Hobab, the father-in-law of Moses, and pitched," etc.). It was here that Jael, the wife of Heber, their chief, slew Sisera, who had sought refuge in her tent (verse 17-21). It would appear from the narrative that while the Kenites preserved their old friendly intercourse with the Israelites, they were also at peace with the enemies of Israel -with the Canaanites in the north and the Amalekites in the south. When Saul marched against the Amalekites, he warned the Kenites to separate themselves from them, for, he said, "Ye showed kindness to all the children of Israel when they came up out of Egypt" (<sup><09516></sup>1 Samuel 15:6). The Kenites still retained their possessions in the south of Judah during the time of David, who made a similar exemption in their case in his feigned attack (<sup><02710></sup>1 Samuel 27:10; compare 30:20), but we hear no more of them in Scripture history. If it be necessary to look for a literal "fulfilment" of the sentence of Balaam (<sup><0422></sup>Numbers 24:22), we shall best find it in the accounts of the latter days of Jerusalem under Jehoiakim, when the Kenite Rechabites were so far "wasted" by the invading army of Assyria as to be driven to take refuge within the walls of the city, a step to which we may be sure nothing short of actual extremity could have forced these Children of the Desert. Whether "Asshur carried them away captive" with the other inhabitants we are not told, but it is at least probable.

Josephus gives the name **Κενετίδες** (*Ant.* 5:5, 4); but in his notice of Saul's expedition (6, 7, 3) he has **τὸ τῶν Σικιμιτῶν ἔθνος** -the form in which he elsewhere gives that of the Shechemites. In the Targums, instead of Kenites we find *Shalmal* (**יַאַמַל שַׁלְמַל**), and the Talmudists generally represent them as an Arabian tribe (Lightfoot, *Opera*, ii, 429; Reland, *Palcest.* p. 140). The same name is introduced in the Samarit. Vers. before "the Kenite" in <sup><01519></sup>Genesis 15:19 only. Procopius describes the Kenites as holding the country about Petra and Cades (Kadesh), and bordering on the Amalekites (ad Genesis 15; see Reland, p. 81). The name has long since disappeared, but probably the old Kenites are represented by some of the nomad tribes that still pasture their flocks on the southern frontier of Palestine. The name of *Ba-Kain* (abbreviated from *Bene el-Kain*) is mentioned by Ewald (*Geschichte*, i, 337, note) as borne in comparatively modern days by one of the tribes of the desert; but little or no inference can be drawn from such similarity in names. The most remarkable development of this people, exemplifying most completely their characteristics-their

Bedouin hatred of the restraints of civilization, their fierce determination, their attachment to Israel, together with a peculiar semi-monastic austerity not observable in their earlier proceedings—is to be found in the sect of the Rechabites, instituted by Rechab, or Jonadab his son, who come prominently forward on more than one occasion in the later history. *SEE RECHABITE*. The founder of this sub-family appears to have been a certain Hammath (Auth. Vers. "Hemath"), and a singular testimony is furnished to the connection which existed between this tribe of Midianitish wanderers and the nation of Israel, by the fact that their name and descent are actually included in the genealogies of the great house of Judah (~~1~~ 1 Chronicles 2:55). It appears that, whatever was the general condition of the Midianites, the tribe of the Kenites possessed a knowledge of the true God in the time of Jethro, *SEE HOBAB*; and that those families which settled in Palestine did not afterwards lose that knowledge, but increased it, is clear from the passages which have been cited. See Hengstenberg, *Bileam*, p. 192 sq.; Schwarz, *Palestine*, p. 218; Ewald, *Gesch. der V. Israel*, i, 337; ii, 31; Ritter, *Erdkunde*, 15:135-138; also the monographs of A. Murray, *Comm. de Kinceis* (Hamb. 1718); A. G. Kerzig, *Bibl. hist. Abhandl. v. d. Kenitern* (Chemnitz, 1798). *SEE MIDIANITE*.

### Ken'izzite

(Heb. ~~Kenizzi'~~ *Kenizzi'*, patronymic from KENAZ), the appellation of two races or families.

1. (Sept. ~~Kenizzites~~ *Κενεζῳῖται*, Vulg. *Cenezcei*, Auth. Vers. "Kenizzites.") Dr. Wells suggests that they were the descendants of Kenaz (*Geogr.* i, 169). Mr. Forster adopts this view (*Geography of Arabia*, ii, 43), but it is clearly at variance with the scope of the Mosaic narrative. The words of the covenant made with Abraham were: "Unto thy seed have I given this land, from the river of Egypt unto the great river, the river Euphrates, the Kenites, and the *Kenizzites*," etc., plainly implying that these tribes then occupied the land, whereas Kenaz, the grandson of Esau, was not born for a century and a half after the Kenizzites were thus noticed. Forster's idea that the promise to Abraham was prophetic cannot be entertained. Nothing further is known' of their origin, which was probably kindred with that of the other tribes enumerated in the same connection. As the name signifies *hunter*, it may possibly be a general designation of some nomade tribe. The sacred writer gives no information as to what part of the country they inhabited, but, as they are not mentioned among the tribes of Canaan

who were actually dispossessed by the Israelites (~~<ORR>~~Exodus 3:8; ~~<RRR>~~Joshua 3:10; ~~<ORR>~~Judges 3:5), we may infer that the Kenizzites dwelt beyond the borders of those tribes. The whole country from Egypt to the Euphrates was promised to Abraham (~~<OIS>~~Genesis 15:18); the country divided by lot among the twelve tribes extended only from Dan to Beersheba, and consequently by far the larger portion of the "land of promise" did not then become "the land of possession," and, indeed, never was occupied by the Israelites, though the conquests of David probably extended over it. Bochart supposes that the Kenizzites had become extinct between the times of Abraham and Joshua. It is more probable that they inhabited some part of the Arabian desert on the confines of Syria to which the expeditions of Joshua did not reach (see Bochart, *Opera*, i, 307). This is the view of the Talmudists, as may be seen in the quotation from their writings given by Lightfoot. (*Opera*, ii, 429).

2. (Sept. **Κενεζαῖος**, but **διακεχωρισμένος** in Numbers; Vulg. *Cenezeus*, Auth. Vers. "Kenezite.") An epithet applied to Caleb, the son of Jephunneh (~~<RRD>~~Numbers 32:12; ~~<RRR>~~Joshua 14:6, 14); probably designating 'his twofold relationship with KENAZ, 2 (see further in Ritter's *Erdkunde*, 15:138). "Ewald maintains that Caleb really belonged to the tribe of the Kenizzites, and was an adopted Israelite (*Isr. Gesch.* i, 298). Prof. Stanley (*Lectures on Jewish Church*, 1, 26t) holds the same view, and regards Caleb as of *Idumean* origin, and descended from Kenaz, Esau's grandson. But a careful study of sacred history proves that the Edomites and Israelites had many names in common; and the patronymic Kenizzite is derived from an ancestor called *Kenaz*, whose name is mentioned in Judges i, 13, and who was perhaps Caleb's grandfather." **SEE CALEB.**

### **Kennaday, John, D.D.**

a noted minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in the city of New York Nov. 3, 1800. In early life he was a printer, devoting even then, however, his leisure, as far as practicable, to literary pursuits. He was converted, under the ministry of the Rev. Dr. Heman Bangs, in the John Street Methodist Episcopal Church; was licensed to exhort the year following; joined the New York Conference in 1823; was stationed on Kingston Circuit in 1823; 1825, Bloomingburgh Circuit; 1826, transferred to Philadelphia Conference, and appointed that and the following year at Patterson, N. J.; 1828-29, Newark, N. J.; 1830-31, Wilmington, Del.;" 1832, Morristown, N. J.; in 1833, retransferred to New York Conference,

and stationed in Brooklyn; 1835-36, preacher in charge of New York East Circuit, embracing all the churches east of Broadway; 1837-38, Newburgh, N. Y.; 1839, retransferred to Philadelphia Conference, and that and the following year stationed at Union Church, Philadelphia; 1841-42, Trinity Church, Philadelphia; 1843-44, second time to Wilmington, Del.; at the close of his pastoral term the Church was divided peacefully, and a new Church organized, called St. Paul's, and for the two following years Dr. Kennaday was its pastor; 1847-48 again pastor of Union Church, Philadelphia; 1849, Nazareth Church, in that city; 1850, transferred to New York East Conference, and that and the following year was pastor of Pacific Street Church, Brooklyn; 1852-53, returned to Washington Street Church; 1854-55, First Church, New Haven, Conn.; 1856-57, second time to Pacific Street Church, Brooklyn; 1858-59, third time to Washington-Street Church, Brooklyn; 1860-61, reappointed to First Church, New-Haven, Conn.; 1862, Hartford, Conn.; and in 1863 he was appointed presiding elder of Long Island District, which office he was administering at the time of his decease. The noticeable fact of this record is the number of times Dr. Kennaday was returned as pastor to churches that he had previously served. Of the forty years of his ministerial life, twenty-two years, or more than half, were spent in five churches. No fact better attests his long-continued popularity and his power of winning the affections of the people. "As a Christian pastor," says bishop Janes, "Dr. Kennaday was eminent in his gifts, in his attainments, and in his devotion to his sacred calling, and in the seals God gave to his ministry. In the pulpit he was clear; in the statement of his subject, abundant and most felicitous in his illustrations, and pathetic and impressive in his applications. His oratory was of a high order. ... Out of the pulpit, the ease and elegance of his manners, the vivacity and sprightliness of his conversational powers, the tenderness of his sympathy, and the kindness of his conduct towards the afflicted and needy... made him a greatly beloved pastor." He died Nov. 13, 1863. -*Conference Minutes*, 1864, p. 89. (J. H.W.)

### Kennedy, B. J.,

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Bolton, Vt.; Aug. 16, 1808; was converted in 1842; served the Church faithfully as a local preacher until 1860, when he joined the Erie Annual Conference, and filled with great success the pulpits at Bainbridge, Mayfield, Bedford, Twinsburgh, and Hudson successively. He died at Hudson, Ohio, Nov. 30, 1869. The chief elements of Kennedy's power with the people were purity of life,

cheerfulness, broad Christian sympathies for fallen humanity, and strong convictions of the saving efficacy of Jesus and his Gospel. He sustained a high position among the brethren of his Conference.-*Christian Advocate* (N. Y.), 1870.

### Kennedy, James

a Scotch prelate, grandson, by his mother, of Robert III of Scotland, was born in 1405 (?). I After studying at home, he was sent to the Continent to finish his education, entered the Church, and as early as in 1437 became bishop of Dunkeld, and in 1440. exchanged for the more important see of St. Andrew. He next made a journey to Florence, to lay before pope Eugenius IV the plan of the reforms he intended introducing in the administration of his diocese. On his return (1444) he was made lord chancellor, and as such took an active part in the affairs of Scotland. Pained at witnessing the discords which marked the first years of the reign of James II, he again applied to the pope for advice; but the latter's intervention, which he thought would restore peace, did not have this result. During the minority of James III he sat in the council of the regency, and, according to Buchanan, used his influence there for the public good... He died at St. Andrew, May 10, 1466. Kennedy founded and endowed the college of San Salvador, which afterwards became the University of St. Andrew. He is reputed to have written a work entitled *Monita Politica*, and also a history of his times, both of which are probably lost. ' See Mackenzie, *Lives*; Crawford; *Lives of Statesmen*; Buchanan, *History of Scotland*; Chambers, *Illustrious Scotsmen*; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 27, 560. (J. N. P.)

### Kennedy, John

an English divine, who flourished about the middle of the 18th century (he died about 1770), rector of Bradley, Derbyshire, is noted for his works on Scripture chronology, of which the following are best known: *Complete System of Astronomical Chronology unfolding the Scriptures* (London, 1762, 4to): this work Kennedy dedicated to the king, and the dedication was composed by Dr. Samuel Johnson : — *Explanation and Proof of ditto* (1774, 8vo), addressed to James Ferguson.-Allibone, *Dictionary of English and American Authors*, vol. ii, s.v.

### Kennedy, Samuel, M.D.

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Scotland in 1720, and educated in the University of Edinburgh. On coming to America he was received by the Presbytery of New Brunswick, and licensed by them in 1750. The following year he was ordained, and installed over the congregations of Basking Ridge, New Jersey, where he was principal of a classical school which acquired considerable celebrity. In 1760 he rendered his name conspicuous in behalf of an Episcopal clergyman by his connection with the ludicrous proclamation, "*Eighteen Presb. Minis. for a groat.*" He was not only a minister and a teacher, but a physician, and practiced medicine with no small reputation in his own congregation. He died August 31, 1787. Sprague, *Annals*, 3:175.

### Kennedy, William Megee,

an early Methodist minister, was born in 1783, in that part of North Carolina which was ceded to Tennessee in 1790. He lived some years in South Carolina, and afterwards settled in Bullock County, Ga. In 1803 he was brought into the Church under the ministry of Hope Hull; joined the South Carolina Conference in 1805, and filled its most important appointments for more than thirty years, half of the time as presiding elder. In 1839 he was struck with apoplexy, and was consequently returned as superannuate, but he still continued to labor until his death in 1840. He was lamented as one of the noblest men of Southern Methodism. Kennedy had a peculiarly well-balanced mind. His counsel was prudent and sagacious; he formed his opinions deliberately. and such was his discretion that, in the various responsible relations he sustained to the Church, it. is questionable whether ,a single instance of rashness could be justly charged upon him. His piety unaffected, his intercourse with the people affectionate, his preaching faithful, earnest, and successful, he was a very popular preacher. He was successively at Charleston (in 1809, 1810, 1820, 1821, 1834, and 1835), Camden (1818), Wilmington, No C. (1819),Augusta, Ga. (1826-27), Columbia, S. C. (1828-29,1836-37). See Summers, *Sketches*, p. 131; Stevens, *history of the M. E. Church*, 4:205. (J. L. S.)

### Kennedy,William Sloane,

a Presbyterian minister (N. S.), was born in Muncy, Pa., June 3,1822; graduated at Western Reserve College in 1846; was licensed by the Cleveland Presbytery in 1848, and soon after installed pastor of the

Congregational Church in Bucksville, Ohio. Here he labored earnestly for four years. In 1852 he accepted a call to Sandusky, Ohio, where he ministered with great success until his removal to Cincinnati in 1859. His work there seemed to promise well, his congregations increased, and his influence was strong; but in the spring of 1860 his health began to fail, and for fourteen months he struggled against disease, preaching even the Sabbath before his death. He died July 30 1861. He was a thorough scholar, a profound theologian, and an instructive and impressive preacher. He wrote *Messianic Prophecies:—a History of the Plan of Union: — Life of Christ*; and *Sacred Analogies.*—*Wilson Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1862.

### **Kennerly, Philip,**

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Augusta Co., Va., Oct. 18, 1769; converted in 1786; entered the Baltimore Conference in 1804; and in 1806, on account of ulcerated throat, located and settled in Logan Co., Ky. In June, 1821, he re-entered the itinerancy in the Kentucky Conference, but died on the 5th of the ensuing October. "But his work was done, his temporalities well adjusted, his slaves emancipated, and his sun went down without a cloud." During his long location his labors were "very extensive and useful." " He was a good preacher, full of faith and of the spirit of *Christ.*"—*Minutes of Conferences*, i, 399.

### **Kennet, Basil,**

an English divine of note, younger brother of the following, was born Oct. 21, 1674, at Postling, in Kent; entered Corpus Christi College, Oxford, in 1690; took the master's degree in 1696, and the year following entered the ministry. In 1706 he was, by the interest of his brother, appointed chaplain to the English factory at Leghorn, where he no sooner arrived than he met with great opposition from the papists, and was in danger of the Inquisition. This establishment of a Church of England chaplain was a new thing; and the Italians were so jealous of the Northern heresy that, to give as little offence as possible, he performed the duties of his office with the utmost privacy and caution. But, notwithstanding this, great offence was taken at it, and complaints were immediately sent to Florence and Rome, when both the pope and the court of Inquisition declared their resolution to expel heresy and the public teacher of it from the confines of the holy see, and secret orders were given to apprehend and hurry him away to Pisa, and thence to some other religious prison, to bury him alive, or otherwise

dispose of him in the severest manner. Upon notice of this design, Dr. Newton, the English envoy at Florence, interposed his offices at that court, where he could obtain no other answer but that " he might send for the English preacher, and keep him in his own family as his domestic chaplain; otherwise, if he presumed to continue at Leghorn, he must take the consequences of it, for, in those matters of religion, the court of Inquisition was superior to all civil powers." When the earl of Sunderland, then secretary of state, was informed of this state of affairs, he sent a menacing letter by her majesty's command, and the chaplain was permitted to continue to officiate in safety (*Life of Bishop Kennet*, p. 53 sq.). In 1713 Kennet's failing health obliged him to quit Leghorn, and he returned to Oxford, to be elected only the year following president of his college. He died, however, shortly after, either towards the close of 1714 or the opening of 1715. He wrote in the theological department an *Exposition of the Apostles' Creed:-Paraphrase on the Psalms*. in verse (1706, 8vo); .and published shortly before his death a volume of *Sermons on several Occasions* (Lond. 1715, 8vo). He also furnished English translations of,

1. Puffendorf's *Law of Nature and Nations*:
2. Placette's *Christian Casuist*
3. Godean's *Pastoral Instructions*: —
4. Pascal's *Thoughts on Religion*, to which he prefixed an account of the manner in which those thoughts were delivered by the author:
5. Balzac's *Aristippus*, with an account of his life and writings:
6. *The Marriage of Thames and Isis*, from a Latin poem of Mr. Camden. Dr. Basil Kennet is said to have been a very amiable man, of exemplary integrity, generosity, and modesty. See Allibone, *Dict. Engl. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.; *Genesis Dictionary*; Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* 6:433. (J. H. W.)

### Kennet, White, D.D.,

an eminent English prelate and writer, was born at Dover Aug. 10, 1660. He studied at St. Edmund Hall, Oxford, and while there attracted attention by publishing in 1680 a pamphlet against the Whig party, entitled *Letter from a Student at Oxford to a Friend in the Country, in Vindication of his Majesty, the Church of England, and the University*.



Through the influence of sir William Glynne he was appointed vicar of Ambrosden, Oxfordshire, in 1684, and obtained a prebend in the church of Peterborough, but returned to Oxford, where he became vice-principal of Edmund Hall, the college to which Hearne belonged. He was decidedly opposed to the concessions in 1688, and was of the number in the Oxford diocese who refused to read the declaration for liberty of conscience. He subsequently (1700) resigned Ambrosden, and settled in London as minister of St. Botolph's, Aldgate, where he became a very popular preacher. He was made successively archdeacon of Huntingdon in 1701. and in 1707 dean of Peterborough, and finally, in 1718, bishop of Peterborough. He died Dec. 19, 1728. Bishop Kennet was a man, as his biographer says, "of incredible diligence and application, not only in his youth, but to the very last, the whole disposal of himself being to perpetual industry and service, his chiefest recreation being variety of employment." His published works are, according to his biographer's statement, fifty-seven in number, including several single sermons and small tracts; but perhaps not a less striking proof of the indefatigable industry ascribed to him is to be seen in his manuscript collections, mostly in his own hand, now in the Lansdowne department of the British Museum Library of Manuscripts, where from No. 935 to 1042 are all his, and most of them containing matter not incorporated in any of his printed works. The principal among the latter are: *Parochial Antiquities attempted in the History of Ambrosden, Burcester, etc.* (Oxford, 1695, 4to; 1818, 4to):-*Ecclesiast. Synods, etc., of the Church of England vindicated from the Misrepresentations, etc.* (Lond. 1701, 8vo): — *An occasional Letter on the Subject of English Convocations* (Lond. 1701, 8vo), and a number of occasional letters and *sermons*:-*Monitions and Advices delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Peterborough, etc.* (London, 1720, 4to):-*On Lay Impropriations* (see below):-*Complete History of England* (Lond. 1719, 3 vols. fol.), etc. Bishop Kennet, in 1713, had. made a large collection of books, maps, etc., with intent to write *An History of the Propagation of Christianity in the English American Colonies*, but, for some reason unknown to us, the plan was never executed. It is to be regretted that the bishop failed to carry out the project; to judge from vol. iii of the *History of England* which he prepared, the contribution would have been valuable to American Church history. In 1850, S. F. Wood and Ed. Baddeley published from bishop Kennet's MSS. his *Lay Impropriations* (Lond. 12mo). See William Newton, *Life. of the Right Rev. Dr. White Kennet* (London, 1730, 8vo); Wood, *Athence Oxonienses*, vol. ii; Chalmers,

*Genesis o. Biog. Dictionary; Hoefer, — Nouv. Biog. Generale, 37, 563; English Cyclopaedia; Allibone, Diet. of Engl. and Amer. Authors, s.v.*

### **Kenney, Pardon T.,**

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in New Bedford, Mass., Sept. 5, 1810. He embraced religion at the tender age of seven, but gradually became indifferent to its personal enjoyment until his nineteenth year, when he was restored to the divine favor. He was licensed to preach in 1830; entered Wilbraham Academy, and in 1832 Middletown University. In 1833 he joined the New England Conference, was appointed to Thompson Circuit; 1834, Hebron; 1835, East Windsor; 1836, Mystic; 1837, North Norwich; 1838-39, Chicopee Falls; 1840-41, Willimantic; 1842, located; 1844, readmitted and sent to Manchester; 1845-46, Mystic Bridge; 1847, Westerly Mission; 1848, Falmouth; 1849, East Harwich; 1850-51, Provincetown Centre; 1852-55, Sandwich District; 1856-57, North Manchester; 1858-59, Stafford Springs; 1860-61, Allen Street, New Bedford; 1862-65, Sandwich District; 1866 -68, New London District. In 1869 he removed to Nebraska City, Neb., and started a school, with the prospect of its becoming a Conference Seminary, but died shortly after, Nov. 11, 1869. As a preacher, he was eminently practical, lucid, fervent, and spiritual, and his labors were attended with success. As a presiding elder, his executive ability gave general satisfaction. *Minutes of Conferences*, 1871, p. 72.

### **Kennicott, Benjamin, D.D.,**

one of the most eminent Biblical scholars, was born of humble parents at Totness, in Devonshire, England, Apr. 4, 1718. At quite a youthful age he succeeded his father as master 'of a charity school in his native place, and here continued until 1744, when, having previously given proof of possessing superior talents, he was, through the kindness of several gentlemen in the neighborhood who interested themselves in his behalf, and opened a subscription to defray his educational expenses, enabled to go to the University of Oxford. He entered at Wadham College, and applied himself to the study of divinity and Hebrew with great diligence, and while yet an undergraduate published *Two Dissertations: 1. On the Tree of Life in Paradise, with some Observations on the Fall of Man; 2. On the Oblations of Cain and Abel* (Oxf. 8vo), which came to a 'second edition in 1747,' and procured him, free of expense, the distinguished honor of a

bachelor's degree, even before the statute time. Shortly afterwards he was elected fellow of Exeter College, and in 1750 took his degree of M.A. By the-publication of several sermons at this time he acquired additional fame, but his great name is due to his elaborate researches for the improvement of the text of the Hebrew Bible, for which he laid the foundation in 1753. It was in this year that he inaugurated his great undertaking by giving to the public the first volume of his dissertations, entitled *The State of the Printed Hebrew Text of the O.T. considered* (Oxford, 1753-1759, 2 vols. 8vo). In this work he evinces the necessity of the undertaking upon which he had set his heart by refuting the popular notion of the "absolute integrity" of the Hebrew text. In the first volume he institutes a comparison of 1 Chronicles xi with 2 Samuel 5 and 23 followed by observations on seventy Hebrew MSS., and maintains that numerous mistakes and interpolations disfigure the sacred Scriptures of the O.T.; in the second volume he vindicates the Samaritan Pentateuch, proves the corruption of the printed copies of the Chaldee paraphrase (the accordance of which with the text of the O.T. was boasted of as evincing the purity of the latter)' gives an account of 'the Hebrew MSS. supposed at his day to have been extant, and closes with the proposition to institute a collation of existing Hebrew MSS. for the purpose of securing a correct edition of the O.T. Scriptures in the original; extending a very hearty invitation for assistance to the Jews also. This undertaking, as we' might naturally expect, met with much opposition both in England and on the Continent. It was feared by many that such a collation might overturn the received reading of various important passages, and introduce uncertainty into the whole system of Biblical interpretation. The plan was, however, warmly patronized by the majority 'of the English clergy; and when, in 1760, he issued his proposals for collecting all the Hebrew MSS. prior to the invention of the art of printing that could be found in Great Britain or in foreign countries, the utility of the proposed collation was very generally admitted, and a subscription to defray the expense of it, amounting to nearly ten thousand pounds, was quickly made. Various persons were employed, both at home and abroad; among foreign literati the principal was professor Bruns, of the University of Helmstadt, who not only collated Hebrew MSS. in Germany, but went; for that purpose into Switzerland and Italy. In consequence of these efforts, more than *six hundred* Hebrew: MSS., and *sixteen* MSS. of the Samaritan Pentateuch, were discovered in different libraries in England and on the Continent, many of which were wholly collated, and others consulted in important passages. To this collation of MSS. was also added

a collation of the most noted printed editions of the Bible, including those edited by the Rabbins, whose annotations, as well as the Talmud itself, were frequently consulted by the learned Kenicott. The collation continued from 1760 to 1769, during which period an account of the progress making was annually published. At length, after sixteen years of. unmitigated industry, appeared the first, and four years later the .second volume of Kennicott's edition of the Hebrew Bible — *etus Testamentum Hebraicum cune variis Lectionibus* (Oxonii, 1776,1780, 2 vols. fol.). Though the number of various readings was found to be very great; yet they were neither so numerous nor by any means so important as those that are contained in Griesbach's edition of the New Testament. But this is easily accounted for from the revision of the Hebrew text by the Masorites in the 7th and 8th centuries, and from the scrupulous fidelity with which the Jews have transcribed the same text from that time. "The text of Kennicott's edition;" says Marsh (*Divinity Lectures*, pt. ii)," was printed from that of Van der Hooght, with which the Hebrew manuscripts, by Kennicott's direction, were all collated. But as variations in the points v were disregarded in the collation, the points were not added in the text. The various readings, as in the critical editions of the Greek Testament, were printed at the bottom of the page, with references to the corresponding readings of the text. In the Pentateuch the variations of the Samaritan text were printed in a column parallel to the Hebrew; and the variations observable in the Samaritan manuscripts, which differ from each other as well as the Hebrew, are likewise noted, with references to the Samaritan *printed* text. To this collation of manuscripts was added a collation of the most distinguished editions of the Hebrew Bible, in the same manner as Wetstein has noticed the variations observable in the principal editions of the Greek Testament. Nor did Kennicott confine his collation to manuscripts and editions. He further considered that as the quotations from the Greek Testament in the works of ecclesiastical writers afford another source of various readings, so the quotations from the Hebrew Bible in the works of Jewish writers are likewise subjects of critical inquiry." To the second volume Kennicott added a *Dissertatio Generalis*, in which an account is given of the manuscripts and other authorities collated for the work, and also a history of the Hebrew text from the time of the Babylonian captivity. This dissertation, which the best Biblical scholars regard as able and valuable, was reprinted at Brunswick, Germany, in 1783, under the superintendence of professor Bruns. The faults attaching to this great work of Dr. Kennicott are thus summarized by Dr. Davidson

(*Biblical Crit.* 2d edit.. p. 154 sq.): "He (i.e. Kennicott) neglected the *Masorah* (q.v.) as if it were wholly worthless. In 'specifying his sources, he is not always consistent or uniform- in his method. Some MSS. are only partially examined. Neither was he very accurate in extracting various readings from his copies. Where several letters are wanting in MSS. there is no remark indicating whether the defect should be remedied, and how. The MSS. corrected by a different hand are rejected without reason. Old synagogue MSS. are neglected, though they would have contributed to the value of the various readings.

Van der Hooght's text is not accurately given, since the marginal *keris*, the vowel points,' and the accents, have been left out. The Samaritan text should have been given in Samaritan letters, that readers might see the origin of many of the various readings. The edition wants extracts from ancient versions, which is a serious defect. His principles or rules for judging Hebrew MSS., and determining the age, quality, or value, are defective. In applying his copious materials he often errs. He proceeds too much on the assumption that the Masoretic text is corrupt where it differs from the Samaritan Pentateuch and ancient versions, and therefore sets about reforming it where it is authentic and genuine. Yet," Dr. Davidson continues, "there can be no doubt that Kennicott was a most laborious editor. To him belongs the great merit of bringing together a large mass of critical materials. The task of furnishing such an apparatus, drawn from so many sources, scattered through the libraries of many lands, was almost Herculean, and the learned author is entitled to all the praise for its accomplishment." An important Supplement to Kennicott's Hebrew Bible was published by De Rossi, under the title of *Varic Lectiones Veteris Testamenti* (Parma, 1784-88,4 vols. 4to, with an Appendix in 1798). The works of Kennicott and De Rossi are, however, too bulky and expensive for general use. An edition of the Hebrew Bible, containing the most important of the various readings in Kennicott's and De Rossi's volumes, was published by Doderlein and Meissner, Leipz. 1793; but the text is incorrectly printed, and the paper is exceedingly bad. A far more correct and elegant edition of the Hebrew Bible, which also contains the most important of Kennicott's and De Rossi's various readings, is that of Jahn (Vienna, 1806,4 vols. 8vo). Dr. Kennicott, during the progress of this work, resided at Oxford, where he was librarian of the Radcliffe Library after 1767, and canon of Christ Church. He died there Sept. 18, 1783. Kennicott's' other works are, *The Duty of Thanksgiving for Peace*, etc.

(Lond. 1749, 8vo): — *A Word to the Hutchinsonians*, etc. (London, 1756, 8vo):-*Christian Fortitude: a Sermon on* ~~ROMS~~ *Romans 8:35, 37* (Oxford, 1757, 8vo): — *Answer to a Letter from the Rev. T. Rutherford, D.D., F.R.S.* (London, 1762, 8vo):-*A Sermon preached before the University of Oxford at St. Mary's Church, May 19, 1765* (Oxf. 1765, 8vo): — *Observations on* ~~OMBS~~ *1 Samuel 6:19* (Oxford, 1768, 8vo): — *Ten Annual Accounts of the Collation of Hebrew MSS. of the O.Test.*, 1760-1769 (Oxf. 1770, 8vo).:-*Critici Sacri, or Short Introd. to Hebrew Criticism* (Lond. 1774, 8vo): — *Vetus Testamentum Hebraicum*, etc. (Oxonii, 1776-80, 2 vols. fol.): -*Dissertatio generalis in Vetus Testamentum Hebraicum*, etc. (Oxonii, 1780, fol.): — *Epistola ad celeberrimum professorem Joannem Davidem Michaelis, de censura primi tomi Bibliorum Hebraicorum nuper editi, in Bibliotheca ejus Orientali, parte xi* (Oxonii, 1777, 8vo): — *Editionis Veteris Testamenti Hebraici cum variis lectionibus brevis defensio, contra Ephemeridum Goettingensium criminationes* (Oxon. 1782, 8vo): — *The Sabbath, a Sermon* (Oxf. 1781, 8vo): — *Remarks on select Passages in the O. T., to which are added eight Sermons* (Oxford, 1787, 8vo), of which more than one hundred pages are occupied with a translation of thirty-two psalms and critical notes on the entire book. " It is worthy of the author's reputation." See Dr. Paulus, *Memorabilia*, No. i, p. 191-198; *Gentl. Magazine*, 1768; *North Amer. Review*, 10:8 sq.; Walch, *Neueste Religionsgesch.* i, 319-410; 5:401-536; Eichhorn, *Einleitung indas A. T.* vol. ii; Darling, *Cyclopedia Bibliograph.* ii, 1721; *English Cyclopaedia*; Kitto, *Bibl. Cyclopedia*, vol. ii, s.v.

### Kennon, Robert Lewis

a Methodist Episcopal minister, born in Granville County, N. C., in 1789, was converted in 1801, entered the South Carolina Conference in 1809, and in 1813 was ordained elder, and located on account of ill health; then studied medicine and practiced for several years, preaching as his health permitted. In 1819 he removed from Georgia to Tuscaloosa, Ala., and continued his profession until 1824, when he re-entered the ministry in the Mississippi Conference, and was four years presiding elder on the Black Warrior District. In 1829-30 he was stationed at Tuscaloosa, in 1831-2 on Tuscaloosa District, in 1834 on the Choctaw Mission, in 1835-6 in Mobile, and in. 1837 in Tuscaloosa. He died during the session of the Conference at Columbus, Miss., Jan. 9, 1838. Mr. Kennon was one of the most able and influential ministers of his time in the Southern States. His home culture in childhood was excellent, and he had a very good academical education.

While studying medicine he further pursued his literary studies at the South Carolina College. Kennon numbered among his friends the foremost men of the county in all professions, and was the father and model of the Conference. He died honored and beloved by a wide circle of brethren and citizens. *Minutes of Conferences*, ii, 573; *Sketches of eminent Itinerant Ministers* (Nashville, 1858), p. 113. (G. L. T.)

## Kenosis

(κένωσις), a Greek term signifying the act of *emptying* or self-divestiture, employed by modern German divines to express the voluntary humiliation of Christ in his incarnate state. It is borrowed from, the expression of Paul, "But *made himself of no reputation* (ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσε, emptied himself)," etc. (Philippians 2:7). The same self-abasement is indicated in other passages of Scripture; e.g. the Son laid aside the glory which he had with the Father before the world was (John 17:5), and became poor (2 Corinthians 8:9). This term touches the essential difficulty in the doctrine of the incarnation. That difficulty seems to consist in the supposition that the Logos *in his absolute infinitude* of being and attributes united himself in one personality with an individual created man. On the other hand, it has been alleged as an objection to the *kenosis* theory that "to assume any self-limitation on the part of God is inconsistent with the unchangeableness of the divine Being." But God's immutability is that perfection by virtue of which his will and nature remain in constant harmony. Every change must, as a matter of course, be rejected that would bring God's will or nature in conflict with each other. But any act on the part of God, affecting his existence internally or externally, that is in harmony with the divine will and being, is consistent with the divine immutability. To deny such acts on the part of God is to deny the *living God Himself*. A God without a motion internally or externally would be, according to the Scriptures, a nullity, a dead God, an idol. "The very idea," says Ebrard, "of God as the living one implies the possibility of a self-limitation or change of self, of course of such a change by which God continues as God, and out of which he has at all times the power of asserting his infinitude. In the divine Being this is possible through the Trinity. As the triune God, there is in his being the possibility for him to distinguish himself from himself also in time, i.e. to receive within himself the difference between existence within time and out of time." That the Son of God can become a man without thereby destroying his true divinity even the fathers of the Church taught. Tertullian says: "God can change himself

into everything and yet remain (in substance) what he is." Hilary says: "The form of God and the form of a servant can indeed not unqualifiedly become a unity; they rather exclude one another as such. But how does their union become a possibility? Answer: Only by giving up the one, the other can be assumed. But he that has emptied himself, and taken upon himself the form of a servant, is therefore not a different person. *To give up a form does not imply the destruction of its substance.* Exactly in order to prevent this destruction the act of self-emptying goes only far enough to constitute the form of a servant." Ebrard makes the fitting comparison: " If a crown prince, in order to set others free, should go for the time being into voluntary servitude, he would be, to all intents and purposes, a servant, and, as he has not forfeited his claims to the crown, also a prince, so that he could with propriety be called both servant and a prince: in the same manner Jesus was the true and eternal God, and at the same time a true and real man; and it can be said with propriety of him, the Son of God is man, and the man Jesus Christ is God." To this is added by the author of *Die biblische Glaubenslehre* (published by the "Calwer Verein"): "The same is the case with man, who, notwithstanding the various changes of his circumstances here, and the great changes which he shall undergo in the resurrection, is still the same person. We meet even in God with a change of conditions. He rested before and after he had created the world; does not this imply a self-limitation on the part of God? And what self-limitations does not God impose upon himself with regard to human liberty! The omnipresence of God is no infinite diffusion, but has its definite starting-point; and if God is not as near to the wicked as he is to the pious, this is likewise an act of self-limitation on God's part over against the ungodly. Again, the personality of God, what else is it than a self-comprehension of the infinite ? Yet in all these self-limitations God remains God. Should, then, the Son not be able to remain in substance what he is, if, out of compassion for fallen humanity, he becomes a man, and, in order to become a man, lays aside his divine glory?"

This leads us, then, to the main question, *What have we to understand by the divine glory which the Son laid aside during his sojourn on earth ?* To this question the Christologians who adopt the *kenosis* return different answers. We are met here again by the old difficulty to unite the divine and the human in one self-consciousness. The question is this, Whether the self-consciousness of the Godman is the divine self-consciousness of the eternal Son, or the self-consciousness of the assumed human nature? Gess (*Gesch.*



*d. Dogmatik*) takes the latter view, and says that, in order to do justice to the true humanity of Jesus Christ, it is necessary to consistently carry out the self-emptying act of the Logos, so that the Son of God in the act of the incarnation laid aside the divine attributes of omnipotence and omniscience, together with his divine self-consciousness, and regained the latter gradually in the way of a really human development, in such a manner as not to affect the true and real divinity of Christ. Whether a temporary laying aside of the divine self-consciousness is consistent with the immutability of the divine Being we need not discuss here. The argumentation of Gess is very acute, and may appear to the metaphysician the most consistent and satisfactory analysis of the personal union of the divine and the human in the person of Christ; but exegetically it seems to us untenable, nor is it fit for the practical edification of the Christian people, and a theology that cannot be preached intelligibly from the pulpit is justly to be suspected. We conclude with Liebner and other Christologians that by the glory which the Son of God laid aside during his sojourn on earth we must not understand his divine self-consciousness, not the fulness of the Deity, as far as it can manifest itself in a human nature. On the contrary, it is said of this very glory, "The Word became flesh and dwelt among us, and we saw his glory, a glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth.... And of his fulness we all have received grace for grace." This divine fulness the Son did not give up at his incarnation, but it followed him as his peculiar property from heaven, from out of the Father's bosom, to legitimate him as the Logos, as the only begotten of the Father, yet so that he turned it into a divine-human glory, acquired in a human manner. Only the form of God, the divine form of existence, consequently the transcendent divine majesty and sovereign power over all things, united with uninterrupted glory, he exchanged, at his incarnation and during the time of his sojourn on earth, for his human form of existence, for the form of the servant. Into this his antemundane glory, however, he re-entered (<sup>417B</sup>John 17:5) on his going home to his Father (<sup>416C</sup>John 6:62), also in the capacity of the exalted Son of man (<sup>418D</sup>Philippians 2:9). But in every stage of his divine-human development the Son's oneness of being and of will With the Father remained, and by this very fact he was in his human teaching and conduct the express image of the invisible God, the personal revealer of him who had sent him, the Son of God in the form of human existence. According to this view, the immanent relation of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost did not suffer any change by the laying aside of the divine form of existence on the part of the Son, nor during the time of his

existence in human form. Only according to this view also have the words of the incarnate Son of God their full force: "Believe me that I am in the Father, and the Father in me; if not, believe me for the very works' sake. The words that I speak unto you I speak not of myself, but the Father that dwelleth in me, he doeth the works" (<sup><B1410></sup>John 14:10, 11). If it be objected that the really human development of Jesus is inconsistent with or excluded by the continuance of the eternal self-consciousness of the Logos in the incarnation, we answer that this inference does not necessarily follow. There is nothing self-contradictory in the assumption that the incarnate Logos had in his one Ego a consciousness of his twofold nature. Even if we cannot explain how the Logos was conscious of himself as the eternal Son of God, and yet had this. self-consciousness only in a human form, yet *the consciousness of his twofold nature* was necessary for the *mediatorial office* of the incarnate Logos; he was to know himself according to his absolute divinity and his human' development; and if we suppose that of his divine self-consciousness *only so much as was necessary for his. mediatorial office* passed over into his human self-consciousness, this double self-consciousness is in perfect agreement with his purely human life and with his mediatorial office. As to the divine attributes or powers that are connected with the divine self-consciousness, there is nothing. self-contradictory in the supposition that the divine Ego of the Logos acted in concert with the powers of human nature, with human self-consciousness, and human volition, if we *adopt the above-mentioned relative self limitation of the divine knowledge and will as necessary for the mediatorial office*. But even if by this view of the personal oneness of the divine and the human in Christ the metaphysical difficulty should not be fully removed, we would prefer confessing the unfathomable depth of this mystery to any philosophical solution of the problem which we could not fully reconcile with the plain teachings of the Word of God.

One of the latest and most striking presentations of this self-abnegation on the part of our Lord is that found in Henry Ward Beecher's *Life of Jesus* (i, 50), which we here transcribe, omitting its monothelitism and anthropopathy: "The divine Spirit came into the world in the person of Jesus, not bearing the attributes of Deity in their full disclosure and power. He came into the world to subject his spirit to that whole discipline and experience through which every *man* must pass. He veiled his royalty; he folded back, as it were, within himself those ineffable powers which belonged to him as a free spirit in heaven. He went into captivity to

himself, wrapping in weakness and forgetfulness his divine energies while he was a babe. 'Being found in fashion as a man,' he was subject to that gradual unfolding of his buried powers which belongs to infancy and childhood. 'And the child *grew* and *waxed* strong in spirit.' He was subject to the restrictions which hold and hinder common men. He was to come back to himself little by little. Who shall say that God cannot put himself into finite conditions? Though a free spirit God cannot grow, yet as fettered in the flesh he may. Breaking out at times with amazing power in single directions, yet at other times feeling the mist of humanity resting upon his brows, he declares, 'Of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, *neither the Son*, but the Father.' This is just the experience which we should expect in a being whose problem of life was, not the disclosure of the full power and glory of God's natural attributes, but the manifestation of the love of God, and of the extremities of self-renunciation to which the divine heart would submit, in the rearing up of his family of children from animalism and passion. The incessant looking for the signs of divine power and of infinite attributes in the earthly life of Jesus, whose mission it was to bring the divine Spirit within the conditions of feeble humanity, is as if one should search a dethroned king in exile, for his crown and his sceptre. We are not to look for a glorified, an enthroned Jesus, but for God manifest *in the flesh*; and in this view the very limitations and seeming discrepancies in a divine life become congruous parts of the whole sublime problem."

Most theologians, however, will see in this progressive development of Jesus rather the growth of the *human* faculties as shone upon by the inward sun of divine life; and in the alternate lights and shades of the Redeemer's career, not so much the vicissitudes imposed upon the enshrined Deity by the earthly abode, as the mutual play of the divine and the human natures, now one and now the other specially manifesting itself. Indeed, the theory of a somewhat *double consciousness*, if we may so express it, or at least an occasional (and in early life a prolonged) withdrawal of the divine cognitions from the human intellect, and thus of the full divine energies from the human will, seems to be required in order to meet the varying aspects under which the compound life of Jesus presents itself in the Gospels. Certainly the union of the divine Spirit with a mere 'human body is a heathen theophany, not a Christian incarnation. Indeed, the "*flesh*" which the Saviour assumed, in its Scripture sense, has reference to *human nature* as such, its mental and spiritual faculties not less than its physical.

The problem, therefore, still is to adjust the God to the man. This, of course, can only be done by conceiving of the infinite as assuming finite relations, and this, in short, is the meaning of *Kenosis*. **SEE HUMILIATION.**

This topic became a subject of controversy in the first part of the 17th century between the theologians of Giessen and those of Tübingen; the former (Menzer and Feuerbourn) contending that Christ during his state of 'earthly humiliation actually *divested himself* (**κένωσις** proper) of omnipotence, omniscience, etc.; while the latter (Luke Osiander, Theodore Thummus, and Melchior Nicolai) maintained that he still continued to possess these divine attributes, but merely concealed them (**κρύψις**) from men (see Thummus, *De ταπεινωσιγραφίᾳ sacra*, Tübing. 1623; Nicolai, *De κενώσει Christi*, ib. 1622). For details of the controversy, see Herzog, *Real Encykl.* 7:511 sq.; 14:786. On the doctrine itself, see Dorner, *Doct. of the Person of Christ*, I, ii, 29; Schrbckh, *Kirchengesch.* 4:670 sq.; comp. *Bib. Repos.* July, 1867, p. 413; *Amer. Presb. Rev.* July, 1861, p. 551; *Meth. Quar. Rev.* Jan. 1861, p. 148; April, 1870, p. 291. The treatise of Bodemeyer, *Die Lehre von der Kenosis* (Getting. 1860), is of a very vague and general character. **SEE CHRISTOLOGY**, vol. ii, p. 281, 282.

### **Kenrick, Francis Patrick, D.D.,**

an American Roman Catholic prelate of great note, was born in Dublin, Ireland, Dec. 3, 1797, received a classical education -in his native city, and in 1815 was sent to Rome to study divinity and philosophy. There he spent two years at the House of the Lazarists, and four years in the College 'of the Propaganda. He was ordained in 1821, and immediately thereafter came to the United States to assume the charge of an ecclesiastical seminary just starting at Bardstown, Ky. He soon distinguished himself 'as a polemic writer by his *Letters of Omicron to Omega*, written in defence of the Roman Catholic doctrine of the Eucharist, in reply to attacks by Dr. Blackburn, president of Danville College, Ky., under the signature of "Omega.". On June 6th, 1830, at Bardstown, he was consecrated bishop of Arath *in partibus infidelium*, and made coadjutor to the right reverend bishop Connell, of Philadelphia, whom he succeeded in 1842. During his episcopate there occurred the anti-Catholic riots, and by his firmness and promptness of effort his people were prevented from retaliatory acts. In 1851 bishop Kenrick was transferred to the archiepiscopal see of Baltimore. In 1852, as "apostolic delegate," he presided over the first

plenary council of the United States held at Baltimore, and in 1859 the pope conferred upon him and his successors the "primacy of honor," which gives them precedence over all Roman Catholic prelates in this country. He died at Baltimore July 8, 1863. Archbishop Kenrick was regarded as one of the most learned men and theologians of his creed in this country. He is 'equally distinguished as a controversialist and a Biblical critic. His style is vigorous and decided. In 1837 he published a series of letters *On the Primacy of the Holy See and the Authority of General Councils*, in reply to bishop Hopkins, of Vermont, subsequently enlarged and reprinted under the title of *The Primacy of the Apostolic See Vindicated* (4th ed., Balt. 1855); also, *Vindication of the Catholic Church* (12mo, Baltimore, 1855), in reply to Dr. Hopkins's *End of Controversy Controverted*. The works, however, which constitute his chief claim to theological eminence are his Latin treatises, on dogmatic theology, *Theologia Dogmatica* (4 vols. 8vo, Phil. 1839, 1840) and *Theologia loralis* (3 vols. 8vo, Phil. 1841-3), which form a complete course of divinity, and are used as text-books in nearly all the Romish seminaries of the United States. An enlarged edition of these works has been published both in Belgium and in this country. This contains many valuable additions, among them a catalogue of the fathers and ecclesiastical writers, with an accurate description of their genuine works. At the time of his death he was engaged in revising the English translation of the Scriptures, of which the whole of the N.T. and nearly all of the O.T. have been published. "It is illustrated by copious notes, and will probably supersede the Douay version in general use." His other works of a sectarian and controversial character are *Catholic Doctrine on Justification Explained and Vindicated* (12mo, Phil. 1841):-*Treatise on Baptism* (12mo, New York, 1843). Kenrick was distinguished both for his sagacity and moderation in counsel, " and for his indefatigable efforts ii extending the power and influence of his Church." While in Philadelphia "he founded the theological seminary of St. Charles Borromeo, and introduced into his diocese the Sisters of the Good Shepherd, who devote themselves to the care of Magdalen asylums." " " During the period of our civil war he was unswerving in his loyalty to the Union, and never failed to inculcate obedience to the laws" in the face of the opt position of many of his people.-Allibone's *Dict. of Authors*, s.v.; Appleton's *New Anmer. Cyclop.* 10:136; *Annual for 1863*, p. 561.

## Kent, Asa

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

## Kent, James

a distinguished English composer of Church music, was born at Winchester in 1700, and at an early age employed as chorister in the cathedral of that city. His talents secured him admittance to the Chapel Royal, London, where he enjoyed the tuition of the celebrated Dr. Croft. After completing his education, he was chosen organist of Finden, in Northamptonshire, and subsequently was appointed organist of Trinity College, Cambridge. In 1737 he was elected to fill the same situation in the cathedral of his native place, which he accepted and held until 1774. He died in 1776. Mr. Kent greatly assisted Dr. Boyce in the preparation of his magnificent work, the collection of Cathedral Music, and his services are duly acknowledged by

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

### Kentigern, St.,

a Scottish prelate who flourished toward the close of the 6th century, was actively engaged in the interests of the Christian Church among the natives of Scotland. He is said to have made many converts while bishop of Glasgow. Bishop Kentigern died about A.D. 600.

### Kephar

(*rp̄k*, *village*), a frequent prefix to the Heb. name of hamlets or small places in Palestine, as in, that here following, and many others mentioned by Reland (*Palcest.* p. 684 sq.) and Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 118, 119, 160, 170, 177, 187, 188, 190, 200, 201, 204, 235). **SEE CAPHAR.**

### Kephar-Chananiah

(*aynmj rp̄k*, ie. *village of Ilananiah*), a place named in the Talmud, and now called *Kefr Anan*, 5 miles S.W. of Safed, containing the ruins of a synagogue (Schwarz, *Palest.* p. 187; compare Robinson, *Later Bib. Res.* p. 78, note).

### Kephir

**SEE LION.**

## Kepler, Johann,

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



the sun, stars, and planets were typical of the Trinity, and that God distributed the planets in space in accordance with regular polyhedrons, etc.

In 1595 Kepler completed his *Mysterium Cosmographicum*, in which he details the many hypotheses he had successively formed, examined, and rejected concerning the number, distance, and periodic times of the planets, and endeavors to demonstrate the correctness of the Copernican system, which at that time was still discredited and rejected as un-Biblical by both Romanists and Protestants. To avoid persecution, Kepler took the precaution to secure the opinion of eminent theologians of both churches before publication, and for this purpose submitted the MS. to the faculty of Tübingen University. Of course they quickly condemned the sacrilegious effort and daring of the young astronomer (see below), but not so thought duke Louis of Wurtemberg, who not only approved of the work, but furnished the means (in 1596) to defray the expense of printing it. It must be borne in mind that in the 16th century astronomical truth was equally unknown to the clergy and the laity, and that the motion of the earth and the stability of the sun were doctrines apparently inconsistent with holy Scripture. Besides, in those days the truths of religion were guarded by a sternness of discipline and a severity of punishment which have disappeared in more enlightened times. In order to form a correct judgment respecting the causes which led to the opposition to Kepler by the 'Church, and the subsequent trial and condemnation of Galileo (q.v.), we must turn to that period when they first submitted their opinions to the public. The philosophy of Aristotle was then prevalent throughout Europe. It was taught in all its universities by professors lay and clerical, and every attempt to refute their doctrines exposed its author to the opposition of the learning and scholarship of that day. One of the principal dogmas of the Aristotelian philosophy was the immutability of the heavens. The brilliant discoveries of Kepler and Galileo struck a blow at the ancient philosophy, and consequently exposed them to the hostility of the Peripatetic philosophers. Now when we reflect that the minds of all thinking men were then completely moulded by that philosophy, and that these, again, governed the reflections of those immediately beneath them, and from them the results of Aristotelianism, mingling up, as they did, especially with the religious opinions of the day, thus reached the whole of the popular intellect, we will find it no matter of surprise that the zeal of these innovators met with the most determined opposition. "The Aristotelian professors, the temporizing

Jesuits, the political churchmen, and that timid but respectful body who at all times dread innovation, whether it be in legislation or in science, entered into an alliance against the philocophical tyrants who threatened them with the penalties of knowledge." " He who is allowed to take the start of his species," says Sir David Brewster, "and to penetrate the veil which conceals from common minds the mysteries of nature, must not expect that the world will be patiently dragged at the chariot-wheels of his philosophy. Mind has its inertia as well as matter, and its progress to truth can only be insured by the gradual and patient removal of the difficulties which embarrass it." Those Protestants, therefore, who are so ready to 'censure the Church of Rome for its action with regard to these great men should remember that it was but carrying out the spirit of the age, and a measure which the spirit of the people demanded. Surely Protestantism has but little to boast of in this matter. More than half a century later we find that the great and good Sir Matthew Hale condemned to death two women for witchcraft on the ground, first, that Scripture had affirmed the reality of witchcraft; and, secondly, that the wisdom of all nations had provided laws against persons accused of the crime. Sir Thomas Browne, the celebrated author of the *Religio Medici*, was called as a witness at the trial, and swore "that he was clearly of opinion that the persons were bewitched," Not only so, but Henry More and Cudworth strongly expressed their belief in the reality of witchcraft; and, more than all, Joseph Glauride, probably the most celebrated theological thinker of his time, wrote a special defence of the superstition, without doubt the ablest book ever written on that subject. As late as 1692 nineteen persons were executed and one pressed to death in Massachusetts on the same plea for witchcraft. **SEE SALEM.** " To deny the possibility, nay, actual existence of witchcraft and sorcery," says Sir William Blackstone (*Commentary on the Laws of England*, bk. iv. ch. 4:sec. 6), "is at once flatly to contradict the revealed Word of God in various passages both of the Old and New Testaments." **SEE WITCHCRAFT.**

In 1597 Kepler married Barbara Muller von Muhleckh. She was already a widow for the second time, although two years younger than Kepler himself. In the year following his marriage, on account of the troubled state of the province, arising out of the two great religious parties into which the German empire was then divided, he was induced to withdraw into Hungary. The Jesuits, anxious to secure for the Romish Church the learning and renown of Kepler, earnestly worked in his behalf, and secured

permission for his return to Gratz. Very independent in character, Kepler was not the man to eat the bread of his opponents, and upon his frank refusal to join the Romanists he was visited with still fiercer opposition. In 1600 he paid a visit to Tycho Brahe, and, by recommendation of the latter, was appointed assistant imperial mathematician by emperor Rudolph II. Upon the death of Tycho in 1601, Kepler succeeded him as principal mathematician to the emperor, and took up his residence at Prague. The special task intrusted to Kepler at this time was the reduction of Tycho's observations relative to the planet Mars, and to this circumstance is mainly owing his grand discovery of the law of elliptic orbits, and that of the equable description of geras. These continued studies, his searchings after harmony, led him at last to the discovery of the three remarkable truths called *Kepler's Laws*. (For an account of these, and the steps that led to their discovery, see the *English Cyclopaedia*, s.v. where also will be found a list of Kepler's works.) In 1624 he went to Vienna, the emperor finding it impossible to make good his promises to assist Kepler; to secure the necessary means to aid him in the completion of the Rudolphine Tables; it was not, however, till 1627 that these tables the first that were calculated on the supposition that the planets move in elliptic orbits made their appearance; and it will be sufficient to say of them in this place, that, had Kepler done nothing in the course of his whole life but construct these, he would have well earned the title of a most useful and indefatigable calculator. He died at Ratisbon, Nov. 15, 1630, and his body was interred in St. Peter's churchyard of that city. "Ardent, restless, burning to distinguish himself by his discoveries, he attempted everything; and, having once obtained a glimpse, no labor was too hard for him in following or verifying it. All his attempts had not the same success, and, in fact, that was impossible. Those which have failed seem to us only fanciful; those which have been more fortunate appear sublime. When in search of that which really existed, he has sometimes found it; when he devoted himself to the pursuit of a chimera, he could not but fail; but even there he unfolded the same qualities, and that obstinate 'perseverance that must triumph over all difficulties but those which are insurmountable." See Breitschwerdt, *Johann Kepler's Leben u. Wirken* (Stuttg. 1831); Brewster, *Lives of the Martyrs of Science* (Lond. 1841); Bailly, *Histoire de l'astronomie moderne*, ii, 4 sq.; Bayle, *Hist. Diet.* s.v.; Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lexik.* v.; Brockhaus, *Converst. Lex.* s.v.; *English Cyclop.* s.v.; Menzel, *Gesch. der Deutschen*, 5:104 sq., 327 sq., 471; 6:10 sq.

## Kerach

SEE CRYSTAL.

## Keralay, De

a French Roman Catholic missionary, who flourished in the early part of the 18th century, joined the Congregation of Foreign Missions, and in 1720 took charge of the mission at Mergui. In 1722. he was consecrated bishop of Rosalia, and became coadjutor to M. de Cire, apostolic vicar of Siam, whom he succeeded in 1727. The court, which had at first appeared favorably inclined towards the Christians, soon began, at the instigation of the bonzes, to persecute them violently. The missionaries were forbidden publishing any books in the Siamese language, or teaching their doctrines to the people. Inscriptions insulting to the Christian faith were placed on the front or inside of the churches. Keralay himself also was repeatedly summoned before the authorities, to answer for his infringements of their regulations, but he displayed throughout great firmness and patience. The death of the king and the civil war which followed gave the Christians some respite, but after a short time persecutions began anew, and it was during these that Keralay -died at Juthia, Nov.: 27, 1737. See *Lettres edifiantes*; Henrion, *Hist. des Missions*; Pallegoix, *Description du royaume Thai* (Paris, 1854, 12mo); Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gnerale*, 27:595. (J. N. P.)

## Kerazin.

SEE CHORAZIN.

## Kerchief

(only in the plur. **t/j PS** *ḥanispachoth'*, so called from being *spread* out; Sept. **ἐπιβόλαια** v.r. **περιβόλαια**, Symmachus **ὑπαυχένια**, *Vulg. cervicalia*), an article of apparel or ornament that occurs only in <sup>2438</sup>Ezekiel 13:18, 21, where it is spoken of as something applied to the head by the idolatrous women of Israel, but the meaning of which it is difficult to discover. Some of the ancient versions (e.g. Symmachus, the Vulgate, etc.) understand *pillows* or cushions for the head, as in the parallel member (so Rosenmiuller, Gesenius, etc.); others (e.g. the Sept., Syriac, etc.) think that *mantles* or coverings for the head are intended. Hitzig understands the *talith* or long cloth worn by Jewish worshippers. SEE FRINGE. The

derivation of the Hebrew word, and the fact that the article might be torn (ver. 21), shows: that it was long, loose, and flexible, like the shawl with which Oriental women envelop themselves (<sup><RBIS></sup>Ruth 3:15; <sup><RB2></sup>Isaiah 3:22); and the statement that they were adapted to be placed "upon the head of every stature" (v/r I [ϕm/qAl K; i.e. persons of whatever height), confirms this view. Kimchi says it was a rich upper garment. It was probably a long and elegant veil or head-dress, perhaps denoting by its shape or ornament the character of those who wore them. **SEE VEIL**. The false prophetesses alluded to practiced divinations, and pretended to deliver oracles which contradicted the divine prophecies. (See *Havernick, Comment. ad loc.*). Schroeder (*De vest. mul. Hebr.* p. 266, 269) well interprets " veils such as those with which in the East women cover the entire head, especially the face" (comp. <sup><RBIS></sup>Ruth 3:15; <sup><RB2></sup>Isaiah 3:22). The Eastern women bind on their other ornaments with a rich embroidered handkerchief, which is described by some travellers as completing the headdress, and falling without order upon the hair behind. **SEE HEAD-DRESS**. This, if of costly and splendid material, would be a not unapt decoration for the meretricious purpose in question. **SEE HANDKERCHIEF**.

### Kerokherdere, John Gerard,

a Dutch theologian and philologist, was born near Maestricht about 1678, and was educated at Louvain, where he afterwards became a professor. He died March 16, 1738. His theological works of note are, *Systemma Apocalypticum* (Louvain, 1708, 12mo):-*Prodromus Danielicus, sive novi conatus historici critici in celeberrimas difficultates historic Vet. Test. monarchiarum Asice, etc., ac pncecipue Daniel. prophet.* (Louv. 1711, 12mo): — *De Monarchia Ronce pagance secundum concordiam inter prophetas Danielelem et Joannem; consequens historia a monarchice conditoribus usque ad urbis et imperii ruinam; accessit series historice Apocalypticce* (Louv. 1727, 12mo): — *De Situ Paradisi terrestris* (Louv. 1731, 12mo).-Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 27:603.

### Kerckhove, John Polyander Van Den,

a Dutch Protestant theologian, born at Metz March 26, 1568, was educated at Embden, where his father was pastor of the French Church, and afterwards went to study Hebrew and philosophy at Bremen, and theology at Heidelberg, under Du Jon and Crellius, and at Geneva under Theodore

de Beza and Antony Lafaye. In 1591 he became pastor of the French Church at Leyden, and soon after at Dort. In 1611 he succeeded Arminius as professor of theology in the University of Leyden. He took part in the Synod of Dort, and was one of the theologians commissioned to draw up the canon of that synod; he was also member of a committee for revising the Bible. 'Kerckhove died Feb. 4, 1646. He wrote *Accord des passages de l'Écriture qui semblent être contraires les uns aux autres* (Dort, 1599, 12mo):-*Theses logice atque ethicce* (1602): — *Responsio ad interpolata A. Cocheletii, doctoris Sorbonnicce* (1610); Cochelet answered in his *Cemeterium Calvinii*: — *Miscellanece Tractationes theologicce, in quibus agitur de predestinatione et Coena Domini* (Leyden, 1629, 8vo):-*Prima Concertatio anti-sociniana* (Amsterd. 1640, 8vo): — *De essentiali Christi Existentia Concertatio, contra Johannern Crellium* (Leyden, 1643, 12m6); etc. He also published Thomas Cartwright's *Commentarii in Proverbia Salomonis*, and was one of the publishers of the *Synopsis purioris Theologicce* (Leyden, 1625, 8vo). See Foppens, *Bibliotheca Belgica* Boxhorn, *Theatrum Hollandicce*, p. 361; Paquot, *Mmoires*, vol. v.; Joh. Fabricius, *Histor. Bibliothecarum*, 4:92.-Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 27:604. (J. N. P.)

## Ke'ren-Hap'puch

(Heb. *Ke'ren-hap-Puk'*,  $\hat{r}q, \text{Ē}WPhj$  *horn of the face-paint*, i.e. cosmetic-box; Sept.  $\text{Ἀμαλθείας}$  [v. r.  $\text{Ἀμαλθαίας}$ ,  $\text{Ἀμαλθείας}$ ,  $\text{Μαλθείας}$ ],  $\text{κέρας}$ , i.e. horn of plenty; Vulg. correctly *Cornu stibii*, i.e. of antimony), a name given to Job's third daughter (Job xlii, 14), after the Oriental ideas of elegance (see Kitto's *Daily Bib. II.* ad loc.). B.C. cir. 2220. **SEE PAINT.**

## Keri And Kethib

( $\text{bytkw yrq}$ , plural  $\hat{y}yrq \hat{\text{bytkw}}$ ), so frequently found in the margins and footnotes of the Hebrew Bibles, exhibit the most ancient various readings, and constitute the most important portion of the critico-exegetical apparatus bequeathed to us by the Jews of olden times. On this subject we substantially adopt Ginsburg's article in Kitto's *Cyclopaedia*, s.v. **SEE MASORAH.**

**I.** *Signification, Classification, and Mode of Indication of the Keri and Kethib.*-The word  $\text{yrq}$  *keri'*, may be either the imperative or the participle passive of the Chaldee verb  $\text{arq}$  *to call out, to read*, and hence may

signify "Read," or "It is read," i.e. the word in question is to be substituted for that in the text. **bytk** *kethib'*, is the participle passive of the Chaldee verb **btK** *to write*, and signifies "It is written," i.e. the word in question is in the text. Those who prefer taking the word **yrp** as participle, do so on the ground that it is more consonant with its companion **bytk** which is the participle passive. The two terms thus correspond substantially to the modern ones *margin* (Keri) and *text* (Kethib). We may add that the Rabbins also call the Keri **arq** *anikra'*, *scripture*, and the Kethib **hr/sm**; *masorah'*, *tradition*; but, according to our ideas, these terms should be reversed.

The different readings exhibited in the Keri and Kethib may be divided into three general classes:

- a. Words to be read differently from what they are written, arising from the omission, insertion, exchanging, or transposition of a single letter (**bytk** **yrp** **yrp** **bytk**);
- b. Words to be read, but that are not written in the text (**bytk** **al** **yrp**); and,
- c. Words written in the text, but that are not to be read (**yrp** **al** **bytk**).

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

1. Corrections of errors arising from mistaking homonyms, e.g. **al**, the negative particle, for the similarly sounding **wl**, the pronoun, of which we have fifteen instances (comp. <sup><0210></sup>Exodus 21:8; <sup><0121></sup>Leviticus 11:21; 25:30; <sup><0101></sup>1 Samuel 2:3; <sup><0168></sup>2 Samuel 16:18; <sup><0180></sup>2 Kings 8:10; <sup><0142></sup>Ezra 4:2; <sup><0135></sup>Job 13:15; 41:4; <sup><0403></sup>Psalms 100:3; 139:16; <sup><0307></sup>Proverbs 19:7; 26:2; <sup><0302></sup>Isaiah 9:2; 63:9), and two instances in which the reverse is the case (<sup><0026></sup>1 Samuel 2:16; 20:2). Besides noticing them in their respective places, the Masorah also enumerates them all on <sup><0115></sup>Leviticus 11:15. The Talmud (*Sopherim*, vi) gives three additional ones, viz., <sup><0122></sup>1 Chronicles 11:21; <sup><0162></sup>Job 6:21; <sup><0345></sup>Isaiah 49:5. | [ for | a, of which we have four instances (<sup><0101></sup>1 Samuel 10:24; <sup><0103></sup>1 Kings 1:33; <sup><0107></sup>Job 7:1; <sup><0307></sup>Isaiah 65:7; <sup><0305></sup>Ezekiel 9:5).

**2.** Errors arising from mistaking the letters which resemble each other, e.g. **b** for **k** (comp. <sup><1213></sup>Proverbs 21:29); **g** for **z** (<sup><357></sup>Ezekiel 25:7); **d** for **!** (<sup><9013></sup>1 Samuel 4:13); **d** for **r**, of which the Masorah on <sup><1099></sup>Proverbs 19:19, and <sup><2204></sup>Jeremiah 21:40, gives four instances (<sup><1037></sup>2 Samuel 13:37; <sup><1266></sup>2 Kings 16:6; <sup><2208></sup>Jeremiah 21:40; <sup><1099></sup>Proverbs 19:19); **h** for **t** (<sup><2801></sup>Jeremiah 28:1; 32:1); **h** for **μ** (<sup><1233></sup>2 Samuel 23:13); **j** for **h**, of which the Masorah on <sup><1121></sup>Proverbs 20:21 gives four instances (<sup><1037></sup>2 Samuel 13:37; <sup><1121></sup>Proverbs 20:21; <sup><2117></sup>Song of Solomon 1:17; <sup><7024></sup>Daniel 9:24); **f** for **ç** (<sup><942></sup>1 Samuel 14:32); **y** for **w** in innumerable instances; **k** for **b** in eleven cases (<sup><6018></sup>Joshua 4:18; 6:5, 15; <sup><9106></sup>1 Samuel 11:6, 9; <sup><1054></sup>2 Samuel 5:24; <sup><1131></sup>2 Kings 3:24; <sup><1584></sup>Ezra 8:14; <sup><1683></sup>Nehemiah 3:20; <sup><1784></sup>Esther 3:4; <sup><8213></sup>Job 21:13; **μ** for **h** (<sup><2312></sup>Isaiah 30:32); **x** for **[** (<sup><1214></sup>2 Kings 20:4); **r** for **d** twice (<sup><2421></sup>Jeremiah 2:20; <sup><1584></sup>Ezra 8:14); **t** for **j** (<sup><2126></sup>Ecclesiastes 12:6); **t** for **h** (<sup><1244></sup>2 Kings 24:14; 25:17; <sup><2621></sup>Jeremiah 52:21).

**3.** Errors arising from exchanging letters which be. long to the same organs of speech, e.g. **b** for **m** of which the Keri exhibits one instance (<sup><6217></sup>Joshua 22:7), and vice-versa, of which the Great Masorah, under letter **b**, gives six instances (<sup><1616></sup>Joshua 3:16; 24:15; <sup><1252></sup>2 Kings 5:12; 12:10; 23:33; <sup><7118></sup>Daniel 11:18); **j** for **a** (<sup><1272></sup>2 Kings 17:21); **[** for **a** (<sup><924></sup>1 Samuel 20:24; <sup><1033></sup>1 Kings 1:33; <sup><8701></sup>Job 7:1; <sup><2377></sup>Isaiah 65:7; <sup><3015></sup>Ezekiel 9:5); **m** for **p** (<sup><2584></sup>Isaiah 65:4).

**4.** Errors arising from the transposition of letters, which the Masorah designates **rj wamw μdqwm**, and of which it gives sixty-two cases, as, for instance, the textual reading, or Kethib, is **l hah**, *the tent*, and the marginal reading, or Keri, transposing the letters **l** and **h**, has **hl ah**, *these* (comp. <sup><1653></sup>Joshua 6:13; 20:8; 21:27; <sup><7165></sup>Judges 16:26; <sup><947></sup>1 Samuel 14:27; 19:18, 22, 23 [twice]; 27:8; <sup><1025></sup>2 Samuel 3:25; 14:30; 17:16; 18:8; 20:14; 24:16; <sup><1025></sup>1 Kings 7:45; <sup><2102></sup>2 Kings 11:2; 14:6; <sup><1346></sup>1 Chronicles 1:46; 3:24; 27:29; <sup><1478></sup>2 Chronicles 17:8; 29:8; <sup><1346></sup>Ezra 2:46; 4:4; 8:17; <sup><1617></sup>Nehemiah 4:7; 12:14; <sup><7005></sup>Esther 1:5, 16; <sup><1392></sup>Job 26:12; <sup><9712></sup>Psalms 73:2; 139:6; 145:6; <sup><1027></sup>Proverbs 1:27; 13:20; 19:16; 23:5, 26; 31:27; <sup><1094></sup>Ecclesiastes 9:4; <sup><2573></sup>Isaiah 37:30; <sup><2425></sup>Jeremiah 2:25; 8:6; 9:7; 15:4; 17:23; 24:9; 29:18, 23; 32:23; 42:20; 1, 15; <sup><1534></sup>Ezekiel 36:14; 40:15; 42:16; 43:15, 16; <sup><7049></sup>Daniel 4:9; 5:7, 16 [twice], 29).



**5.** Errors arising from the small letter **y** being dropped before the pronominal **w** from plural nouns, and making them to be singular, of which there are a hundred and thirteen instances [it is very strange that the Masorah Magna only enumerates fifty-six of these instances] (<sup><0334></sup>Genesis 33:4; <sup><0271></sup>Exodus 27:11; 28:28; 32:19; 39:4, 33; <sup><0302></sup>Leviticus 9:22; 16:21; <sup><0423></sup>Numbers 12:3; <sup><0323></sup>Deuteronomy 2:33; 7:9; 8:2; 27:10; 33:9; <sup><0304></sup>Joshua 3:4; 8:11; 16:3; <sup><0314></sup>Ruth 3:14; <sup><0309></sup>1 Samuel 2:9, 10 [twice]; 3:18; 8:3; 10:21; 22:13; 23:5; 26:7 [twice], 11, 16; 29:5 [twice]; 30:6; <sup><0311></sup>2 Samuel 1:11; 2:23; 3:12; 12:9, 20; 13:34; 16:8; 18:7, 18; 19:19; 20:8; 23:9, 11; 24:14, 22; <sup><1057></sup>1 Kings 5:17; 10:5; 18:42; <sup><1064></sup>2 Kings 4:34; 5:9; 11:18; <sup><0307></sup>Ezra 4:7; <sup><0303></sup>Job 9:13; 14:5; 15:15; 20:11; 21:20; 24:1; 26:14; 31:20; 37:12; 38:41; 39:26, 30; 40:17; <sup><0305></sup>Psalms 10:5; 24:6; 58:8; 106:45; 147:19; 148:2; <sup><1063></sup>Proverbs 6:13 [twice]; 22:24; 26:24; <sup><2315></sup>Isaiah 52:5; 56:10; <sup><2458></sup>Jeremiah 15:8; 17:10, 11; 22:4; 32:4; 52:33; <sup><2322></sup>Lamentations 3:22, 32, 39; <sup><0320></sup>Ezekiel 3:20; 17:21; 18:23, 24; 31:5; 33:13, 16; 37:16 [twice], 19; 40:6, 22 [twice], 26; 43:11 [thrice], 26; 44:5; 47:11; <sup><0710></sup>Daniel 11:10; <sup><0306></sup>Amos 9:6; <sup><0301></sup>Obadiah 1:11; <sup><0314></sup>Habakkuk 3:14); as well as from the insertion of **y** before the pronominal **w** and before the pronominal **!in** singular nouns, and making them plural; the Keri exhibits seven instances of the former. (<sup><1165></sup>1 Kings 16:26; <sup><0458></sup>Psalms 105:18, 28; <sup><1067></sup>Proverbs 16:27; 21:29; <sup><2404></sup>Ecclesiastes 4:17; <sup><2092></sup>Daniel 9:12) and eight of the latter in the word **/bd** (<sup><0737></sup>Judges 13:17; <sup><1033></sup>1 Kings 8:26; 22:13; <sup><0347></sup>Psalms 119:147, 161; <sup><2456></sup>Jeremiah 15:16 [twice]; <sup><0502></sup>Ezra 10:12).

**6.** Errors of a grammatical nature, arising from dropping the article **h** where it ought to be, of which the Keri exhibits fourteen instances (<sup><0442></sup>1 Samuel 14:32; <sup><0239></sup>2 Samuel 23:9; <sup><1047></sup>1 Kings 4:7; 7:20; 15:18; <sup><1212></sup>2 Kings 11:20; 15:25; <sup><2325></sup>Isaiah 32:15; <sup><2403></sup>Jeremiah 10:13; 17:19; 40:3; 52:32; <sup><2508></sup>Lamentations 1:18; <sup><2630></sup>Ezekiel 18:20), or from the insertion of it where it ought not to be, of which there are ten instances (<sup><0262></sup>1 Samuel 26:12; <sup><1208></sup>1 Kings 21:8; <sup><1372></sup>2 Kings 7:12, 13; 15:25; <sup><2050></sup>Ecclesiastes 6:10; 10:3, 20; <sup><2391></sup>Isaiah 29:11; <sup><2381></sup>Jeremiah 38:11); or from the dropping of the **h** after **r** [**n**, or writing **awh**, instead of **ayh**, when used as feminine.

**7.** Errors arising from the wrong division of words, e.g. the first word having a letter which belongs to the second, exhibited by the Keri in three instances, and stated in the Masorah on <sup><1032></sup>2 Samuel 5:2' (<sup><1032></sup>2 Samuel 5:2; <sup><0332></sup>Job 38:12; <sup><2516></sup>Lamentations 4:16), or the second word having a

letter which belongs to the first, of which there are two instances (<sup><0212></sup>1 Samuel 21:12; <sup><0402></sup>Ezra 4:12); or one word being divided into two separate words, of which the Masorah on 2 Chronicles 34 mentions eight instances (<sup><0765></sup>Judges 16:25; <sup><0001></sup>1 Samuel 9:1; 24:8; <sup><1885></sup>1 Kings 18:5; <sup><4806></sup>2 Chronicles 34:6; <sup><2905></sup>Isaiah 9:6; <sup><2906></sup>Lamentations 1:6; 4:3), or two separate words being written as one, exhibited by the Ker. in fifteen instances (<sup><0301></sup>Genesis 30:11; <sup><0402></sup>Exodus 4:2; <sup><0502></sup>Deuteronomy 33:2; <sup><1304></sup>1 Chronicles 9:4; 27:12; <sup><4602></sup>Nehemiah 2:23; <sup><8801></sup>Job 38:1; 40:6; <sup><9000></sup>Psalms 10:10; 55:16; 123:4; <sup><2815></sup>Isaiah 3:15; <sup><4629></sup>Jeremiah 6:29; 18:3; <sup><4806></sup>Ezekiel 8:6).

**8.** Exegetical Keris or marginal readings which substitute euphemisms for the cacophonous terms used in the text, in accordance with the injunction of the ancient sages, that "all the verses wherein indecent expressions occur are to be replaced by decent words (e.g. **hnl gçy** by **hnbkçy** [of which the Keri exhibits four instances, viz. <sup><6830></sup>Deuteronomy 28:30; <sup><2816></sup>Isaiah 13:16; <sup><2402></sup>Jeremiah 3:2; <sup><3442></sup>Zechariah 14:2]; **µyl wp[** by **µyrwj f** [of which the Keri exhibits six instances, viz. <sup><6827></sup>Deuteronomy 28:27; <sup><0816></sup>1 Samuel 5:6, 9; 6:4, 5, 17; omitting, however, <sup><0612></sup>1 Samuel 5:12]; **µynwyrj** by **µynwybd** [of which the Keri exhibits one instance, viz. <sup><1025></sup>2 Kings 6:25]; **µhyrwj** by **µtawx** [of which the Keri exhibits two instances, <sup><2187></sup>2 Kings 18:27; <sup><2362></sup>Isaiah 36:12]; **µhynyç ymym** by **µhyl gr ymym** [of which the Keri exhibits two instances, <sup><2187></sup>2 Kings 18:27; <sup><2362></sup>Isaiah 36:12]; **twarj ml** by **twaxwml** [of which there is one instance, <sup><2107></sup>2 Kings 10:27, comp. *Megilla*, 25 b)]." The manner in which this general class of various readings is indicated is as follows: The variations specified under 1 and 2, not affecting the vowel points, are simply indicated by a small circle or asterisk placed over the word in the text (**bytk**), which directs to the marginal reading (**yrq**), where the emendation is given, as, for instance, the Kethib in <sup><1208></sup>Exodus 21:8 is **al oin** <sup><0212></sup>1 Samuel 20:24 **l 22[**, and in <sup><1023></sup>Proverbs 21:29 **ˆyboq**, and the marginal gloss remarks **wl 8q l a 8q ˆyby q**, the **q** being an abbreviation for **yrq**. In the variations specified under 3 and 4, where the different letters of the Kethib and the Keri require different vowel points, the abnormal textual reading, or the Kethib, has not only the small circle or asterisk, but also takes the vowel points which belong to the normal marginal reading, or the Keri, e.g. the appropriate pointing of the textual reading, or the Kethib, in <sup><2171></sup>2 Kings 17:21, is **adywi** but it is pointed **aø2DYwi** because these vowel signs belong

to the marginal reading, or the Keri, **j dyw**, which it is intended should accompany the vowel points in the text. The same is the case with the textual reading in <sup><1040></sup>2 Samuel 14:30, which, according to the marginal reading, exhibits a transposition of letters, and which can hardly be pronounced with its textual points **hYōyXōbiw]** because these vowel signs belong to the Keri, **hwtyxhw**. Finally, in the variations specified under 5, 6, 7, and 8, which involve an addition or diminution of letters, and which have therefore either more or fewer letters than are required by the vowel points of the Keri, a vowel sign is sometimes given without any letter at all, or two vowel signs have to be attached to one letter, and sometimes a letter has to be without any vowel sign; the variation itself being either indicated in the margin by the exhibition of the entire word which constitutes the different reading, or by the simple remark that such and such a letter is wanting or is redundant. For instance, in <sup><2817></sup>Lamentations 5:7, which, according to the Masorah, exhibits two of the twelve instances where the **w** conjunctive has been dropped from the beginning of words (comp. also <sup><1207></sup>2 Kings 4:7; <sup><8107></sup>Job 2:7; <sup><1234></sup>Proverbs 23:24; 27:24; <sup><2513></sup>Isaiah 55:13; <sup><2102></sup>Lamentations 2:2; 4:16; 5:3, 5; <sup><2703></sup>Daniel 2:43), the textual reading, or Kethib, is **μnyaδlj naʔ2** and the marginal reading, or Keri, is **μnyaw wnj naw**, the vowel sign of the conjunction from the margin being inserted in the text under the little circle, which, consequently, has no letter at all; in <sup><2406></sup>Jeremiah 42:6, again, where the textual reading is **wna**, and the marginal reading **wnj na**, yet the Kethib, which has only three letters, takes the vowel signs of the Keri, which has five letters, and is pointed **Wnā}** with two different vowel points attached to the one **w**; whilst in <sup><12715></sup>2 Kings 7:15, where the reverse is the case, the marginal reading having fewer letters, and hence fewer vowels than the textual reading, which takes the vowel signs of the former, the Kethib is pointed **μzp] hB}** and the **h** has no vowel sign at all. There is a peculiarity connected with the marginal indication of those words the variations of which consist in the diminution or addition of a single letter. When a letter is dropped from a word in the text, the whole word is given in the marginal reading with the letter *ii'* question, and the remark "*Read so;*" as, for instance, <sup><1942></sup>1 Samuel 14:32; <sup><1224></sup>Proverbs 23:24, where the **h**, according to the Masorah, is dropped from **l l çh**, and **w** from **dl wyw**, as indicated by **l l V** and **gl é20y**; the marginal glosses are **l l çh 8q dl wyw 8q**; but when the reverse is the

case, if a letter has crept into a word, the whole word is not given in the marginal gloss, but it is simply remarked that such and such a letter is redundant (**ryty**), or is not to be read (**yrq al**), as, for instance, in Eccles. 10:20; <sup><1097></sup>Nehemiah 9:17, where the **h**, according to the Masorah, has crept in before **μyṣnk**, and **w** before **dsj**, the marginal gloss simply remarks **8h ryty 8w ryty**. Upon this point, however, the greatest inconsistency is manifested in the Masoretic glosses; compare, for instance, the Kethib **wyny[** and **yl gr** in <sup><2048></sup>Ecclesiastes 4:8, 17, both of which, according to the Keri, have a redundant **y**, and are singular nouns, yet the Masoretic note upon the former is **wny[ 8q**, exhibiting the whole word, whilst on the latter it simply remarks **y ryty**.

**b.** The second class (*insertions* directed), which comprises *entire words* that have been omitted from the text, exhibits ten such instances which occur in the Hebrew Bible, as follows: <sup><0703></sup>Judges 20:13; <sup><0805></sup>Ruth 3:5, 17; <sup><1008></sup>2 Samuel 8:3; 16:23; 18:20; <sup><1201></sup>2 Kings 19:31,37; <sup><2438></sup>Jeremiah 31:38; 1, 29. Besides being noted in the marginal glosses on the respective passages, these omissions are also given in the Masorah, on Deuteronomy 1 and <sup><0806></sup>Ruth 3:16. They are also enumerated in the Talmud (Tract *Sopherim*, 6:8, and in *Nedarim*, 37 b). In *Nedarim*, however, the passage which refers to this subject is as follows: "The insertion of words in the text (**ˆyṣrq ˆbytk al w**) is exhibited in **trp [**<sup><1008></sup>2 Samuel 8:3]; **çya** [ibid. 16:23]; **μyab [**<sup><2438></sup>Jeremiah 31:38]; **hl [ [**<sup><2402></sup>Jeremiah 50:29]; **ta [**<sup><0801></sup>Ruth 2:11]; **yl a [**<sup><0805></sup>Ruth 3:5, 17];" thus omitting four instances, viz. <sup><0703></sup>Judges 20:13; <sup><1008></sup>2 Samuel 18:20; <sup><1201></sup>2 Kings 19:31, 37, and adding one, viz., Ruth ii, 11, which is neither given by the Masorah nor in *Sopherim*.

This class of variations is indicated by a small circle or asterisk placed in the text with the vowel signs of the word which is wanting, referring to the margin, where the word in question is given. Thus, for instance, in <sup><0703></sup>Judges 20:13, where, according to the Keri, the word **ynb[** is omitted, the Kethib is **ˆmṣba ˆp wba; aṭw[** upon which the marginal gloss remarks **al w yrq ynb bytk**

**c.** Of the third class (*omissions* suggested), exhibiting *entire words* which have crept into the text, there are eight instances, as follows: <sup><0802></sup>Ruth 3:12; <sup><1033></sup>2 Samuel 13:33; 15:21; <sup><1768></sup>2 Kings 5:18; <sup><2406></sup>Jeremiah 38:16; 39:12;

51:3; <sup>25816</sup>Ezekiel 48:16. These variations are not only noted in the marginal glosses on the respective passages, but are also given in the Masorah on <sup>18812</sup>Ruth 3:12. The passage in *Nedarim*, 27 b, which speaks of this class of variations, remarking, "Words which are found in the text, but are not read (<sup>1</sup>yrq al w <sup>1</sup>bytk), are exhibited in an [<sup>12518</sup>2 Kings 5:18]; taw [<sup>24211</sup>Jeremiah 32:11]; <sup>1</sup>rdy [<sup>25108</sup>Jeremiah 51:3]; <sup>1</sup>çmj [<sup>25816</sup>Ezekiel 48:16]; <sup>1</sup>µa [<sup>18812</sup>Ruth 3:12]," omits <sup>10133</sup>2 Samuel 13:33; 15:21; and <sup>24816</sup>Jeremiah 38:16; 39:12; and adds <sup>24211</sup>Jeremiah 32:11, which does not exist in the Masorah; whilst *Sopherim*, 6:9, which remarks <sup>1</sup>çmj <sup>1</sup>rdy l awg <sup>1</sup>µwqmb rçak <sup>1</sup>wnma, referring to <sup>10133</sup>2 Samuel 13:33; <sup>24212</sup>Jeremiah 39:12; <sup>10151</sup>2 Samuel 15:21; <sup>18812</sup>Ruth 3:12; <sup>25108</sup>Jeremiah 51:3; <sup>25816</sup>Ezekiel 48:16; omits <sup>12518</sup>2 Kings 5:18, and <sup>24816</sup>Jeremiah 38:16.

This class of variations is not uniformly indicated in the different editions of the Bible. Generally the word in question has no vowel signs, but an asterisk or small circle is put over it, referring to the margin, where it is simply remarked <sup>1</sup>yrq al w <sup>1</sup>bytk, written [in the text], but not [to be] read; in one or two instances, however, the word itself is repeated in the margin, as in 2 Kings, 5:18, where we have it <sup>1</sup>yrq al w <sup>1</sup>bytk an, [the word] an [is] written [in the text], but [is] not [to be] read.

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

|             |    |           |    |
|-------------|----|-----------|----|
| Genesis     | 24 | Habakkuk  | 2  |
| Exodus      | 12 | Zephaniah | 1  |
| Leviticus   | 5  | Haggai    | 1  |
| Numbers     | 11 | Zechariah | 7  |
| Deuteronomy | 24 | Malachi   | 1  |
| Joshua      | 38 | Psalms    | 74 |
| Judges      | 22 | Proverbs  | 70 |

|          |     |               |      |
|----------|-----|---------------|------|
| 1 Samuel | 73  | Job           | 54   |
| 2 Samuel | 99  | Song of Songs | 5    |
| 1 Kings  | 49  | Ruth          | 13   |
| 2 Kings  | 80  | Lamentations  | 28   |
| Isaiah   | 5   | Ecclesiastes  | 11   |
| Jeremiah | 148 | Esther        | 14   |
| Ezekiel  | 143 | Daniel        | 129  |
| Hosea    | 6   | Ezra          | 33   |
| Joel     | 1   | Nehemiah      | 28   |
| Amos     | 3   | 1 Chronicles  | 41   |
| Obadiah  | 1   | 2 Chronicles  | 39   |
| Micah    | 4   |               |      |
| Nahum    | 4   | Total.....    | 1353 |

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

For the collation of Bomberg's Bible, the Plantin Bible, and the Antwerp Bible, we are indebted to the tables exhibited in Cappellus's *Critica Sacra*, p. 70, and Walton's *Prolegomena* (ed. Cantabrigiae, 1828, i, 473); and though we have been able by our arrangement to correct their blunder in representing Elias Levita as separating the Five Megilloth from the Hagiographa, and giving the number of Keris to be 329 exclusive of the Megilloth, yet we were, obliged to describe the Megilloth apart from the Hagiographa. to which they belong according to the Jewish order of the Canon. Elias Levita's own words on the numbers are as follows: "I counted the Keris and Kethibs several times, and found that they were in all 848.; of these, 65 are in the Pentateuch, 454 in the Prophets, and 329 in the Hagiographa. It is surprising that there should only be 65 in the Pentateuch, 22 of which refer to the single word **hr[n**, which "interpretations," **ryty**; "Deficiencies," **rysj** is **y[n** il the Kethib, and

hr[n in the Keri; that the book of Joshua, which in quantity is about a tenth part of the Pentateuch, should have 32; and that the books of Samuel, which are merely about a fourth the size of the Pentateuch, 'should contain 133" (*Massoreth HaMassoreth*, ed. Sulzbach, 1771, p. 8 sq.). It will be seen from this extract that Elias Levita not only gives six Keris less in Joshua than we have given, but also differs from Abrabanel in the number of Keris to be found in the books of Samuel.

|                     |  | Bloomberg<br>1523-24 | Plantin<br>Bible<br>1566 | Antwerp<br>Royal<br>Bible 1572 | Elias<br>Levita | Our<br>Results |
|---------------------|--|----------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Pentateuch          | Variations<br>Interpolations<br>Deficiencies     | 73                   | 74                       | 69                             | 65              | 76             |
|                     |  | 1                    | 1                        | 1                              |                 |                |
|                     |  | 74                   | 2                        | 1                              |                 |                |
|                     |  |                      | 77                       | 71                             |                 |                |
| Earlier<br>Prophets | Variations<br>Interpolations<br>Deficiencies     | 337                  | 239                      | 277                            |                 | 361            |
|                     |  | 11                   | 25                       | 18                             |                 |                |
|                     |  | 2                    | 5                        | 5                              |                 |                |
|                     |  | 350                  | 269                      | 300                            |                 |                |
| Later<br>Prophets   | Variations<br>Interpolation<br>s<br>Deficiencies | 348                  | 250                      | 347                            | 454             | 377            |
|                     |  | 2                    | 25                       | 11                             |                 |                |
|                     |  |                      | 1                        |                                |                 |                |
|                     |  | 350                  | 276                      | 358                            |                 |                |
| Five<br>Megiloth    | Variations<br>Interpolations<br>Deficiencies     | 51                   | 43                       | 48                             |                 | 71             |
|                     |  | 11                   | 14                       | 8                              |                 |                |
|                     |  | 62                   | 57                       | 56                             |                 |                |
| Hagiographa         | Variations<br>Interpolations<br>Deficiencies     | 362                  | 187                      | 242                            | 329             | 468            |
|                     |  | 60                   | 34                       | 20                             |                 |                |
|                     |  | 1                    | 1                        | 1                              |                 |                |
|                     |  | 423                  | 222                      | 263                            |                 |                |
|                     | Total  | 1259                 | 901                      | 1048                           | 848             | 1353           |

N.B. - In this table, what are denoted by "Variations" are designated by the Marosites as **yrq** ;

**III. Origin and Date of the Keri and Kethib.**-The Talmud traces the source of these variations to Moses himself, for we are distinctly told in *Nedarim*, 37 b, that "the pronunciation of certain words according to the

scribes (μyṛpws arqm), the emendations of the scribes (μyṛpws rwf[]), the not reading of words which are in the text (yrq al w bytk), and the reading of words which are not in the text (bytk al w yrq), etc., are a law of Moses from Sinai." Jacob b.-Chajim defends this view in his elaborate *Introduction* to the Rabbinic Bible. Elias Levita, who also expresses this Talmudic declaration, explains it as follows: "The Keri and Kethib of the Pentateuch only are a law of Moses from Mount Sinai, and the members of the Great Synagogue, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, Daniel, Hananiah, Mishael, Azariah, Ezra, Nehemiah, Mordecai, and Zerubbabel, and other wise men from the craftsmen and artisans (rgsmhw çrj hm) to the number of a hundred and twenty, wrote down the Keri and the Kethib according to the tradition which they possessed that our teacher Moses (peace be with him!) read words differently from what they were written in the text; this being one of those mysteries which they knew, for Moses transmitted this mystery to Joshua, Joshua to the elders, the elders to the prophets, etc., and these were put down in the margin as his readings, Ezra acting as a scribe. In the same manner they proceeded in the Prophets and Hagiographa with every word respecting which they had a tradition orally transmitted from the prophets and the sages that it was read differently from what it was in the text. But they required no tradition for the postexilic books, as the authors themselves were present with them; hence, whenever they met with a word which did not seem to harmonize with the context and the sense, the author stated to them- the reason why he used such anomalous expressions, and they wrote down the word in the margin as it should be read" (*Massoreth Ila-Massoreth*, fol. 8 b, sq.). Mendelssohn, in his valuable introduction to his translation of the Pentateuch, and most of the ancient Jewish writers, propounded the same view. It is in accordance with this recondite sense ascribed to the origin of the Keri and Kethib that Rashi remarks on <sup>4085</sup>Genesis 8:16, "The Keri is bxwh, the Kethib axyh, because he was first to tell them to go out; but if they should refuse to go, he was to make them go." Kimchi, however, is of the opposite opinion. So far from believing that these variations proceeded from the sacred writers themselves, who designed to convey thereby various mysteries, he maintains that the Keri and Kethib originated after the Babylonian captivity, when the sacred books were collected by the members of the Great Synagogue. These editors of the long-lost and mutilated inspired writings "found different readings in the volumes, and adopted those which the majority of copies had, because these, according



to their opinion, exhibited the true readings. In some places they wrote down one word in the text without putting the vowel signs to it, or noted it in the margin without inserting it in the text, whilst in other places they inserted one reading in the margin and another in the text" (Introduction to his *Commentary on Joshua*). Ephodi (flourished 1391-1403), who maintains the same view, remarks that Ezra and his followers "made the Keri and Kethib on every passage in which they found some obliterations and confusion, as they were not sure what the precise reading was." Abrabanel, who will neither admit that the Keris and Kethibs proceeded from the sacred writers themselves, nor that they took their rise from the imperfect state of the codices, propounds a new theory. According to him, Ezra and his followers, who undertook the editing of the Scriptures, found the sacred books entire and perfect; but in perusing them these editors discovered that they contained irregular expressions, and loose and ungrammatical phrases, arising from the carelessness and ignorance of the inspired writers. "Ezra had therefore to explain these words in harmony with the connection, and this is the origin of the Keri which is found in the margin of the Bible, as this holy scribe feared to touch 'the words which were spoken or written by the Holy Ghost. These remarks he made on his own account to explain those anomalous letters and expressions, and he put them in the margin to indicate that the gloss is his own. Now, if you examine the numerous Keris and Kethibs in Jeremiah, and look into their connection, you will find them all to be of this nature, viz., that they are to be traced to Jeremiah's careless and blundering writing. .... From this you may learn that the books which have most Keris and Kethibs show that their authors did not know how to speak correctly or to write properly" (Introduction to his *Commentary on Jeremiah*). Though Abrabanel's hypothesis has more truth in it than the other theories, yet it is only by a combination of the three views that the origin of the Keri and Kethib can be traced and explained. For there can be no doubt that *some* of the variations, as the Talmud, Rashi, etc., declare, have been transmitted by tradition from time immemorial, and have their origin in some recondite meaning or mysteries attached to the passages in question; that some, again, as Kimchi, Ephodi, etc., rightly maintain, are due to' the blunders and corruptions which have crept into the text in the course of time, and which the spiritual guides of the nation tried to rectify by a comparison of codices, as is also admitted by the. Talmud (comp. *Jerusalem Megillah*, 4:2; *Sopherim*, 6:4); and that others, again, as Abrabanel remarks, are owing to the carelessness of style, ignorance of idioms and provincialisms,

which the editors and successive interpreters of the Hebrew canon discovered in the different books, or, more properly speaking, which were at variance with the grammatical rules and exegetical laws developed in aftertime by the Masorites. Such, however, was their reverence for the ancient text, that these Masorites who made the new additions to it left the text itself untouched in the very places where they believed it necessary to follow another explanation or reading, but simply inserted the emendation in the margin. Hence the distinction between the ancient text *as it was written*, or Kethib (**bytk**), and the more „modern *emended reading*, or Keri (**yrq**); and hence, also, the fact that the Keri is not inserted in the synagogal scrolls, though it is followed in the public reading of the Scriptures.

**IV. Importance of the Keri and Kethib, especially as relating to the English Version of the Hebrew Scriptures.**—Some idea of the importance of the Keri and Kethib may be gathered from the following analysis of the seventy-six variations which occur in the Pentateuch. Of the seventy-six Keris, twenty-one give **hr[n** instead of **r[n** (<sup><0244></sup>Genesis 24:14, 16, 28, 55, 57; 34:3 [twice], 12; <sup><0225></sup>Deuteronomy 22:15 [twice], 16, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26 [twice], 27, 28, 29), which was evidently epicene in earlier periods (comp. Gesenius, *G-qamm.* sec. 23, sec. 32, 6; Ewald, *Lehrbuch*, sec. 175, b); fifteen have the plural termination **wyA**; affixed to nouns instead of the singular **w** in the text (<sup><0304></sup>Genesis 33:4; <sup><0271></sup>Exodus 27:11; 28:28; 32:19; 39:4, 33; <sup><0322></sup>Leviticus 9:22; 16:21; <sup><0413></sup>Numbers 12:3; <sup><0223></sup>Deuteronomy 2:33; 5:10; 7:9; 8:2; 27:10; 33:9), which some think is no real variation, since in earlier periods the termination **w** was both singular and plural, just as **ydgb** stands for both **yDgBa** and **ydGB**; seventeen give more current and uniform forms of words (<sup><0087></sup>Genesis 8:17; 10:19; 14:8; 24:33 with 50:26; 25:23 with 35:11; 27:3 with 5, 7; 27:29 with the same word in the next clause; 36:6, 14 with ver. 18; 39:20, 22; 43:28 with 27:29; <sup><0242></sup>Exodus 16:2; 16:7 with <sup><0461></sup>Numbers 16:11; <sup><0445></sup>Numbers 14:36 with 15:24; <sup><0213></sup>Numbers 21:32 with 32:39; 32:7 with 30:6; <sup><0523></sup>Deuteronomy 32:13 with <sup><0413></sup>Amos 4:13); five substitute the termination third person singular, **w** for **h** (<sup><0491></sup>Genesis 49:11 [twice]; <sup><0225></sup>Exodus 22:26; 32:17; <sup><0405></sup>Numbers 10:36), which is a less common pronominal suffix (comp. Gesenius, *Gramm.* sec. 91; Ewald, *Lehrbuch*, sec. 247, a); two make two words of one (<sup><0301></sup>Genesis 30:11; <sup><0402></sup>Exodus 4:2); two have **wyl** **ç** instead

of **wl ç** (<sup><0163></sup>Exodus 16:13; <sup><0413></sup>Numbers 11:32); three give plural verbs instead of singular (<sup><0205></sup>Leviticus 21:5; <sup><0404></sup>Numbers 34:4; <sup><0307></sup>Deuteronomy 31:7), which are no doubt an improvement, since <sup><0404></sup>Numbers 34:4 is evidently a mistake, as may be seen from a comparison of this verse with verse 5; three substitute the relative pronoun **wkd** for the negative particle **al** (<sup><0208></sup>Exodus 21:8; <sup><0121></sup>Leviticus 11:21; 25:30), which is very important; two substitute euphemisms for cacophonous expressions (<sup><0307></sup>Deuteronomy 28:27, 30); and two are purely traditional, viz., <sup><0416></sup>Numbers 1:16; 26:9. The Pentateuch, however, can hardly be regarded as giving an adequate idea of the importance of the Keri and Kethib, inasmuch as the Jews, regarding the law as more sacred than any other inspired book, guarded it against being corrupted with greater vigilance than the rest of the canon. Hence the comparatively few and unimportant Keris when contrasted with those occurring in the other volumes. Still, the Pentateuch contains a few specimens of almost all the different Keris.

As to the question how far our English versions have been influenced by the Keri and Kethib, this will best be answered by a comparison of the translations with the more striking variations which occur in the Prophets and Hagiographa. In <sup><0101></sup>Joshua 5:1, the textual reading is "till *we* were passed over" **wnr̄b[ ]**, the Keri has **μrb[ ]**, "until *they* passed over;" and though the Sept., Vulg., Chaldee, Luther, the Zurich Bible, Coverdale, the Bishops' Bible, the Geneva Version, etc., adopt the Keri, the A. V., following Kimchi, adheres to the Kethib; whilst in <sup><0107></sup>Joshua 6:7, where the textual reading is "and *they* said (**wrmayw**) unto the people," and the marginal emendation is "and *he* said" (**rmayw**), and where the Vulg., Chaldee, Luther, the Zurich Bible, Coverdale, the Bishops' Bible, and the Geneva Version again adopt the Keri, as in the former instance, the A. V. abandons the textual reading and espouses the emendation. In <sup><0157></sup>Joshua 15:47, where the Keri is "*the bordering sea* (**μyh l wbḡh**) and its territory," and the Kethib has "and *the great sea* (**l dḡh μyh**) and the territory," which is again followed by the ancient versions and the translations of the Reformers, the A. V., without taking any notice of the textual reading in the margin, as in <sup><0106></sup>Joshua 8:16, adopts the emendation, whereas in <sup><0153></sup>Joshua 15:53 the A. V. follows the textual reading (**μwny**) *Janum*, noticing, however, the emendation (**μwny**) *Janus* in the margin. All the ten emendations of the second class, which propose the insertion of

entire words into the text (**yrq bytk al w**), are adopted in the A. V. without the slightest indication by the usual italics that they are not in the text. Of the eight omissions of entire words-in the third class (**yrq al w bwtk**) nothing decisive can be said, inasmuch as six of them. refer to simple particles, and they might either be recognised by the translators or not without its being discernible in the version. The only two instances, however, where there can be no mistake (<sup>244B</sup>Jeremiah 41:3; Ezekiel xlvi, 16), clearly show that the A. V. follows the marginal gloss, and accordingly rejects the words which are in the text. Had the limits of this article allowed it, we could have shown still more unquestionably that, though the A. V. generally adopts the marginal emendations, yet in many instances it proceeds most arbitrarily, and adheres to the textual reading; and that, with very few exceptions, it never indicates, by italics or in the margin, the difference between, the textual and the marginal readings.

Inattention to the Keri and Kethib has given rise to the most fanciful and absurd expositions, of which the following may serve both as a specimen and a warning. In looking at the text of the Hebrew Bible, it will be seen that there is a final *Mem* ( $\mu$ ) in the middle of the word **hbr $\mu$ l**, <sup>239B</sup>Isaiah 9:6. We have already alluded to the fact that it exhibits one of the fifteen instances where the Kethib, or the textual reading, is one word, and the Keri, or the emended reading, proposes two words (see above, sec. 1). Accordingly, **hbr $\mu$ l** stands for **hB $\epsilon$ i $\mu$ l** ;=  **$\mu$ h**l ; i.e. "*to them the dominion shall be great,*" corresponding to the common abbreviation  **$\mu$ B**; for  **$\mu$ hB**; The question is not whether  **$\mu$ l** may be considered as an abbreviation of  **$\mu$ hl**, seeing there are no other examples of it; suffice it to say that Jewish scribes and critics of ancient times took it as such, just as they regarded  **$\mu$ l ara** (<sup>237B</sup>Isaiah 33:7) as a contraction of **hara  $\mu$ hl** =  **$\mu$ l** (comp. the Syriac, Chaldee, Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, Vulgate, Elias Levita, etc.); and that the Sept. read it as *two words* (i.e. **hbr hl**). Subsequent scribes, however, found it either to be more in accordance with the primitive reading, or with their exegetical rules, as well as with the usage of the prophet himself (comp. <sup>237B</sup>Isaiah 33:23), to read it as one word; but their extreme reverence for the text prevented them from making this alteration without indicating that some codices have two words. Hence, though they joined the two words together as one, they yet left the final *Mem* to exhibit the variation. An example of the reverse occurs in

~~41213~~ Nehemiah 2:13, where  $\mu\psi\chi\omega\rho\mu\eta$  has been divided into two words,  $\mu\psi\chi\omega\rho\ \mu\eta$ , and where the same anxiety faithfully to exhibit the ancient reading has made the editors of the Hebrew canon retain the medial *Mem* at the end of the word. It was to be expected that those Jews who regard both readings as emanating from the Holy Spirit, and as designed to convey some 'recondite meaning, would find some mysteries in this final *Mem* in the middle of  $hbr\psi l$ . ' Hence we find in the Talmud (*Sanhedrin*, 94) the following remark upon it: "Why is it that all the *Mems* in the middle of a word are open [i.e.  $m$ ] and this one is closed [i.e.  $\mu$ ] ? The Holy One (blessed be he!) wanted to make Hezekiah the Messiah, and Sennacherib Gog and Magog; whereupon Justice pleaded before the presence of the Holy One (blessed be he !), 'Lord of the World, ' What! David the king of Israel, who sang so many hymns and praises before thee, wilt thou not make him the Messiah; but Hezekiah, for whom thou. hast performed all those miracles, and who has not uttered one song before thee, wilt thou make him the Messiah?' Therefore has the *Mem* been closed." Aben-Ezra again tells us that the scribes (not he himself, as Gill erroneously states) see in it an allusion to the recession of the shadow on the dial in Hezekiah's time; whilst Kimehi will have it that it refers to the "stopping up of the breaches in the walls of Jerusalem, which are broken down during the captivity, and that this will take place in the days of salvation, when the kingdom which had been shut ip till the coming of the Messiah will be opened." But that Christian expositors should excel these mystical interpretations is surpassing strange. What are we to say to Galatinus, who submits that this *Mem*, being the cipher of 600, intimates that six hundred years after this prophecy the birth of Christ was to take place? or to the opinion which he quotes, that the name  $\mu\psi\rho\mu\ \eta\rho\zeta$  *Miaria Dominna*, or even the perpetual virginity of Mary is thereby indicated (lib. 7:c. xiii)?. or to Calvin, who thinks that it denotes the close and secret way whereby the Messiah should come to reign and set up his kingdom? or to the opinion which he mentions that it indicates the exclusion of the Jews from the Messiah's kingdom for their unbelief? or to the conjecture of Gill, that "it may denote that the government of Christ, which would be for a time straitened, and kept in narrow bounds and limits, should hereafter be throughout the world, to the four corners of it, so as to be firm and stable, perfect and complete, which the figure of this letter, being shut and four-square, may be an emblem of?"

It should be added that there are some words which are always read differently (yrq) from what they are written in the text (bytk), and which, from the frequency of their occurrence, have only the vowel signs of the proposed Keri, without the latter being exhibited in the marginal gloss. These are,

- a. The name **hwby**, which has always the vowel signs of **ynda}** and is pronounced with these vowels, i.e. **h20wby]** except when it precedes this name itself, in which case it has the vowel signs of **μyhæ}**, i.e. **h2awby]**
- b. The name Jerusalem, when, as in the earlier books of Scripture, it is written with a *Yod* before the *Mens*, has never its own points, i.e. **μl eWry]** or **μA**; but has the vowel signs of **μybivWry]** and is read so; c. The word **awh**, which was epicene in earlier periods, is always pointed **awhā** in the Pentateuch, when it is used as feminine, to make it conformable to the later feminine form **ayh**; and,
- c. The name **rkççy** is always furnished with the vowels belonging to the Keri, **rkCyā** with one *Shin*.

It remains only for us to say under this head that the judicious critic will often find good reason for differing from the opinion that seems to be implied in these Masoretic notes, and will in such cases, of course, prefer the Kethib to the Keri. *SEE CRITICISM, BIBLICAL.*

**V. Literature.**—One of the earliest attempts freely to discourse upon the origin and value of the Keri and Kethib is that of D. Kimchi, in the Introduction to his *Commentary on Joshua*; Abrabanel, too, has a lengthy disquisition on this subject, in the Introduction to his *Commentary on Jeremiah*. He was followed by the laborious Jacob ben-Chajim, who fully discusses the Keri and Kethib in his celebrated Introduction to 'the *Rabbinic Bible*, translated by Ginsburg in the *Journal of Sacred Literature* for July, 1863; and by the erudite and bold Elias Levita, who gives a very lucid account of the Keri and Kethib in his *Massoreth Ha-Massoreth*, ed. Sulzbach, 1771, p. 8 a, sq.; 21 a, sq. Of Christian writers are to be mentioned the masterly treatises by Cappellus, *Critica Sacra*, lib. 3:cap. 9:sq.; Buxtorf, *Tiberias*, cap. xiii; Buxtorf the younger, *Anticritica* (Basileae, 1653), cap. 4:p. 448-509; Hilleri *De Arcano Kethib et Keri* (Tub. 1692); Walton, *Biblia Polyglotta, Proleg.* (Cantab. 1828), i, 412 sq.;

Wolf, *Bibliotheca Hebræa*, ii, 507-533; Frankel, *Vorstudien-zu der Septuaginta* (Leipzig, 1841), p. 219 sq.; Sticht, *De Keri et Kethibh* (Altouia, 1760; and against him Dreschler, *Sententic Stichii*, etc. Lips. 1763); Tragard, *yrqw bytk* (Gryph. 1775); W. olffradt, *De Keri et Ch'ihibh* (Rost. 1739). **SEE VARIOUS READINGS.**

### Keri, Francis Borgia,

a learned Hungarian Jesuit, born in the beginning of the 18th century, in the county of Zemplin, Hungary, entered the Jesuitical order when yet very young, and became an instructor of philosophy and mathematics at Tyrnau. He died at Buda in 1769. Keri distinguished himself greatly as a historian, especially by his *Imperatores Offomani a capta Constantinopoli* (Tyrnau, 1749, 9 pts. folio). He wrote also *Imperatores Orientis compendio exhibiti, e compluribus Graecis præcipue scriptoribus, a Constantino Magno -ad Constantinum ultimum* (Tyrnau, 1744, folio). See Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Gener.* 27:612; Horangi, *Nova Memoria Hungarorum*, ii, 332.

### Keri, Janos

a noted Hungarian prelate, born in the first half of the 17th century; entered as a mere youth, in 1656, the order of St. Paul, became afterwards director of the establishment, and held successively the bishoprics of Sirmium, Csanad, and Waitzen. He died in 1685. Bishop Keri wrote *Ferocia Hartis Tureici* (Pos. 1672, 8vo): — *Philosophia scholastica* (Presb. 1673, 3 vols. fol.), etc.—Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog.* <sup><1672></sup>Genesis 27:612; Czwittinger, *Hungaria Literata*, p. 203.

### Ke'rioth

(Heb. *Keriyoth'*, *twr'ap* cities; Sept. in Jeremiah *Καριώθ*, in ver. 41 v. r. *Ἀκκαριώθ* and *Ἀκκαρών*, elsewhere *πόλεις*; Vulg. *Carioth*; Auth. Vers." Kiriioth" in Amos ii, 2), the name of two places.

**1.** A town in the south of Judah (hence probably included within Simeon), mentioned between Hadattah and Hezron (<sup><1675></sup>Joshua 15:25). From the absence of the copulative after it, Reland (*Palcest.* p. 700,708) suggested that the name ought to be joined with the succeeding, i. q. *cities of Hezron*, i.e. Hazor itself, as in several ancient versions (but see Keil, ad loc.); and Maurer (*Comment.* ad loc.) has defended this construction, which the enumeration in ver. 32:requires, i.e. Keriioth-Hezron =Hazor-Amam. **SEE**

**JUDAH, TRIBE OF.** It seems to be the place alluded to in the name of Judas Iscariot (Ἰσκαριώτης, i.e. *h/Yræþ/vyaa* *narrative of Kerioth*). Dr. Robinson conjectures (*Bibl. Researches*, ii, 472) that the site is to be found in the ruined foundations of a small village discovered by him on the slope of a ridge about ten miles south of Hebron, and still called by the equivalent Arabic name *el-Kuryetein* (comp. De Saulcy's *Dead Sea*, i, 431; Van de Velde, *Narrative*, ii, 82). With this agree *the plural* form of the word, the associated *epithets*, and *the frontier* position, suggesting that the place was a fortification of contiguous hamlets for nomades rather than an individual city. **SEE CITY; SEE HAZOR.**

**2.** A strong city of the land of Moab, mentioned in connection with Bethgamul and Bozrah (<sup><2489></sup>Jeremiah 48:24), in the prophetic denunciations of its overthrow by the Babylonian invaders on their way to Palestine (<sup><2484></sup>Jeremiah 48:41; <sup><3111></sup>Amos 2:2). But for the mention of Kiriathaim in the same connection (from which, however, it is somewhat difficult to distinguish it), we should be inclined (see Ritter's *Erdk. 15:583*) to locate it at *Kureyat* on Jebel Attarus, east of the Dead Sea. **SEE KIRJATH-HUZOTH.** Porter confidently identifies it with the present *Kureiyeh*, six miles east of Busrah, in the plain at the foot of the mountain range of Bashan, where are very extensive remains of former edifices (*Damascus*, ii, 191 sq.). But the associate names (in the first passage of Jeremiah) appear to indicate a locality south-west of Bozrah, and it is doubtful whether the Mishor (q.v.) of Moab extended so far as this. **SEE BOZRAH.** The Kerioth (*cities*) in question may therefore be "the ancient cities t! the north of Amman and south-west of Busrah, still bearing the names of *Kiriath* and *Kiriatin*, where the edifices are of such gigantic proportions and primitive forms as to induce a strong conviction that they were the work of the early Emim" (Graham, in the *Jour. of Sac. Lit.* April, 185.8, p. 240).

**Kerithuth.**

**SEE TALMUD.**

**Kerkaroth.**

**SEE CAMEL.**



## Kerkassandi,

in Hindu mythology, is the name of the first Buddha who appeared (when men were yet attaining to the desirable age of 40,000 years) to take upon himself the sins of the world, to redeem them, and to secure them the continued enjoyment of the high age mentioned.-Vollmer, *Mythol. Worterb.* s.v. .

## Kernel.

(only in the plur. **μυλᾶρι**] *chartsannim'*, so called from their *sharp* taste; Sept. **στέμφυλα**, Vulg. *uvapassa*) is 'understood by the Talmudists (so the A.V.) to mean the *grape-stones* (Mishna, *Nasir.* 6:2) as opposed to the skin ("husk"), i.e. the entire substance of the grape from the centre to the surface (<sup><1001></sup>Numbers 6:4). The ancient versions, however, refer it to the sour or *unripe grapes* themselves, and this signification is favored by the use of kindred words in the connate languages. (See further in Gesenius, *Thesaur. Heb.* p. 527.) **SEE GRAPE.**

Kero, a monk of St. Gall, who lived in the 8th century, is considered as the old German commentator of the rule of the Benedictines. His work appeared in the first volume of Schilter's *Thesaurus antiquitatum Teutonic.*, in the second volume of Goldast's *Scriptores rerum Aleman.*, and in the first volume of Hattemer's *Denkmale d. Mittelalters*. He is also considered as the author of the translation of the Lord's Prayer and the Apostles' Creed into old High-German, and is said to have written the *Glossarium Keronis* (to be found also in *Hattemer's Denkmale*), and a number of hymns, etc. -Pierer, *Universal Lex.* 8:s.v.

## Ke'ros

(Heb' *Keyros'*, **sdqg** *curved*, <sup><1077></sup>Nehemiah 7:47; Sept. **Κειράς** v. r. **Κιράς**; or **srqg** *Keros'*, <sup><1214></sup>Ezra 2:44; Sept. **Κηραός** v. r. **Κορές, Κάδης**; Vulg. *Ceros*), a man whose descendants (or a place whose former inhabit-ants) returned as Nethinim from Babylon with Zerubbabel (<sup><1214></sup>Ezra 2:44; <sup><1077></sup>Nehemiah 7:47). B.C. ante 536.

## Kerr, George (1), D.D., LL.D.,

a Presbyterian minister, particularly eminent as a Christian educator, was born in Antrim County, Ireland, Dec. 18, 1814, and came to this country

with his parents in 1823. Early attached to the Church, he decided to enter the ministry, for which he sought thorough preparation, first by a full classical course at Williams College, Mass., and later at the Union Theological Seminary of New York City. He was licensed and ordained in 1844, and began his ministerial labors as pastor of the Reformed (Protestant Dutch) Church in Conesville, Schoharie Co., N.Y. In 1846 he received an urgent call to the principalship of Franklin (N. Y.) Academy, an institution then hardly deserving a higher place than the district school. . Kerr, accepting the position, soon made this academy one of the best in the state. For a short period he filled a chair in the New York State Agricultural College, and then became principal of Watertown Academy, N. Y., and in 1865 removed to Cooperstown, where he did active and valuable service for the large seminary then located there. In 1867 he decided to return to Franklin and to resume his position in that school, but, while preparing for the removal, died, March 27. "Dr. Kerr was a man of work; his characteristics were prominent and clearly defined; all through life he was intellectually on the alert; everywhere, on all worthy subjects, analytical, independent, discriminating. He was a thorough scholar, especially in Greek literature, and a marvel of enthusiasm and power as a teacher" (Wilson, *Presb. His. Almaniac*, 1868, p. 215). He aimed not only to educate the mind, but had particular regard for the education of the *heart* of all his students. (J. H.W.)

### Kerr, George (2),

a Methodist minister, was born in Ireland in 1819. His parents, who emigrated to Canada in 1822, intended him for the mercantile profession; but, converted when seventeen years old, and shortly after impressed with the conviction that he was called to preach, he came over to the States, and settled at .Winstead, Conn., was made a local preacher, and in 1844 joined the New York Conference.' In 1866. he was superannuated, and made Hudson, N.Y., his residence. He died while on a visit to his friends in Ireland, Sept. 8, 1869. He was much esteemed, not only by members of his own Church, but by ministers and members of other evangelical churches of the city.-Smith, *Annals of Deceased Preachers of N. Y. and N. Y. E. Conj*: p. 119.

## Kerr, Henry M.,

a Presbyterian minister, was born in York District, S. C., Dec. 30, 1782. In very early life his mother had consecrated him, as Hannah did her Samuel, to the Lord, and had often expressed her desire to him that he should be a minister of the Gospel of the blessed Jesus. His parents being in moderate circumstances, and he the oldest of eleven children, he was compelled to labor for their maintenance; hence his education was much neglected in his earlier years. He went first to an academy in Roman County, N. C.; then he repaired to Iredell County, and enjoyed the advantages of instruction under the celebrated James Hall, D.D. Here he completed a very extensive course of scientific study, and was readily received as a candidate for the ministry by Concord Presbytery in 1811. He pursued his theological course part of the term with the Rev. Dr. Kilpatrick, and part of it with James M'Kee, D.D. In 1814 he was licensed by Concord Presbytery. At that time he was residing in Salisbury, N. C. He remained there, teaching and preaching, until the spring of 1816, when he removed to Lincoln County, and he was ordained in November of that year pastor of Olney, Long Creek, and New Hope churches. In 1819 he removed to Rutherfordtown to take charge of the village academy. He preached at the same time in the old church of Little Britain, and, after three years, removed into the bounds of this church. Here he spent fourteen years, and his labors were again blessed in a remarkable degree. In 1833 he removed to Jonesboro', East Tennessee; but, not finding his ministerial associations pleasant, he travelled further west, and settled in Hardeman County, West Tennessee, in 1835. Here he performed much missionary labor in all the surrounding counties, and organized many churches. The infirmities of age made it necessary for him to abandon, in part, his evangelistic labors, and he devoted the last years of his life to Bethel and Aiwell churches, in M'Nairy County. In the fall of 1860 he settled near Watervalley, in the Presbytery of North Mississippi, where he finished his long and useful career January 28, 1865. Trained under the old system, he made no effort at rhetorical display. His discourses were pre-eminently scriptural. He used "the sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God," and it was sharp in the heart of the King's enemies." His style was perspicuous and energetic, and he was often truly eloquent. The providence of God cast his lot chiefly in destitute portions of the land, and his labors were evangelistic. He organized more churches, it is believed, than any other member of the Presbytery. For many years he was stated clerk of the Presbytery of Western Tennessee District, and his

acquaintance with the form of government and discipline was so perfect that his word was taken as the solution of all doubts and difficulties."-Wilson, *Presb. Historical Almanac*, 1868, p. 338.

### Kerr, James,

a Presbyterian minister, a native of Scotland, was born in 1805, and was educated in the University of Glasgow, where he took his A.B. in 1832. In his twenty-fifth year he emigrated to the United States, and shortly after entered the Western Theological Seminary,; was licensed to preach by the Presbytery of Baltimore April 27, 1836, and was ordained an evangelist by the Presbytery of Winchester at Martinsburg, Va., April 22, 1837. He labored first as a missionary in Hampshire County, Va., for two years, and was successful in his ministry, planting the standard of the Cross in many portions of that hitherto forsaken country. He was next invited by the Church of Cadiz, Ohio; began his ministerial work in this congregation Dec. 2, 1838, and was regularly installed June, 1839. He died April 19, 1855. Kerr was the author of *Mode of Baptism*, and a small work on *Psalmsody*. "He was a good presbyter, and made an excellent presiding officer of an ecclesiastical court, to which both the members of the Presbytery and Synod can testify. His decisions were uniformly correct, and his thorough acquaintance with the government and polity of our Church gave him a superior influence in all her judicial meetings upon which he was called to attend. He was remarkably conscientious in every sphere of life, whether as a citizen, a Christian, or a minister. So decided was he against reading sermons, or even taking the smallest abstract into the pulpit, that he invariably voted against the licensure and ordination of any young man that did commit this 'great mistake,' as he sometimes termed it. As a preacher he was clear and logical, plain and interesting, in his statements of the great truths of the Gospel. His pulpit productions thoroughly partook of his own character, and came forth as the result of close application and much study; and on no occasion would he agree to preach, if it could at all be avoided, without special preparation."-Wilson, *Presb. Historical Almanac*, 1867, p. 160.

### Kerr, John,

a Baptist minister of Scottish descent, was born in Caswell County, N. C., Aug. 14, 1782, converted in 1800, baptized in 1801, and at once licensed to preach. "Determined to avail himself of every means in his power to

render his ministry efficient and useful, the young evangelist travelled to South Carolina to see the excellent Marshall and listen to his preaching, and thence to Georgia to form the acquaintance of the distinguished and venerable Mercer. Returning from the South, he visited Virginia, and became personally known to the lamented Semple and other valuable ministers of the state. Wherever he went his preaching produced a thrilling effect. His youthful appearance, the ardor and gracefulness of his manner, and the beauty of his diction, attracted universal attention. There are not a few who still remember his visit to Eastern Virginia with lively emotion after the lapse of almost half a century." In 1811 he embarked on the stormy sea of politics, consenting to become a candidate for Congress, and he was twice elected thereto. He was a member of that body during the War of 1812, and served his country at that critical period with a fervent and enlightened patriotism. At the close of his Congressional career he returned to Halifax, and served the churches at Arbor and at Mary Creek. In March, 1825, he removed to the city of Richmond, and became the pastor of the First Baptist Church. Here his fine pulpit talents were brought into active and successful operation. Crowds hung with delight on his ministry. In less than a year more than five hundred members were added to the Church, two hundred and seventeen of whom were white. This successful work continued until dissension was sown among his parishioners by the preaching of Alexander Campbell, whose efforts finally drew from Kerr's church nearly half of its members (in 1831). By the close of 1832 he had grown weary of the contentions to which the division had given rise, and resigned his charge. He died Sept. 29, 1842. He was naturally of a frank, generous, and disinterested disposition. Incapable of artifice himself, he was not always guarded against it in others. His temperament, peculiarly ardent, sometimes perverted his judgment. His manners were uniformly bland, gentle, and conciliating. In social intercourse he was highly gifted, never failing to impart an interest and a charm to conversation. He was dignified without ostentation, and cheerful without levity. "As a Christian, he imbibed in a high degree the spirit of his Master. His piety was not the dwarfish and stunted growth of sectarianism—morose, censorious, and persecuting, but the product of enlarged and liberal views—cheerful, candid, and conciliatory. Though he was firm to his convictions as a Baptist, he was remarkably free from bigotry, and was a lover of good men of every communion. As a preacher he possessed commanding talents. A fine person, a sonorous voice, and a graceful manner at once prepossessed his hearers in his favor. His apprehension was

quick, his perception clear, and his imagination remarkably vivid. He is ranked among the most popular preachers of his day in Virginia, and for more than thirty years he rarely if ever failed to be appointed at associations and other important meetings to preach on occasions of the greatest interest."-Sprague, *Annals*, 6:446 sq.

### Kerr, Joseph, D.D.,

a prominent minister of the Associate Reformed Church, was born in Antrim County, Ireland, in 1778; educated at the University of Glasgow, and, with a view of entering the ministry, pursued theological studies under the direction of the Associate Presbytery of Derry. He came to this country in 1801, and was licensed by the Second Presbytery of Pennsylvania shortly after. His appointment lay over a vast area of country west of the Alleghanies, a work for which he seemed to have been endowed by nature. In 1804 he was called to Mifflin and St. Clair as regular pastor, and, accepting, was installed October 17. When *the* Presbytery decided to establish a theological school at Pittsburg, they looked to him for its head, and felt constrained to urge his removal to that place, and appointed him professor of theology, a post which he successfully filled until he died, Nov. 15, 1829. "The death of Dr. Kerr shed a gloom not only over the large circle of his friends and acquaintances, and the families of his pastoral charge, but over the entire Synod of the West, as it seemed at once to dash the brightening prospects of the infant theological seminary intrusted to his supervision .... With an athletic physical constitution, of more than ordinarily prepossessing appearance, he was endowed with intellectual powers of the first order, highly cultivated, and possessed of all the essential elements of a natural orator. With undoubted yet unostentatious piety, mild, kind, affable, affectionate, benevolent, liberal, and hospitable almost to a fault, he at once won the friendship and affections of his acquaintances, and the confidence of the congregations to whom he ministered, and, without assuming it, or even being apparently conscious of it, he occupied from the commencement of his ministry the position of a master spirit, which was accorded to him without envy and without opposition by his co-presbyters."-(Wilson, *Presb. Historical Almanac*, 1863, p. 372 sq.

## Kerr, Joseph R.

son of the preceding, and also a minister of the Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church, was born in St. Clair township, Alleghany Co., Pa., Jan. 18, 1807, and was educated at the Western University of Pennsylvania, where he graduated in 1826 with the highest honors of his class. In the fall of 1827 he entered the theological seminary at Pittsburg, founded then only a short time, over which his father presided, and was licensed Sept. 2, 1829. Only two and a half months later his father died, and young Kerr was called to fill his place in the pastorate, and, accepting the proffered place, was ordained July 29, 1830. "Thus called by Providence to fill the pulpit of such a man as his father, he succeeded, from the very first, in giving entire satisfaction to his people, and soon became one of the most, if he- was not, altogether the most, popular of the preachers in the city, but it was at the expense of such exhausting toil as contributed slowly but surely to undermine a constitution at best but delicate. From being a student of divinity, and without any experience, he entered at once on the pastoral oversight of a large congregation, and all the duties connected with the office of the Christian ministry. In his preparation for the pulpit he was a close, unwearying student. He was ambitious of excellence in whatever he attempted connected with his office, and became a workman that needeth not to be ashamed" (Sprague, *Annals* [Associate Ref. Presb. Church], 9:162. His health, however, failed him, and in 1832 he was obliged to take an assistant, Moses Kerr (q.v.), a younger brother. His health, notwithstanding this timely precaution, continued to fail, and he died June 14, 1843. Kerr published an address, *Responsibility of Literary Men* (1836), and a sermon on *Duelling* (1838). (J. H.W.)

## Kerr, Moses

a minister of the Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church, third son of Dr. Joseph Kerr (q.v.), was born in St. Clair, Pa., June 30, 1811. Naturally of a serious and thoughtful cast of mind, and manifesting in very early life decided piety, his education was directed from the first with a view to qualifying him for the sacred ministry. Signs of failing health, however, induced him to devote himself to mercantile life, but it soon proved as unfavorable to his health as his application to study, and he engaged in farm-work. His health becoming restored, he entered the Western University of Pennsylvania, and graduated in 1828. In the fall of the same year he began the study of theology in the seminary then under the care of

his father; was licensed to preach on the 28th of April, 1831, and shortly after was called as pastor to Alleghany. But when the Presbytery met to ordain and install him, he returned the call on account of a hemorrhage of the lungs. The Presbytery, however, proceeded with his ordination to the office of the ministry. This was on the 9th of October, 1832. Shortly after he sailed for Europe, and on his return, with every appearance of restored and established health, resumed preaching, and finally accepted a call by the large and influential congregation of Robinson's Run, in the vicinity of Pittsburg, September 2, 1834. But a little more than six months later he was again attacked with hemorrhage of the lungs, and demitted his pastoral charge. During a vacancy he discharged for a time the duties of professor of languages in the Western University of Pennsylvania; afterwards of Biblical literature and criticism in the theological seminary, Alleghany. But his tastes and talents were for the pulpit, and he again accepted a call as a preacher, this time from the Third Church, Pittsburg, 18th of October, 1837. With that congregation he closed his life on the 26th of January, 1840. Moses Kerr "was a student from the love of study, and a careful reader of the best writings not only in theology, but in literature generally. With a becoming appreciation of the demands of his profession, he aimed to store his mind not only with the matter of text-books of theology and the works of past ages, but the fresh discussions of living divines, and at the same time keep up with the general advance of literature and science in the world. As a preacher he had capabilities which, with ordinary health and an ordinary length of life, must have rendered him eminent in his profession." - Sprague, *Annals*, 9:166.

### Kersey, Jesse,

a minister of the Society of Friends, was born at York, Pa., in 1768. In his early youth his heart was given to God. In his seventeenth year he experienced a call to the Gospel ministry, but still remained an apprentice to the trade of a potter about four years, and afterwards taught school. In 1804 he embarked for England on a Gospel mission. In 1805 he returned to America, and in 1814 went on a religious mission to the Southern States, afterwards returning to his home, and continuing to labor and preach. He died near Kennet, Pa., in 1845. As a minister, Mr. Kersey's affability of manners, his grave and dignified deportment, the soundness of his principles, the beauty and simplicity of his style of address, heightened in their effect by the depth of his devotional feelings, gave an interest and a



charm which gained him many admirers. See Janney, *Hist. of the Friends*, 4:116. (J. L. S.)

## Keryktik

(from κηρύσσω, to *preach*), i.e. the *art of preaching*, is a modern name for *Homiletics*, first introduced by Stier (*Keryktik*, 1830,1846). **SEE HOMILETICS.**

## Keseph.

**SEE SILVER.**

## Kesitah

(ἡφύκα) A.V. "piece of money," "piece of silver"). The meaning and derivation of this word, which only occurs thrice in the O. T., has been a subject of much controversy. The places where it is found <sup><1339></sup>Genesis 33:19, recording Jacob's purchase of a piece of ground at Shechem; <sup><1342></sup>Joshua 24:32, a verbal repetition from Genesis; and <sup><1821></sup>Job 42:11, where the presents made to Job are specified, and it is joined with rings of gold indicate either the name of a coin or of some article used in barter. The principal explanations of the word are:

**1.** That of the Sept. and all ancient versions, which render it "a *lamb*," either the animal itself or a coin bearing its impress (Hottinger, *Diss. de Numm. Orient.*), a view which has been revived in modern times by the Danish bishop Munter in a treatise published at Copenhagen, 1824, and more recently still by Mr. James Yates, *Proc. of Numism. Society*, 1837, 1838, p. 141. The entire want of any etymological ground for this interpretation has led Bochart (*Hierozoic.* i, 1. 2, c. 3) to imagine that there had been a confusion in the text of the Sept. between ἑκατὸν μνῶν and ἑκατὸν ἄμνῶνς, and that this error has passed into all the ancient versions, which may be supported by the singular fact that in <sup><1330></sup>Genesis 31:7,41, we find μὴνᾶς τρεῖς (A.V. "ten times," *hnm* however, more usually standing for a particular weight) translated by the Sept. δέκα ἄμνῶν, which it is difficult to account for on any supposition save that of a mistake of the copyist for μνῶν. **SEE SHEEP.**

**2.** Others, adopting the rendering "lamb," have imagined a reference to a weight formed in the shape of that animal, such as we know to have been

in use among the Egyptians and Assyrians, imitating bulls, antelopes, geese, etc. (see Wilkinson's *Anc. Egypt.* ii, 10; Layard; *Nineveh and Babylon*, p. 600-602; Lepsius, *Denkmale*, 3:plate 39, No. 3).

3. Faber, in the German edition of *Harmzer's Obs.* ii, 15-19, quoted by Gesenius (*Thesaur.* p. 1241), connects it with the Syriac *kesta*, Heb. **tsq**, "a vessel," an etymology accepted by Grotefend (see below), and considers it to have been either a measure or a silver vessel used in barter (comp. AElia, *V. H.* i, 22).

4. The most probable view, however, is that supported by Gesenius, Rosenmuller, Jahn, Kalisch, and the majority of the soundest interpreters, that it was, in Grotefend's words (*Numism. Chronicles* ii, 248), "merely a silver weight of undetermined size, just as the most ancient shekel was nothing more than a piece of rough silver without any image or device." The lost root was perhaps akin to the Arabic *kasat*, "he divided equally." Bochart, however (*ut sup.*), is disposed to alter the punctuation of the *Shin*, and to connect the word with **fvq** "truth," adding "potuit q id est vera dici moneta quaecunque habuit justum pondus, ant etiam moneta sincera et **ἀκίβδηλος**."

According to Rabbi Akiba, quoted by Bochart, a certain coin bore this name in comparatively modern times, so that he would render the word by **qpn**, **δάνακες**: Kitto, s.v. See Kitto, *Daily Bible Illustrations*, ad loc. Job. **SEE MONEY**.

### Kesler, Andreas

a German theologian, born July 17, 1595, was educated at the University of Jena, and afterwards became adjunct professor in the philosophical faculty of Wittenberg. In 1623 he was called to fill a professorship in Coburg; in 1625 he became pastor and superintendent at Eisfeld; in 1633 director of the gymnasium at Schweinfurt, whence in 1635 he was recalled to Coburg to fill a high ecclesiastical position. He died May 15, 1643. His writings consist, besides sermons, of polemical works against the Roman Catholic Church, for a list of which see Hagelhan, *Leichenrede*. See also Henning Witte, *Memoric Theologorum* (Decas 5), p. 557 sq.-Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 7:518.

## Kessler, Christian Rudolph,

a German Reformed minister, born February 20, 1823, in the Canton of Graubunden, Switzerland, was educated in the best schools of his native land, and afterwards spent some time at the University of Leipsic; came to America with his 'parents in 1841; studied theology at Mercersburg, Pa.; was licensed and ordained in the spring of 1843, and took charge of congregations in Pendleton County, Va. In 1844 he became associated with Dr. Bibighaus as assistant pastor in the Salem congregation, Philadelphia. His health failing, in 1848 he removed to Allentown, Pa., to establish a female seminary. In this enterprise he was remarkably successful. He died March 4, 1855, leaving the institution he had founded in a flourishing condition.

## Kessler (Ahenarius), Johann Jacob

was born at St. Gall in 1502, and studied theology at Basle. In 1522 he went to Wittenberg to hear Luther, and on his way fell in with him at Jena, yet without knowing him. In 1523 he returned to St. Gall, but his inclination to the reform doctrines would not conscientiously permit him to enter the priesthood, and he became a saddler. At the request of his compatriots, he finally, in 1524, began Sunday evening meetings for the Study of Scripture, which, on account of the general interest, were in 1525 transferred to the Church of St. Lawrence. He was somewhat opposed at first by a few narrow-minded theologians, and at their request even discontinued his meetings for a time; but the public, determined to hear the preaching of Kessler, induced him finally to enter the ministry, and he became, in 1535, evangelical pastor of the Church of St. Lawrence, and dean of St. Gall in 1573. He died March 15, 1574. Kessler wrote *Sabbatha, St. Gallische' Reformationschronik*. See J. J. Bernet, *J. Kessler* (St. Gall, 1826); Herzog, *Real-Encyklop. 7*: 518; Pierer, *Universal Lex. s.v.*

## Kethem.

*SEE GOLD.*

## Kethib.

*SEE KERI.*

**Kethubim.**

*SEE HAGIOGRAPH.*

**Kethuboth.**

*SEE TALMUD.*

**Ketsach.**

*SEE FITCHES.*

**Ketsiyah.**

*SEE CASSIA.*

**Kett, Henry, B.D.**

a learned English divine, was born at Norwich in 1761; studied at Trinity College, Oxford, of which he became fellow, and afterwards obtained the living of Charlton, Gloucestershire. He was drowned, while bathing, in. 825. His principal works are: *History, the Interpreter of Prophecy* (London, 4th ed, with additional notes, 1801, 2 vols. .8vo): — *Sermons preached, 1790, at the Lectures founded by the late Rev. John Brompton, M.A.* (London, 2d ed. 1792, 8vo): — *Elements of general Knowledge* (Lond. 8th edit. 1815, 2 vols. 8vo).-Allibone, *Dict. Engl. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.

**Kett(e)ler, Wilhelm,**

bishop of Muster from 1553 to 1557, though a layman, was promoted to the prelatial dignity by special request of the duke of Cleve. He was one of the most enlightened minds of this period in the Roman Catholic Church, and himself inclining to the Reformation, in concert with the duke of Cleve, persuaded Cassander (q.v.) to use his influence and his pen to prevent further schism in the Church, and to bring back those who had left the Romanists. At Rome he was disliked for his mildness towards the Reformers, and finally quitted the bishopric.

**Kettenbach, Heinrich Von**

an eminent German writer of the period of the Reformation, was probably of French extraction. Little is known of his life. He became a Franciscan,

and in 1521 went to Ulm in the place of one of the brethren expelled by the general of the order for holding evangelical opinions. Kettenbach, however, soon followed the example of his predecessor: he preached against the papacy and the monks, and, having thus aroused the enmity of the Dominicans, was in turn obliged to leave Ulm the same year. He then went to Wittenberg, where he openly joined the Reformation, took part in all the movements in favor of emancipation from Rome, and was probably killed in the peasants' war. Kettenbach was a very popular preacher, and made many converts from Romanism, which he attacked in *Vergleichung des Allerheiligsten Herrn u. Vaters Papst gegen d. seltsamen u. fremden Gast in d. Christenheit, genannt Jesus*, etc. (M Wittenb. 1523) : *Practica; Neue Apologie u. Verantwortung Martini Luthers wider d. Papisten Mordgeschrei* (1523). It is generally supposed that Kettenbach wrote largely, but that his works have been lost. His influence among the Reformers must have been great, or he would not have been among the persons cited by Eck to appear with Luther before the Reichstag at Augsburg. See Pierer, *Univ. Lex.* s.v.; Veesenmeyer, *Beitrdge z. Gesch. d. Literatur u. Refj*: p. 79 sq.; Keim, in Herzog, *Real-Encyclopadie*, s.v.

## Kettle

(**dWD**, *dud*, so called from *boiling*), 'a large *pot* for cooking purposes' (<sup><0214></sup>1 Samuel 2:14; elsewhere rendered "pot," <sup><0806></sup>Psalm 81:6; <sup><0812></sup>Job 41:20; "caldron," <sup><4513></sup>2 Chronicles 35:13). The same term in the original also signifies "basket" (<sup><1207></sup>2 Kings 10:7; <sup><2412></sup>Jeremiah 24:2; probably <sup><0806></sup>Psalm 86:6). From the passage in <sup><0213></sup>1 Samuel 2:13,14, it is evident that the kettle was employed for the purpose of preparing the peace-offerings, as it is said (verse 14), "All that the flesh-hook brought up the priest took for himself." In the various processes of cookery represented on the monuments of Egypt, we frequently see large bronze pots placed over a fire in a similar manner. *SEE FLESH-POT.*

## Kettlewell, John, B.D.

an eminent English divine (nonjuror), was born at Northallerton, Yorkshire, March 10, 1653; studied at St. Edmund's Hall, Oxford, and in 1675 became fellow of Lincoln College. Still but a youth, he distinguished himself by the publication of his celebrated work, *Measures of Christian Obedience*. He was generally noticed, and in 1682 lord Digby presented young Kettlewell with the vicarage of Coleshill, Warwickshire, but he was

deprived of it soon after the Revolution on account of his refusal to take the oath of obedience to William and Mary. He removed to London. and died there April 12, 1695. His principal works have been collected and published under the style, *Works printed from Copies revised and improved by the Author a little before his Death* (Lond. 1719, 2 vols. fol.) -*The Duty of Moral Rectitude* (Tracts of Angl. Fathers, 4:219).-Darling, *Cyclopaedia Bibliographica*, ii, 1725; Macaulay, *Hist. of England*, vol. iv (1856); Nelson, *Life of Kettlewell* (Lond. 1718).

### Kettner, Friedrich Ernst

a German theologian, was born at Leipzig Jan. 21, 1671, and educated at the university of that place. He was licensed in 1697, and became shortly after superintendent in Quedlinburg, and first court preacher. He died July 21, 1722. His writings are mainly confined to local Church History.-*Allgemeines Hist. Lex.* 3:22.

### Ketu'rah

(Heb. *Keturah'*, [hrWfQj](#)] *girdled*, otherwise *incense*; Sept. [Χετούρα](#)), "the second wife, or, as she is called in [1303](#)1 Chronicles 1:32, the concubine of Abraham; by her he had six sons, whom he lived to see grow to man's estate, and whom. he established 'in the east country,' that they might not interfere with Isaac ([0230](#)Genesis 25:1-6). B.C. cir., 1997 et post. As Abraham was 100 years old when Isaac was born, who was given to him by the special bounty of Providence when 'he was as good as dead' ([8112](#)Hebrews 11:12); as he was 140 years old when Sarah died; and as he himself died at the age of 175 years, it has seemed improbable that these six sons should have been born to Abraham by one woman .after he was 140 years old, and that he should have seen them all grow up to adult age, and have sent them forth to form independent settlements in that last and feeble period of his life. It has therefore been suggested that, as Keturah is called Abraham's 'concubine' in Chronicles, and as she and Hagar are probably indicated as his 'concubines' in [0236](#)Genesis 25:6, Keturah had in fact been taken by Abraham as his secondary or concubine wife before the death of Sarah, although the historian relates the incident after that event, that his leading narrative might not be interrupted. According to the standard of morality then acknowledged, Abraham might quite as properly have taken Keturah before as after Sarah's death" (Kitto); although, it is true, this would hardly have been in keeping with his usual regard for

Sarah's feelings, and would have been likely to introduce into the family another scene of discord such as he had seen with Hagar. In opposition to these and similar arguments, however, which are maintained by Prof. Bush (*Note on* <sup><1251></sup>Genesis 25:1), Dr. Turner justly urges (*Companion to Genesis*, p. 293 sq.) the evident order of the narrative, the occasion offered by the death of Sarah, which preceded Abraham's demise thirty-six years, and the emphatic manner in which Keturah is introduced as a full *wife*, with lawful heirs, although of less esteem than Sarah. As to the objection drawn from the impotence of Abraham in consequence of advanced age, it is readily removed by the implied renewal of his vigor at the promise of an heir by Sarah (compare <sup><8111></sup>Hebrews 11:11); and, if sound, it would prove too much, for it would require the birth of all the six sons by Keturah to be dated before that of Isaac. *SEE ABRAHAM.*

On the Arabian. affinities of Keturah, see the *Journal Asiaticque*, Aug. 1838, p. 197 sq. "Her sons were 'Zimran, and Jokshan, and Medan, and Midian, and Ishbak, and Shuah' (<sup><1252></sup>Genesis 25:2); besides the sons and grandsons of Jokshan, and the sons of Midian. They evidently crossed the desert to the Persian Gulf, and occupied the whole intermediate country, where traces of their names are frequent, while Midian extended south into the peninsula of Arabia Proper. In searching the works of Arab writers for any information respecting these tribes, we must be contented to find them named as Abrahamic, or even Ishmaelitish, for under the latter appellation almost all the former are confounded by their descendants. Keturah herself is by them mentioned very rarely and vaguely, and evidently only in quoting from a rabbinical writer. (In the *Kdmus* the name is said to be that of the Turks, and that of a young girl [or slave] of Abraham; and, it is added, her descendants are the Turks!) M. Caussin de Perceval (*Essai*, i, 179) has endeavored to identify her with the name of a tribe of the Amalekites (the 1st Amalek) called *Katura.*, but his arguments are not of any weight. They rest on a weak etymology, and are contradicted by the statements of Arab authors, as well as by the fact that the early tribes of Arabia (of which is Katfira) have not, with the single exception of Amalek, been identified with any historical names; while the exception of Amalek is that of an apparently aboriginal people whose name is recorded in the Bible; and there are reasons for supposing that these early tribes were aboriginal" (Smith). *SEE ARABIA.*

## Keuchenius, Petrus,

a learned Dutch theologian, was born at Bois-le-Duc August 22, 1654, and studied at Leyden, and Utrecht. He was successively minister at Alem, Tiel, and Armheim. He died March 27, 1689. He wrote *Annotata in omnes N.T. libros*, the second and only complete edition of which, superintended by Alberti, appeared at Leyden in 1755. "The author's aim in these annotations is to throw light on the N. Test. by determining the sense in which words and phrases were used at the time it was written, and among those with whom its writers were familiar. For this purpose he compares the language of the N. Test. with that of the Septuagint, and calls in aid from the Chaldee and Syriac versions. His notes are characterized by sound learning and great good sense. Alberti commends in strong terms his erudition, his candor, solidity, and impartiality."-Kitto's *Biblical Cyclopaedia*, ii, 729.

## Kewley, John. D.D.,

a Roman Catholic priest, was by birth an Englishman, and of Roman Catholic parentage. He was educated at St. Omar's, and was in early life a Jesuit. He afterwards renounced the doctrines and communion of the Church of Rome, joined "Lady Huntingdon's persuasion," preached somewhat among that body and the Methodists, and, coming to the United States, was admitted to holy orders in the Protestant Episcopal Church by bishop Claggett (about 1804); in 1809 became rector of an Episcopal Church in Middletown, Conn., and in 1813 of the parish of St. George's, New York, where he continued till he sailed for Europe in 1816. He afterwards became reconciled to the Church of Rome, and returned to his original ecclesiastical connection, in which he continued till his death. Kewley was a man of great meekness and gentleness, always untiring in the discharge of his holy functions, and fervent and effective in his preaching. He published a *Sermon* delivered at the opening of the Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Maryland in 1806; also a sermon entitled *Messiah the Physician of Souls*, preached at Middletown and Cheshire in 1811. See Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, 5:545. (J. L. S.)

## Key

is a common heraldic bearing in the insignia of sees and religious houses, particularly such as are under the patronage of St. Peter. Two keys in salire are frequent, and keys are sometimes *interlaced* or linked together at the



*bows*, i.e. rings. Keys *indorsed* are placed side by side, the wards away from each other.

## Key

### Picture for Key

(**j t p̄h̄i** *maphte'ach*, an opener, <sup><U&S></sup>Judges 3:25; <sup><Z></sup>Isaiah 22:22; "opening," <sup><R&Z></sup>1 Chronicles 9:27; **κλείς**; from its use in *shutting*, <sup><O&G></sup>Matthew 16:19; <sup><LIS></sup>Luke 11:52; <sup><OIS></sup>Revelation 1:18; 3:7; 9:1; 20:1), an instrument frequently mentioned in Scripture, as well in a literal as in a figurative sense. The keys of the ancients were very different from ours, because their doors and trunks were generally closed with bands or bolts, which the key served only to loosen or fasten. Chardin says that a lock in the East is like a little harrow, which enters half way into a wooden staple, and that the key is a wooden handle, with points at the end of it, which are pushed into the staple, and so raise this little harrow. **SEE LOCK**. Indeed, early Oriental locks probably consisted merely of a wooden slide, drawn into its place by a string, and fastened there by teeth or catches; the key being a bit of wood, crooked like a sickle, which lifted up the slide and extracted it from its catches, after which it was drawn back by the string. But it is not difficult to open a lock of this kind even without a key, viz. with the finger dipped in paste or other adhesive substance. The passage <sup><ZIR></sup>Song of Solomon 5:4, 5 is thus probably explained (Harmer, *Obs.* 3:31; vol. i, 394, ed. Clarke; Rauwolff, ap. Ray, *Trav.* ii, 17). Ancient Egyptian keys are often found figured on the monuments. They were made of bronze or iron, and consisted of a straight shank, about five inches in length, with three or more projecting teeth; others had a nearer resemblance to the wards of modern keys, with a short shank about an inch long; and some resembled a common ring, with the wards at its back. The earliest mention of a key is in <sup><U&S></sup>Judges 3:23-25, where Ehud having gone "through the porch and shut the doors of the parlor upon him, and *locked* them," it is stated that Eglon's "servants took a *key* and opened them'" Among the Assyrian monuments are extant traces of strong gates, consisting of a single leaf, which was fastened by a huge modern lock, like those still used in the East, of which the key is as much as a man can conveniently carry (<sup><Z></sup>Isaiah 22:22), and also by a bar which moved into a square hole in the wall. **SEE DOOR**.

The term *key* is frequently used in Scripture as the symbol of *government*, *power*, and *authority*. Even in modern times, in transferring the government of a city, the keys of the gates are delivered as an emblem of authority. In some parts of the East, for a man to march along with a large key upon his shoulder at once proclaims him to be a person of consequence. The size and weight of these oftentimes require them to be thus carried (Thomson, *Land and Book*, i, 493). So of Christ it is said, "And the key of the house of David will I lay upon his shoulder; so he shall open, and none shall shut; and he shall shut, and none shall open" (~~(2222)~~ Isaiah 22:22; ~~(6667)~~ Revelation 3:7). He also has the "keys of hell and of death" (~~(6618)~~ Revelation 1:18; comp. 9:1; 20:1). Our Saviour said to Peter, as the representative of the apostles generally, upon whom collectively the same prerogative was on another occasion conferred, "And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven" (~~(6669)~~ Matthew 16:19; 18:18)-that is, the power of preaching the Gospel officially, of administering the sacraments as a steward of the mysteries of God, and as a faithful servant, whom the Lord hath set over his household. This general authority is shared in common by all ministers and officers in the Church. The grant doubtless likewise included the authority to establish rules and constitutional orders in the Church, to which Christ himself gave no special ecclesiastical form, but left it to be organized by the apostles after his own resurrection. This power, too, in a subordinate degree, is delegated to the Church of later times; for it is noteworthy that even the apostles have not definitely prescribed any specific form of Church polity, and this is therefore, in a great measure, left to the discretion of each body of Christians. Indeed, the settlement of the cardinal doctrines of Christianity, as a basis of Church-membership and ecclesiastical discipline, appears to be the only explicit element of the authority conferred in these passages by Christ to his apostles-and this exclusively belonged to them, inasmuch as their office was not transmissible; so that the canon of Scripture, as well as the essential points of Church constitution, have been completed by them for all time. *SEE SUCCESSION*. As to Peter himself, it is a gratuitous assumption on the part of Romanists that the authority was conferred upon him personally above his fellow-disciples, since in the other passage the general "ye" is used in place of the individual "thou." It is true, however, that as Peter was here addressed as the foreman, so to speak, of the apostolical college, he was eventually honored as the instrument of the

introduction of the first Gentile as well as Christian members into the Church (see Acts 2; 10), a fact to which Peter himself alludes in a very unassuming way (~~418D~~Acts 15:7). The association of this authority with the power of *absolution* is another unauthorized gloss of the Roman Catholic Church; for the passage in which this is conferred (~~412B~~John 20:23, "Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained") stands in a very different connection, and is evidently to be interpreted of the exclusively apostolical right to pronounce upon the religious state of those to whom, by the imposition of hands, they imparted the peculiar miraculous gifts of the primitive age (see ~~418A~~Acts 8:14-17; 19:6). In accordance with the above analogies, the "key of knowledge" is the means of attaining to true knowledge in respect to the kingdom of God (~~412S~~Luke 11:25; comp. ~~413B~~Matthew 23:13; ~~424C~~Luke 24:32). It is said that authority to explain the law and the prophets was given among the Jews by the delivery of a key. *SEE BIND*. The Rabbins say that God has reserved to himself four keys-the key of rain, the key of the grave, the key of fruitfulness, and the key of barrenness. *SEE KEYS, POWER OF THE*.

### Keyes, Josiah,

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Canajoharie, N. Y., Dec. 3, 1799; converted at the age of twelve; entered the Genesee Conference in 1820; in 1831-34 was presiding elder on Black River District, and in 1835 on Cayuga District, where he died April 22, 1836. Mr. Keyes possessed a grasping intellect and great application. Without regular instruction, he acquired "a respectable knowledge of Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, and as a general scholar, a theologian, and a preacher, he stood eminent among the Methodist ministry of the day. He was a very useful man, a sincere Christian, and many souls were converted through his *labors*."-*Minutes of Conferences*, ii, 412; Geo. Peck, D.D., *Early Methodism* (N. Y. 1860, 12mo), p. 473. (G. L. T.)

### Keys, John

a Presbyterian minister of English descent, was born at Wilton, N. H., in 1778. He graduated at Dartmouth College, Hanover, N.H., in 1803, and afterwards taught school for several years. He studied 'theology at Morristown, N. J., under James Richards, D.D.; was licensed in 1805, and in 1807 ordained by the New York Presbytery at Orangedale, N. J., and in

1808 installed pastor of the Church at Sand Lake, near Albany, N.Y. In 1814 he accepted a call from the Congregational Church of Wolcott, Conn.; in 1824 removed to Tallmadge, Ohio, as pastor of a Congregational Church, and afterwards preached successively at Dover, Newburg, Ohio; at Peoria, Ill.; at St. Louis, Mo.; and at Cedar Rapids and Elkader, Iowa. At last he returned to Dover, Ohio, where he died January 27, 1867. Mr. Keys was an industrious student. As a preacher he took the greatest delight in his work; as a Christian he had great faith in the power of special prayer. See Wilson, *Presb. Historical Almanac*, 1868, p. 216.. (J. L. S.).

## Keys, Power Of The,

a term which in a general sense denotes the extent of ecclesiastical power, or, in a narrower sense, the right to authorize or prohibit absolution; and it is upon the interpretation in the one sense or the other that the Protestant and Romish churches differ from each other. We base this article, in the main, upon that in Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 13:579 sq.

**I. New-Testament Doctrine.**-The expression - **κλεις Δαυιδ** "key of the house of David" (<sup><370></sup>Isaiah 22:22), denotes the power which was given to the king's officer over the royal household. In literal symbolism, **κλεις Δαυιδ** (<sup><487></sup>Revelation 3:7) denotes the authority which Christ as King exercises over his realm with special regard to his right of admission or dismissal. When Jesus (<sup><169></sup>Matthew 16:19) solemnly intrusted to Peter, as a representative of the apostles, the keys of the heavenly kingdom, he invested him by that act simply with his apostolical station, which involves the founding of the Christian Church by the preaching of the forgiveness of sin (<sup><247></sup>Luke 24:47) and the establishment of the Gospel doctrine (<sup><19></sup>Matthew 20:19). In this sense the commission (<sup><23></sup>John 20:23) to the other eleven apostles must likewise be interpreted, for we have no reason to believe that the apostles ever exercised the authority, as Jesus did, of relieving the sinner of his guilt; and yet, even if proofs could be adduced to show that the apostles did exercise such authority, all evidence that such authority was transferred to the Church after the apostolic age is surely wanting. Besides, it is proper to make a distinction between the power of the keys claimed for Peter as an expression of apostolical authority, and the power "to bind and to loose" which Jesus (<sup><169></sup>Matthew 16:19) also conferred not only upon his other apostles, but upon the whole Church (<sup><1818></sup>Matthew 18:18). Both expressions, to *bind* and to *loose*, which in New-Testament usage do not require a personal, but an impersonal object,

mean, according to Rabinnical language, to *permit* and to *forbid*, to *confirm* and to *revoke* (see Lightfoot, ad loc. Matthew, and comp. the art. **SEE BIND**); and in the N.T. passages quoted they can refer only to the sphere of Christian social life. Against the opinion of the later Church, that Paul (~~418B~~ 1 Corinthians 5:3-5) made use of the apostolic authority to forgive and to retain sins, Ritschl (*Al.-Kathol. Kirche*, 2d edit., p. 337 sq.) argues that in this passage only a disciplinary regulation is referred to; that Paul conceded to the Church the right of discipline, and only exercised authority when he supposed himself to act in harmony with the wish of the Church; and that, if the apostle (~~418B~~ 2 Corinthians 2:6-10) held a contrary doctrine, he would be subject to the charge of simulation. The apostolical writings, moreover, do not allude to any other agency in the Church for the remission of sins than that spoken of by Paul himself, ~~418B~~ 2 Corinthians 5:18 sq., namely, reconciliation by Christ and the prayers of believers (~~418B~~ 1 John 5:16; ~~418B~~ James 5:16).

**II. Doctrine of the Patristic Period.**-The misconception of the meaning of the power to *bind* and to *loose* was early manifested in the Church. The Jewish-Christian *Clementine Homilies*, it is true, still evince a knowledge of the original signification of the words to *bind* and to *loose*, inasmuch as they still supply-in the N.T. sense -simply an impersonal object; but, withal, they have so far enlarged upon the meaning of the expression as to find comprehended in the power to which it alludes all privileges of the episcopal office as a continuation of the apostolical office (iii, 72). Quite the opposite was held in the Gentile-Christian Church of the 2d century. It interpreted the power "to bind and to loose" as authority to retain and to forgive sin, and supplied the two verbs with personal objects; yet regarded-in the spirit of the apostolic Church-as the authorities vested with the power to *bind* and to *loose*, the society (Church), and not the bishop.

In so far as from a heathen-Christian stand-point the power of the "keys" was identified with the power "to bind and to loose," the former was held to express in one conception both the latter acts, viz. excommunication and readmittance to the Church; but as the keys of Peter were taken also to comprehend all rights of Church government, and especially of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, we need not wonder that among the Church fathers of the patristic period all these different views were somewhat mixed (comp. Tertullian, *De Putdic.* 21; Cyprian, *le unit. eccles.* cap. 4). It was in the period of scholasticism that a really strict distinction was aimed

at, and yet to this day Roman Catholics have failed to recognise generally this discrimination.

The whole Church was at first regarded as bearers of the keys, i.e. of the power to *bind* and to *loose*, evidently because Christ works and has his abode there. (For this reason, also, the martyrs were accorded the position of " *precipua ecclesie membra*," in whom Christ is active for his own glorification. Comp. Eusebius, 5:2, 5; Tertullian, *De Pudic.* ; Idem, *Apolog.* 39).

The first decided change of view is found among the Montanists. Tertullian (in his *De Pudicitia*) limits the promise of ~~Matthew~~ Matthew 16:18 sq. simply to the person of Peter as the apostolical founder of the Church; the power to forgive sin he regards as the right of the Church in so far as she is identical with the Holy Ghost. The bearer of this right he holds to be the spiritual man (*spiritualis homo*), but that the latter, in the interests of the Church, abstains from exercising this prerogative. His opponent, the Roman bishop, however, interpreted it in favor of all the bishops (*bishopric umerus episcoporum*, chap. xxi). This thought Cyprian enlarged upon with a free use of the Montanistic thesis, holding that the episcopate is the inheritor (*heir*) of the apostolic power, the seat and the organ of the Holy Ghost, and therefore possessed of power to *bind* or to *loose* of its own accord. Of course, from such a stand-point, Cyprian was forced to reject as presumption the claim of the martyrs to the power of the keys; he only conceded to them the right of intercession for the fallen. To prove the ideal unity of the Church, Cyprian advances the argument that the power of the keys was first intrusted by Christ to Peter, and only afterwards to the other apostles (*De unit. eccles.* cap. iv). In the writings of Optatus Milevitanus this thought takes the form that Christ intrusted the keys to Peter, and that Peter himself surrendered them to the other apostles. The power of the keys in this sense evidently denotes the episcopal power in all its extent, i.e. the ecclesiastical government. With Cyprian, to *bind* and to *loose* already means to retain or forgive sins forever, yet he only uses these expressions when speaking of the forgiveness of sins by baptism (e.g. *Epist.* 73, c. 7). Later, however, they are used in a narrower sense, and refer to great sins committed after baptism; in short, they denote the right of exercising penance-discipline, a power in principle conceded to the bishop, but which actually he was permitted to exercise only in union with all his clergy. Not all sins committed after baptism were subject to the power of the keys, only the greater ones, as Augustine has it, "committed against the

Decalogue" (*Serm.* 351. i, "De pœnit." c. 4). This declaration, however, is to be taken with the exception of all inward sins, i.e. trespasses against the ninth and tenth commandments; moreover, in the older practice, only the different species of idolatry, murder, and unchastity were punished by ecclesiastical courts. It is incorrect to argue, as has been done on the part of Protestants, that only the public sins—those which caused trouble to the Church, were taken account of by the Church. As to the sins alluded to above, whether committed in secret or publicly, it was supposed that they did injury to the gifts of regeneration, and entangled the soul in the meshes of spiritual death; they were therefore called *peccata* (delicta or crimina) *mortalia*, also *copfitalia*; the others were regarded as simply daily experiences of the remains of weakness cleaving to the believer, of which it seems almost impossible to be rid in this life. For the former only the power of the keys and the exercise of penance were regarded as in force; the latter, on the other hand, were supposed to be atoned for by the daily penance of a believing heart, by the fifth request in the Lord's Prayer, by oblation and the eucharist, etc. They were called *neccata venialia*.

Actually the power of the keys was exercised by the whole clerical body, under the presidency of the bishop. In formal inquisitorial proceedings, the fact of the commission of a mortal sin was determined either by the voluntary confession of the perpetrator or by indictment and hearing of witnesses, followed, in case of established guilt, by the declaration of excommunication; but the excommunicated retained the privilege of praying for admission to the exercise of penance in the Church. This last, in early days, was in all cases public, especially after the time of Augustine, at least in cases of public crime; but after the beginning of the 4th century it was regulated by steps corresponding to catechumenical grades. Upon the expiration of the term of penance, the length of which, in the early Church, was discretionary with the bishop, but in later times was determined by ecclesiastical laws, the excommunicated was again received into Church membership. This act, which was consummated by imposition of hands, prayer, and the kiss of peace by the bishop, with the assistance of the clergy before the altar (*ante apsidem*), in presence of the membership of the Church, was called *reconciliation*, or the bestowal of peace (*pacem dare*). Penitent souls, however, in danger of immediate death, could be reconciled even before the expiration of their period of penance, in presence of the bishop, by any presbyter, or, if such a one was not accessible, even by a deacon (*Cyprian, Epist.* 18:1; *Conc. Eliberit.* can. 32); a practice which we

find even as late as the Middle Ages, and which clearly proves that in the early Church reconciliation was more an act of jurisdiction than of order.

In the earliest days of the Church, the exercise of its prerogative of the power "to loose," in reconciliation, coincided completely with *absolution*, except that to this term there was not given the meaning which it received in the Middle Ages. Above all, it must not be forgotten that the Church fathers did not place the atoning power in the reconciling activity of the Church, but in the activity of the penitent himself; from the Church the penitent received only instruction how to heal the wound he had created by sin: hence they frequently designated penance as the medicine, and the clerus imposing it as the physician; he (the penitent) was to repair himself from his crime by his good works, and merit the divine forgiveness. Thus must be understood Cyprian's frequent demand of "justa poenitentia," which consists in the congruity of the guilt with the penance offered as reparation. That God alone absolved from sin was the accepted axiom of the early Church. Yet the Church hesitated not to consider itself one of the means of grace, competent to assist in the work of salvation, acting upon the theory laid down by Cyprian: "Extra ecclesiam nulla salus." So long as the mortally sinning one saw himself inwardly and outwardly separated from the Church, the absolute way to salvation, divine forgiveness, seemed to him inaccessible; there was no need of judgment by the courts, he was already judged. If the Church again admitted him to membership among the purified, he was not necessarily among the number of the saved, but he had at least the prospect of salvation; he now belonged to the number of those over whom the Lord on the final day would sit in judgment, from whom he would select his own. Upon this point Cyprian (*Ep.* lv, 15, 24) and Pacian (*Epist. (dl Sqympron. in fine)*) are very clear. As the absolving judgment of the Church thus becomes rather uncertain, depending upon approval or rejection in the final judgment, there was need of further elucidation. Reconciliation was therefore joined with prayer by a petition that God would forgive the penitent his sins, accept as sufficient his repentance, which of course could only afford a limited satisfaction for the committed offence, and restore to him the lost spiritual gifts. For this reason the act was accompanied by the imposition of hands; compare Augustine, *De Baptism.* 3:c. 16, who says of this ceremony that it is "oratio super hominem," i.e. the symbolic pledge that the answer of prayer should benefit the penitent, and that with it was bestowed the gift of the Holy Ghost. In this sense Cyprian speaks of a "remissio facta per sacerdotes apud



Dominum grata"-for he knows only a forgiving activity of God; and with him all absolving action of the Church confines itself to the restitution of external communion, and the prayerful intercession of the Church viz. of the priests, martyrs, and believers. However greatly Pacian and Ambrosius may differ in their defence against the Novatians on the right of the priest to absolve from sin, they never claimed for the priest more than the power of intercession-a privilege which they believed he held in common with the congregation.

It is in the Augustinian period that we first discover an endeavor to define the place of the priest in the exercise of the power of the keys. The older fathers, Cyprian and Ambrose, had limited the effect of mortal sins by holding that they inflicted a mortal wound upon the fallen-calling to mind the man who, on his way from Jerusalem to Jericho, fell among murderers; and so ecclesiastical penance was regarded simply as a remedy for the afflicted. In the Augustinian period, however, sin was held to be a death-inflicting agent, implying that the fallen was dead, and had to be restored to life. But, as the Church did not possess this power, a change of heart was supposed to precede the exercise of the power of the keys-in short, that a divine influence visited the heart before any human agency could be effectually applied. Augustine, in several passages of his writings (e.g. *Tract. 22 in Er. Joh.*; *Tract. 49, No. 24*) finds the process exemplified in the resurrection of Lazarus: the sinner, like Lazarus, is dead, and, so to speak, rests spellbound in the grave; Mercy awakens him, and restores him to life by wounding him inwardly, and, amid great pain, brings him to a consciousness of his offences; upon Mercy's call he arises, like Lazarus, from the grave, and comes to light, bowed down by his guilt, and, with an acknowledgment to the bishop, seeks the means of salvation in the practice of penance; he is at last freed by the activity of the priests, as Lazarus was freed by the disciples. This picture we find, from this time forward, in most representations of the penance process, down to the Middle Ages; and especially did the Victorinians form their conception of absolution upon it. If in this picture the act of loosing can only designate the united action of the Church on the fallen, viz. the imposition of penance, intercession, the removal of excommunication, and the admission to the means of grace, it would seem that in other places Augustine holds that the forgiveness of sin is to be mediated by the Church; yet even here he does not speak of the Church as a professed institution of mercy, but rather the community of saints, or of the predestined, by whom the Spirit of God performs its work.

Thus he says (*Serm.* 99, cap. 9): "The Spirit forgives, not the Church; this Spirit is God. God dwells in his temple, i.e. in his saintly believers, in his 'Church, and he forgives sin by *this agency*, because it is the living temple." But even this forgiveness is considered only as the fruit of prayers pleasing to God, and therefore answered by him. While, therefore, Augustine traces forgiveness in reconciliation mainly to the prayerful intercession of the faithful, Leo the Great argues that the priests alone are specific intercessors for the fallen, and that without their intercession forgiveness cannot be secured (" ut indulgentia nisi supplicationibus sacerdotum nequeat obtineri"). He bases this exclusive intercession prerogative of the priests upon the fact that the Saviour, according to his promise (<sup><41XP></sup>Matthew 28:29), which Leo refers simply to the clerus, always assists the action of his priests, and that he makes them the channel of his spiritual gifts (*Ep.* 82, al. 108; ad Theod. cap. 2). It is thus that the Catholic notion of the clerical priesthood, which, independent of the laity, communicates God's mercy, and regards this mediatorship as essential, has taken definite shape; and what has been added in later times is simply a more complete or perfect development of the idea as it originated with Leo. But even he does not make the assertion that the priest, instead of being a mediator by prayer for forgiveness, has himself the authority, by virtue of his office, to absolve from sin.

We do not possess an absolution-formula of the first ages of the Church, but we have every reason to suppose, upon the premises stated, that it could only have been deprecativ. Augustine even denounced the expression " I forgive thy sins," of the Donatists, as heretical (*Serm.* 99, c. 7-9). If, in our last allusion to the reconciliation of the sinner by means of prayerful intercession, the priest alone seemed to be entitled to be deprecator, we find a very different view was entertained by other Church fathers. In accordance with <sup><B44D></sup>Leviticus 14:2, Jerome says that the priests cannot make the leper clean, nor the reverse; they can simply distinguish between the clean and the unclean (*Comm. in Matthew* lib. iii). Not understanding, therefore, <sup><4169></sup>Matthew 16:19 to concede to the bishops and the elders any other power, it follows that he concedes to the ecclesiastical office simply the authority of distinction, i.e. the judicial power of pronouncing those as loosed who by the mercy of God had been inwardly loosed, and those as bound who have not yet been loosed by God's mercy—a judicial decision whose validity is essentially confined to the forum of the Church, and does not extend to the forum of God. Just so says Gregory the

Great (*Horn.* 26, in *Ev. No.* 6), "It must be determined what guilt has preceded and what penitence has followed guilt in order that the shepherd may loose those whom the Lord in his mercy visits with a sense of repentance. Only when the judgment of the inner judge is obeyed can the action of the officer to loose be a correct and real one." Adding, as he does, like Augustine, the narrative of the resurrection of Lazarus, it is evident that Gregory did not consider the bishop's action in mortal sins as anything more than constituting a recognition of the inner condition of the sinner; those into whose heart God has breathed the spirit of life the ecclesiastical judge is to pronounce as loosed, those yet spiritually dead as bound.

As in the early Church great penitence was conceded only once, so reconciliation by the Church was not repeated a second time. In the writings of Sozomen (*lib.* 7:16) we first find a witness for the principle of admitting also backsliders to penance and reconciliation. This change of practice was a necessary consequence of the enactment of penitential laws which extended the scope of the term mortal sin also to such offences as had formerly been considered simply venial.

**III.** *Doctrine of the Middle Ages and the Roman Catholic Church.*-The ancient Church classified her members into three sections-the faithful, the catechumens, and the penitent. The power of the keys was exercised upon the last, and in a certain sense also upon the second class; these two only were in any need of reconciliation or absolution by the Church. There is not the slightest evidence or reason to believe that the faithful were obliged to make confession of sins to the priest, even before communion. On the other hand, we find, after the beginning of the Middle Ages, a tendency among the newly-converted Germanic nations to enlarge the practice of penance into a general institution in the Church, and to make the power of the keys, which concerned the penitent alone, a general court of appeal and of mercy for all the faithful. This was done first by subjecting also mental sins to the power of the keys, while in the earlier Church such a thing had never been dreamed of. The origin of this innovation has been demonstrated with full evidence by *Wasserschleben (BPussordnung d. abendlindischen Kirche, p. 108 sq.)*. Monachism was the exercise of penance for all life. In the monastery it was early considered an act of asceticism to disclose to the brethren the most secret manifestations of sin. In the old British and Irish Church education was directed especially to the order and interests of practical Church life; morals and discipline were

generally regulated by monastic rule, which thus penetrated society at large, and more or less influenced all civil legislation. As early as the penance-canons of Vinniaus, who flourished towards the end of the 5th century, the order is given that mental sins, even though prevented from execution, should be atoned for by abstinence from meat and wine for the period of twelve months. The Anglo-Saxon *Poezitentiale*, which bears the name of Theodore of Canterbury, prescribes for lusts of fornication twenty to forty days' abstinence. The rules of penance of the Irish monk Columban (died A. 1). 615) imported these regulations to the Continent, and ordered that all sinful lusts of the mind should be atoned for by penance with bread and water from forty days to six months (compare *Wasserschleben, Bussordnung*, p. 108,109, 185,353). In the 5th century the semi Pelagian John Cassian, of Marseilles, established eight principal or radical sins (*vitia principalia*), from which spring the actual sins, namely, intemperance, licentiousness, avariciousness, anger, sadness, bitterness, vanity, pride (*Coll. S.S. Patrum V, "de octo principalibus vitiis"*). In the instructions of Columban (*Biblioth. Patr. mrxim. 12:23*) they are mentioned under the name of "*crimina capitalia*," by which the early Church designated simply those actual mortal sins that were subject to public penitence, and under this name they were introduced into several Anglo-Saxon and Frankish penance-regulations. The Synod of Chalons, in the year 813, directs the priest, in canon 32, to pay special regard to the principal sins of the confessors, a commendation which Alcuin already made in his *De divinis officiis*, cap. 13. From these eight radical sins the seven death-sins of scholasticism were developed. In these regulations of penance we find also already penance redemptions, so important to the history of absolution, which originated simply by a transfer of the old Germanic composition system to ecclesiastical life.

The extension of the power to bind and to loose over all Christians was a necessary consequence of such influences as those just alluded to. In the instructions for penance of the abbot Othman, of St. Gall (died A.D. 761), we have the principle laid down that without confession there is no forgiveness of sin. In Columban's book of confession (can. 30). on the borders of the 6th and 7th centuries, it is ordered that before every communion there should be confession, especially of mental excitements. According to Regino of Prum (died 915) (*De discipl. eccles. ii, 2*), every person ought to confess at least once a year. The first provincial synod which makes confession a general obligation is that of Aenham, A.D. 1109

(canon 20, in two very varying recensions). Innocent III is really the originator of the general penance law, *SEE PENANCE*, and thus likewise of the regular periodical exercise of the power of the keys over all Christians. His regulation had no doubt the intention of staying, by ecclesiastical shackles on the conscience, a spreading heresy, as seems evinced by the similarity of canon 29 of the fourth Lateran synod with the twelfth canon of the celebrated Synod of Toulouse in 1229.

Notwithstanding the opposition which manifested itself in the Frankish realm against the penitential books and those of its rules not corresponding to the regulations of the older canons, its principles took effectual hold, and caused a decided revolution in the practice of penance and reconciliation. Even though, after the 4th century, by the side of the public penance, private penance for secret offences had been practiced, reconciliation had remained public; now a distinction was made between public and private penance; the latter was inflicted on voluntary confession, the former for offences publicly proved against the perpetrator; and for great crimes, such as murder, public penance was followed by public reconciliation, which was gradually called absolution. But as, moreover, the extension and enlargement of the practice of penance and confession greatly increased the confessional business, the imposition of public penance, and the grant of a corresponding reconciliation, remained the prerogative of the bishop, while private confession and private absolution fell to the presbyter, who, however, exercised the right to forgive sin merely as the bishop's delegate. In the early Church reconciliation was granted only upon the expiration of penance; the penance regulations of Gildas, however, permitted private reconciliation upon completion of half of the penitential period; the rules of Theodore of Canterbury granted it at the expiration of a year, or even after six months. Boniface ordered in his statutes that it should be granted immediately after confession (Gieseler, *Ch. Hist.* ii, I, § 19, note b). All these changes became prevalent in the Carolingian Age.

Public reconciliation of the penitents was practiced in the Romish Church as early as the 5th century on Green-Thursday (*Epist. Innocentii I, ad Docentiuin, c. 7*); in the Milanese and Spanish on Char-Friday (*Morin. lib. 9:cap. 29*). After the penitents on Ash Wednesday had received ashes upon their head, and had been solemnly expelled from the Church, they were, according to the *Pontifical Romanum*, again solemnly led, on Green-Thursday, to the cathedral, where they were relieved of their

excommunication and blessed by the bishop after the mercy-seat had been implored and the person sprinkled with holy water and incense. Public reconciliation and public penance naturally, in the course of the Middle Ages, gradually gave place to private confession and private absolution. Since the Reformation it has become obsolete, and the formulas for the same find a resting-place in the Episcopal ritual (comp. Daniel, *Codex liturgicus*, i, 279-288).

Upon the theological importance of absolution, and the relation which the priest in the administering of it sustains to it, the same opposite opinions which we found in the patristic period were entertained in the first half of the Middle Ages. According to the view of which Jerome and Gregory the Great must be especially designated as representatives, the priest is judge in *obro ecclesice*, and may by his judgment simply determine and certify for the Church the manifestation of divine mercy in the penitent's heart. Thus, in the *Homilies* of Eligius of Noyon, which, in all probability, belong to the Carolingian period, we read that the priests, who are in Christ's stead, must by their office, in a visible manner (externally or ecclesiastically), absolve those whom Christ, by an invisible (inwardly effected) absolution, declares worthy of his reconciliation (atonement). Thus says Haymo of Halberstadt (died 853), in a sermon (*Homn. in Octav. Pasch.*), after alluding to the practices of the O.T. priests towards lepers: "Those whom he recognises by repentance and worthy improvement as inwardly loosed, the shepherd of souls may absolve by his declaration." According to this view, divine forgiveness not only precedes priestly absolution, but also confession; it is the portion of the sinner from the moment when he repents in his heart and turns to God. Absolution of the Church in this instance is simply the confirmation of what God has already done. A proof that this was the stand-point in the 12th century is furnished in Gratian's treatment of the Decretals (cans. 33:qu. iii). He there proposes the question whether anybody can give satisfaction to God by simple repentance without confession (and consequently, also, without absolution). He first adduces the reasons and authorities that must compel an affirmative answer to this question, then those that would answer it in the negative; at the close he leaves it to the reader to decide for himself in favor of the one or the other, as both opinions have the favor and disapproval of wise and pious men. Peter the Lombard, Gratian's contemporary, says (*Sent. lib. 4:dist. 17*) that the sense of forgiveness is felt before the confession of the lips, indeed, from the moment when the holy desire fills the heart. The priest has

therefore the power to bind and to loose only in the sense that he declares men bound or loosed, just as the disciples declared Lazarus free from his bonds only after Christ had restored him to life. The declaration of the priest has therefore simply the effect of releasing before the Church the person already loosed by God. According to cardinal Robert Pulleyn (died 1115), the death-sinner enjoys divine forgiveness as soon as he repents; absolution is a sacrament, i.e. the symbol of a sacred cause, for it externally represents forgiveness already secured in the heart by repentance, *not as if the priest actually forgave, but by the external symbol, for the sake of greater consolation, he makes the penitent doubly sure of forgiveness, although it has already become manifest* (*Sentent.* lib. 7:1). If, at the same time, the anxiety still remaining in the heart is lessened or relieved, this is the effect of absolution, not depending so much upon the activity of the priest as upon God, from whom it springs. By the exercise of divine forgiveness the sinner is simply relieved of the ultimate consequences of his guilt, i.e. eternal damnation; yet earlier or more immediate punishment can only be prevented by his future efforts to atone for the act. Hence the priest imposes a certain measure of satisfaction, a compliance with which can alone free the transgressor from punishment corresponding to the greatness of his guilt; if the satisfaction is too moderate, the penitent must not fancy himself absolved before God; he will have to atone to the fulness of the measure either in this world or in purgatory. The direct bestowal of complete absolution before God we evidently do not find here conceded to be the prerogative of the Church; her judgment is competent only to free the sinner after compliance with her imposition of punishment; on divine punishments she has no judgment.

Nearest in view to Robert Pulleyn comes Peter of Poitiers, chancellor of the University of Paris (he died about 1204), who (in his five *Libri Sententiarum*) lays down the doctrine that forgiveness of sin precedes confession, and that it is secured by repentance. He earnestly contends that the priest cannot relieve the confessing one of his guilt or of eternal punishment; both he asserts to be the prerogative of God alone. The priest has simply the authority to indicate or to declare that God has forgiven the penitent his sin. God, however, relieves of eternal punishment only on condition of definite satisfactions, which the priest has to determine as to measure, and to impose according to the greatness of the crime; and on this account the priest must possess not simply the power to loose, but also the power of discretion (*clavis discretionis*), which is not granted to

everybody. The penitent is therefore advised in all cases to go, if possible, beyond the measure of satisfaction imposed by the priest, lest in purgatory the offender may be obliged to make satisfaction for his neglect here. It is quite characteristic that this scholastic regards confession as a sacrament of the O.T., for the whole process of penance he bases upon the personal activity of the penitent (*Sent.* 3:cap. 13 and 16).

Alongside of this view, according to which the possessor of the power of the keys officiates essentially as judge *infrbro ecclesie*, another is entertained, which finds its strongest exponent in Leo the Great, according to whom the priest is intercessor and mediator for the penitent before God. This particular view, in its successive developments, has exerted the greatest influence in expanding the priestly power of the keys. This position is assigned to the priest in all late penitential books. Its nature is clearly defined by Alcuin, who, from the analogy of Leviticus (v, 12), in which the sinner is advised to seek the priest with his sacrifice, draws the conclusion that Christian penitents also must bring their sacrifice of confession to God by way of the priest, in order that it may be pleasing to and secure the forgiveness of the Lord (*Adfjratr. inprovinc. Gothorum*, ep. 96). For this very reason he calls (in his *De officiis divinis*) the priest "sequester ac medius inter Deum et peccatorem horninern ordinatus, pro peccatis intercessor." This sacerdotal intercession received a higher import in the 11th or 12th century by the *De vera et falsa pcententia*, a work attributed, though incorrectly, to Augustine. It develops the following doctrines:

1. That the priest in confession stands in God's stead-his forgiveness is God's forgiveness; for does not Christ say, "Whom ye hold to be loosed and bound, but on whom ye practice the work of justice or of mercy?" (cap. xxv).
2. Gregory the Great had already laid down the dogma that by penance (but not by absolution), sin, which in itself was irremissible, became remissible, i.e. became an expiable guilt by the personal activity of the penitent. This thought was modified in the work just alluded to, so that in confession, it- is true, the sinner is not cleared before God, but the committed offence is changed from a mortal to a venial sin (cap. xxv).
3. Such sins no longer incur eternal, but simply temporal punishment, and may be atoned for, either in this world by works of confession, or after death in purgatory, where the pain to bq endured for them shall far exceed



any torments which the martyrs ever suffered in this life. This thought was taken up by the Victorinians, and from it was developed a complete system. Hugo of St. Victor regarded the priest as the visible medium which man, spellbound by his senses, needs in his approaches to God, and which God uses to pour upon the human heart his mercies; yea, in virtue of this position he does not hesitate to refer the passage in <sup>(1213)</sup>Exodus 21:28 to the priests, and to call them *gods* (comp. lib. ii, *De sacr.* pt. 14: cap. 1). And why should he not? Had not pope John VIII, in the year 878 (*Epist.* 66), already assumed for himself the power, in virtue of his authority from Peter, to bind and to loose, to absolve from all sins, those who had fallen in battle for the Church? and had not bishop Jordanus, of Limoges, in 1031, at the council held in that city, developed the principle that Christ had intrusted to his Church such a power, that she may loose after death those whom in life she had bound? (Mansi, 19:539; Gieseler, *Ch. Hist.* ii, 1, § 35, note K). Hugo's principles quickly spread among his contemporaries. Cardinal Pulleyn says that confession made to the priest means virtually '(quasi) confession to God; and Alexander III declares that what the priest learns in confession he does not learn as judge, but as God (" ut Deus," cap. 2, ap. Greg. *De offic. judicis ordin.* i, 31). Now if we behold in the priest an intermediate being between God and man, surrounded by a splendor before which the layman's eye is blinded, it is no more than reasonable to expect that his acts must gain in importance, and his position approach nearer and nearer to the office of God's representative. Hugo beholds the sinner bound by a twofold bondage—by an internal and external, by hardness and by incurred damnation; the former God loosens by contrition, the latter by the assistance of the priest, as the instrument by which he works. Here also the resurrection of Lazarus serves both as example and as proof (lib. ii, pt. 14: cap. 8). His pupil, Richard of St. Victor, goes a step further in his tract *De potestate ligandi et solvendi*. Loosing from *guilt*, the effects of which are manifest in imprisonment (impotency) and servitude (sin service), God alone performs, either directly, or indirectly by men, who need not necessarily be priests; it is done even before confession, by contrition. The loosing from *eternal punishment* God performs by the priest, to whom, for this purpose, the power of the keys has been intrusted; he changes it (i.e. the punishment) into a transitory one, to be absolved either upon earth or in purgatory. The loosing from *transitory* punishment is effected by the priest himself by changing it into an exercise of penance, which is done by the imposition of a corresponding satisfaction.

If hitherto we find independently, side by side, two opinions, namely, that the administrator of the power of the keys either judges *inforo ecclesice* or as an interceding mediator, we need not wonder that the advance of doctrinal development soon effected a dialectical union of the two. Richard of St. Victor evidently aimed at such a fusion; the great scholastics of the 13th century accomplished it; and Thomas Aquinas is to be especially regarded as the author of the doctrine defined by the Council of Trent. Alexander of Hales, in his *Summa Theologie* (pt. 4:qu. 20, membr. 3:art. 2), opens with the sentence, "The power to bind and to loose really belongs only to God; the priest can simply co-operate." But wherein shall this co-operation consist? Never would the priest take the liberty to absolve any one did he not suppose him to be loosed by God. Alexander is the first writer who meets the alternative as to whether the priest is to be regarded as deprecator or as judge. He holds him to be both in one person; the former he is before God, the latter before the penitent. But the power to loose he can exercise only after God has loosed. He is .to the sinner simply an interpreter of what God has already accomplished in him, or is doing in reply to priestly intercession. Alexander of Hales then proceeds to the question whether the priest *can remit eternal punishment*. He replies (membr. ii, art. 2), that as eternal punishment is infinite, and cannot be severed from the offence, the priest does not possess any power to remit it; only God, whose powers have no bounds, can do this. On the other hand, the power of the keys can extend to temporal (or finite) punishments, inasmuch as the priest is God's instituted arbitrator. He explains this in detail thus: God's mercy forgives so that it does not affect his justice. His justice would require a measure of punishment exceeding our powers of endurance; therefore he has instituted, in his mercy, the priest as arbitrator, and given him authority to *levy* the divine punishment, and also, in virtue of Christ's sufferings, to remit a portion of it, for which God's justice need not be exercised. To the question whether the keys have authority also over purgatory, he replies, only *per accidens*, inasmuch as the priest may change the purgatorial punishment into a temporal one, i.e. into an exercise of penance. Just so reason Bonaventura (lib. 4, dist. 18, art. ii) and Albert the Great (*Comment.* lib. 4, dist. 18, art. xiii), the former often in the very words of Alexander.

Upon this basis Thomas Aquinas completed the doctrine of the Romish Church on the power of the keys. As Thomas generally distinguishes in ecclesiastical "power" between *potestas ordinis* and *potestas jurisdictionis*

(Suppl. part 3, *Sumnuce*, qu. 20, a. 1, resp.), so there exists also a twofold "key," namely, *clavis ordinis* and *clavis jurisdictionis* (qu. 19, art. 3). The keys of the Church themselves are the power to remove the obstacle interposed by sin, and thus make admission to heaven possible (qu. 17, art. 1). The *clavis ordinensis*, so called because the priest receives it at ordination, directly opens heaven to the person by the forgiveness of sins (sacramental absolution), while the *clavis jurisdictionis* only indirectly causes this result, namely, by the intercession of the Church through excommunication and absolution in the ecclesiastical forum. It is therefore not in a strict sense a *clavis coeli*, but simply *qucedam dispositio ad ipsam* (qu. 19, art. 3). To the acts of *clavis jurisdictionis* belong furthermore also the grant of indulgence (qu. 25, art. 2, ad 1 m.). Only the *clavis ordinis* is of a sacramental nature (ibid.); hence also laymen and deacons may possess and exercise the *clavis jurisdictionis*, like the judges *infbro ecclesice*, for instance, the archdeacons (quest. 19, art. 3) and the papal legates (quest. 26, art. 2). On the other hand, the use of the sacramental *clavis ordinis* necessarily presupposes the possession of the *clavis jurisdictionis*, as the priest receives at ordination simply the authority to forgive sins, while for the exercise of it a definite circle of men (so to speak, the material or the object of the power of the keys), who are subjected to his jurisdiction ("plebs subdita per jurisdictionemr," qu. 17, art. 2, ad 2 m.), is necessary. The *clavis ordinis* can therefore not be exercised until after the possession of the *clavis jurisdictionis* (qu. 20, art. 1 and 2); and, vice-versa, a bishop may, by the withdrawal of the *clavis jurisdictionis*, deprive a schismatic, heretic, excommunicated, suspended, or degraded person of his inferiors (subjects), as well as of the possibility of exercising the *clavis ordinis* (qu. 19, art. 6).

The sacramental power of the keys (*claris ordinis*) comes into practice in priestly absolution, and it is particularly due to Thomas Aquinas that in the Romish doctrine this power of the keys has gained so much importance, that all parts of the sacrament of penance secure their unity in it. Thomas himself argues that God alone relieves of guilt and eternal punishment on condition of mere contrition; but this contrition can only assure the heart and afford evidence of forgiveness when followed by the fulness of love (as an attendant *of faes formata*), and furthermore must be accompanied with a desire for sacramental confession and absolution. To him who thus repents, guilt and eternal punishment are already remitted before confession, because in the concomitant desire, while repenting, to subject

himself to the power of the keys, the latter at once exerts its influence (*in voto existit*, although not *in actu se exercet*). If such a person comes into the penance-chair, the grace showered upon him is greatly increased (augetur gratia) by the exercise (in actu) of the power of the keys. But if contrition does not sufficiently fill the sinner's heart (for want of love, as is frequently the case in the simple *attritio*), and therefore his disposition does not admit the actual exercise of the power of the keys, then the latter supplements his disposition by removing any still existing hinderance to the inpouring of sin-forgiving grace, provided he does not himself bar all access to his heart. In all these relations the priest has that place in the sacrament of penance which water holds in the sacrament of baptism; the former is *instrumentum animatum*, as the latter is *instrumentum inanimatum*. His power, whether simply *in voto* requested or *in actu* exerted, makes way for the overflowing stream of mercy, and secures the necessary disposition for its reception (*ibid.* qu. 18, art. 1 and 2). The power of the keys is consequently the red thread which is threaded at contrition, drawn through penance, and becomes visible to the outward eye also in absolution. It gives the real form, the frame that secures to all acts of penance (which by it first become *partes sacramenti*, and receive a sacramental character) their inner connection, and supplies to all what is still needed for their completion (comp. qu. 10, art. 1). This is manifest in the effects of absolution by the power of the keys; for example (according to qu. 18, art. 2), temporal punishment is remitted (just the opinion of Richard of St. Victor). Yet this is not completely done as in baptism, but only so in part; the portion still remaining must be atoned for by the personal satisfactions of the penitent, by his prayer, by almsgiving, by fasting to the fulness of the measure meted out by the priest (qu. 18, art. 3). The imposition of satisfactions Thomas calls *binding*, i.e. obliging to atone for punishments still in reserve. The satisfactions have the twofold object of appeasing divine justice and of counteracting any tendency in the soul to sin. Punishment still in reserve (poenne satisfactorie) again can be remitted in virtue of the *clavis jurisdictionis* by means of indulgence (qu. 25, art. 1), which in the forum of God has the same value as in that of the Church; and this, according to the idea of substituting satisfaction on which it rests, may be of benefit even to souls in purgatory.

By this further development of the doctrine of the power of the keys the form of absolution also was necessarily considerably altered. Alexander of Hales says that in his day the *deprecativ*e formula preceded and was

followed by the *indicative*; and this he justifies from his stand-point by the sentence, " Et deprecatio gratiam impetrat et absolutio gratiam supponit" (comp. pt. 4:qu. 21, membr. 1). The indicative form of absolution, however, must have been an innovation, for the unnamed opponent of Thomas alluded to in his opusculum xxiii (others xxii) actually asserts that to within thirty years the absolution formula used by all priests was *Absolutionem et remissionem tibi tribuat Deus*. Thomas defends with special emphasis the formula *Ego te absolvo*, etc., because it has in its favor the analogy of other sacraments, and because it precisely expresses the effect of the sacrament of penance, namely, the removal of sin, as an exercise of the power of the keys. He interprets its contents in the following words: "Ego impendo tibi sacramentum absolutionis." But he also advises that the indicative form be preceded by the deprecative, lest on the part of the penitent the sacramental effects may be prevented (comp. Daniel, *Cod. Liturg.* i, 297).

The doctrine of Thomas had in its essentials already been dogmatically defined by Eugenius IV in 1439 at the Council of Florence (Mansi, 31:1057), and in its different rules more minutely at the Council of Trent, at its fourteenth session, Nov. 25, 1551. The Council of Trent, in its decree and the canons appended, had simply pronounced authoritatively the exclusive right of the priest to absolve, and it explained the spirit of the latter to be not merely an announcement of forgiveness, but a judicial and sacramental act. The Roman catechism enters far more into detail on this particular point: as the priest in all sacraments performs Christ's office, the penitent has to honor in him the person of Christ. Absolution announced by him does not simply mean, but actually procures forgiveness of sin (pt. ii. cap. 5, qu. 17 and 11), for it causes the blood of Christ to flow unto us, and washes away sins committed after baptism (qu. 10). If, in contrition, confession, and satisfaction, the personal activity of the penitent (the *opus operans*) is pre-eminent, on the other hand, in absolution (by which, as the *forma sacramenti*, those acts of penance first really assume a sacramental character, and become *partes sacramenti*), he must become perfectly passive (for it operates altogether *ex opere operato*). From this stand-point the objection frequently raised on the Roman Catholic side against Protestant polemics seems in some sort reasonable, namely, that absolution is neither hypothetical nor absolute, and that it is a sacramental act to which this distinction cannot actually be applied; and it must be conceded on our part that, with the conditions understood to be concurrent, it

furnishes such a degree of certainty that its effects cannot fail to be manifest in every one who does not intentionally frustrate it.

This, however, is only one side, in which the priest stands as intercessor between God and the penitent, no longer (as formerly regarded) as a deprecant simply, but as dispenser of mercies. The Roman Catholic conception of absolution furnishes for consideration still another side, according to which the priest is essentially judge, not simply *in foro ecclesie*, but also, at the same time, *in foro Dei*, i.e. judge in God's stead. As such, he investigates sin to determine a corresponding punishment, and examines the spiritual condition of the confidant in order to know whether to bind or to loose. He is therefore not simply executor of the *opus operatum*, but also judge of the *opus operans*. Now, as such, he gives a judgment, and this must be either hypothetical or absolute. If we look at the form of the sacramental practice, "Ego te absolve," and compare with it the assurances of the Roman catechism that the voice of the absolving priest is to be looked upon as if he heard the words of Christ to the leper, "Thy sins be forgiven thee" (*I. c. qu. 10*), we cannot do otherwise than regard the priestly decision as absolute, both by its form and contents, as an infallible divine decision. But if, on the other hand, we consider that the priest—and this is conceded on the part of the Roman Catholics—may also be fallible; that the confessor is, after all, a very imperfect surrogate on account of his want of omnipotence; yea, that but very rarely he can attain to an accurate knowledge of the spiritual condition of the confidant, his judgment must necessarily become conditioned; the whole sacrament becomes equally hypothetical, as upon this rests its basis. Thus the Roman Catholic doctrine fluctuates between two opposite poles of assurance and contingency. This, indeed, is the necessary consequence of its development as we have followed it in history, in which two separate originally distinct views as to the position of the priest in absolution had been combined, without, however, really agreeing with each other.

**IV. Doctrine of the Reformation and Protestantism.** A very new development was given to the doctrine of the power of the keys by the Reformers. Especially noteworthy is,

**1. Luther's Attitude.**—He retained private confession and private absolution, although he knew them to be innovations of the Middle Ages; he even never wholly abolished the sacramental character of absolution. Yet, notwithstanding this apparent adherence to Romish practices, it will be

found that he changed, so to speak, regenerated the whole institution in a reformatory spirit. With Luther also the power of the keys is identical with the power to bind and to loose. The keys he regards as nothing else than the authority or office by which the Word is practiced and propagated. As the Word of God, from the nature of its contents, is both law and gospel, so the sermon has the twofold task of alarming the secure sinner by threats of the law, and of giving peace to the troubled conscience by the consolations of the Gospel, i.e. by the forgiveness of sins. The former is denoted by the *binding* key, the latter by the *loosing* key, which are both equally essential to keep Christians in the narrow path of spiritual life. Even the sermon Luther therefore considers as an act (the essential act) of the power of the keys, and the consolation afforded by it as a perfectly effectual absolution. From the latter, however, is to be particularly distinguished *common absolution*, accorded at the close of the sermon, to which Luther assigns the task of admonishing all hearers to obtain for themselves forgiveness of sin; also *private absolution*, to be received only at the confessional, and which is nothing more nor less than a sermon confined to one auditor. The existence of these different modes of exercising the power of the keys he ascribes partly to God's riches, who did not wish to manifest any littleness in the matter, and partly to the wants of an abashed conscience and a timid heart, which greatly need this strength and stimulant against the devil. The value of private absolution he places in its quasi sacramental character, for, like the sacrament, it also affords a real advantage in confining the Word to a particular person, and thus more securely strikes home than in the sermon. It is true, for this reason, private absolution cannot be regarded as an absolute necessity to forgiveness of sin; but he views it as unquestionably beneficial and advisable (Steitz, *Privatbeichte ut. Privatabsolutio*, p. 7-14). As Luther, moreover, did not look upon the confessional as a judicial authority, but simply as a mercy-seat, so he looked upon absolution, which he recognised as the most important feature of confession, not as a judicial decision, but as the simple announcement of the Gospel: "Thy sins are forgiven thee"-the apportionment of the forgiveness of sin to a *particular* person, the confinement of its consolation to the most individual needs of a single heart. The power and effect do not depend, according to Luther, upon the priestly character or upon the priestly utterance of him who administers it, but upon the word of Christ, which is announced by it, and upon the command of Christ, which is executed by it. For this very reason, all distinction of human and divine activity disappears from it; neither is the

sentence of the person absolving afterwards ratified by God, nor does the absolver announce upon earth the judgment of heaven; but in the forgiveness at absolution God's forgiveness is directly afforded. The only condition upon which the effect of absolution depends is that upon which rests the effect likewise of the Word of God, i.e. of the sermon, namely, faith; for by faith it is received. Repentance is efficacious only so far as it is the indispensable preparation for the reception, but in itself cannot insure forgiveness, as without faith it remains simply sin come to life and experienced in the heart, a Judas-pain of despair (Steitz, *ut supra*, § 6, 13, 15-18). Notwithstanding this irremissible necessity of faith, Luther is far from basing upon it the power of absolution; a weak faith may receive strength also; yea, even to the unbeliever it is truly offered, and affords him forgiveness on account of the indwelling of the Word of God, at least for the moment, but if repelled by unbelief it only adds to his responsibility before the judge. The result of absolution is consolation to the conscience and peace with God in forgiveness of sins and restitution in innocence of the baptismal pledge. Private absolution, Luther holds, must be administered to every individual who demands it; and on this account the power to loose in private absolution is not accompanied by the power to bind. Upon this rests the importance of the distinction between private absolution and private confession; for to confess does not mean anything else than inwardly to desire absolution for our sins and for our guilt: confession can therefore not be *offered* to any one, for God himself does not offer it; it must be an inward want. For this reason, again, no remuneration can be demanded of the person confessing. Luther makes no distinction between the absolution of the layman and that of the priest. It is also his opinion that man cannot too frequently enjoy absolution and the consolation of forgiveness, hence God, in the riches of his mercy, has so ordered it that this consolation may be experienced wherever the Church of the faithful exerts her influence. He holds, finally, that while it may be well to confess all one's different sins, it is most important to confess those that particularly oppress the heart.

The *key to bind*, for which Luther found no place in private confession, he assigned particularly to *jurisdiction*; it found its application, therefore, in the ban. Luther's opinions on this point may be summed up as follows: the ban can be exercised only in cases of public sin and reproach, and for notorious disinclination to repentance; it is the public declaration of the Church that the sinner has bound himself, i.e. has deprived himself of all



association of love, and surrendered himself to the devil. It excludes simply from the public association with the Church and her sacraments, not from the inner membership of the Church, from which the sinner himself only can cut loose. It is merely a public punishment of the Church, and has no other object than to improve the sinner. For this reason he is simply excluded from the sacrament, not from the sermon, nor even from the intercession of the Church on his behalf. The loosing from the ban is the public declaration of the Church that the person hitherto under ban has been reconciled to and is again accepted by the Church. This loosing is to be granted to any one who seeks it in repentance and faith; and this absolution of the Church, in virtue of the power of the keys, is God's absolution. A ban unjustly imposed can do the person so punished no harm, and should be borne patiently; nor must it be forgotten that external membership in the Church may be coexistent with exclusion from inner membership.

**2.** *Melancthon* coincided generally with Luther on the doctrine of the power of the keys, but with this difference, that he regarded the keys as an essential attribute of the episcopal or ministerial office. Yet we find in ecclesiastical regulations made under his supervision, as early as 1543, some decided deviations from Luther's doctrines. It is there directed to admit no one to communion "unless he have previously received private absolution from his pastor or some other competent person" (*Richter, Kirchenordnung*, ii, 45). Furthermore, the right is conceded to the absolving minister, under certain conditions, to deny absolution to the confessing. The ban itself, however, in consequence of its abuse, was early taken from the hands of the clergy, and its imposition left to the Consistory. Absolution was bestowed in the church at Sunday vesper service by imposition of hands. The formulas of absolution are partly exhibitory; not unfrequently both stand side by side for selection.

Chemnitz is the first who disputes that absolution can be regarded as a sacrament in the same manner as baptism and communion, and assigns for his reason that it rests simply upon the Word of God, and has received no additional external sign. He also regards the exercise of absolution as a specific prerogative of the sacred office, although he still holds to the old Protestant principle that the keys were given to the Church herself. (See Schmidt, *Dogmatik*, § 53, note 5; Heppe, *Dogymatik*, 3:250; Kliefoth [see below], p. 278.) Moreover, he argues that it must be left to the absolving

clergyman to use his judgment and cognition in the refusal or grant of absolution.

Quite differently teach Quenstedt and Hollaz. They explicitly speak of the power to forgive sin as an official prerogative of the servants of the divine Word, and the latter even teaches, in a quite un-Protestant manner, that the servants (ministers) relatively and effectually convert, renew, and bless the sinner by the Word of God; so they also relatively and effectually forgive sin (Heppe, p. 252).

As a misconstruction of the original Protestant view on this doctrine, we must certainly regard Baier's position that absolution is a juridical act; and he, in consequence, distinguishes the *potestas ordinis* and the *potestas clavium or jurisdictionis*, and determines the former to be a *potestas publice docendi et sacramenta administrandi*, and the latter a *potestas remittendi et retinendi peccata* (comp. Schmidt, § 59, note 9).

**3.** *The Swiss reformers*, from the very commencement, interpreted the power of the keys to refer especially to the exercise of ecclesiastical government, and more particularly to Church discipline, and in this sense they have formulated in their confessions the rules pertaining to this subject. On the other hand, Calvin referred the power of the keys altogether to the preaching of the Gospel and the exercise of Church discipline, disregarding the sacramental idea. He taught:

**1.** Absolution is twofold: one part serves faith, the other belongs to Church discipline.

**2.** Absolution is nothing else than the witness of the forgiveness of sin based upon the forms of the Gospel (*Instit.* lib. 3:cap. 4:§ 23).

**3.** Absolution is conditional; its conditions are repentance and faith.

**4.** As to the existence of these conditions men must necessarily be uncertain, so that the certainty of binding and loosing does not depend upon the judicial decision of a human court. The servants of the divine Word can therefore absolve only conditionally (§ 18): in virtue, viz. of this Word they can promise forgiveness to all who believe on Christ, and threaten damnation to those who do not lay hold of Christ (§ 21).

**5.** In this exercise of their functions they can, for this reason, not fall into error, for they do not promise more than the Word of God commands

them; while the sinner can secure for himself certain and complete absolution with perfect assurance whenever he will lay hold upon the mercy of Christ in accordance with the spirit of the Bible promise, "According to thy faith be it unto thee" (§ 22).

**6.** The other absolution, which forms a constituent of Church discipline, has nothing to do with secret sins; it extinguishes only any offence which may have been given to the Church (§ 23). In this also the Church follows the infallible rule of the divine Word: in virtue of this word she announces that all adulterers, thieves, murderers, misers, and the unjust shall have no part in the kingdom of God; and in this binding she cannot err. With this same Word she looses the repenting ones, to whom she brings consolation (§ 21). According to these principles, which, with utter disregard of the sacramental idea, designate absolution simply as a species of sermon, and with it reproduce the doctrine of German Protestantism in an improved form, Calvin could not cast aside private absolution; yet he declined to recognise in it a general institution of the Church, and made its administration dependent upon the individual need of those who should demand it. Its value to the end in view he speaks of very much in the strain of the Lutheran Church: "It happens sometimes that some one hears the promises given to all the faithful, and nevertheless remains in doubt whether to him also his sins are forgiven. When such a one uncovers his secret wound to his pastor, and hears that voice of the Gospel, 'Be of good cheer, thy sins are forgiven thee' (~~and~~ Matthew 9:2), addressed to himself, his heart is quieted and freed from all fear. Nevertheless we must take care lest we should dream of a power of the keys not in accordance with the doctrine of the gospels" (§ 14). It is true, this does not look exactly like Lutheran private absolution, but it is certainly the only evangelical sense; and of this alone the Scriptures, the apostolic Church, and the following centuries down to the Middle Ages, know anything.

**4.** Private absolution, as a whole, could be a blessing only so long as that specific religious interest which the Reformation awakened in all circles remained fresh and full of life; with a lassitude of the latter, the former also, together with confession, its offspring, necessarily deteriorated to a dead ecclesiastical form, and, instead of encouraging faith, favored a false security. In several Lutheran churches its exercise was ignored, and finally resulted in a complete change of the manner of confession and absolution (Steitz, p. 159 sq.). The fresh and living spirit of the Reformation had fled, private confession and private absolution had sunk to a mere thoughtless

form, Church ban had become a punishment, public reconciliation a public restitution; this ecclesiastical punishment was pronounced only by the consistories, and simply in cases of offences of the flesh.

**5.** Suddenly *Pietism* came forward with a loud protest, and demanded a decided reform in the exercise of the power of the keys. The forerunner in this direction was Theophilus Grossgebauer, professor at Rostock (*Wachterstimme aus dem verwiisteten Zion*, 1661), who regarded as essential for private sins only confession before God, but for public sins, to which alone he referred the power to bind and to loose, public confession and reconciliation in presence of the offended Church. Spener, although in favor of retaining private confession and private absolution, advocated a modified form, viz., announcement to the pastor, and, as its object, advice for and examination of the condition of the confidant's soul; and he insisted that the confessor, whose choice he left to personal confidence, should absolve only those truly repenting, but should impress the sinner with his guilt, and should turn over the doubtful ones to a college of elders for them to judge and to exercise the authority of the ban. With special emphasis he declared the power of the keys to be a right of the whole Church or of the brotherhood, which, by way of abuse, had fallen exclusively into the hands of the ecclesiastics. With far greater decision his adherents opposed the institution of private confession: the attacks of pastor Johann Kaspar Schade, of Berlin, on the confessional, which he called an institution of Satan, and his abolition of private absolution of his own accord, resulted first in an investigation of the merits of the question (Nov. 16, 1698), and finally in an electoral resolution (shortly afterwards followed by a like regulation on the part of other states), which ordered confession and absolution of all confidants in common, but, on the other hand, left private confession and private absolution to be determined by the needs of the individual. The war thus opened between Pietism and Lutheran orthodoxy led the latter to declare private confession and private absolution a divine institution, and thus only brought some credit to the old Lutheran institutions, while it greatly increased the fervor of their opponents.

**6.** In the sphere of dogmatics Schleiermacher was the first among German Protestant divines to reintroduce the idea of the power of the keys, but he confines its application, after special exclusion of the sermon, to the law-giving and judicial (administrative) power of the Church, which he regards as the essential outgrowth of the ecclesiastical office of Christ, and whose existence he ascribes to the association of the Church with the world (§

144, 145). When we consider, however, how vague and contradictory are the confessional books of the evangelical churches on this point (we need invite only to a comparison of the passages collected by Schleiermacher in § 145), how things altogether distinct are there joined, and how difficult it is in an exegetical way to define the subject with any degree of certainty, it seems the most proper course to ignore the attempt altogether of introducing into dogmatics such figurative terms as "keys of the heavenly kingdom," to "bind and loose." What has thus far been written upon these phrases would have been much more in place in defining "forgiveness of sin" and "justification" when alluding in practical theology to preparation for communion (as has been done, with a good deal of tact, by Nitzsch in his *Prakt. Theol.* ii, 2, 428), and in ecclesiastical law under discipline without any cause for fear of complication.

As regards the idea of absolution so prominent in the exercise of the power of the keys, it has, during the last twenty years, again become (in Germany) matter of general investigation. The beginning was made by the court preacher, Dr. Ackermann (at the Church diet in Bremen in 1852), on private confession. Although he did not lay particular stress upon absolution, but simply justified confession on its own account and as a psychological need, it naturally led to a debate on absolution by the Church diet, followed by a lively discussion between the Lutheran and Reformed ministers. On the part of the Lutherans every possible effort was made to reinvest private absolution with its former rights, and to pave the way at least for its early reintroduction. They went so far as to vindicate it as a divine institution, argued for general absolution as a duty, and, well knowing its origin in the Middle Ages, appealed to it as an institution sanctified by tradition of the Church.

Even the assertion was not wanting that absolution, under all circumstances, possesses divine power, so as actually to free the sinner from his guilt, quite in contradiction to the new Lutheran doctrine. *SEE LUTHERANISM, NEW.*

**V.** *Doctrine of the Greek Church.* — The Greek Church entertains views on the doctrine of the power of the keys and on absolution very similar to those entertained by the Latin Church in the Middle Ages. The subject is treated in full in Covell, *Account of the Greek Church* (Cambridge, 1722, fol.), p. 229 sq.; Neale, *Eastern Church*, Introd. ii. *SEE GREEK CHURCH.*

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

**VII.** *Literature.* — J. Morinus, *De disciplina in administratione sacramenti penitentiae* (Paris, 1651, Antwerp, 1682); Daille, *De poenitentiae et satisfactionibus humanis* (Amst. 1649); *De sacramentali sive auriculari Latinorum confessione* (Genesis 1661); Hottinger, *Smegma exercitatum de poenitentia antiquioris Romanae ecclesiae* (Tigurini, 1706); Wernsdorf, *De absolutione non niere declarativa* (Vitt. 1761); Abicht, *De confessione privata* (Gedan. 1728); Fix, *Gesch. d. Beichte* (Chemnitz, 1800); Dens, *Theologia*, tom. vi; *De Sacramentis*. Panit. No. 14, tom. ii, No. 91, *De Petri Petri*; Mohnike, *Das Sechste Hauptstück im Katechismus* (Strals. 1830); Barren, *On the Supremacy* (in *Works*, 7:134 sq., Oxf. 1830); Chas. Elliott, *Delineation of Roman Catholicism* (3d ed., by Dr. Hannah, Lond. 1851), p. 195 sq., 613 sq.; Mohler, *Symbölics* (transl. by Robertson, 3d ed., N. Y. Cathol. Publ. House, 1870), p. 217 sq. H. C. Lea, *Studies in Ch. Hist.* (Phila. 1869), p. 153, 223 sq.; Iaag (Romish), *Histoire des Dogmes Chrétiens*, vol. ii, § 20; *London Review*, 1864 (July), p. 86 sq.; *Evang. Quart. Rev.* 1869 (April), p. 69, 269; (July) p. 69, 341; Martigny, *Dictionnaire des Antiquités*, p. 156. Among the early monographs on the keys we may mention those of Wigand, *De clave ligante* (Francof. 1561); Schmid, *De clavibus ecclesiae* (Argent. 1667); Botface, *De clavibus Petri* (Haf. 1707); Luther, *Von d. Schliisseln* (ed. Wiesing, Frankft. and Lpz. 1795). Of late (chiefly German) treatises specially on the subject we may name Rothe, *Amst d. Schlissel* (Gorl. 1801); Brescius, *Amt d. Schlusssel* (Breslau, 1820); Steitz, *Das Bussacrament* (Frankft. 1854); idem, *Die Privatbeichte und Pritiatabsolution* (Frankft. 1851); Kliefoth, *Beichte und Absolution* (Schwer. 1856); Pfisterer, *Luther's Lehre von der Beichte* (Stuttg. 1857). *SEE ABSOLUTION; SEE LAY REPRESENTATION; SEE ROCK.*

### Keyser, Leonhard,

a Baptist martyr, originally a Roman Catholic priest, flourished in the first half of the 16th century. He joined the Baptists in 1525, and immediately

began preaching the Reformation doctrine, undismayed by all the tyranny exerted against the faithful by water, fire, and sword. In the second year of his ministry (1527) he was apprehended at Scherding, on the River Inn, and condemned to the flames. "The chief heads of accusation against him were, that faith alone justifies, without good works; that there are only two sacraments; that the Gospel was not preached by the papists in Germany; that confession is not God's command; that Christ is the only satisfaction for sin; that there is no purgatory; that Christ is the only Mediator; and that all days (alluding to feast or saints' days) are alike with *God*." -*Baptist Martyrs*, p. 60.

### Kezi'a

(Heb. *Ketsiah'*, ה[γχα] *cassia*, as in <sup><1981></sup>Psalm 45:9; Septuag. Κασσία v. r. Κασσί), the name of Job's second daughter, born to him after the return of his prosperity (Job 42"14). B.C. cir. 220.

### Ke'ziz

(Hebrew *Ketsits'*, /γχα] *abrupt*; only with qm[εe'meki, *valley*, prefixed; Septuag. both Ἀμεκκασίς, Vulg. *Vallis Casis*), or rather *Enmek-Keziz* (Vale of Keziz), a city of the tribe of Benjamin, mentioned between Beth-hoglah and Beth-arabah (<sup><1982></sup>Joshua 18:21), and therefore probably situated in a steep ravine of the same name leading to the valley of the Jordan. **SEE BETHBASI**. M. De Saulcy found a small valley by the name of *Kaaziz* about an hour and a half distant from Bethany, in the direction of Jericho (*Narrative*, ii, 17), which he conjectures (p. 26) was the ancient Valley of Keziz. So also Van de Velde (*Memoir*, p. 328) calls it *Wady el Kaziz*.

### Khadijah

is the name *of the first* wife of the Islamite prophet. See MOHAMMED.

### Khan

#### Picture for Khan

is the more common Arabic name for the public establishments which, under the less imposing title of *menzil*, or the more stately one of *caravanserai* (q.v.), correspond to our Occidental ideas of an INN **SEE INN** (q.v.). These afford lodging, but not usually food, for man and beast. They are generally found near towns, but sometimes in the open country

on a frequented route. They are mentioned in the N. Test. (πανδοχείον, <sup><2034></sup>Luke 10:34) and Talmud (qdnwp, Lightfoot, *Opp.* p. 799), and something of the kind seems to occur in the later books of the O.T. (twrge <sup><2417></sup>Jeremiah 41:17; the κατάλυμα of <sup><1117></sup>Luke 2:7 is, however, thought by some to have been of a more private character). The earlier Hebrews knew of no such provision for travellers (<sup><1427></sup>Genesis 42:27; <sup><1024></sup>Exodus 4:24; <sup><2423></sup>2 Kings 19:23; the w̄bmi being merely the stopping-place over night; the hnwp of <sup><1011></sup>Joshua 2:1 indicating rather a brothel, and the twyn of <sup><1918></sup>1 Samuel 19:18 the home of the prophet-scholars). Entertainment was generally furnished by individual hospitality (q.v.).

### Khatchadur,

an Armenian theologian, flourished in the opening of the 17th century. He was bishop of Dehougha, and in 1630 was sent by the Armenian patriarch Michael III to Constantinople on an ecclesiastical mission, and later to Poland. He is particularly celebrated, however, as a poet.-Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gener.* 27:675.

### Khatchid I

elected patriarch of Armenia in 972, is noted in the annals of the ecclesiastical history of Armenia for the interest he manifested toward literature and the fine arts, and for the establishment of a number of monasteries. He died at his residence in Arkina in 992. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 27:676.

### Khatchid II

was patriarch of Armenia in 1058, but was oppressed by the Byzantine emperor Constantine Ducas, who imprisoned him for some three years, and then banished him to Cappadocia. He died in 1064. Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 27:676.

### Khazars Or Khozars

is the name of a Finnish people, a rude but powerful nation, north of the Caucasus, related to the Bulgarians and Hungarians, which in the 8th century embraced Judaism. After the dissolution of the empire of the Huns they settled on the borders of Europe and Asia, and at one time possessed a realm near the mouth of the Wolga (by them called Atil or Atel), on the



Caspian Sea (after them sometimes called Khazar Sea), where the Kalmucks (q.v.) now live. They gave much uneasiness to the Persians, especially during the reign of Khosru I (q.v.), and in the 7th century, after the downfall of the Sassanians, the Khazars' went across the Caucasus, invaded Armenia, and conquered the Crimea, hence called at one time *Khazari* or *Cho (a)zari*. The Byzantine emperors trembled before the warlike skill of the Khazars, and paid large tributes to keep them at a respectful distance from Constantinople; the Bulgarians and other peoples were their vassals; the Russians (Kievians) appeased their desire for conquest by an annual tribute, and with the Arabs they were waging constant warfare. But by degrees, as they abandoned their nomadic habits, their warlike spirit decreased, and they largely fostered commercial intercourse with the outer world. They exchanged dried fish, the furs of the north, and slaves for the gold and silver and the luxuries of southern climates. Merchants of all religions—Jews, Christians, and Mohammedans—were freely admitted, and their superior intelligence over his more barbarous subjects induced one of their kings, Bulan, to forsake their coarse, idolatrous worship, greatly mixed with sensuousness and licentiousness, and to embrace (A.D. 740) the Jewish religion. "By one account," says Milman (*Jews*, 3:138), "he was admonished by an angel; by another, he decided in this singular manner between the claims of Christianity, Moslemism, and Judaism. He examined the different teachers apart, and asked the Christians if Judaism were not better than Mohammedanism; the Mohammedan, whether it was not better than Christianity. Both replied in the affirmative; on which the monarch decided in favor of Judaism." According to one statement secretly, to another openly, he embraced the faith of Moses, and induced learned teachers of the law to settle in his dominions. Of course at first, the change of religious belief was confined to the royal household, and the four thousand nobles of the land, who, with Bulan, embraced Judaism; but soon the new religion spread, and ere long the majority of the nation bowed in adoration to the one and ever-living God. Judaism actually became a necessary condition to the succession to the throne, but there was the most liberal toleration to all other forms of faith. *SEE OBADIAH*. Rabbi Hasdai, a learned Jew, who was in the highest confidence with Abderrahman, the caliph of Cordova, first received intelligence of this sovereignty possessed by his brethren through the ambassadors of the Byzantine emperor. After considerable difficulty, Hasdai succeeded in establishing a correspondence with Joseph, the reigning king. The letter of Hasdai is extant, and an answer of the king,

which does not possess equal claims to authenticity. The whole history has been wrought out into a religious romance, entitled *Cosri*, **SEE JEHUDA HA-LEVI**, which has involved the question in great obscurity. Basnage rejected the whole as a fiction of the Rabbins, anxious to prove that "the sceptre had not entirely departed from Israel." Jost inclines to the belief that "there is a groundwork of truth under the veil of poetic embellishment." The latest writers upon the subject admit without hesitation, and Jewish writers almost boast of the kingdom of Khazar. Comp. Frahn's *Commentary of Ibn-Foszlán "De Chazaris"* (in the *Memoires de l'Academie Imperiale des Sciences de Petersbourg*, 1822, vol. viii); D'Hosson. *Peuples du Caucase*; Dufrémery, in the *Journal Asiatique*, 1849, p. 470 sq.; Reinaud, *Abulfedc*, Introd. p. 299; Vivien de St. Martin, *Les Khazars* (in the *Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions et des Belles-Lettres*, Paris, 1851). The Khazars became extinct as a nation in A. D. 945, when they were conquered by Swaitoslaw [duke of Kiev (q.v.)], and their name, otherwise almost forgotten, was preserved in the archives of the Muscovite. See Schweitzer, *Juzdriissiche Volker*; Carmoly, *Itinéraires de la Terre Sainte* (Brux. 1847), p. 1-104; Rapoport, *Kerenm Chemed*, 5:197 sq.; Cassel, in Ersch und Gruber, *Encyklopadie*; Gritz, *Geschichte d. Juden*, 5:211 sq.; Rule, *Karaites*, p. 79 sq. **SEE KIEF**. (J. H.W.)

### **Khedr, Al**

is the name which figures in the *Koran* (chap. 18, Sale's edition, p. 244) as that of a person whom the Mohammedans assert the Lord pointed out to Moses as superior in wisdom to any other living person, Moses included. The story the Mohammedans tell is thus given by Sale: "Moses once preaching to the people, they admired his knowledge and eloquence so much that they asked him whether he knew any man in the world who was wiser than himself, to which he answered in the negative; whereupon God, in a revelation, having reprehended him for his vanity (though some pretend that Moses asked God the question of his own accord), acquainted him that his servant Al Khedr was more knowing than he; and, at Moses's request, told him that he might find that person at a certain rock where the two seas met, directing him to take a fish with him in a basket, and that where he missed the fish that was the place. Accordingly Moses set out, with his servant Joshua, in search of Al Khedr." See Sale's *Koran*, p. 244.

## Khlesl, Melchior

a German theologian, born at Vienna in 1553 of Protestant parents, was induced to enter the Roman Catholic Church, and joined the Jesuits. After studying five years under the Jesuits he took the first four orders, then continued his studies for two years at Ingolstadt, and was ordained priest in 1579. He became successively provost of the cathedral at Vienna, administrator of the bishopric of Neustadt in 1588, and bishop of Vienna in 1598. The loose conduct of the Roman Catholic clergy having greatly contributed to the rapid spreading of Protestant doctrines, Khlesl showed himself a zealous partisan of reform in this respect, while, on the other hand, he did his utmost to bring Protestants back into the fold of Romanism. Yet he was still more inclined to mingle in politics than in Church affairs. He attached himself to the grand duke Matthias, eldest brother of the emperor Rudolph II, whom the latter particularly disliked on account of a prediction, according to which this brother was to depose him. The emperor contemplated exiling Khlesl, but the latter succeeded in organizing a conspiracy, and Matthias was made emperor in Rudolph's place. The Protestant princes had a part in this revolution, but Khlesl took good care that they should not derive any benefit from it to further their religion. Under emperor Matthias he became president of the privy council in 1611, and cardinal in 1616. Notwithstanding his opposition to Protestantism, which he rigorously persecuted in 1616-18, he remained at the head of the German party, and opposed the adoption of the grand duke Ferdinand as heir to the throne. Ferdinand himself by arresting Khlesl at Vienna, July 20, 1618, and confining him first at the castle of Ambras, and then at the convent of Georgenberg, in Tyrol. In 1622 a requisition from the pope caused him to be transferred to Rome, where he was imprisoned for seven months in the castle of St. Angelo. After his liberation he returned to Vienna in 1627, and was restored to the possession of his property and his offices. He gave up politics to attend exclusively to the management of ecclesiastical affairs, and died Sept. 18, 1630. His fortune, amounting to over half a million, he left to the bishopric of Vienna; 100,000 florins to Neustadt and Vienna for a yearly mass for his soul; 100,000 florins to the convent of Himmelspforte, 20,000 to the Jesuits, and 46,000 to his relatives. Khlesl's motto was " Strong and mild:" strong in action, mild in manner; the latter was somewhat difficult for him to submit to, as he was naturally hasty. He had not received a classical education, but was well versed in the Bible, in patristics, and in homiletics. See Hammer-

Purgstall, *Lebensbeschreibung des Cardinals Khlesl* (Vienna, 1847-51, 4 vols. 8vo) ; Pierer, *Univ. Lex. s.v.*; Wetzter und Welte, *Kirch.-Lex.* 6:225.

## Khiestovshchicki.

*SEE SKOPTZI.*

## Khlistie

(*Lashers*), also called Danielites, is the name of a powerful Russian sect. They call themselves "people of God," "Tribe of Israel," " worshippers of the true God," or " Brothers and Sisters." They originated in the first year of the reign of the emperor Alexis (A.D. 1645). According to their tradition, there descended, in the days of Alexis, upon Mt. Gorodin, in the district of Wladimir, in great power, on a wagon of fire surrounded by a cloud, "God the Father," accompanied by the hosts of heaven. The latter returned again to the other world, but the Lord himself remained on the earth, and manifested himself in the flesh in the person of Daniel Philippon (or Philippitch). This they hold to have been the second manifestation of God the Father in the flesh, and as in his first manifestation Jerusalem was enlightened, so at this time Russia was blessed with special divine favor; and, corresponding to Jerusalem, they point out as their Zion, or, as they call it, " the higher region," the province Kostroma, in which Daniel Philippon was born. The historical facts in the case, as related by Dixon (*'Free Russia'*, p. 139), however, are, that Daniel was a peasant in the province of Kostroma, and, after serving for a time in the Russian army, ran away from his flag in battle, declared himself the Almighty, and wandered about the empire, teaching those who would listen to his voice his doctrine, inculcated in the following twelve commandments:

- 1.** I am the God of whom the prophets spoke. I came for the second time into the world to redeem the souls of men. There is no God besides me.
- 2.** There is no other doctrine, and no other is to be sought.
- 3.** In what you are taught, therein also remain.
- 4.** Keep the commandments of your God, and become fishers of men in general.
- 5.** Drink no strong drinks, and do not fulfil the lust of the flesh.

- 6.** Do not get married, and whosoever is married let him live with his wife as with his sister. This is the sense of the Old Testament Scriptures. The unmarried should not marry, and those who are married should separate.
- 7.** No abusive word (*diabol*) is to be used.
- 8.** Not to attend wedding or baptism festivities, or drink at parties.
- 9.** Not to steal; and if any one takes of another the smallest coin, it will have to melt on his head at the judgment day from the heat of punishment before he can be pardoned
- 10.** These commandments are to be kept secret, not to be revealed even to father or mother. The suffering from fire and the knout must be endured, because for it the kingdom of heaven and bliss on earth are obtained.
- 11.** Friends are to visit friends, to give suppers of friendship, to exercise love, to keep these commands, and pray to God.
- 12.** To believe in the Holy Spirit.

Their own tradition asserts that Daniel himself did not issue these commands, but that a son was born to revenged him fifteen years before his appearance in this world, in the person of Ivan Timofejen, in the village Maksakon, of a woman one hundred years old. That this Ivan, when thirty-three years old, was summoned by Daniel to the village Staraja, and there received his godhead, and that, thereupon father and son ascended into heaven, and, after a short tarry, from the same place descended Jesus the Christ, in the person of Ivan, who at once commenced to preach, assisted by twelve disciples, the doctrines embodied in the twelve commandments above cited, and entered into the state of holy matrimony with a young female, whom they call " the daughter of God." To add to the romance of the story, the persecutions to which these fanatical religionists were subject has given rise to an imitation of the resurrection narrative of the N.-T. Scriptures. After suffering persecution under various forms and of divers kinds, Ivan was partly burned and then crucified; but, after removal from the cross, and his burial on a Friday, he rose again, and on the Sunday after appeared in the midst of his followers. Again seized by the authorities, he was tried and crucified a second time, and his skin taken off; one of his female followers standing by then wrapped the body in a sheet, out of which a new skill formed itself, and after burial he again rose and commenced anew the preaching of his doctrines, and made many followers.

Thereafter Ivan took up his residence at Moscow, and openly taught his new religion. The house which he occupied was called the "New Jerusalem." He died on the day of St. Tichon, after living some forty five years at Moscow, and ascended to heaven in presence of his disciples, to join his father and the saints. Notwithstanding the frenzy of this fabulous narrative, the sect is numerous, and has among its members many of the nobles of the land.

Like the Skoptzi, the sect of the Khlistic also observe some of the practices of the regular Church, to ward off suspicion and to shield themselves from persecution. From their usages it is known that before they go to communion in the church they first partake of it according to their own form. They also have a separate form of baptism. They have pictures of their god Daniel Philippon, their Jesus Christ, their mother of God, saints, prophets, and teachers whom they adore. The orthodox church edifices they call "ant-nests," and their priests "idolaters and adulterers." Marriage is considered an impurity, and all entering this state are lost, yet they permit one of the nearest relatives of Daniel Philippon and Ivan Timofejen to enter this state to prevent the interruption of the lineage. The water from a well in the village Staraja, near Kostroma, is in the winter sent about in the shape of ice, and used by them to bake their communion bread. In the same village lived in 1847 a girl, Uliana Visilijewa by name, who was adored as the last of the lineage by many from all parts, among them nobles and merchants of Moscow, and though for this reason the government passed unnoticed her sacrilegious acts, she was at last arrested and sent to a monastery.

Their mode of worship is very much like that of the Skoptzi, except that after service they partake of an ordinary meal in common, which is prolonged till late in the evening, and often becomes the occasion of licentious sins. This sect is known in various localities by different names; in some parts they are called *Ljady* (useless), in others *Chorashy* (hypocrites), *Vertvni* (turners), *Kupidony* (Cupido, the god of love). Great numbers of these heretics have been sent into the Causasus and Siberia, where many of them have been forced to enter the armies and the mines. See Dixon *Free Russia*, Chap. 24

### **Kholbah**

(Arabic), a peculiar form of prayer used in Mohammedan countries at the commencement of public worship in the great mosques on Friday at noon.

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

### Khonds.

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

*Divisions.* — Some of these races have attached themselves to Hindu society, and serve in a condition of degradation as *Chandals* or *Mechas*, i.e. outcasts or pariahs. They often hold offices of trust and responsibility in village communities, but, according to Hindu law, they should live outside of villages, and own no property but dogs and asses. Their customs and institutions are, however, everywhere different from those of the Hindus.

There are others of these aboriginal tribes who have not mingled with Hinduism at all, or only very partially. Among these are the *Kols* of Bengal and Eastern Nagpoor, the Khonds of Central India, the Bheels of the Vindhya Mountains, the Khaudesh Malwah, etc., of Central India, and others in the south amid the forests of the Neilgherry Hills, in Guzerat, and other places (see *Edinb. Review*, April, 1864). These preserve their own habits, even where Hinduism most presses them. They have no castes, their widows are allowed to remarry, they have no objection to any kind of flesh, and otherwise differ greatly from the Aryan peoples.

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

*Name.* — They term themselves *Knee, Kui, Koinga, Kwuinga*, but are known to Europeans by their Hindu name of *Khond* or *Kond*. Their language is affiliated with the Uriya (Ooriya), but the dialects are many, and often "a Khond of one district has been found unable to hold communication with one of a neighboring tribe." The speech has "a peculiar pectoral enunciation." Ethnologically, all these tribes are Turanian or Mongolian.

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



contract such marriages. An unmarried woman may become a mother without disgrace.

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

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

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

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

*Personal and Social Characteristics.* - These people, like almost all known rude races, are "given to hospitality." For the safety of a guest life and honor are pledged. He is "before a child." A murderer even may not be hurt in the house of his enemy; it is doubtful if he may be even *starved* in it. The Khond physiognomy is clearly Turanian. The color varies from that of light bamboo to a deep copper; the forehead is full, the cheek-bones high, the nose broad at the point, the lips full, but not thick, and the mouth large. The Khonds are of great bodily strength and symmetry, well informed on common subjects, of quick comprehension, and otherwise show considerable intellectual capability. Their mode of salutation is with the hand raised over the head. Their natural moral qualities are of mixed character. They are personally courageous and resolute. They have so great a love of personal liberty that it is affirmed they have been known to tear out their tongues by the roots that they might perish rather than endure confinement. They are not very intensely attached to their tribal institutions, but have great devotion to the persons of their patriarchal chiefs. They have, however, a great spirit of revenge, and are given to seasons of periodical intoxication. They drink a liquor made of the *Mow* flower, this tree being found near every hut and in the jungles. They are a "nation of drunkards," and will drink any intoxicating beverage, the stronger the better.

*Laws.* — They have no code by which they are governed, but follow custom and usage. The right of property is recognised. Murder is left to private revenge or retaliation. In case of matrimonial unfaithfulness, the seducer may be put to death if the husband choose, or he may accept the entire property of the criminal in lieu of his right to put him to death. Property stolen must be returned, or its equivalent given. There are seven judicial tests; common oaths are administered on the skin of a tiger or lizard. Ordeals of boiling water and oil are likewise resorted to.

*Arts and Manufactures.* — The Khonds manufacture axes, bows and arrows, a species of plough, and other implements; they distil liquor, extract oil, work in clay and metals, and dye their simple garments. Their houses are formed of strong boards, plastered inside.

*Arms and Agriculture.* — They use the sling, bow and arrows, and a broad battle-axe, and adorn themselves for battle as for a feast. They raise rice, oils, millet, pulse, fruits, tobacco, turmeric, mustard, etc. No money other than "cowries" (shells) was until recently known, all property being

estimated in "lives," as of bullocks, buffaloes, goats, fowls, etc. Women share in the work of harvest and sowing.

*Diseases and Remedies.* — For external wounds they resort to a poultice of warm mud, made of the earth of the ant-hills. They also cauterize with a hot sickle over a wet cloth. For internal ailments they have no medicines. They consider all diseases to be supernatural, and the priest, being the physician, must discover the deity that is displeased. He divides rice into small heaps, which he dedicates to sundry gods; then he balances a sickle with a thread, puts a few grains upon each end of it, and calls upon the names of the gods, who answer by agitating the sickle, whereupon the grains are counted, and if the number of them be odd he is offended. The priest becomes "full of the god," shakes his head frantically, utters wild and incoherent sentences, etc. Deceased ancestors are invoked in the same way, when offerings of fowls, rice, and liquor are made, which subsequently become the priest's portion.

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

*Mythology.* —

(I.) The catalogue of gods worshipped among the Khonds is extensive.

(1.) At the head of the pantheon is the *Earth-Goddess*, who, with the sun, receives the principal worship. The Earth-Goddess is the superior power, and presides over the productive energies of nature. She is malevolent, and is invoked in war. She controls the seasons, and sends the periodical rains. To her human sacrifices were offered. There are, besides her,

(2.) a God of Limits, who fixes boundaries, and whose altar is on the highways.

(3.) The sun and moon; ceremonially worshipped.

(4.) The God of Arms, to whom a grove is devoted.

(5.) The God of Hunting, worshipped by parties who hunt in companies of thirty or forty, and surround their game.

- (6.) The God of Births, worshipped in case of barrenness.
- (7.) The God of Small-pox, who "sows" that disease as men do the earth with seeds.
- (8.) The Hill-god, without formal worship.
- (9.) The Forest-god, to whom birds, hogs, and sheep are offered.
- (10.) The God of Rain.
- (11.) Of Fountains.
- (12.) Of Rivers.
- (13.) Of Tanks; and
- (14.) the village gods, who are the guardians of localities, and of domestic and familiar worship.

(II.) Besides the above principal gods there are inferior local or partially acknowledged gods, worshipped under symbols of rude stone smeared with turmeric, etc. The great conservative principle is worshipped.

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

*Religious Rites and Sacrifices.* — Nothing was definitely known of the tribes of Gumsur until the British army was brought into collision with them in 1836, subsequently to which the custom of human sacrifices was discovered to exist among them. The British government, after a long series of efforts, succeeded in abolishing it. Major Campbell says, "The Khonds generally propitiated their deity (the Earth-Goddess) with human offerings (p. 38, 39). This had been handed down through successive generations, and was regarded as a national duty. In Gimsur it is offered under the effigy of a bird, in other localities as an elephant (p. 51). The victim, called *Mieriah*, must be purchased, may be of any age, sex, or caste, adults being best, and the more costly the more acceptable. These are purchased from relations in time of famine or poverty, or are stolen from other regions by professed kidnapers of the Panoo caste (p. 52). In some cases Meriah women were allowed to live until they had borne children to Khond fathers, the children being reared for sacrifice.... The

sacrifice, to be efficacious, must be public (p. 53). In Guimsur it was offered annually. The priest officiates. For a month previous there is much feasting, dancing, intoxication, etc. One day before, the victim is stupefied with toddy, and bound, sitting, at the bottom of a post bearing an effigy. The crowd dance, and say, 'O god, we offer this sacrifice to you; give us good crops, seasons, and health.' To the victim they say, 'We bought you with a price, and did not seize you; now we sacrifice you according to our custom, and no sin rests with us' (p. 55). Various other ceremonies are performed, after which they return to the post near the village idol, always represented by three stones, a hog is sacrificed, the blood flows into a pit, the human victim, having been intoxicated, is thrown in and suffocated in the bloody mire. The priest cuts a piece of the flesh and buries it; others do likewise, carrying the flesh to their own villages. In some cases the flesh is cut while the victim is yet alive, and buried as a sacred and supernatural manure."

*Cognate Tribes.* — These and other aboriginal races have received so much attention from ethnographers, philologists, and other scientific men that further details are not needed here. The prominence given to these aboriginal races of late years might justify full articles on the kindred tribes, but, as they are of substantially of the same level, we have chosen to make a tolerably full sketch of the Khonds, as typical of the aboriginal Turanian element in Hindustan. The following copious literature will enable persons to make a pretty exhaustive study of what is known concerning them.

*Literature.* — *Edinburgh Review*, April, 1864; *Calcutta Review*, vol. 5:6:x; *Calcutta Christian Observer*, April, July, 1837; *Transactions of Ethnological Society*, i, 15; 6:24-27; also for 1865, p. 81; B. H. Hodgson, *Aborigines of the Eastern Frontier; Chepang and Busunda Tribes; Aborigines of Southern India* (Calcutta, 1849); *4 borigiues of India* (Calcutta, 1847); M'Pherson's *Reports upon the Khonds of the Districts of Gtunjan and Cubback* (Calcutta, 1842); *A personal Narrative of thirteen Years among the wild Tribes of Khondistan for the Suppression of human Sacrifices*, by Major Genesis John Campbell, C. B. (Lond. 1864)); *Sonthalia and the Sonthals*, by E. G. Man (Lond. 1868); Metz, *The Tribes of the Neilgherries*; Lewin, *Hill Tracts of Chittagong*; Harkness, *Aborigines of the Neilcherries* (London, 1832); *The People of India*, by J. F. Watson and J. W. Kaye, vol. i; *History of the Suppression of Infanticide*, etc., by John Wilson, D.D., F.R.S. (Bombay and London, 1855); Tylor, *Primitive Culture*, vol. i and ii (London, 1871); Lubbock, *Origin of*

*Civilization*, etc. (Lond. 1871) ; Brace, *Races of the Old World* (New York, 1863); Latham, *Elements of Comparative Philology* (Lond. 1862); Anderson, *Foreign Missions* (New York, 1869); M'Lennan, *Primitive Marriage*; Hunter, *Rural Bengal*. (J. T. G.)

## Khorsabad.

SEE NINEVEH.

## Khosru,

or Khusru I, surnamed NUSHIRVAN (*the noble soul*), and known in Byzantine history as *Chosroes I*, the greatest monarch of the Sassanian dynasty, a son of Kobad, king of Persia, mounted the throne in A.D. 531. He is noted in ecclesiastical history for his contests with Justinian (q.v.), and gave shelter to great numbers of those whom Justinian, the Byzantine emperor, persecuted for their religious opinions. He also waged war with Justin II (570), and Justinian, grand-nephew of the emperor of that name. Khosru, however, did not live to see the end of the contest, as he died in 579. His government, though very despotic, and occasionally oppressive, was yet marked by a firmness and energy rarely seen among the Orientals. It was during the reign of this prince that the fanatical followers of Mazdak, who had obtained numerous proselytes to the inviting doctrine of a communism of goods and women, were banished from the lands of the Sassanidae. Persia, during his reign, stretched from the Red Sea to the Indus, and from the Arabian Sea far into Central Asia. "The virtues, and more particularly the justice of this monarch, form to the present day a favorite topic of Eastern panegyric, and the glories and happiness of his reign are frequently extolled by poets as the golden age of the Persian sovereignty. His reign forms an important epoch in the history of science and literature: he founded colleges and libraries in the principal towns of his dominions, and encouraged the translation of the most celebrated Greek and Sanscrit works into the Persian language. A physician at his court, of the name of Barzziyeh, is said to have brought into Persia a Pehlvi translation of those celebrated fables which are known under the name of Bidpai or Pilpay, and it was from this translation of the Indian tales that these fables found their way to nearly every other nation of Western Asia and Europe. The conquests of Khosru were great and numerous; his empire extended from the shores of the Red Sea to the Indus; and the monarchs of India, China, and Thibet are represented by Oriental historians

as sending ambassadors to his court with valuable presents to solicit his friendship and alliance" (*English Cyclopaedia*). See Ewald, *Zeitschrijf fur die Kunde des Alorgenlandes*, i, 185 sq.; Malcolm, *History of Persia* (see Index). **SEE PERSIA.**

## Khosru II,

grandson of the preceding, surnamed PURVIZ (the *Generous*), was raised to the throne in 590. In the first years of the 7th century he opened war upon the Romans, and for seventeen years inflicted upon the Byzantine Empire a series of disasters the like of which they had never before experienced. Syria was conquered in 611, Palestine in 614, Egypt and Asia Minor in 616, and the last bulwark of the capital, Chalcedon, fell soon after. " The Roman Empire was on the brink of ruin; the capture of Alexandria had deprived the inhabitants of Constantinople of their usual supply of corn, the northern barbarians ravaged the European provinces, while another powerful Persian army, already advanced as far as the Bosphorus, was making preparations for the siege of the imperial city. Peace was earnestly solicited by Heraclius, who had succeeded Phocas in 610, but without success. Khosru, however, did not cross the Bosphorus, and at length, in 621, he dictated the terms of an ignominious peace to the emperor. But Heraclius, who had hitherto made very few efforts for the defence of his dominions, rejected these terms, and in a series of brilliant campaigns (A.D. 622-627) recovered all the provinces he had lost, repeatedly defeated the Persian monarch, and advanced in his victorious career as far as the Tigris. Khosru was murdered in the spring of the following year, 628, by his son Siroes." **SEE PERSIA.**

## Khozars.

**SEE KHAZARS.**

## Kibby, Epaphras,

a Methodist minister, was born in Somers, Connecticut, in 1777. In 1793 he joined the Methodist Episcopal Church at New London, and immediately became active in religious duties, and in 1798 entered the ministry. Through his labors Methodism was introduced into Bath and Hallowell, Maine. Melville B. Cox, the first foreign missionary of the M. E. Church, was converted under his preaching in the latter place. He also formed the first Methodist society in New Bedford. He was a local

preacher eleven years; returned superannuated in 1841, in which relation he continued till his death, Sept. 8, 1864. Kibby's habits of study were careful and close, as shown in his accurately-trained reasoning powers, as well as his elegant and forcible diction. He was passionately fond of choice literature and poetry, and was himself a poet of taste and considerable ability. His pulpit talents were of a superior order, his judgment cool and clear, his piety deep and uniform. See *Conf. Minutes*, 1865, p. 60; Stevens, *History of the Methodist Episcopal Church*, 4:35, 72, 73, 481. (J. L. S.)

### Kib'roth-Hatta'ivah

Heb. *Kibroth'-hat-Taivah'*, **חִבְרוֹתַיִם** *graves of the longing*; Sept. **Μνήματα τῆς ἐπιθυμίας**, Vulg. *Sepulchra concupiscence*), the fifteenth station of the Israelites in the desert of Sinai, between Taberah and Hazeroth, so called from being the burial-place of the multitudes that died from gorging themselves with the preternatural supply of quail-flesh (<sup><0413></sup>Numbers 11:34, 35; 33:16, 17; <sup><0802></sup>Deuteronomy 9:22; comp. <sup><0973></sup>Psalms 78:30, 31; <sup><0006></sup>1 Corinthians 10:6). From the omission of Taberah in the list at <sup><0316></sup>Numbers 33:16, and the absence of any statement of removal in Numbers 11, it has been by some inferred that Taberah and Kibrothhattaavah were but different names for the same place; but in <sup><0802></sup>Deuteronomy 9:22 they are clearly distinguished, although they apparently lay not far apart. Kibrothhattaavah was probably situated in wady *AMurrah*, not far N.E. from Sinai (Robinson, *Res.* i, 221 sq.), corresponding in position to the *Erweis el-Eberig*, where Palmer has found traces of an ancient encampment (*Desert of the Exodus*, p. 212 sq.). Schwarz's identification (*Palestine*, p. 213) with *Ain esh-Shehabeh*, in the interior of the desert (Robinson, i, 264), is far astray. **SEE EXODE.**

### Kibza'im

[many *Kib'zaim*] (Hebrew *Kibtsa'yin*, **קִבְצָאִים** *two heaps*; Sept. **Καβσαίμ**), a Levitical city of the tribe of Ephraim, assigned to the Kohathites, and appointed a city of refuge (<sup><0622></sup>Joshua 21:22, where it is mentioned in connection with Gezer and Beth-horon, as if lying on the edge of the mountains of Ephraim); otherwise called JOKMEAM (<sup><1068></sup>1 Chronicles 6:68), which, however, is elsewhere (<sup><0234></sup>Joshua 21:34) assigned to the Merarites in Zebulun, probably by a slight diversity arising from its contiguity to the Kishon, which formed the boundary-line between those tribes (<sup><0311></sup>Joshua 19:11).



## Kid

(properly *ydægedi'*, so called from *cropping* the herbage; more fully, *μyZ[æ ydæ* "kid of the goats;" fem. *hYdægediyah'*, a *she-kid*, Cant. i, 8; also *z[Ā B*, *son of a goat*, <sup><4817></sup>2 Chronicles 35:7, orig.; sometimes for *z[Ēa* *goat*, itself, <sup><0451></sup>Numbers 15:11; <sup><1127></sup>1 Kings 20:27; likewise *ry[æ si'r*, *hairy*, i.e. a goat, <sup><0438></sup>Genesis 35:31; <sup><0423></sup>Leviticus 4:23; 9:3; 16:5; 23:19, etc.; fern. *hry[æ seirah*, <sup><0423></sup>Leviticus 4:28; 5:6; Greek ἔριφος, <sup><0452></sup>Luke 15:29; "goat," <sup><0252></sup>Matthew 25:32, ver. 33 ἔριφίον, diminutive), the young of the goat, reckoned a great delicacy among the ancients; and it appears to have been served for food in preference to the lamb (<sup><0270></sup>Genesis 27:9; 38:17; <sup><0069></sup>Judges 6:19; 14:6; <sup><0161></sup>1 Samuel 16:20). It still continues to be a choice dish among the Arabs. By the Mosaic law, the Hebrews were forbidden to dress a kid in the milk of its dam; and this remarkable prohibition is repeated three several times (<sup><0239></sup>Exodus 23:19; 34:26; <sup><0421></sup>Deuteronomy 14:21). This law has been variously understood. However, it is generally supposed that it was intended to guard the Hebrews against some idolatrous or superstitious practice of the neighboring heathen nations. The practice is quite common with modern Orientals (Thomson, *Land and Book*, i, 135). Kids were also among the sacrificial offerings (<sup><0123></sup>Exodus 12:3, margin; <sup><0423></sup>Leviticus 4:23-26; <sup><0176></sup>Numbers 7:16-87). *SEE GOAT.*

## Kidd, Benjamin,

a noted Quaker minister, was born in Yorkshire, England, about 1692; entered the ministry at the age of twenty-one, emigrated to this country about 1722, and labored here successfully for some time. He afterwards returned, however, to England, and settled at Banbury, Oxfordshire, "where his exemplary conduct gained him the esteem of all ranks and persuasions." He died March 21, 1751. Kidd served his generation in "turning many from darkness to light, and from the paths of disobedience to the wisdom of the just."-Janney, *Hist. of the Friends*, 3:287.

## Kiddah.

*SEE CASSIA.*

## Kidder, Richard, D.D.,

an eminent English prelate and learned Orientalist, was born at Brighthelmstone, in Sussex. He studied at Emanuel College, Cambridge, of which he was elected fellow in 1655. He afterwards became vicar of Stanground, Huntingdonshire, but was ejected in 1662 for nonconformity. He, however, conformed some time after, and became rector of Raine, Essex, in 1664, and successively rector of St. Martin's Outwick, London, in 1674; prebendary of Norwich in 1681; dean of Peterborough in 1689; and finally bishop of Bath and Wells in 1691. He died in 1703. He was considered one of the best divines of his time, and a clear and elegant writer. His principal works are *Demonstration of the Messiah*, etc. (London, 1684, 1699, 1700, 3 vols.; another edit. 1726, fol., and often since): — *The Judgment of private Discretion in Matters of Religion defended*-a sermon on <sup><S1E1></sup>1 Thessalonians 5:21 (Lond. 1687, 4to) :A *Sermon preached before the King and Queen at Whitehall, Nov. 5, 1692* [on <sup><1E14></sup>2 Samuel 24:14] (Lond. 1693, 4to): -*Sermon, <sup><S1E5></sup>Zechariah 7:5, of Fasting* (Lond. 1694, 4to): — *A Commentary on the Five Books of Moses*, etc. (London, 1694, 2 vols. 8vo): — *Bellarmino examined* (Gibson's Preservative, 4:55): — *On Repentance* (Tracts of Angl. Fathers, ii, 300).-Darling, *Encyclop. Bibliograph.* vol. ii, s.v.; Birch, *Life of Tillotson*; Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* s.v.

## Kidderminster.

SEE KYDERMINSTER.

## Kiddushim.

SEE TALMUD.

## Kidney

(only in plur. **תִּבְּלֵי קִי** *kelayoth'*, prob. from the idea of its being the seat of *longing*), the leaf-fat around which was specially to be a burnt-offering, significant of its being the richest and most central part of the victim (<sup><1E29></sup>Exodus 29:13, 22; <sup><1E14></sup>Leviticus 3:4, 10, 15; 4:9; 7:4; 8:16, 25; 9:10, 19; <sup><2E14></sup>Isaiah 34:3). Spoken also of the " *reins*" of a human being, i.e. the inmost soul, which the ancients supposed to be seated in the viscera (compare the Homeric **φρήν**, midriff, hence mind), both in a physical sense (<sup><1E16></sup>Job 16:13; 19:27; <sup><1E13></sup>Psalms 139:13; <sup><2E13></sup>Lamentations 3:13), and

figuratively (<sup><907></sup>Psalm 7:9; 16:7; 26:2; 73:21; <sup><1236></sup>Proverbs 23:16; <sup><2413></sup>Jeremiah 11:20; 12:2; 17:10; 20:12). Sometimes applied to *kernels* of grain, from their kidney-like shape and richness (<sup><624></sup>Deuteronomy 32:14).

## Kid'ron

(Heb. *Kidron'*, <sup><170></sup>*רְדִיחַן* *turbid*, compare <sup><1866></sup>Job 6:16; Sept. *Κέδρων*, N.T. *Κεδρών*, <sup><610></sup>John 18:1, where some copies erroneously have *Κεδρῶν*, and the Auth. Version "Cedron;" Josephus *Kespcuv*, Genesis - *ὠνος*), the brook or winter torrent which flows through the valley of Jehoshaphat (as it is now called), on the east side of Jerusalem (see 1 Macc. 12:37). "The brook Kidron" is the only name by which "the valley" itself is known in Scripture, for it is by no means certain that the name "Valley of Jehoshaphat" in Joel (<sup><2082></sup>Joel 3:12) was intended to apply to this valley. The word rendered "brook" (<sup><1053></sup>2 Samuel 15:23; <sup><1027></sup>1 Kings 2:37; 15:13; <sup><1236></sup>2 Kings 23:6, 12; <sup><4156></sup>2 Chronicles 15:16; 29:16; 30:14; <sup><2644></sup>Jeremiah 31:40; compare <sup><4025></sup>Nehemiah 2:15; <sup><3164></sup>Amos 6:14) is *l j ñi nachal*, which may be taken as equivalent to the Arabic *wady*, meaning a stream *and* its bed or valley, or properly the valley of a stream, even when the stream is dry. The Septuagint and evangelist (in the above passages), as well as Josephus (*Ant.* 8:1, 5; but *φάραγξ* in 9:7,3; *War.* 5:6, 1), designate it *χειμαρῶν*, a storm brook, or winter torrent. But it would seem as if the name were formerly applied also to the ravines surrounding other portions of Jerusalem, the south or west, since Solomon's prohibition to Shimei to "pass over the torrent Kidron" (1 Kings ii, 37; Josephus, *Ant.* 8:1, 5) is said to have been broken by the latter when he went in the direction of Gath to seek his fugitive slaves (ver. 41,42). Now a person going to Gath would certainly not go by the way of the Mount of Olives, or approach the eastern side of the city at all. The route—whether Gath were at Beit-Jibrin or at Tell es-Safieh — would be by the Bethlehem gate, and then nearly due west. Perhaps the prohibition may have been a more general one than is implied in ver. 37 (comp. the king's reiteration of it in ver. 42), the Kidron being in that case specially mentioned because it was on the road to Bahurim, Shimei's home, and the scene of his crime. At any rate, beyond the passage in question, there is no evidence of the name Kidron having been applied to the southern or western ravines of the city.

The Kidron is mentioned several times in the Scripture history, being the memorable brook which David crossed barefoot and weeping when fleeing from Absalom (<sup><1053></sup>2 Samuel 15:23, 30); and Jesus must often have crossed

it on his way to the Mt. of Olives and Bethany (see <sup><6181></sup>John 18:1). According to the Talmud, the blood of the animals slaughtered in the Temple, and other refuse (probably the impurities from the city, *Nazir*, lvii, 4), were carried through a sewer into the lower Kidron, and thence sold as manure to gardeners (*Joma*, lviii, 2). For early notices of the Kidron, see William of Tre, 8:2; Brocardus, p. 8; Reland, p. 294 sq. The distinguishing peculiarity of the Kidron—that in respect to which it is most frequently mentioned in the O.T. is the impurity which appears to have been ascribed to it. Excepting the two casual notices already quoted, we first meet with it as the place in which king Asa demolished and burnt the obscene phallic idol, *SEE ASHERAH*, of his mother (<sup><1151></sup>1 Kings 15:13; <sup><4151></sup>2 Chronicles 15:16). Next we find the wicked Athaliah hurried thither to execution (*Joseph. Ant.* 9:7, 3; <sup><1116></sup>2 Kings 11:16). It then becomes the regular receptacle for the impurities and abominations of the idol-worship, when removed from the Temple and destroyed by the adherents of Jehovah (<sup><4916></sup>2 Chronicles 29:16; 30:14; <sup><1234></sup>2 Kings 23:4, 6, 12). In the course of these narratives the statement of Josephus just quoted as to the death of Athaliah is supported by the fact that in the time of Josiah it was the common cemetery of the city (<sup><1236></sup>2 Kings 23:6; comp. <sup><3453></sup>Jeremiah 26:23, "graves of the common people"), perhaps the "valley of dead bodies" mentioned by Jeremiah (<sup><3340></sup>Jeremiah 31:40) in close connection with the "fields" of Kidron, and the restoration of which to sanctity was to be one of the miracles of future times (*ibid.*). It was doubtless the Kidron valley which was in the mind of the prophet Ezekiel when he described the vision of the holy and healing waters flowing from the Temple through the desert into the sea (<sup><3478></sup>Ezekiel 47:8); and this very contrast with its customary uses serves to add emphasis to his prophecy (comp. Wilson, *Lands of the Bible*, ii, 32; Stanley, *Syr. and Pal.* p. 288). How long the valley continued to be used for a burying-place it is very hard to ascertain. After the capture of Jerusalem in 1099 the bodies of the slain were buried outside the Golden Gateway (*Mislin*, ii, 487; *Tobler, Umgebungen*, p. 218); but what had been the practice in the interval the writer has not succeeded in tracing. To the date of the monuments at the foot of Olivet we have at present no clue; but, even if they are of pre-Christian times, there is no proof that they are tombs. From the date just mentioned, however, the burials appear to have been constant, and at present it is the favorite resting-place of Moslems and Jews, the former on the west, the latter on the east of the valley. The Moslems are mostly confined to the narrow level spot between the foot of the wall and the commencement of the precipitous slope, while the Jews

have possession of the lower part of the slopes of Olivet, where their scanty tombstones are crowded so thick together as literally to cover the surface like a pavement.

The Kidron is a mountain ravine, in most places narrow, with precipitous banks of naked limestone; but here and there its banks have an easy slope, and along its bottom are strips of land capable of cultivation. It contains the bed of a streamlet, but during the whole summer, and most of the winter, it is perfectly dry; in fact, no water runs in it except when heavy rains are falling in the mountains round Jerusalem. The resident missionaries assured Dr. Robinson that they had not during several years seen a stream running through the valley (see *Bibl. Researches*, i, 396-402). On the broad summit of the mountain ridge of Judaea, a mile and a quarter north-west of Jerusalem, is a slight depression; this is the head of the Kidron. The sides of the depression, and the elevated ground around it, are whitened by the broad, jagged tops of limestone rocks, and almost every rock is excavated, partly as a quarry, and partly to form the facade of a tomb. The valley or depression runs for about half a mile towards the city; it is shallow and broad, dotted with corn-fields, and sprinkled with a few old olives. It then bends eastward, and in another half mile is crossed by the great northern road coming down from the hill Scopus. On the east side of the road, and south bank of the Kidron, are the celebrated Tombs of the Kings. The bed of the valley is here about half a mile due north of the city gate. It continues in the same course about a quarter of a mile farther, and then, turning south, opens into a wide basin containing cultivated fields and olives. Here it is crossed diagonally by the road from Jerusalem to Anathoth. As it advances southward, the right bank, forming the side of the hill Bezetha, becomes higher and steeper, with occasional precipices of rock, on which may be seen a few fragments of the ancient city wall; while on the left the base of Olivet projects, greatly narrowing the valley. Opposite St. Stephen's gate the depth is fully 100 feet, and the breadth not more than 400 feet. The olive-trees in the bottom are so thickly clustered as to form a shady grove; and their massive trunks and gnarled boughs give evidence of great age. This spot is shut out from the city, from the view of public roads, and from the notice and interruption of wayfarers. *SEE GETHSEMANE*. A zigzag path descends the steep bank from St. Stephen's gate, crosses the bed of the valley by an old bridge, and then branches. One branch leads direct over the top of Olivet. This path has a deep historical interest; it was by it that David went when he fled from Absalom: "The

king passed over the brook Kidron, and all the people passed over, towards the way of the wilderness" (<sup><1053></sup>2 Samuel 15:23). *SEE OLIVET.* Another branch runs round the southern shoulder of the hill to Bethany, and it has a deep sacred interest, for it is the road of Christ's triumphal entry (<sup><1201></sup>Matthew 21:1 sq.; <sup><1257></sup>Luke 19:37). Below the bridge the Kidron becomes still narrower, and here traces of a torrent bed first begin to appear. Three hundred yards farther down, the hills on each side—Moriah on the right and Olivet on the left—rise precipitously from the torrent bed, which is spanned by a single arch. On the left bank is a singular group of tombs, comprising those of Absalom, Jehoshaphat, and St. James (now so called); while on the right, 150 feet overhead, towers the south-eastern angle of the Temple wall, most probably the "pinnacle" on which our Lord was placed (<sup><1045></sup>Matthew 4:5). The ravine runs on, narrow and rocky, for 500 yards more; there, on its right bank, in a cave, is the fountain of the Virgin; and higher up on the left, perched on the side of naked cliffs, the ancient village of Siloam. A short distance farther down, the valley of the Tyropeeon falls in from the right, descending in terraced slopes, fresh and green, from the waters of the Pool of Siloam. The Kidron here expands, affording a level tract for cultivation, and now covered with beds of cucumbers, melons, and other vegetables. Here of old was the "King's Garden" (<sup><1485></sup>Nehemiah 3:15). The level tract extends down to the mouth of Hinnom, and is about 200 yards wide. A short distance below the junction of Hinnom and the Kidron is the fountain of En-Rogel, now called Bir Aylb, "the Well of Job," or "Joab." The length of the valley from its head to En-Rogel is 2- miles, and here the historic Kidron may be said to terminate. Every reference to the Kidron in the Bible is made to this section. David crossed it at a point opposite the city (<sup><1953></sup>1 Samuel 15:23); it was the boundary beyond which Solomon forbade Shimei to go on pain of death (<sup><1027></sup>1 Kings 2:37); it was here, probably, near the mouth of Hinnom, that Asa destroyed the idol which Maachah his mother set up (15:13); and it seems to have been at the same spot, "in the fields of Kidron," that king Josiah ordered the vessels of Baal to be burned (<sup><1234></sup>2 Kings 23:4). It would seem, from <sup><1236></sup>2 Kings 23:6, that a portion of the Kidron, apparently near the mouth of Hinnom, was used as a burying-ground. The sides of the surrounding cliffs are filled with ancient rock tombs, and the greatest boon the dying Jew now asks is that his bones be laid in the Valley of Jehoshaphat. The whole of the left bank of the Kidron, opposite the Temple area, far up the side of Olivet, is paved with the white tombstones of Jews. This singular longing is doubtless to be ascribed to the

opinion which the Jews entertain that the Kidron is the *Valley of Jehoshaphat* mentioned by Joel (~~29RD~~ Joel 3:2). **SEE JEHOSHAPHAT, VALLEY OF.** Below En-Rogel the Kidron has little of historical or sacred interest. It runs in a winding course east by south, through the Wilderness of Judaea, to the Dead Sea. For about a mile below En-Rogel the bottom of the valley is cultivated and thickly covered with olive-trees. Farther down a few fields of corn are met with at intervals, but these soon disappear, and the ravine assumes the bleak and desolate aspect of the surrounding hills. About seven miles from Jerusalem the features of the valley assume a much wilder and grander form. Hitherto the banks have been steep, with here and there a high precipice, and a jutting cliff, giving variety to the scene. Now they suddenly contract to precipices of naked rock nearly 300 feet in height, which look as if the mountain had been torn asunder by an earthquake. About a mile farther, on the side of this frightful chasm, stands the convent of St. Saba, one of the most remarkable buildings in Palestine, founded by the saint whose name it bears, in the year A.D. 439. The sides of the chasm both above and below the convent are filled with caves and grottoes, once the abode of monks and hermits, and from these doubtless this section of the valley has got its modern name, *Wady er-Raheb*, "Monk's Valley" (Wolcott, *Researches in Pal.*, il Biblical Cabinet, xliii, 38). Below Mar Saba the valley is called *Wady en-Nar*, "Valley of Fire"-a name descriptive of its aspect, for so bare and scorched is it that it seems as if it had participated in the doom of Sodom. It runs on, a deep, narrow, wild chasm, until it breaks through the lofty line of cliffs at Ras el-Feshkhah, on the shore of the Dead Sea. It will thus be seen that the head of the Kidron is just on the verge of the water-shed of the mountain-chain of Judah, about 2600 feet above the sea. Its length, as the crow flies, is only twenty miles, and yet in this short space it has a descent of no less than 3912 feet-the Dead Sea having a depression of 1312 feet (Van de Velde, *Memoir*, p. 179, 182).-Kitto; Smith. In 1848 the levelling party of the Dead Sea Expedition, under command of Lieut. Lynch, worked up the wady en-Nar, the bed of the Kidroll, from the Dead Sea to Jerusalem. They encountered several precipices from ten to twelve feet high, down which cataracts plunge in winter. They found the ravine shut in on each side by high, barren cliffs of chalky limestone, and the dry torrent-bed interrupted by boulders, and covered with fragments of stone (*Narrative*, p. 384, 387). The place where it empties into the Jordan is a gorge 1200 feet deep, narrow at the bottom, with a bed tilled with confused fragments of rock,

much worn, but perfectly dry (*ib.*). For further notices, see Ritter's *Erdkunde*, xv,(600; Robinson, *Biblical Researches*, ut sup.

## Kief

or Kiev, the name of the chief town of the government of that name, on the west bank of the Dnieper, one of the oldest of the Russian towns, and formerly the capital (containing 60,000 inhabitants, with a university and a theological school), was in 864 taken from the Khazars by two Norman chiefs, companions of Ruric, and conquered from them by Oleg, Ruric's successor, who made it his capital. In 1240 (when it ceased to be the capital) it was nearly destroyed by Batfkhan of Kiptchak. Christianity was first proclaimed in Russia at Kief in 988. In the 14th century it was seized by Gedimin, grand duke of Lithuania, and annexed to Poland in 1569, but in 1686 was restored to Russia. Kief is the oldest Russian metropolitan's residence, the cradle of Russian Christianity. It is also noted on account of two Church (Greek) councils that have been held there. See Landon, *Manual of Church Councils*.

**(a)** The first of these convened about 1147, and is noted for the manner in which the bishops elected a metropolitan in the place of Michael II. With the exception of Niphont of Novocorod, they all agreed to take the election into their own hands, without allowing to the patriarch of Constantinople the exercise of his right either to nominate or confirm. Niphont strongly protested against the step, but without effect. The choice of the synod fell upon Clement, a monk of Smolensk. As a substitute for the patriarchal consecration, Onuphrius proposed that the hand of St. Clement of Rome, whose relics had been brought from Cherson, should be placed upon his head. This election led to great disorder, and subsequently the patriarch Luke Chysoberges consecrated Constantine metropolitan, who condemned the acts of this synod, and suspended for a time all the clergy ordained by Clement.-Mouravieff's *Hist. Russ. Church* (by Blackmore), p. 35.

**(b)** Another council was convened here in 1622. Meletius, archbishop of Polotsk, at one time a most zealous defender of the orthodox Church in Russia, had been obliged to flee into Greece upon a groundless suspicion of having been concerned in the murder of Jehoshaphat, Uniate archbishop of Polotsk, and, urged by fear, had given himself up to the Uniate party, and written an apology in censure of the orthodox Church; in this council



he was called to account, made to perform open penance, and to tear his book. Soon after he entirely apostatized; and, going to Rome, had the title of archbishop of Hieropolis conferred on him.-Mouraviftl, r. 179.

In the neighborhood of Kief is the convent of KievoPetchersk, a celebrated Russian sanctuary, which annually attracts thousands of pilgrims from the most remote corners of the empire. In the days of king Wladimir, the river Bug, near this city, was considered sacred by many Russian sects, and in many respects Kief, in those days, resembled the city of Benares in India. The reader can best obtain a view of the worship of rivers in the East by turning to the article *SEE GANGES* (comp. Vollmer, *Mythol. Worterbuch*, p. 1049).

### Kiernander, John Zachariah,

a Swedish Protestant missionary, was born at Axtadt, Ostrogothia (now the laen Lindkoping), Dec. 1, 1710. He studied at the school of Lindkoping, and afterwards at the universities of Upsal and Halle. Professor Franke recommended him to the English Society for the Diffusion of Christian Knowledge. and he was sent to India in 1740. Here he labored zealously for sixty years, and acquired such reputation that the shah of Persia intrusted to him the Arabic translation of the Psalm s and the N.T. In 1767 he established at Calcutta a church, which was opened in 1770, but, as he was obliged to bear the expense almost exclusively himself, he was reduced to poverty. Kiernander was successively connected with the Dutch Church at Chinsurah, Bengal, and when that town was taken by the English in 1795 he was made prisoner, but afterwards permitted to settle at Calcutta. He died inl 1799. See Walch, *Neueste Religionsgesch.*; *Acta Historico-ecclesiastica* ; *Asiatic Annual Register*; Rose, *New Biographical Dictionary*; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 22:715. (J. N. P.)

### Kiesling, Johann Rudolph,

a German Protestant theologian, was born at Erfurt, Oct. 21, 1706; became first deacon of Wittemberg in 1738, extraordinary professor of philosophy at Leipzig in 1740, professor of Oriental languages in the same university in 1746, and, finally, professor of theology at Erlangen in 1762. He retained this latter position until his death, April 17, 1778. He wrote a large number of works, the most remarkable of which are, *Exercitationes in quibus J. Chr. Trombelli Dissertationes de cultu sanctorum modeste*

*diluuntur* (Lpzg. 1742-1746, 3 pts. 4to): — *Historia de Usu Symbolorum* (Lpzg. 1753, 8vo): — *De Disciplina Clericorum, ex epistolis ecclesiast. conspicua, Liber* (Lpzg. and Nuremberg, 1760, 8vo):-Programs. *antiquoris Ecclesie Christiane hereticos contra immaculatam Marice Virginis conceptionem testes sistit* (Erlangen, 1775, 4to): — *Lehr-ebaude d. Wiedertazifer* (Revel, 1776, 8vo). He also published during the years 1756-61 the theological journal entitled *Neue Beitrige von alten u. neuen theolog. Sachen*, established by J. E. Knapp in 1751 (Lpzg. 8vo). See Winer, *Handb. d. theologischen Literatur*; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Geulrale*, 27:716. (J. N. P.)

### Kiffin, William,

a distinguished English Baptist minister, born in 1616, originally a merchant, by his wealth exerted great influence at the courts of king Charles II and James II, and thereby indirectly secured many favors to his brethren. By his means the false and scurrilous pamphlet entitled '*Baxter Baptized in Blood*' was examined and condemned; and by his intercession, also, twelve Baptists who had been condemned to death at Aylesbury received the king's pardon. In 1683, two of his grandsons, Benjamin and William Hewling, young gentlemen of great fortunes, accomplished education, and eminent piety, were concerned in the ill-timed and illfated expedition of the duke of Monmouth, which terminated in the destruction of almost all who had any hand in it, including the two Hewlings, though every effort was made by Kiffin to save their lives. Kiffin was pastor of the Baptist church, Devonshire Square, London, from 1639 to 1701. He died Sept. 29, 1701, at an advanced age, "leaving behind him a character of rare excellence, tried alike by the fire of prosperity and adversity in the most eventful times." He wrote in favor of strict communion in reply to John Bunyan, opposed Dr. Featley in the famous disputation at Southwark, and was handled with severity by Edwards in his *Ganyrceana*. He is regarded as the father of the "Particular Baptists." An estimate may be formed of the high position Kiffin must have occupied in his day if Macaulay (*History of England, vol. ii*) could say, "Great as was the authority of Bunyan with Baptists, that of William Kiffin- was still greater. Kiffin was the first man among them in wealth and station." "His portrait," says Skeats (*Hist. English Free Churches*, p. 154), "does not bear out the once current impression concerning the Baptists of that age. With skull-cap and flowing ringlets, with mustache and 'imperial,' with broad lace collar and ample gown (see his portrait in Wilson's *Dissenting Churches*, i, 403), he

resembles a gentleman Cavalier rather than any popular ideal of a sour-visaged and discontented Anabaptist." See Crosby, *Hist. Engl. Baptists; and Lives* (Lond. 1659, 4to, and one by Joseph Gurney, 1833, 8vo; also his Autobiography, edited by Orme, Lond. 1823, 8vo). (J. H. W.)

### Kikayon.

*SEE GOURD.*

### Kilburn, David,

a Methodist Episcopal minister, born at Gilsum, N. H., October 24, 1784, was converted when seventeen years old, licensed to preach in 1805, and, after three years' labor as a local preacher, was received into the New England Conference, and obtained his first appointment at Union, Me. His subsequent stations were Readfield, Me.; Stanstead, Canada; Danville, Barnard and White River, Needham, Boston, Portland, Me.; Wethersfield and Barre, Vt.; Providence, R. I.; Lowell, Lynn-Common, Bridgewater. North-west Bridgewater, Waltham, Barre, Ashburnham, South Royalston, Enfield, and Southampton. He travelled also the following districts as presiding elder: Portland District, Maine Conference; New Hampshire, Boston, Springfield, and Providence Districts, in the New England Conference. In 1851 he became superannuated, in 1852-53 effective, in 1854 supernumerary, in 1856 effective, in 1858 again supernumerary, and in 1859 he again became superannuated, in which relation he remained till the time of his death, July 13, 1865. Kilburn " was a man of great endurance, and constitutionally qualified for the immense labor he performed; of sound judgment, clear understanding, strong will; earnest and conscientious in the performance of duty. During his laborious ministry he sustained a high reputation and exerted a powerful influence . . . His prudent foresight, his comprehensive views, his knowledge of men, his almost intuitive perception of character, his urbanity, his high moral and Christian virtues, entitled him to an honorable social and official position in the Church which he so faithfully served."-Conf. *Minutes*, 1866, p. 56.

### Kilbye, Richard,

an English theologian, was born at Ratcliffe in the second half of the 16th century, and was educated at Oxford University, with which he was identified throughout life; he was its rector in 1590, and held a professorship of the Hebrew language. He died Nov. 7, 1620. Richard

Kilbye was one of the translators of king James's version of the Bible. He also published several *Sermons* (1613, etc.) and a *Commentary on Exodus*.

Another English divine of the same name flourished about the same time in Warwickshire. He died in 1617, and is the author of a work entitled *Burden of a loadened Conscience* (1616, 8vo; often reprinted).-Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Dict.* 27:720; Allibone, *Dict. of English and American Authors*, vol. ii, s.v.

## Kildare,

an ancient church in central Ireland, founded A.D. 480, derived its name from the Irish *celle*, church, and *dair*, the oak, and was at first established by St. Bridget as a Christian school, and afterwards called a nunnery, for the purpose of teaching pagan women, married or single, the doctrines and duties of Christianity. Soon a town or city grew up around it, and in later times it formed an extensive diocese. In the early period of Ireland's history it is nothing remarkable to find woman assuming the position of public instructor; Druidism, the former religion of Ireland, assigned offices to females. In the early history of the Irish Church we have several intimations that Christian women were employed in its services. St. Patrick, in his *Confession*, sect. 18, writes about a woman of noble birth, of the daughters of the minor king, and even handmaids in servitude, who were active in the cause of Christianity. The *Book of Armagh*, an accredited manuscript of the 7th century, in speaking of an earlier period, says expressly, "The early Irish Christians did not reject the fellowship and help of woman, for they were founded on the rock, and did not fear the blast of temptation." St. Bridget, the founder of this church and female seminary, tradition says, died about A. 1). 515, at an advanced age, loved in life and lamented in death. In honor of her memory, through an extent of fourteen centuries, in different countries and in different languages, millions have been called by her name; more children, perhaps, than after any other Christian woman whose name is not in the inspired records. Her memory was cherished by the Picts and the British Scots, but in no place except Kildare was it more honored than in the Hebrides, where at a later and less pure age she became the patroness of their churches. Several lives of her have been written by foreigners and in different languages, but the best and the fullest is said to be that by St. Ultan, the materials for which he obtained from a manuscript in the monastery of Ratisbon, Germany. See Moore, *Hist. of Ireland*; Ware's *Irish Antiquities*; Todd, *Irish Church*, p. 28. (D. D.)

## Kilham, Alexander

one of the most celebrated characters in the history of Methodism, the founder of the "New Connection of Wesleyan Methodists," frequently called simply "Kilhamites," and really the first man in the Methodist connection who advocated the representation of the lay element in the government of the Church, was born at Epworth, England, July 10, 1762. His parents were Methodists, and he enjoyed a training strictly in accordance with their own religious convictions. Vacillating in character and impetuous in temper in his youthful days, he struggled hard against all religious impressions, but was finally converted at the age of eighteen, and shortly after began preaching. Brackenbury, one of Wesley's right-hand men, met young Kilham one day at Epworth while himself on a preaching excursion, and engaged him at once as his travelling companion. In Brackenbury's missionary visit to the Channel Islands, Kilham proved himself an able assistant. In 1785, shortly after their return from the islands, Wesley received Kilham into the regular itinerant ministry. Like all other laborers of early Methodism, his ministrations frequently met with opposition, and an encounter with a mob was almost a daily experience. At Bolton his chapel was stoned; at Alford market-place he was attacked by a clergyman and a constable; at Spilsby he was assailed with dirt and eggs. In another place gunpowder was laid under the spot where he expected to preach, with a train extending some distance, but without effect, for he took his stand elsewhere and escaped the danger. It was amid such difficulties and trials that Kilham zealously labored for the cause of his Master. In 1791 the founder of Methodism expired. During the life of Wesley there had been no actual separation of the Wesleyans from the Established Church. He had been careful to avoid religious meetings during the hours for public worship in the Establishment. He had never allowed the celebration of the ordinances of baptism and the Lord's Supper by his own preachers; his people received these at the hands of the ministers of the Established Church. Frequently a voice dissenting from this course was heard from among the Wesleyan ministers. Kilham himself had dared, three years before the death of Wesley, to record the wish, "Let us have the liberty of Englishmen, and give the Lord's Supper to our societies." About the time of Wesley's death he wrote, "I have had several warm contests with a friend because I would not have my child baptized in the usual way. The storm, however, soon blew over. I hope God will open the eyes of the Methodists to see their sin and folly in their inconsistent connection with

the Church." The opposition against ecclesiastical subserviency to the laws of the Church of England became more determined after the decision of the Conference at Manchester, July 26, 1791, the first after Mr. Wesley's death, to "take the plan as Mr. Wesley had left it." "The controversy could not," says Stevens (*History of Methodism*, 3:38), "but be resumed, and more definite results must be reached before the Church could be at rest. Partisans of the national Church regarded the pledge as binding the Methodists to the Establishment; the advocates of progress dissented, and, in the language of Pawson, declared, 'Not so; our old plan has been to follow the openings of Providence, and to alter or amend the plan as we saw it needful, in order to be more useful in the hand of God.' Hanby, whom Wesley had authorized to administer the sacraments, still claimed the right to do so wherever the societies wished him. Pawson wrote the same year that if the people were denied the sacraments they would leave the connection in many places. Taylor was determined to administer them in Liverpool; and Atmore wrote that, having 'solemnly promised upon his knees before God and his people that he would give all diligence not only to preach the word, but to administer the sacraments in the Church of God,' he would do so wherever required by the people. 'We were as much divided,' he later wrote, 'in our views and practice as before;' and numerous disputes occurred during the year respecting the administration of the sacraments and a total separation from the Church of England. Circular letters in great abundance were sent into different parts of the kingdom, and the minds of the people were much diverted from the pursuit of more sublime objects by others which tended but little to the profit of the soul.' The diversified opinions of the connection were, in fine, resolving themselves into three classes, and giving rise to as many parties, composed respectively of men who, from their attachment to the Establishment, wished no change, unless it might be a greater subordination to the national Church by the abandonment of the sacraments in those cases where Wesley had admitted them; of such as wished to maintain Wesley's plan intact, with official provisions which might be requisite to administer it; and such as desired revolutionary changes, with a more equal distribution of powers among laymen and preachers." Kilham belonged to the third party, and used all the means at his command to influence the leaders in that direction. At the next Conference, however, he was severely criticised for his assertion of the popular rights, and for the publication of a pamphlet on the *Progress of Liberty*, in which he urged a distribution of the power of government between the clerical and the lay elements. In the course of the

controversy severe remarks had been thrown out by Kilham, which were construed by the preachers into defamations of the society, and at the London Conference of 1796 he was formally arraigned, and expelled from the connection. This summary process precipitated the division of sentiment, and resulted in the establishment of an independent body (now known as the *New Connection Methodists*) in 1797 at Ebenezer Chapel. **SEE METHODISTS, NEW CONNECTION.** A writer in the *Wesleyan Times* of May 12, 1862, furnishes documents which go to prove that Kilham's course, both in 1793-4, and even as late as 1796, had the approval of the most celebrated leaders of Methodism. At that time Dr. Adam Clarke, Pawson, Bromwell, and Cownley, all earnestly indorsed the movement. Kilham himself did not long survive the ecclesiastical censure of his brethren. He died July 20, 1798. It is but just to his memory to say that he is acknowledged by all to have been a man of fervent piety, and that he was animated by great zeal for the success of the Wesleyan cause. What he actually sought to accomplish was the entire separation of the Methodists from the Established Church, with a due representation of the lay element in the government of the new Church, to be formed at once. See, for a fuller discussion of this subject, besides the article **SEE NEW CONNECTION METHODISTS**, and the authorities already quoted, Smith, *Hist. of Wesleyan Methodism* (new edition), ii, 36 sq.; Cooke, *Hist. of Kilham*. (J. H. W.)

### Kilhamites.

**SEE KILHAM.**

### Kilian

or Kyllina, a saint of the Roman Catholic Church, and bishop of Wurzburg in the 7th century, was a native of Ireland, and a member of that distinguished body of Irish missionaries among the Teutonic nations to whose labors in the 6th and 7th centuries Christianity and civilization were so largely indebted in the southern and south-eastern countries of Europe. He was of a noble family, and while yet young entered the monastic life in his native country. Having undertaken, in company with several of his fellow-monks, a pilgrimage to Rome, he was seized, on his journey (A.D. 665) through the still pagan province of Thuringia, with a desire to devote himself to its conversion, and with his fellow-pilgrims, the presbyter Colman and the deacon Donattus, he secured for the project at Rome, in

687, the sanction of pope Conon, by whom he was ordained bishop. On his return he succeeded in converting the duke Gosbert, with many of his subjects, and in opening the way for the complete conversion of Thuringia. Unfortunately, however, Kilian provoked the enmity of Geilana, who, although the widow of Gosbert's brother, had been married to Gosbert, by declaring the marriage invalid, and having induced Gosbert to separate from her, he was murdered at her instigation, during the absence of Gosbert in 789, together with both his fellow-missionaries, and the Bible, Church monuments, and ecclesiastical vestments consigned to the flames. After Gosbert's return Geilana denied the deed, but both she and the murderer fell a prey to insanity, and Gosbert himself fell by the hands of a murderer, his son Hedan II was deposed, and, indeed, his whole family became extinct. Such are the oldest legends concerning Kilian's fate. One of them, written in the 10th or 11th century, is to be found in Mabillon, *Act. Sanct.* (ii, 991); another, with some arbitrary variations, in Surius (iv, 131). Yet this legend appears somewhat doubtful, since no mention is otherwise made of any British missionaries before Boniface. Rhabanus Maurus (Canisius, *Lect. Atiq.* ii, 2, p. 333) claims that Gosbert himself condemned Kilian in 847 on account of his preaching. As to the punishment said to have overtaken all the family of Gosbert, it is contradicted by history, for Hedan II was yet in peaceful possession of his dukedom in 716, remained in relation with the British missionaries, and gave St. Willebrord some land at Arnstadt and Miühlberg, near Gotha. The facts may be that Kilian belonged to the Anglo-Saxon Roman Church, and that his death was caused by his strict enforcement of the rules concerning matrimony. Before his appointment to Thuringia Kilian seems to have already distinguished himself in the ministry. Mosheim says, " He exercised his ministerial functions with great success among the Franks, and vast numbers of them embraced Christianity" (*Eccles. History*, i, 441). Hence he is sometimes denominated "the Apostle of Franconia." The Rev. Mr. DeVinne, a writer on the early Church history of Ireland, gives credence to the legend concerning Kilian's missionary efforts in Germany, and his sad fate, on the ground that " towards the close of the 7th century there appear to have been a great number of Irish ecclesiastics and scholars in Germany and other parts of Central Europe. Many of these, that they might be the more useful to the people, translated their names into Latin or German, and in all things not sinful identified themselves with the different nationalities among whom they labored. To this class belong Wiro, Rumbold, bishop of Mechlin, Florentius, bishop of Strasburg, Colman, Albinus, Clementus, and



many others, of whom Mosheim said there were 'French and Irish who refused a blind submission, and gave much trouble to Rome' " (comp. De Vinne, *Primit. Irish Ch.*). See Ign. Gropp, *Lebensbesch. d. heiligen Kiliani Bischofens u. dessen Gesellen* (Wtirtzburg, 1738, 4to); J. Rion, *Leben u. Tod d. heil. Kilian* (Aschaffenburg, 1834); J. Ch. A. Seiders, *Bonifacius*, etc. (Mayence, 1845), p. 97 sq.; F. W. Rettberg, *Kirchengesch. Deutschl.* (Göttingen, 1848), ii, 303; Todd, *Irish Church*, p. 70 sq. (J. H. W.)

### Killigrew, Henry, D.D.,

an English divine, was born in 1612, and educated at Christ Church, Oxford, where he graduated in 1628. He was made chaplain to James, duke of York, and prebend of Westminster, in 1642, and died about 1685. His *Sermons* were published (1666, 4to; 1685, 4to; 1689, 4to; and 1695, 4to: the last edition was by bishop Patrick, who highly eulogized the abilities of Killigrew as a pulpit orator). Allibone, *Dict. of Engl. and Amer. Authors*, vol. ii, s.v.

### Kilvert, Francis,

an English theologian and teacher, was born in Bath in 1793. His early education was under the instruction of Dr. Rowlandson, at Hungerford; afterwards he was at the Bath Grammar School, where, because of his superior acquirements, he was engaged as one of the assistant masters prior to his entering Oxford. He went to Worcester College in 1811, was ordained deacon in 1816, and priest in 1817. His first curacy was that of Claverton, near Bath. In 1837 he became possesser of Claverton Lodge, in which he continued to teach privately until his death, Sept. 19, 1863. Kilvert was a man of uncommon purity of life, and as an instructor of the youth his precepts and holy example were invaluable. He published a volume of *Sermons* (preached in St. Mary's Church, Bathwick, 1827):—*Selection from unpublished Papers of Bishop Warburton* (1841):—*Collection of original Latin Inscriptions*; and *Memoirs of Bishop Hurd* (1860). See Appleton, *American Annual Cyclopaedia*, 1863, p. 571. (J. L. S.)

### Kilwardeby, Robert

a noted English prelate, flourished in the second half of the 13th century. He was educated at the universities of Oxford and Paris. In 1272 he became archbishop of Canterbury, and in 1277 was made cardinal. He died

in 1279. Cardinal Kilwardeby is said to have written as many as 39 different works, but none of these were ever printed. See Iloefor, *Nouv. Biog.* <sup>ⲁⲓⲧⲱ</sup>Genesis 27:730.

### Kimashon.

*SEE THORN.*

### Kimber, Isaac,

an English dissenting minister, born at Wantage, Berkshire, in 1692, was educated at Gresham College, London, and the Dissenters' Academy, and in 1724 became pastor at Namptwich, Cheshire, but resigned in 1727 on account of some difficulties with his congregation, and returned to London, where he published a periodical which lived some four years. He was also employed by booksellers in various literary undertakings, compiling a number of historical works. among which we remark the *Life of Oliver Cromwell* (London, 1714, 8vo). He wrote also the *Life of bishop Beveridge* prefixed to the folio edition of that prelate's works, of which he was *editor*:-*Sermons, etc., to which is prefixed Memoirs of the Life and Writings of the Author* (London, 1756, 8vo). He died in 1758. See Chalmers, *General Biographical Dictionary*; Allibone, *Dictionary of English and American Authors*, vol. ii, s.v. (J. N. P.)

### Kimchi, David, Ben-Joseph

(by the Jews frequently called *Redak*, from the initial letters **q8dr = yj mq dwd 8r**), one of the most distinguished Jewish writers of the Middle Ages, the great exponent of Hebrew grammar and lexicography, was born at Narbonne, in the south of France, in 1160. Very little is known of his private life. He must certainly have enjoyed, even among his contemporaries, considerable influence, gained perhaps, in a measure, by his masterly defence of Moses Maimonides; for in 1232 we find him acting as the arbiter to settle the dispute then existing between the Spanish and French rabbis respecting the opinions advanced in the *More Nebokim* of Maimonides. He died about 1240. His works are:

**(1.)** *Commentary on the Pentateuch* (**hrwth l [ cwrp**), only Genesis has been published by A. Ginsburg (Pressburg, 1842), cap. i, 1-10 being supplied by Kirchheim from the writings of Kimchi, as the MS. was defective:

- (2.) *Commentary on the earlier Prophets* (μυνωζαρ μγaybn I [ wrp), i.e. Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings, printed in the Rabbinical Bibles edited by Jacob ben-Chajim (Venice, 1525, 1548), Buxtorf (1619), and Frankfurter (1724-27):
- (3.) *Commentary on the later Prophets* (I [ ζwp μυνwrj a μγaybn), i.e. Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the minor prophets; also given in the Rabbinical Bibles:
- (4.) *Commentary on the Psalm s* (μyl ht I [ ζwp), first printed in 1477, reprinted several times, and also given in the Rabbinical Bibles of Jacob ben-Chajim, but not in those edited by Buxtorf and Frankfurter:
- (5.) *Commentary on Ruth* (twr tlgm I [ ζwp), published for the first time by Mercier (Paris, 1563):
- (6.) *Commentary on Chronicles* (μymyh yrbr I [ ζwp), given in the Rabbinical Bibles:-
- (7.) *Commentary on Job* (bwyā I [ ζwp), which has not yet been published:-(8.) The celebrated work called *iMiklol* (I wl km), or *Perfection*, which consists of two parts-a. A Hebrew Grammar (qwdqdh ql j ), usually bearing the name *Miklol*, edited, with notes, by Elias Levita (Ven. 1545), and by M. Hechim (Furth, 1793):-and
- (9.) b. A Hebrew Lexicon (yn[ h ql h), commonly called *The Book of Roots* (μyζrçh rqs), the best editions of which are by Elias Levita (Venice, 1546), and Biesenthal and Lebrecht (Berlin, 1847):
- (10.) *Refutation of Christianity*, (μyrxwnl twbwçt), in which he denies that Messianic predictions are embodied in the Psalm s; printed together with Lippmann's celebrated *Nitsachon* (y j xn) (Amst. 1709, 1711; Königsberg, 1847): — and
- (11.) Another polemical work called j wky, also printed with the *Nitsachon*. Kimchi, as he himself frankly says in his introduction to the *Aiklol*, did not so much furnish new and startling criticism as an exhibit of the results of the manifold and extensive labors of his numerous predecessors. His lexicon is, to a great extent, a translation of Ibn-Ganach's *Book of Roots* **SEE IBN-GANACH**, and he freely quotes the great Jewish-

Arabic, commentators, grammarians. and lexicographers, Saadia, IbnKoreish, Chajug, Ibn-Ganach, Ibn-Gebirol, Ibn-Giath, Ibn-Balaam, Gikatilla, and many other celebrities. "But, though his claims are modest," says Ginsburg, in Kitto (*Cyclop. Bibl. Lit.* vol. ii, s.v.), " yet his merits are great. He was the first who discovered the distinction between the long and the short vowels, whereby the understanding of the changing of vowels has been greatly facilitated. He moreover defended a simple, natural, and grammatical exegesis, at a time when most of his Jewish brethren were enamored of Hagadic, Cabalistical, and astrological interpretations. It is therefore not to be wondered at that he became so eminent among his brethren that they applied to him, by a play of words, the saying in the Mishna (*Aboth*, 3:17), *hrwt `ya j mq `ya ma*, *No Kimchi, no understanding of the Scriptures.*" Among Christian scholars also Kimchi enjoyed great celebrity, more especially, however, among the precursors of the Reformation and the Reformers themselves, "notwithstanding his hostility to Christianity, which is displayed throughout his commentaries, and which arose from the persecutions that the Jews had to endure at the hands of the Crusaders." Many passages obnoxious to adherents of the Christian faith were struck out by the Inquisition, and are omitted in later editions of Kimchi's Commentaries. Pococke collected all the passages which had been omitted from the Prophets in *Not. ad Portam Mosis*, in his theological works (ed. Lend. 1740), i, 241 sq. The first efforts of Christian scholars in compiling Heb. lexicons, or glossaries, and grammars, were based on the labors of Kimchi, and the notes accompanying the Latin Bibles of Mmnmster and Stephen are derived from him. Excerpts of his Commentary on Isaiah were translated into Latin by Munster, and a Latin version of the whole of it was published by Malanimeus (Florence, 1774). Leusden published Latin versions of Joel (Utrecht, 1656) and Jonah (Utrecht, 1657). De Muis published a Latin translation of Malachi (Paris, 1618). Vehe published a German translation of Amos (Col. 1581), and Dr. M'Caul translated the Commentary on Zechariah and the Preface to the Psalm s into English (London, 1837). A Latin translation of the Commentary on the Psalm s was made by Janvier (Constanz, 1544). His grammatical labors embraced in the *Miklol* was translated into Latin by Guidacier (Paris, 1540), and a Latin version of the *Roots* was published in 1535. See Steinschneider, *Catalogus Lib. Hebr. in Bibliotheca Bodleiana*, col. 868-875; F irst, *Bibliotheca Judaica*, ii, 183 sq., and his *Introd. to liebrew Dictionary* ; the masterly biography of Kimchi by Geiger in *Ozar Nechmad* (Vienna, 1857), p. 157 sq.; Dukes, *Die Famllie Kirnchi*

(*Literaturblatt des Orients*, 1850); Grtitz, *Gesch. der Juden*, 6:236 sq.; Kitto, *Bibl. Cyclop.* s.v.

### Kimchi, Joseph, Ben-Isaac,

a distinguished Jewish Rabbi, father of the preceding (David), was born in Spain in the latter half of the 11th century, but was obliged to quit Spain during the terrible persecutions by the Mohammedans, and settled at Narbonne, France. Just as little is known of his personal history as of his son's. He was well versed in the science of the Hebrew language and Biblical exegesis, and by the introduction into Southern France of that thorough scholarship for which the Spanish Jews in his day are so celebrated, gave a new impetus to the study of the O.-Test. Scriptures in the original. As has been pithily said, he became the Aben-Ezra of Southern France. He died about 1180. He wrote a number of valuable contributions to exegetical theology, but it is as a theologian, especially as a polemic, that Joseph Kimchi excelled. His most important works are: **tyr~~h~~irpse** (*Book of the Covenant*), a treatise against Christianity, in the form of a dialogue between a Jew (Maamin or believer) and a Christian (Min or heretic), and which was published in the *Milchemeth ha-Shem* (Constantinople, 1710,8vo): — **µvbi twoj } hæpse** against a Jew named Peter Alphonse, who had become a Christian: this work was never published. He also wrote in Hebrew verse the maxims of Solomon ben-Gabirol (of this fragments appeared in the *Zion* [Francof. 1842, 8vo], ii, 97-100); some Hebrew hymns, which were inserted in the *Aijalet haShachar* (published by Mard. Jare [Mantua, 1612,8vo]); a Hebrew translation of Bachia ben-Joseph's morals, printed in the works of the latter (Leipzig, 1846, 12mo); besides commentaries on most of the books of the O.T. The last are as follows:

- (1.) *Commentary on the Pentateuch*, entitled **hrwt rps** (*The Book of the Law*); fragments are extant in MS., De Rossi 166, and in the quotations of his son D. Kimchi:
- (2.) *Commentary on the earlier Prophets*, called **hnqmh rps**, *The Bill of Purchase*, in allusion to <sup>3621</sup>Jeremiah 32:11:
- (3.) *Commentary on the later Prophets*, called **ywl gh rps** (*The unfolded Book*, in allusion to <sup>3624</sup>Jeremiah 32:14). These works, too, have not as yet come to light, and we only know them through the numerous quotations

from them dispersed through David Kimchi's Commentaries on the Prophets:

(4.) *Commentary on Job*, of which defective MSS. are preserved in the Bodleian Library and at Munich, 200: —

(5.) *Commentary on Proverbs*, a perfect MS. of which exists in the Munich Library, No. 242:

(6.) *Hebrew Grammar*, called **ʿwrkz rps** (*The Book of Remembrance*), which is the first written by a Jew in a Christian country, and is quoted by D. Kimchi in the *Miklol*, **anq**, b:

(7.) Another grammatical work. Entitled **fql h rwbj rps**, also quoted in the *Miklol*; **wl q**, a. "Both as a commentator and a grammarian," says Ginsburg (in Kitto, *Bibl. Cyclop.* vol. ii, s.v.), "Joseph Kimchi deserves the highest praise; and, though his works still remain unpublished, his contributions to Biblical literature produced a most beneficial influence, inasmuch as they prepared the way in Christian countries for a literal and sound exegesis. His son, David Kimchi, who constantly quotes him, both in his commentaries and under almost every root of his Hebrew Lexicon, has familiarized the Hebrew student with the grammatical and exegetical principles of this deservedly esteemed Hebraist." See, besides the works cited under David Kimchi, Biesenthal and Lebrecht's edition of D. Kimchi's *Radicum Liber* (Berlin, 1847), col. 24 sq.; and Geiger's excellent treatise in *Ozar Nechmad* (Vienna, 1856), i, p. 97-119; Bartolucci, *Mag. Biblioth. Rabbin.* 3:327; *Literaturblatt des Orients*, 1850; Furst, *Bibliotheca Judaica*, ii, 186 sq. (J. H.W.)

### Kimchi, Moses, Ben-Joseph

(also called *Remak*, from the initial letters **q8mr** = **yj mq hçm 8r**), eldest son of the preceding (Joseph), flourished about 1160-1170. Though far inferior in ability to his father and brother, he has earned an honorable place as a commentator and grammarian. His works are:

(1.) *Commentary on Proverbs* (or **yl çm rps çwrp**) (printed in the Rabbinic Bibles of Jacob ben-Chajim, Ven. 1526, 1548; Buxtorf, Basel, 1619; and Frankfurter, Amst. 1724-27). This work has been falsely ascribed to Aben-Ezra. Compare Reifmann, in *Literaturblatt des Orients*,

1841, p. 750, 751; *Zion* (F. a. M. 1841), i, 76; Lippmann, in *Zion* (F. a. M. 1842), ii, 113-117, 129-133, 155-157, 171-174, 185-188:

(2.) *Commentary on Ezra and Nehemiah* (also printed in the Rabbinical Bibles, and erroneously attributed to Aben-Ezra):

(3.) A grammatical work, entitled **t [dh yl ybç l hm** (or *Journey on the Paths of Knowledge*), which became a manual for both Jews and Christians beginning the study of Hebrew grammar. It was highly commended by Elias Levita, who annotated and edited it in 1508. It was afterwards published, with a Latin translation, by Seb. Munster (Basel, 1531), and since frequently, with diverse additions and modifications. " The chief merit of this little volume consists in the fact that M. Kimchi was the first to employ therein the word **dqp** as a paradigm of the regular verbs, instead of the less appropriate verb media gutturalis **l [p**, which had been used by his predecessors, in imitation of Arabic grammarians :"-(4.) A grammatical treatise on the anomalous expressions, entitled **rps tçwbj t**, quoted by D. Kimchi in the *Miklol*. See Biesenthal and Lebrecht's edition of D. Kimchi's *Radicum Liber* (Berlin, 1847), col. 38 sq.; Fiirst, *Bibliotheca Judaica*, ii, 187 sq.; Steinschneider, *Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Bibliotheca Bodleiana*, col. 1838-1844; by the same author, *Bibliographisches Handbuch* (Leipzig, 1859), p. 74 sq.; Geiger's *Ozar Nechnrad*, ii, 17 sq.; Ginsburg, in Kitto, *Bibl. Cyclop.* ii, s.v.

## Kimmosh, Kimosh.

SEE NETTLE.

## Ki'nah

(Heb. *Kinah'*, **hnyqaa** an *elegy*, as in <sup><400></sup>Jeremiah 9:9, etc.; Septuag. **Κινά** v. r. **Ἰκόμ**), a city in the extreme south of Judah (hence prob. included within the territory of Simeon), mentioned between Jagur and Dimonah (<sup><4652></sup>Joshua 15:22). " Stanley (*Sinai and Pal.* p. 160) ingeniously connects Kinah with the Kenites (**ynaqj**), who settled in this district (<sup><0016></sup>Judges 1:16). But it should not be overlooked that the list in Joshua 15 purports to record the towns as they were at the conquest, while the settlement of the Kenites probably (though not certainly) did not take place till after it. It is mentioned in the *Onomasticon* of Eusebius and Jerome (s.v. *Kiva, Cina*), but not so as to imply that they had any actual knowledge of it. With the

sole exception of Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 99), it appears to be unmentioned by any traveller, and the town *Cinah*, situated near the wilderness of Zin,' with which he would identify it, is not to be found in his own or any other map" (Smith). The true position of Kinah can only be conjecturally located as not far from the Dead Sea, possibly in wady Fikreh.

## Kinanah.

SEE MARBAH.

## Kindervater, Christian Victor,

a German preacher and philosopher of the Kantian school, was born at Neuenheiligen, Thuringia, in 1758, and was educated at the University of Leipzig. He became pastor at Pedelwitz; near Leipzig, in 1790; in 1804, general superintendent at Eisenach, and died May 9, 1806. His most important works are, *An hono qui animum neget esse immortalenz, animo possit esse tranquillo* (Lips. 1785, 4to): -*Giebt es unerschütterliche Beruhigung in Leiden ohne den auf Moralität gegründeten Glauben an die Unsterblichkeit* (1797):-*Gespräche über das Wesen der Götter* (1787):-*Adumbratio quæstionis, an Pyrrhonis doctrina omnis tollatur virtus* (1789, 4to): — *Skeptische Dialogen über die Vortheile der Leiden, und Widerwartigkeiten dieses Lebens* (1788, 8vo): — *Geschichte der Wirkungen der verschiednen Religionen auf die Sittlichkeit und Glückseligkeit des Menschengeschlechts in iltern und neuern Zeiten* (1793, 8vo):-*Geist des reinen Christenthums* (1795, 8vo): — *Darstellung der Leidengesch. Jesu* (1797, 8vo):-*De indole atque forma regni Messicæ e mente Johannis Baptistæ Dissertatio* (1803, 4to).-Krug, *Encyklop. Lex.* vol. ii, s.v.; During, *Deutsche Kanzelredner d. 18en und 19en Jahrh.* p. 155 sq.

## Kindred.

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

1. **h3713** *ʿāšipāchāh*, usually rendered "family," answering to the Latin *gens*, except that it more distinctly includes the idea of original affinity or derivation from a common stock; it corresponds exactly with our word *clan*. It is used of the different tribes of the Canaanites (<sup><0108></sup>Genesis 10:18); of the subdivisions of the Hebrew people (<sup><0164></sup>Exodus 6:14; <sup><0002></sup>Numbers 1:20, etc.); sometimes for one of the tribes (<sup><0377></sup>Joshua 7:17; <sup><0712></sup>Judges



13:2, etc.), and in the later books tropically for a people or nation (<sup><248B></sup>Jeremiah 8:3; 25:9; <sup><412D></sup>Ezekiel 20:32; <sup><311B></sup>Micah 2:3). It is translated *kindred* in the A. V. at <sup><024I></sup>Genesis 24:41; <sup><0163></sup>Joshua 6:23; <sup><011B></sup>Ruth 2:3; <sup><832D></sup>Job 32:2-in all of which it refers to relationship by *consanguinity*, more or less remote.

**2. t d| װ**, *mnole'deth*, conveys primarily the idea of *birth, nativity*; hence a *person born, a child* (<sup><028D></sup>Genesis 28:9; <sup><880D></sup>Leviticus 18:9,11), and *persons of the same family or lineage* (<sup><011E></sup>Genesis 12:1; 24:4; 31:3; 43:7; <sup><010D></sup>Numbers 10:30; <sup><172D></sup>Esther 2:10; 8:6-in all which passages it is translated *kindred* in the A. V.). In some of these instances, however, the kinship is only the remote one of common nationality arising out of common descent.

**3. t [ d|װ**, *moda'ath*, literally *knowledge*, is used to express blood-relationship in <sup><880D></sup>Ruth 3:2; compare **[ d|װ** (<sup><011B></sup>Ruth 2:1; <sup><0104></sup>Proverbs 7:4).

**4. hLaG|** *geillah'*, *redemption*, a word which properly designated such near relationship by blood as would confer the rights and obligations of a **l aG|** or kinsman, avenger, and redeemer, on the party. *SEE GOEL*. As commonly used, however, it denotes either the thing redeemed (<sup><0145></sup>Ruth 4:6), or the right of redeeming (<sup><025D></sup>Leviticus 25:29, etc.), or the redemption price (<sup><025B></sup>Leviticus 25:26, etc.). The only passage in which it is translated *kindred* in the A. V. is <sup><26115></sup>Ezekiel 11:15. Hengstenberg (*Christol.* 3:9, E. 1') and Havernick (*Comment. ad loc.*) contend that **hl ag** is to be taken here not in the sense of *relationship*, but in that of *suretyship* or *substitutionary action*, and they would translate the passage, "Thy brethren are the men of thy suretyship," or "redemption," i.e. the men whom it lies on them to redeem or act for. The Sept. seems to have read **U| װG|** for they give **αἰχμαλωσαίς** here.

**5. j a;** *ach*, which properly means *brother*, occurs only once with the rendering *kindred* in the A. V., in <sup><3129></sup>1 Chronicles 12:29. It is frequently used elsewhere in a wide sense, and may be understood of nearly all collateral relationships whatever, whether by consanguinity, affinity, or simple association. From this comes **hwj ai** *brotherhood* (<sup><8114></sup>Zechariah 11:14).

Besides these terms, the Hebrews expressed consanguinity by such words and phrases as **rcB**; *flesh* (<sup><01377></sup>Genesis 37:27; <sup><25877></sup>Isaiah 58:7); **yræb** **ymæj** *my bone and my flesh* (<sup><01214></sup>Genesis 29:14; <sup><0002></sup>Judges 9:2; <sup><0010></sup>2 Samuel 5:1, etc.); **raæj** *flesh* (<sup><01812></sup>Leviticus 18:12, 13, etc.; <sup><01204></sup>Numbers 27:41), with **hraÿj** coll. *kinswomen* (<sup><01817></sup>Leviticus 18:17); and **raæj** **/rcBæj** *flesh of his flesh* (A. V. *near of kin*, <sup><01816></sup>Leviticus 18:6; *nigh of kin*, 25:49).

**II.** In the New Test. we have the following Greek words thus rendered: **γένος**, the most general and frequent term, our *kin*, i.e. birth relationship, with its derivative **συγγένεια**, *co-relationship*; **πατριά** (<sup><01825></sup>Acts 3:25), *descent in a direct line* ("lineage," <sup><01014></sup>Luke 2:4; "family," <sup><01815></sup>Ephesians 3:15); and **φυλή** (Rev. 5:9; 7:9; 11:9; 13:7; 14:6), a *tribe* (as elsewhere rendered).

In addition to these Heb. and Greek words, various others of cogitate derivation or similar signification are frequently rendered "kin," "kinship," etc.

**III.** The terms expressive of immediate relationship are FATHER, MOTHER, BROTHER, SISTER, SON, DAUGHTER; those expressing collateral consanguinity are UNCLE, AUNT, NEPHEW (niece does not occur in the A.V., but brother's or sister's daughter), COUSIN; those expressive of affinity are FATHER-IN-LAW, MOTHER-IN-LAW, SON-IN-LAW, DAUGHTER-IN-LAW, BROTHER-IN-LAW, SISTER-IN-LAW. See each of these in their place.

**IV.** The relations of kindred, expressed by few words, and imperfectly defined in the earliest ages, acquired in course of time greater significance and wider influence. The full list of relatives either by consanguinity, i.e. as arising from a common ancestor, or by affinity, i.e. as created by marriage, may be seen detailed in the *Corpus Juris Civ. Digest. lib. 38:tit. 10, de Gradibus*; see also *Corp. Jur. Canon. Decr. ii, c. 35:9, 5. SEE AFFINITY.*

The domestic and economical questions arising out of kindred may be classed under the three heads of MARRIAGE, INHERITANCE, and BLOOD-REVENGE, and the reader is referred to the articles on those subjects for information thereon. It is clear that the tendency of the Mosaic law was to increase the restrictions on marriage, by defining more precisely the relations created by it, as is shown by the cases of Abraham and Moses.

For information on the general subject of kindred and its obligations, see Selden, *De Jure Naturali*, lib. v; Michaelis, *Laws of Moses*, ed. Smith, ii, 36; Knobel on Leviticus 18; Philo, *De Spec. Leg.* 3:3, 4, 5, vol. ii. 301-304, ed. Mangey; Burckhardt, *Arab Tribes*, i, 150; Keil, *Bibl. Arch.* ii, 50, § 106, 107. *SEE KINSMAN.*

## Kine

(*hrP*; *parah*, 'i.e. fruitful, a heifer, <sup><01215></sup>Genesis 32:15; 41:2-27; and so rendered in <sup><0492></sup>Numbers 19:2-9; also a young milk-cow, <sup><0017></sup>1 Samuel 6:7-14; "cow," <sup><0210></sup>Job 21:10; <sup><23107></sup>Isaiah 11:7; a "heifer" just broken to the yoke, <sup><2016></sup>Hosea 4:16; put as a symbol of a voluptuous female, <sup><0100></sup>Amos 4:1: sometimes in the Auth. Vers. for *āl a*,, *e'leph*, usually an *ox*, as rendered in <sup><0108></sup>Psalms 8:8; <sup><2040></sup>Proverbs 14:4; <sup><23124></sup>Isaiah 30:24; but fem. in <sup><0073></sup>Deuteronomy 7:13; 28:4, 18, 51; also for *rqK*; *bakar'*, <sup><0524></sup>Deuteronomy 32:14; <sup><0079></sup>2 Samuel 17:29; a *beeve* or one of a herd of cattle, elsewhere without distinction of sex, and rendered "ox," "bullock," "herd," etc.). See Cow.

## King

(Heb. and Chald. *Ēl m*, *me'lek*, ruler; βασιλεύς), the most general term for an absolute, independent, and life-long sovereign.

**1. Scriptural Applications of the Title.** — In the Bible the name does not always imply the same degree of power or importance, neither does it indicate the magnitude of the dominion or territory of the national ruler thus designated (<sup><0131></sup>Genesis 36:31). Many persons are called "kings" in Scripture whom we should rather denominate *chiefs* or *leaders*; and many single towns, or towns with their adjacent villages, are said to have kings. Hence we need not be surprised at seeing that so small a country as Canaan contained *thirty-one kings* who were conquered (<sup><0619></sup>Joshua 12:9,24), besides many who no doubt escaped the arms of Joshua. Adonibezek himself, no very powerful king, mentions *seventy kings* whom he had subdued and mutilated (<sup><0007></sup>Judges 1:7; <sup><1021></sup>1 Kings 4:21; 20:1, 16). Even at the present day the heads of Arab tribes are often called "king," which in this case also means no more than *sheik* or *chief*. In like manner, in the New Test., owing to the peculiar political relations of the Jews, the title "king" has very different significations:

(1.) The Roman *emperor* (<sup><4023></sup>1 Peter 2:13, 17); and so the "seven kings" (<sup><670></sup>Revelation 17:10) are perhaps the first seven Casars (comp. Thilo, *Apocr.* 579).

(2.) Herod Antipas (<sup><4040></sup>Matthew 14:9; <sup><4062></sup>Mark 6:22), although only *tetrarch* (compare <sup><4089></sup>Luke 3:19).

(3.) So also the ten provincial representatives of the Roman government (<sup><672></sup>Revelation 17:12), as being supreme within their respective jurisdictions. *SEE GOVERNOR*, etc.

"King," in symbolical language, signifies the possessor of supreme power, whether lodged in one or more persons (<sup><2085></sup>Proverbs 8:15, 16). It is applied in the Scriptures to God, as the sole proper sovereign and ruler of the universe (<sup><5017></sup>1 Timothy 1:17), and to Christ, the Son of God, the sole head and Governor of his Church (<sup><5065></sup>1 Timothy 6:15,16; <sup><4071></sup>Matthew 27:11; <sup><4088></sup>Luke 19:38; <sup><4044></sup>John 1:49; 18:33, 34); also to men, as invested with regal authority by their fellows (<sup><4025></sup>Luke 22:25; <sup><5011></sup>1 Timothy 2:1, 2; <sup><4023></sup>1 Peter 2:13-17); so also the people of God are called *kings* and *priests* (<sup><4944></sup>Psalm 49:14; <sup><2022></sup>Daniel 7:22, 27; <sup><4088></sup>Matthew 19:28; <sup><4022></sup>Luke 22:29, 30; <sup><4041></sup>1 Corinthians 6:2, 3; <sup><5012></sup>2 Timothy 2:12; <sup><6006></sup>Revelation 1:6; 2:26, 27; 3:21; 5:10; 22:5). In <sup><4884></sup>Job 18:14 it is applied to Death, who is there called the "king of terrors." In <sup><4843></sup>Job 41:34, leviathan, or the crocodile, is thus designated: "he is a king over all the children of pride." (See Wemyss's *Symbol. Dict.*)

The application, however, of the term "king," with which we are here particularly concerned, is that of the name of the national ruler of the Hebrews during a period of about 500 years previous to the destruction of Jerusalem, B.C. 588. It was borne first by the ruler of the Twelve Tribes united, and then by the rulers of Judah and Israel separately. *SEE KINGS, BOOK OF.*

2. *Origin of the Hebrew Monarchy.* — Regal authority was altogether alien to the institutions of Moses in their original and unadulterated form. Their fundamental idea was that Jehovah was the sole king of the nation (<sup><4007></sup>1 Samuel 8:7); to use the emphatic words in <sup><2322></sup>Isaiah 33:22, "the Lord is our judge, the Lord is our lawgiver, the Lord is our king." Although Moses ventured, with his half-civilized hordes, on the bold experiment of founding a society without a king, and in doing so evinced a rare patriotism and self-denial, for without doubt the man who rescued the Jews from bondage and

conducted them to the land of Canaan might, had he chosen, have kept the dominion in his own hands, and transmitted a crown to his posterity, yet he well knew what were the elements with which he had to deal in framing institutions for the rescued Israelites. Slaves they had been, and the spirit of slavery was not yet wholly eradicated from their souls. They had witnessed in Egypt the more than ordinary pomp and splendor which environ a throne. Not improbably the prosperity and abundance which they had seen in Egypt, and in which they had been, in a measure, allowed to partake, might have been ascribed by them to the regal form of the Egyptian government. Moses may well, therefore, have apprehended a not very remote departure from the fundamental type of his institutions.

Accordingly he makes a special provision for this contingency (<sup>(45174)</sup>Deuteronomy 17:14), and labors, by anticipation, to guard against the abuses of royal power. Should a king be demanded by the people, then he was to be a native Israelite; he was not to be drawn away by the love of show, especially by a desire for that regal display in which horses have always borne so large a part, to send down to Egypt, still less to cause the people to return to that land; he was to avoid the corrupting influence of a large harem, so common among Eastern monarchs; he was to abstain from amassing silver and gold; he was to have a copy of the law made expressly for his own study — a study which he was never to intermit till the end of his days, so that his heart might not be lifted up above his brethren, that he might not be turned aside from the living God, but, observing the divine statute?, and thus acknowledging himself to be no more than the vicegerent of heaven, he might enjoy happiness, and transmit his authority to his descendants.

The removal of Moses and Joshua- by death soon left the people to the natural results of their own condition and character. Anarchy ensued. Noble minds, indeed, and stout hearts appeared in those who were termed judges; but the state of the country was not so satisfactory as to prevent an unenlightened people, having low and gross affections, from preferring the glare of a crown and the apparent protection of a sceptre to the invisible and, therefore, mostly unrecognised arm of Omnipotence. A king accordingly is requested (1 Samuel 8). The misconduct of Samuel's sons, who had been made judges, was the immediate cause of the demand being put forth. The request came with authority, for it emanated from all the elders of Israel, who, after holding a formal conference, proceeded to Samuel, in order to make him acquainted with their wish. Samuel was

displeased; but, having sought in prayer to learn the divine will, he was instructed to yield to the demand; yet at the same time he was directed to "protest solemnly unto them, and show them the manner of the king that shall reign over them." Faithfully did the prophet depict the evils which a monarchy would inflict on the people. In vain; they said, "Nay, but we will have a king over us." Accordingly, Saul, the son of Kish, of the tribe of Benjamin, was, by divine direction, selected, and privately anointed by Samuel "to be captain over God's inheritance;" thus he was to hold only a delegated and subordinate authority (1 Samuel 9; 10:1-16). Under the guidance of Samuel, Saul was subsequently chosen by lot from among the assembled tribes; and though his personal appearance had no influence in the choice, yet, when he was plainly pointed out to be the individual designed for the sceptre, Samuel called attention to those personal qualities which in less civilized nations have a preponderating influence, and are never without effect, at least, in supporting the physical dignity of a reign (<sup><0107></sup>1 Samuel 10:17-27). (For a fuller discussion of this change in the Hebrew constitution, see Kitto's *Daily Bible Illustrations* under the portion of history in question.) **SEE SAMUEL.**

The special occasion of the substitution of a regal form of government for that of the judges seems to have been the siege of Jabesh-Gilead by Nahash, king of the Ammonites (<sup><0110></sup>1 Samuel 11:1; 12:12), and the refusal to allow the inhabitants of that city to capitulate except on humiliating and cruel conditions (<sup><0112></sup>1 Samuel 11:2, 4-6). The conviction seems to have forced itself on the Israelites that they could not resist their formidable neighbor unless they placed themselves under the sway of a king, like surrounding nations. Concurrently with this conviction, disgust had been excited by the corrupt administration of justice under the sons of Samuel, and a radical change was desired by them in this respect also (<sup><0115></sup>1 Samuel 8:3-5). Accordingly, the original idea of a Hebrew king was twofold: 1st, that he should lead the people to battle in time of war; and, 2dly, that he should execute judgment and justice to them in war and in peace (<sup><0121></sup>1 Samuel 8:20). In both respects the desired end was attained. The righteous wrath and military capacity of Saul were immediately triumphant over the Ammonites; and though ultimately he was defeated and slain in battle with the Philistines, he put even them to flight on more than one occasion (<sup><0123></sup>1 Samuel 14:23; 17:52), and generally waged successful war against the surrounding nations (<sup><0147></sup>1 Samuel 14:47). **SEE SAUL.** His successor, David, entered on a series of brilliant conquests over the Philistines,

Moabites, Syrians, Edomites, and Ammonites; and the Israelites, no longer confined within the narrow bounds of Palestine, had an empire extending from the River Euphrates to Gaza, and from the entering in of Hamath to the river of Egypt (<sup><102></sup>1 Kings 4:21). In the meanwhile complaints ceased of the corruption of justice; and Solomon not only consolidated and maintained in peace the empire of his father David, but left an enduring reputation for his wisdom as a judge. Under this expression, however, we must regard him, not merely as pronouncing decisions, primarily or in the last resort, in civil and criminal cases, but likewise as holding public levees and transacting public business "at the gate," when he would receive petitions, hear complaints, and give summary decisions on various points, which in a modern European kingdom would come under the cognizance of numerous distinct public departments. *SEE DAVID; SEE SOLOMON.*

**3. Functions and Prerogatives.** — Emanating as the royal power did from the demand of the people and the permission of a prophet, it was not likely to be unlimited in its extent or arbitrary in its exercise. The government of God, indeed, remained, being rather concealed and complicated than disowned, much less superseded. The king ruled not in his own right nor in virtue of the choice of the people, but by concession from on high, and partly as the servant and partly as the representative of the theocracy. How insecure, indeed, was the tenure of the kingly power. how restricted it was in its authority, appears clear from the comparative facility with which the crown was transferred from Saul to David; and the part which the prophet Samuel took in effecting that transference points out the quarter where lay the power which limited, if it did not primarily, at least, control the royal authority. It must, however, be added that, if religion narrowed this authority, it also invested it with a sacredness which could emanate from no other source. Liable as the Israelitish kings were to interference on the part of priest and prophet, they were, by the same divine power, shielded from the unholy hands of the profane vulgar, and it was at once impiety and rebellion to do injury to "the Lord's anointed" (<sup><106></sup>Psalm 2:6, 7 sq.). Instances are not wanting to corroborate and extend these general observations. When Saul was in extremity before the Philistines (1 Samuel 28), he resorted to the usual methods of obtaining counsel: "Saul inquired of the Lord; the Lord answered him not, neither by dreams, nor by Urim, nor by the prophets." So David, when in need of advice in war (<sup><107></sup>1 Samuel 30:7), resorted to Abiathar the priest, who, by means of the ephod, inquired of the Lord, and thereupon urged the king to take a certain

course, which proved successful (see also <sup><1011></sup>2 Samuel 2:1). Sometimes, indeed, as appears from 1 Samuel 28, it was a prophet who acted the part of prime minister, or chief counsellor, to the king, and who, as bearing that sacred character, must have possessed very weighty influence in the royal divan (<sup><1121></sup>1 Kings 22:7 sq.). We must not, however, expect to find any definite and permanent distribution of power, any legal determination of the royal prerogatives as discriminated from the divine authority; circumstances, as they prompted certain deeds, restricted or enlarged the sphere of the monarch's action. Thus, in <sup><9110></sup>1 Samuel 11:4 sq., we find Saul, in an emergency, assuming, without consultation or deliberation, the power of demanding something like a levy *en masse*, and of proclaiming instant war. With the king lay the administration of justice in the last resort (<sup><1015></sup>2 Samuel 15:2; <sup><1016></sup>1 Kings 3:16 sq.). He also possessed the power of life and death (2 Samuel 14). To provide for and superintend the public worship was at once his duty and his highest honor (1 Kings 8; <sup><1124></sup>2 Kings 12:4; 18:4; 23:1). One reason why the people requested a king was that they might have a recognised leader in war (<sup><9031></sup>1 Samuel 8:20). The Mosaic law offered a powerful hindrance to royal despotism (<sup><9125></sup>1 Samuel 10:25). The people also, by means of their elders, formed an express compact, by which they stipulated for their rights (<sup><1124></sup>1 Kings 12:4), and were from time to time appealed to, generally in cases of " great pith and moment" (<sup><1320></sup>1 Chronicles 29:1; <sup><1117></sup>2 Kings 11:17; Josephus, *War*, ii, 1, 2). Nor did the people fail to interpose their will, where they thought it necessary, in opposition to that of the monarch (<sup><9145></sup>1 Samuel 14:45). The part which Nathan took against David shows how effective, as well as bold, was the check exerted by the prophets; indeed, most of the prophetic history is the history of the noblest opposition ever made to the vices alike of royalty, priesthood, and people. If needful, the prophet hesitated not to demand an audience with the king, nor was he dazzled or deterred by royal power and pomp (<sup><1122></sup>1 Kings 20:22, 38; <sup><1115></sup>2 Kings 1:15). As, however, the monarch held the sword, the instrument of death was sometimes made to prevail over every restraining influence (<sup><9217></sup>1 Samuel 22:17). **SEE**  
**PROPHET.**

To form a correct idea of a Hebrew king, we must abstract ourselves from the notions of modern Europe, and realize the position of Oriental sovereigns. It would be a mistake to regard the Hebrew government as a limited monarchy, in the English sense of the expression. It is stated in <sup><9125></sup>1 Samuel 10:25, that Samuel " told the people the manner of the kingdom,



and wrote it in the book and laid it before the Lord," and it is barely possible that this may refer to some statement respecting the boundaries of the kingly power. (The word *ἔπιταγή*, literally *judgment*, translated "manner" in the A. V., is translated in the Sept. *ehmcaīwa*, i.e. statute or ordinance [comp. Ecclus. 4:17; Bar. ii, 12; 4:13]. But Josephus seems to have regarded the document as a prophetic statement, read before the king, of the calamities which were to arise from the kingly power, as a kind of protest recorded for succeeding ages [*Ant.* 6:4, 6]). But no such document has come down to us; and if it ever existed, and contained restrictions of any moment on the kingly power, it was probably disregarded in practice. The following passage of sir John Malcolm respecting the shahs. of Persia may, with some slight modifications, be regarded as fairly applicable to the Hebrew monarchy under David and Solomon: " The monarch of Persia has been pronounced to be one of the most absolute in the world. His word has ever been deemed a law; and he has probably never had any further restraint upon the free exercise of his vast authority than has arisen from *his regard for religion*, his respect for established usages, his desire for reputation, and his fear of exciting an opposition that might be dangerous to his power or to his life" (Malcolm's *Persia*, ii, 303; comp. Elphinstone's *India*, bk. 8, ch. 3). It must not, however, be supposed to have been either the understanding or the practice that the sovereign might seize at his discretion the private property of individuals. Ahab did not venture to seize the vineyard of Naboth till, through the testimony of false witnesses, Naboth had been convicted of blasphemy; and possibly his vineyard may have been seized as a confiscation, without flagrantly outraging public sentiment in those who did not know the truth (~~1~~ 1 Kings 11:6). But no monarchy perhaps ever existed in which it would not be regarded as an outrage that the monarch should from covetousness seize the private property of an innocent subject in no ways dangerous to the state. And generally, when sir John Malcolm proceeds as follows in reference to "one of the most absolute" monarchs in the world, it will be understood that the Hebrew king, whose power might be described in the same way, is not, on account of certain restraints which exist in the nature of things, to be regarded as " a limited monarch" in the European use of the words. " We may assume that the power of the king of Persia is by usage absolute over the property and lives of his conquered enemies, *his rebellious subjects, his own family, his ministers, over public officers civil and military, and all the numerous train of domestics, and that he may punish any person of these classes without examination or*

*normal procedure of any kind*; in all other cases that are capital, the forms prescribed by law and custom are observed; the monarch only commands, when the evidence has been examined and the law declared, that the sentence shall be put in execution or that the condemned culprit shall be pardoned" (ii, 306). In accordance with such usages, David ordered Uriah to be treacherously exposed to death in the forefront of the hottest battle (~~10115~~ 2 Samuel 11:15); he caused Rechab and Baanah to be slain instantly, when they brought him the head of Ishbosheth (~~10442~~ 2 Samuel 4:12); and he is represented as having on his death-bed recommended Solomon to put Joab and Shimei to death (~~11075~~ 1 Kings 2:5-9). In like manner, Solomon caused to be killed, without trial, not only his elder brother Adonijah and Joab, whose execution might be regarded as the exceptional acts of a dismal state-policy in the beginning of his reign, but likewise Shimei, after having been seated on the throne three years. And king Saul, in resentment at their connivance with David's escape, put to death 85 priests, and caused a massacre of the inhabitants of Nob, including women, children, and sucklings (~~09218~~ 1 Samuel 22:18, 19).

Besides being commander-in-chief of the army, supreme judge, and absolute master, as it were, of the lives of his subjects, the king exercised the power of imposing taxes on them, and of exacting- from them personal service and labor. Both these points seem clear from the account given (~~09811~~ 1 Samuel 8:11-17) of the evils which would arise from the kingly power, and are confirmed in various ways. Whatever mention may be made of consulting " old men," or " elders of Israel," we never read of their deciding such points as these. When Pul, the king of Assyria, imposed a tribute on the kingdom of Israel, " Menahem, the king," exacted the money of all the mighty men of wealth, of each man 50 shekels of silver (~~12159~~ 2 Kings 15:19). When Jehoiakim, king of Judah, gave his tribute of silver and gold to Pharaoh, *he* taxed the land to give the money; he exacted the silver and gold of the people, of every one according to his taxation (~~12235~~ 2 Kings 23:35). The degree to which the exaction of personal labor might be carried on a special occasion is illustrated by king Solomon's requirements for building the Temple. He raised a levy of 30,000 men, and sent them to Lebanon by courses of 10,000 a month; and he had 70,000 that bare burdens, and 80,000 hewers in the mountains (~~11053~~ 1 Kings 5:13-15). Judged by the Oriental standard, there is nothing improbable in these numbers. In our own days, for the purpose of constructing the Mahmudeyeh Canal in Egypt, Mehemet Ali, by orders given to the various

sheiks of the provinces of Sakarah, Ghizeh, Mensfirah, Sharkieh, Menuf, Bahyreh, and some others, caused 300,000 men, women, and children to be assembled along the site of the intended canal (see Mrs. Poole's *Englishwoman in Egypt*, ii, 219). This was 120,000 more than the levy of Solomon.

In addition to these earthly powers, the king of Israel had a more awful claim to respect and obedience. He was the vicegerent of Jehovah (<sup><9001></sup>1 Samuel 10:1; 16:13), and, as it were, His son, if just and holy (<sup><3074></sup>2 Samuel 7:14; <sup><9805></sup>Psalm 89:26, 27; 2:6, 7). He had been set apart as a consecrated ruler. Upon his head had been poured the holy anointing oil, composed of olive-oil, myrrh, cinnamon, sweet calamus, and cassia, which had hitherto been reserved exclusively for the priests of Jehovah, especially the high-priest, or had been solely used to anoint the Tabernacle of the Congregation, the Ark of the Testimony, and the vessels of the Tabernacle (<sup><023></sup>Exodus 30:23-33; 40:9; <sup><0210></sup>Leviticus 21:10; <sup><1013></sup>1 Kings 1:39). He had become, in fact, emphatically " the Lord's anointed." At the coronation of sovereigns in modern Europe, holy oil has frequently been used as a symbol of divine right; but this has been mainly regarded as a mere form, and the use of it was undoubtedly introduced in imitation of the Hebrew custom. But, from the beginning to the end of the Hebrew monarchy, a living real significance was attached to consecration by this holy anointing oil. From well-known anecdotes related of David-and, perhaps, from words in his lamentation over Saul and Jonathan (<sup><1021></sup>2 Samuel 1:21)-it results that a certain sacredness invested the person of Saul, *the first* king, as the Lord's anointed; and that, on this account, it was deemed sacrilegious to kill him, even at his own request (<sup><0245></sup>1 Samuel 24:6, 10; 26:9, 16; 2 Samuel i, 14). After the destruction of the first Temple, in the Book of Lamentations over the calamities of the Hebrew people, it is by the name of " the Lord's Anointed" that Zedekiah, the *last* king of Judah, is bewailed (Lamentaions 4:20). Again, more than 600 years after the capture of Zedekiah, the name of the Anointed, though never so used in thee Old Testament-yet suggested, probably, by <sup><0402></sup>Psalm 2:2; <sup><2025></sup>Daniel 9:26-had become appropriated to the expected king, who was to restore the kingdom of David, and inaugurate a period when Edom, Moab, the Ammonites, and the Philistines would again be incorporated with the Hebrew monarchy, which would extend from the Euphrates to the Mediterranean Sea and to the ends of the earth (<sup><4006></sup>Acts 1:6; <sup><0045></sup>John 1:41; 4:25; <sup><2112></sup>Isaiah 11:12-14; <sup><9728></sup>Psalm 72:8). Thus the identical Hebrew word

which signifies anointed, through its Aramaic form adopted into Greek and Latin, is still preserved to us in the English word *Messiah*. (See Gesenius's *Thesaurus*, p. 825.) See § 4, below.

**4. Appointment and Inauguration.** — The law of succession to the throne is somewhat obscure, but it seems most probable that the king during his lifetime named his successor. This was certainly the case with David, who passed over his elder son Adonijah, the son of Haggith, in favor of Solomon, the son of Bathsheba (<sup><1003></sup>1 Kings 1:30; 2:22); and with Rehoboam, of whom it is said that he loved Maachah, the daughter of Absalom, above all his wives and concubines, and that he made Abijah her son to be ruler among his brethren, to make him king (<sup><4112></sup>2 Chronicles 11:21, 22). The succession of the firstborn has been inferred from a passage in <sup><1203></sup>2 Chronicles 21:3, 4, in which Jehoshaphat is said to have given the kingdom to Jehoram "because he was the first-born." But this very passage tends to show that Jehoshaphat had the *power* of naming his successor; and it is worthy of note that Jehoram, on his coming to the throne, put to death all his brothers, which he would scarcely, perhaps, have done if the succession of the first-born had been the law of the land. From the conciseness of the narratives in the books of Kings no inference either way can be drawn from the ordinary formula in which the death of the father and succession of his son is recorded (<sup><1158></sup>1 Kings 15:8). At the same time, if no partiality for a favorite wife or son intervened, there would always be a natural bias of affection in favor of the eldest son. There appears to have been some prominence given to the mother of the king (<sup><12412></sup>2 Kings 24:12,15; 1 Kings ii, 19), and it is possible that the mother may have been regent during the minority of a son. Indeed, some such custom best explains the possibility of the audacious usurpation of Athaliah on the death of her son Ahaziah: a usurpation which lasted six years after the destruction of all the seed-royal except the young Jehoash (<sup><12101></sup>2 Kings 11:1-3). The people, too, and even foreign powers, at a later period interrupted the regular transmission of royal authority (<sup><12124></sup>2 Kings 21:24; 23:24, 30; 24:17). *SEE HEIR.*

It is supposed both by Jahn (*Bib. Archceol.* § 222) and Bauer (in his *Heb. Alterthiimer*, § 20) that a king was only *anointed* when a new family came to the throne, or when the right to the crown was disputed. It is usually on such occasions only that the anointing is specified, as in <sup><0901></sup>1 Samuel 10:1; <sup><1014></sup>2 Samuel 2:4; <sup><1003></sup>1 Kings 1:39; <sup><1303></sup>2 Kings 9:3; 11:12; but this is not *invariably* the case (see <sup><1230></sup>2 Kings 23:30), and there does not appear

sufficient reason to doubt that each individual king was anointed. There can be little doubt, likewise, that the kings of Israel were anointed, though this is not specified by the writers of Kings and Chronicles, who would deem such anointing invalid. The ceremony of anointing, which was observed at least in the case of Saul, David, and Solomon (<sup><0994></sup>1 Samuel 9:14; 10:1; 15:1; 16:12; <sup><1004></sup>2 Samuel 2:4; 5:1; <sup><1003></sup>1 Kings 1:34; 39:5), and in which the prophet or high-priest who performed the rite acted as the representative of the theocracy and the expounder of the will of heaven, must have given to the spiritual power very considerable influence; and both this particular and the very nature of the observance direct the mind to Egypt, where the same custom prevailed, and where the power of the priestly caste was immense (Wilkinson's *Anc. Egypt.* 5:279). Indeed, the ceremony seems to have been essential to constitute a legitimate monarch (<sup><1112></sup>2 Kings 11:12; 23:30); and thus the authorities of the Jewish Church held in their hands, and had subject to their will, a most important power, which they could use either for their own purposes or the common good. In consequence of the general observance of this ceremony, the term "anointed," "the Lord's anointed" (<sup><0020></sup>1 Samuel 2:10; 16:6; 24:6; <sup><1002></sup>2 Samuel 19:21; <sup><1002></sup>Psalms 2:2; <sup><2704></sup>Lamentations 4:20), came to be employed in rhetorical and poetical diction as equivalent in meaning to the designation "king." *SEE ANOINTING.*

We have seen in the case of Saul that personal and even external qualities had their influence in procuring ready obedience to a sovereign; and further evidence to the same effect may be found in <sup><1948></sup>Psalms 45:3; <sup><3382></sup>Ezekiel 28:12: such qualities would naturally excite the enthusiasm of the people, who appear to have manifested their approval by acclamations (<sup><0904></sup>1 Samuel 10:24; <sup><1005></sup>1 Kings 1:25; <sup><1193></sup>2 Kings 9:13; 11:13; <sup><1431></sup>2 Chronicles 23:11; see also Josephus, *War*, i, 33, 9).

**5. Court and Revenues.**-The following is a list of some of the officers of the king:

1. The recorder or chronicler, who was perhaps analogous to the historiographer whom sir John Malcolm mentions as an officer of the Persian court, whose duty it is to write the annals of the king's reign (*Hist. of Persia*, c. 23). Certain it is that there is no regular series of minute dates in Hebrew history until we read of this recorder, or *remembrancer*, as the word *mazkir* is translated in a marginal note of the English version. It signifies one who keeps the memory of events

alive, in accordance with a motive assigned by Herodotus for writing his history, viz. that the acts of men might not become extinct by time (Herod. i, 1; <sup><4086></sup>2 Samuel 8:16; <sup><1048></sup>1 Kings 4:3; <sup><2818></sup>2 Kings 18:18; <sup><3308></sup>Isaiah 36:3, 22). *SEE RECORDER.*

**2.** The scribe or secretary, whose duty would be to answer letters or petitions in the name of the king, to write dispatches, and to draw up edicts (<sup><4087></sup>2 Samuel 8:17; 20:25; <sup><1220></sup>2 Kings 12:10; 19:2; 22:8). *SEE SCRIBE.*

**3.** The officer who was *over the house* (<sup><2325></sup>Isaiah 32:15; 36:3). His duties would be those of chief steward of the household, and would embrace all the internal economical arrangements of the palace, the superintendence of the king's servants, and the custody of his costly vessels of gold and silver. He seems to have worn a distinctive robe of office and girdle. It was against Shebna, who held this office, that Isaiah uttered his personal prophecy (xxii, 15-25), the only instance of the kind in his writings (see Gesen. *Jesa.* i, 694). *SEE STEWARD.*

**4.** The king's friend (<sup><1048></sup>1 Kings 4:5), called likewise the king's companion. It is evident from the name that this officer must have stood in confidential relation to the king, but his duties are nowhere specified.

**5.** The keeper of the vestry or wardrobe (<sup><1202></sup>2 Kings 10:22).

**6.** The captain of the body-guard (<sup><4023></sup>2 Samuel 20:23). The importance of this officer requires no comment. It was he who obeyed Solomon in putting to death Adonijah, Joab, and Shimei (<sup><1025></sup>1 Kings 2:25, 34, 46).

**7.** Distinct officers over the king's treasures-his storehouses, laborers, vineyards, olive-trees, and sycamore-trees, herds, camels, and flocks (<sup><1375></sup>1 Chronicles 27:25-31).

**8.** The officer over all the host or army of Israel, the commander-in-chief of the army, who commanded it in person during the king's absence (<sup><4023></sup>2 Samuel 20:23; <sup><13734></sup>1 Chronicles 27:34; <sup><40101></sup>2 Samuel 11:1). As an instance of the formidable power which a general might acquire in this office, see the narrative in <sup><4083></sup>2 Samuel 3:30-37, when David deemed himself obliged to tolerate the murder of Abner by Joab and Abishai.

9. The royal counsellor (<sup><1372></sup>1 Chronicles 27:32; <sup><2118></sup>Isaiah 3:3; 19:11,13). Ahithophel is a specimen of how much such an officer might effect for evil or for good; but whether there existed under Hebrew kings any body corresponding, even distantly, to the English Privy Council in former times, does not appear (<sup><1063></sup>2 Samuel 16:20-23; 17:1-14).

The following is a statement of the sources of the royal income:

1. The royal demesnes, corn-fields, vineyards, and olive-gardens. Some at least of these seem to have been taken from private individuals, but whether as the punishment of rebellion, or on any other plausible pretext, is not specified (<sup><9084></sup>1 Samuel 8:14; <sup><1375></sup>1 Chronicles 27:26-28).
2. The produce of the royal flocks (<sup><9207></sup>1 Samuel 21:7; <sup><10323></sup>2 Samuel 13:23; <sup><1460></sup>2 Chronicles 26:10; <sup><1375></sup>1 Chronicles 27:25).
3. A nominal tenth of the produce of corn-land and vineyards, and of sheep (<sup><9815></sup>1 Samuel 8:15,17).
4. A tribute from merchants who passed through the Hebrew territory (<sup><11004></sup>1 Kings 10:14). 5. Presents made by his subjects (<sup><9027></sup>1 Samuel 10:27; 16:20; <sup><11025></sup>1 Kings 10:25; <sup><9710></sup>Psalms 72:10). There is, perhaps, no greater distinction in the usages of Eastern and Western nations than in what relates to the giving and receiving of presents. When made regularly, they do, in fact, amount to a regular tax. Thus, in the passage last referred to in the book of Kings, it is stated that they brought to Solomon 'every man his present, vessels of silver and vessels of gold, and garments, and armor, and spices, horses and mules, a rate year by year.'
6. In the time of Solomon, the king had trading vessels of his own at sea, which, starting from Eziongeber, brought back once in three years gold and silver, ivory, apes, and peacocks (<sup><11022></sup>1 Kings 10:22). It is probable that Solomon and some other kings may have derived some revenue from commercial ventures (<sup><11028></sup>1 Kings 9:28).
7. The spoils of war taken from conquered nations and the tribute paid by them (<sup><1082></sup>2 Samuel 8:2, 7, 8, 10; <sup><1021></sup>1 Kings 4:21; <sup><1426></sup>2 Chronicles 27:5). 8. Lastly, an undefined power of exacting compulsory labor, to which reference has already been made (<sup><10812></sup>1 Samuel 8:12,13,16). As far as this power was exercised it was equivalent to so much income.

There is nothing in <sup><0902></sup>1 Samuel 10:25, or in <sup><1018></sup>2 Samuel 5:3, to justify the statement that the Hebrews defined in express terms, or in any terms, by a particular agreement or covenant for that purpose, what services should be rendered to the king, or what he could legally require. *SEE SOLOMON.*

**6. Usages.** — A ruler in whom so much authority, human and divine, was embodied, was naturally distinguished by outward honors and luxuries. He had a court of Oriental magnificence. When the power of the kingdom was at its height, he sat on a throne of ivory, covered with pure gold, at the feet of which were two figures of lions, with others on the steps approaching the throne. The king was dressed in royal robes (<sup><1220></sup>1 Kings 22:10; <sup><1480></sup>2 Chronicles 18:9); his insignia were a crown or diadem of pure gold, or perhaps radiant with precious stones (<sup><1010></sup>2 Samuel 1:10; 12:30; <sup><1211></sup>2 Kings 11:12; <sup><1925></sup>Psalm 21:3), and a royal sceptre (<sup><3591></sup>Ezekiel 19:11; <sup><2345></sup>Isaiah 14:5; <sup><1915></sup>Psalm 45:6; Amos 1:5,8). Those who approached him did him obeisance, bowing down and touching the ground with their foreheads (<sup><0248></sup>1 Samuel 24:8; <sup><1024></sup>2 Samuel 19:24); and this was done even by a king's wife, the mother of Solomon (<sup><1016></sup>1 Kings 1:16). His officers and subjects called themselves his servants or slaves, though they do not seem habitually to have given way to such extravagant salutations as in the Chaldaean and Persian courts (<sup><0973></sup>1 Samuel 17:32, 34, 36; 20:8; <sup><1053></sup>2 Samuel 6:20; <sup><2004></sup>Daniel 2:4). As in the East at present, a kiss was a sign of respect and homage (<sup><0901></sup>1 Samuel 10:1; perhaps <sup><1912></sup>Psalm 2:12). He lived in a splendid palace, with porches and columns (<sup><1102></sup>1 Kings 7:2-7). All his drinking-vessels were of gold (<sup><1102></sup>1 Kings 10:21).

At his accession, in addition to the anointing mentioned above, jubilant music formed a part of the popular rejoicings (<sup><1044></sup>1 Kings 1:40); thank-offerings were made (<sup><1025></sup>1 Kings 1:25); the new sovereign rode in solemn procession on the royal mule of his predecessor (<sup><1038></sup>1 Kings 1:38), and took possession of the royal harem—an act which seems to have been scarcely less essential than other observances which appear to us to wear a higher character (<sup><1023></sup>1 Kings 2:13, 22; <sup><1062></sup>2 Samuel 16:22). A numerous harem, indeed, was among the most highly estimated of the royal luxuries (<sup><1053></sup>2 Samuel 5:13; <sup><1110></sup>1 Kings 11:1; 20:3). It was under the supervision and control of eunuchs, and passed from one monarch to another as a part of the crown property (<sup><1028></sup>2 Samuel 12:8). The law (<sup><5777></sup>Deuteronomy 17:17), foreseeing evils such as that by which Solomon, in his later years, was turned away from his fidelity to God, had strictly forbidden many



wives; but Eastern passions and usages were too strong for a mere written prohibition, and a corrupted religion became a pander to royal lust, interpreting the divine command as sanctioning eighteen as the minimum of wives and concubines.

Deriving their power originally from the wishes of the people, and being one of the same race, the Hebrew kings were naturally less despotic than other Oriental sovereigns, mingled more with their subjects, and were by no means difficult of access (<sup><1098></sup>2 Samuel 19:8; <sup><1113></sup>1 Kings 20:39; <sup><1087></sup>Jeremiah 38:7; <sup><1086></sup>1 Kings 3:16; <sup><1135></sup>2 Kings 6:26; 8:3). After death the monarchs were interred in the royal cemetery in Jerusalem: "So David slept with his fathers, and was buried in the city of David" (<sup><1120></sup>1 Kings 2:10; 11:43; 14:31). But bad kings were excluded "from the sepulchres of the kings of Israel" (<sup><1437></sup>2 Chronicles 28:27).

See Schickard, *Jus Regium Hebrceor.* (Tilbing. 1621); Carpzov, *Apopar. Crit.* p. 52; Michaelis, *Mos. Recht.* i, 298; Otho, *Lex. Rabbin.* p. 575; Hess, *Gesch. d. K. Juda uud Israels* (Ziir. 1787); Houtuyn, *Monarchia Hebrceorum* (Leyd. 1685); Newman, *Hebrew Monarchy* (Lond. 1847, 1853); Pastoret, *Legislation des lebreux* (Paris, 1817); Salvador, *Hist. des Institutiones de Moise* (Paris, 1828); Hullmann, *Staatsverfassung der Israeliten* (Lpz. 1834); Maurice, *Kings and Prophets of the O.T.* (Lond. 1852, Bost. 1858); *Brit. and For. Evang. Review*, April, 1801. **SEE MONARCHY.**

## King

is the name of the five canonical works of the followers of Confucius. **SEE CONFUCIUS.**

## King, Alonzo

a Baptist minister, was born in Wilbraham, Mass., April 1, 1796. His early educational advantages were few; but in 1818 he went to prosecute his studies in the family of the Rev. Leland Howard, then pastor of the Baptist church in Windsor, Vt., where he was converted to Christ. He afterwards entered Waterville College, Maine, and graduated in 1825. He was ordained pastor of the Baptist Church in North Yarmouth, Me., in 1826, subsequently of a small church in Northbrough, Mass., and finally settled at Westborough, Mass., where he died in 1835. King was a man of great humility, self-consecration, and self-abandonment. His preaching was never

bold or startling, but always quiet, tender, persuasive. He had a talent for lyric poetry, and many of his productions are abroad without his name. His style as a writer was pure, with a decided cast of the imaginative or poetic, which was always apparent in his sermons and his printed productions. He compiled the Memoir of the distinguished missionary, Rev. George D. Boardman. See Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, 6:747. (J. L. S.)

### King, Barnabas, D.D.

a Presbyterian minister, was born in New Marlborough, Mass., June 2, 1780. While yet in his 14th year, his great proficiency in study attracted the attention of Dr. Catline, who afterwards bore all the expense of fitting him for Williams College, Mass., which he entered in 1802. In 1804 he graduated, and then for a year taught school and studied theology with Dr. Catline. In 1805 he was licensed by the Berkshire Congregational Association, Mass., and in 1805 was ordained by the Presbytery, and installed as pastor of the Rockaway Church, N. J., where he continued to preach till 1848; his congregation then called a colleague pastor, which relation continued until the death of Dr. King, April 10, 1862. King was a man of admirable character; his consistent piety no one questioned, and his sympathetic heart made him a model pastor. As a preacher, his style was very simple, but scriptural, and usually very earnest. See Wilson, *Presbyterian Hist. Almanac*. 1863. (J. L. S.)

### King, Charles

the noted president of Columbia College, was born in New York, March 16, 1789. In company with his father, Rufus King, he went to England, and, during his residence at the court of St. James as the representative of the American government, young Charles attended Harrow School, and later went to Paris to further prepare himself for admission to college. He, however, afterwards abandoned this intention and entered the mercantile profession. In 1823 he became co-editor of the *New York American*. In 1849 he was chosen president of Columbia College. He died at Frascati, near Rome, in Italy, Sept. 27, 1867. A list of his works, which are not of special interest to theological students, is given by Allibone, *Dict. of English and American Authors*, ii, s.v.; *New American Cyclopaedia*, 1867, p. 425.

## King, Edward

a noteworthy English antiquary and lawyer, was born in 1735 in Norfolk, and was a graduate of Cambridge University. He was elected F.R.S. in 1767 and F.S.A. in 1770. He died in 1807. King wrote a number of works connected with theology, politics, political economy, and antiquities. We have room here only to note his *Morsels of Criticisms, tending to Illustrate some few Passages in Holy Scripture upon philosophical Principles and an enlarged View of Things* (Lond. 1788, 4to, and since). The contents of this work are: On the word "Heaven" in the Lord's Prayer; Septuagint Translation of Genesis; John the Baptist being Elias; Future coming of Christ; Day of Judgment; Series of Events in Revelation; Daniel's Prophecy; Deaths of Ananias and Sapphira; Dissertations on Light; The Heavens; Stars; Fluid of Heat; Miracles; Jacob and Esau; Soul, Body, Spirit, etc. King's learning was profound and extensive, but he was so inclined to the speculative and hypothetical that he perpetually fell into difficulty by advancing statements which he was unqualified to establish. The want of discrimination between theory and fact, supposition and reality, together with the tenacity with which he clung to his premature conclusions when assailed, proved quite detrimental. In a work of his treating on the signs of the times, he was very desirous of tracing the history of the French Revolution to the records of sacred antiquity; he also ventured to assert the genuineness of the second book of Esdras in the Apocrypha. He was replied to by Gough and bishop Horsley. See Chalmers's *Biog. Dict.* vol. xix (Lond. 1815); Watkins's *Biog. Dict.* (Lond. 1820); Blake's *Biog. Dict.* (3d edit. Phila. 1840); Allibone, *Dict. of Engl. and American Authors*, ii, s.v.

## King, Henry, D.D.

bishop of Chichester, and eldest son of John King (q.v.), was born at Wornall, Buckinghamshire, in Jan. 1591. He studied at Westminster School, from whence he was elected to Christ Church, Oxford, in 1608. Having entered the Church, he became chaplain to king James I, archdeacon of Colchester, residentiary of St. Paul's, and canon of Christ Church; dean of Rochester in 1638, and finally bishop of Chichester in 1641. Although he was generally considered a Puritan, and his nomination had been a measure to conciliate that party, he remained a faithful adherent of the king during the civil war, and at the Restoration was reinstalled in his bishopric. He died Oct. 1, 1669. He was considered a very successful

preacher and a learned divine. His principal works are, *An Exposition upon the Lord's Prayer* (London, 1634, 4to):-*A Sermon of Deliverance, Psalm 91:3* (Lond. 1626, 4to):-*Two Sermons upon the Act Sunday, July 10, 1625* (Oxford, 1625, 4to):-*The Psalm s of David turned into Metre* (1621, 12mo; new edition, with biographical notice, notes, etc., by Dr. John Hannah 18, 143, 2mo); etc. See Wood, *Athene Oxonienses*, vol. ii; Ellis, *Specimens*, vol. iii; Chalmers, *Genesis Biog. Dictionary*; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 27:739; Allibone, *Diet. of JEnglish and American Authors*, ii, s.v. (J. N. P.)

### King, James S.

a Presbyterian minister, was born at Albany, N. Y., Aug. 20, 1832. He graduated from the College of New Jersey, Princeton, N. J., and studied theology in the Princeton Seminary. He was licensed by the New York Presbytery, and in 1858 ordained and installed pastor of the Rockland Lake Church, New York, where he was quite successful and greatly beloved by his people. Failing health, however, compelled him to withdraw from the active duties of the pastorate. During the period of his necessitated rest he did some effective work. He died at Woodlawn, near Sing Sing, New York, Sept. 15, 1864. Mr. King was an estimable minister, of good talents, and thoroughly consecrated to his work. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1866, p. 126; Appleton, *Annual Cyclopaedia*, 1865, p. 468.

### King, John (1), D.D.

bishop of London, an English theologian and a descendant of Robert King, first bishop of Oxford, was born at Wornall, Buckinghamshire, about 1559. He studied at Christ Church, Oxford. Having entered the Church, he became successively chaplain to queen Elizabeth, archdeacon of Nottingham in 1590, D.D. in 1601, dean of Christ Church in 1605, and, finally, bishop of London in 1611. He died in 1621. James I called him the *king of preachers*. He wrote *Lectures upon Jonas, delivered at Yorke*, 1594 (Lond. 1611, 4to), and some *Sermons*. See Wood, *Athence Oxonienses*, vol. i; Dodd, *Church History*, vol. i; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 27:739; Allibone, *Dict. of English and American Authors*.

### King, John (2), D.D.

an English theologian, was born in Cornwall in 1652. He studied at Oxford and Cambridge, and became successively rector of Chelsea and (in 1731)

prebendary of the Cathedral of York. He died May 30, 1732. King wrote *Animadversions* (2d ed. 1702, 4to):- *The Case of John Atherton, Bishop of Waterford* (1716, 8vo); and a number of *Sermons*. — *Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 22:742.

### King, John (3)

a Methodist minister, of whose early history nothing is definitely known, was one of the first lay evangelists who founded Methodism in this country. He came from London to America in the latter part of 1769, and his enthusiastic sympathy with the pioneer Methodists led him to throw himself immediately into their ranks. The Church hesitated when he presented himself for license, but, persistent in his determination to preach, he made an appointment "in the Potter's Field," where he proclaimed his first message over the graves of the poor, and began a career of eminent usefulness. Afterwards he was licensed, and stationed in Wilmington, Del. Thence he went into Maryland, and was the first to introduce Methodism to the people of Baltimore. In this latter place he preached from tables in the public streets, and suffered much opposition from frequent mobs. King was afterwards received into the regular itinerancy. He was a member of the first Conference of 1773, and was appointed to New Jersey. He soon after entered Virginia; still later he was again in New Jersey. He located during the Revolution, but in 1801 reappeared in the itinerant ranks in Virginia, and finally located in 1803. King was a pious, zealous, and useful man. He died at an advanced age, in the vicinity of Raleigh, N. C. He was probably the only survivor, at the time of his decease, of all the preachers of ante-revolutionary date.—Stevens, *Hist. of the M. E. Church*, i, 87. (J. L. S.)

### King, John Glen, D.D., F.R.S., F.A.S.

a distinguished English theologian and antiquarian, was born in Norfolk about 1731. He studied at Caius College, Cambridge, entered the Church, and in 1764 was appointed chaplain to the English factory at Petersburg. He afterwards became successively rector of Wormley, Hertfordshire (in 1783), and minister of the chapel in Broad Court) Drury Lane, London (in 1786). He died Nov. 3, 1787. King wrote *The Rites and Ceremonies of the Greek Church in Russia, containing an Account of its Doctrine, Worship, and Discipline* (Lond. 1772, 4to): — *A Letter to the Bishop of Durham, containing some Observations on the Climate of Russia*, etc. (Lond. 1778,

4to); etc. See *Gent. Magazine*, lvii and lix; Chalmers, *Genesis Biog. Dictionary*; Allibone, *Dictionary of English and American Authors*, ii, 1031.

### King, John L.

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Indiana Feb. 1, 1835; was educated at Knox College, Galesburg, Ill., and studied divinity in Lane Theological Seminary, Ohio; was licensed and ordained at Cincinnati in 1861, and then assumed the pastorate at Williamsport, Indiana; afterwards labored as a missionary among the sailors at Detroit, Michigan, and finally went to Idaho and Colorado Territories. He died near Denver, Nov. 10, 1866. Mr. King was a man of ripe scholarly attainments and fine abilities, earnestly devoted especially to the work of elementary religious teaching. Wilson, *Presb. Historical Almanac*, 1867.

### King, Peter

lord chancellor of England, was born at Exeter, Devonshire. in 1669; went to Holland, and studied at the university at Leyden, and upon his return to England studied law at Lincoln's Inn, and became member of Parliament in 1699. In 1708 he was appointed recorder of London, and knighted. At the accession of George I he was made lord chief justice of the Court of Common Pleas, and soon after promoted to the peerage as lord King, baron of Ockham. He was made lord chancellor in 1725, but does not seem to have been as successful in that position as was expected. He died in 1733. He was well versed in both ecclesiastical history and the law. His principal works are. *An Enquiry into the Constitution, Discipline, Unity, and Worship of the Primitive Church*, etc. [Anon.] (Lond. 1712, 8vo) : in this, his first publication, he advocated, with much ability and learning, the right of Protestant dissenters from episcopacy to be comprehended in the scheme of the national establishment. The work excited much attention, and provoked much discussion, especially when the second edition was issued (1713). Prominent among the opponents was the nonjuring Sclater, who wrote an Answer to it. King himself has been said to have afterwards altered his opinion on the subject:-*The History of the Apostles' Creed, with critical Observations on its several Articles* [Anon.] (London, 1702, 8vo)-a work displaying extraordinary learning and judgment, and highly commended by the ablest critics, among others by Mosheim. See *Gentleman's Magazine*, vol. lxii and lxx; Chalmers, *General Biog.*

*Dictionary*; Lord Campbell, *Lives of Lords Chancellors*; Allibone, *Dict. of English and American Authors*, s.v. (J. H.W.)

### King, Richard

an English theologian, was born at Bristol in 1749; studied at the University of Oxford, and became successively rector of Steeple, Morden, and of Worthing. He died in 1810. King wrote *Letters from Abraham Plymley to his Brother Peter on the Catholic Question* (Lond. 1803, 8vo), which created some sensation: — *On the Inspiration of the Scriptures* (1805, 8vo): — *On the Alliance between Church and State* (1807, 8vo). His wife, Frances Elizabeth Bernard, wrote *Female Scripture Biography* (12th edit. London, 1840, 12mo): *The Benefits of the Christian Temper*; etc. See *Gent. Magazine* (1810); Rose, *New Biographical Dictionary*, s.v.

### King, Thomas Starr,

a Unitarian minister, was born in New York Dec. 16, 1824. His father, Rev. T. F. King, was a Universalist clergyman of very decided ability, but died in the prime of life, and Thomas, at the age of twelve years, while fitting to enter Harvard College, found himself the principal support of a large family. He managed, however, successfully to complete his studies, and in September, 1845, preached his first sermon in Woburn, Mass. The next year he was settled over his father's former charge in Charlestown, whence he was called in 1848 to the Hollis Street Unitarian Church, Boston, where he preached with great acceptance and a constantly increasing reputation till 1860, when he accepted the call of the Unitarian Church in San Francisco to become their pastor. He entered upon his new duties with a zeal and energy which won the hearts of the people, and ere long he was as thoroughly identified with California interests as if his whole life had been spent there. His congregation increased in numbers and power with great rapidity; but he was a preacher for the whole city and state, and crowds hung upon his eloquent utterances, and his bold, earnest words. At the outbreak of our late civil war, King, finding California in a hesitating position, flung himself into the breach, and by his eloquence and earnestness saved the state; and when the sanitary commission was organized, he first set in motion, and through the next three years pushed forward, the efforts in behalf of the sick and wounded soldiers. His labors in this cause, added to his pastoral duties, were too severe for his strength, and he (died March 4, 1864, after a very brief illness. Mr. King published

several discourses and addresses, etc.-Appleton, *New American Cyclopaedia*, 1865, p. 468.

### King, William, (1)

archbishop of Dublin, a learned divine and metaphysician, was born at Antrim, province of Ulster, Ireland, May 1, 1650. He studied at Trinity College, Dublin, entered the Church in 1674, and became chaplain to Parker, archbishop of Tuam. The latter being translated to the archbishopric of Dublin in 1679, King became chancellor of St. Patrick and St. Marburgh, Dublin. Ireland was then a prey to violent religious controversies, which served also as a cloak for political dissensions. King wrote several pamphlets against Peter Manby, dean of Londonderry, who had embraced Roman Catholicism. In 1688 he was made dean of St. Patrick. The Revolution breaking out soon after, and James II having taken refuge in Ireland, King was twice sent to the Tower of Dublin as a partisan of the insurgents. He defended his opinions in a work entitled *The State of the Protestants of Ireland under the late King James's Government* (3d and best ed. Lond. 1692, 8vo), which gave rise to a controversy between him and Charles Leslie, a partisan of the fallen monarch. In 1691 King was made bishop of Derry, and applied himself with much zeal to the task of bringing back into the Church the dissenters of his diocese. He finally became archbishop of Dublin in 1702, was appointed one of the lords justices of Ireland in 1717, and again in 1721 and 1723, and died at Dublin May 8, 1729. He was through life held in high esteem as a man, as well as in his character of a prelate and writer on theology. His principal work in that line is the *De Origine Mali* (Dublin, 1702, 4to; Lond. 1702, 8vo). "The object of this work is to show how all the several kinds of evil with which the world abounds are consistent with the goodness of God, and may be accounted for without the supposition of an evil principle." It was attacked by Bayle and also by Leibnitz: by the former for the charges of Manichaeism made against him, and by the latter because King had taken him to task for his optimism. King, however, during his life made no reply, but he left among his papers notes of answers to their arguments, and these were given to the world after his death by Dr. Edmund Law, bishop of Carlisle, together with a translation of the treatise itself (Camb. 1758, 8vo). 'In 1709 he published a sermon on *Divine Predestination and Foreknowledge consistent with the Freedom of Alan's Will*, preached before the House of Peers. In this work he advanced a doctrine concerning the moral attributes of God as being different from the moral qualities of



the same name in man. This valuable and most important work was often reprinted (Exeter, 1815, 8vo; London, 1821, 8vo; and in the *Tracts of Angl. Fathers*, ii, 225). He wrote also *A Discourse concerning the Inventions of Men in the Worship of God* (Lond. 1697, sm. 8vo): — *An Admonition to the Dissenters* (London, 1706, sm. 8vo) :*An Account of King James II's Behavior to his Protestant Subjects of Ireland*, etc. (Lond. 1746, 8vo): — *A Vindication of the Rev. Dr. Henry Sacheverell*, etc. [Anon.] (Lond. 1710, 8vo); etc. See *Bibliographica Britannica*; Chalmers, *General Biographical Dictionary*; *Cyclopaedia Bibliographica*, ii, 1730; Hook, *Ecclesiastical Biography*, 6:456; *English Cyclopaedia*, s.v.; and especially Allibone, *Dict. Enyl. and Am. Auth.* ii, 1032. (J. N. P.)

### King, William, (2)

a Scotch Presbyterian minister, was born in Tyrone, Ireland. He emigrated to America in 1830, and became pastor of a church at Nelson, Canada West. After laboring there faithfully and earnestly for many years he removed to Carador, C.W., where he died, March 13, 1859.

### Kingdom Of God

or of Heaven (ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ or τῶν οὐρανῶν). In the New Testament the phrases " kingdom of God" (<sup><4053></sup>Matthew 6:33; <sup><4014></sup>Mark 1:14, 15; <sup><4045></sup>Luke 4:43; 6:20; <sup><303></sup>John 3:3, 5), "kingdom of Christ" (<sup><4134></sup>Matthew 13:41; 20:21; <sup><600></sup>Revelation 1:9), "kingdom of Christ and of God" (<sup><4055></sup>Ephesians 5:5), " kingdom of David," i.e. as the ancestor and type of the Messiah (<sup><4110></sup>Mark 11:10), " the kingdom" (<sup><4082></sup>Matthew 8:12; 13:19; 9:53), and "kingdom of heaven" (<sup><4082></sup>Matthew 3:2; 4:17; 13:41, 31, 33, 44. 47; <sup><5048></sup>2 Timothy 4:18), are all synonymous, and signify *the divine spiritual kingdom, the glorious reign of the Messiah*. The idea of this kingdom has its basis in the prophecies of the Old Testament, where the coming of the Messiah and his triumphs are foretold (<sup><4926></sup>Psalm 2:6-12; 101:1-7; <sup><2101></sup>Isaiah 2:1-4; <sup><3001></sup>Micah 4:1; <sup><2101></sup>Isaiah 11:1-10; <sup><4235></sup>Jeremiah 23:5, 6; 31:31-34; 32:37-44; 33:14-18; <sup><3523></sup>Ezekiel 34:23-31; 37:24-28; <sup><2044></sup>Daniel 2:44; 7:14, 27; 9:25, 27). In these passages the reign of the Messiah is figuratively described as a golden age, when the true religion, and with it the Jewish theocracy, should be re-established in more than pristine purity, and universal peace and happiness prevail. All this was doubtless to be understood in a spiritual sense; and so the devout Jews of our Saviour's time appear to have understood it, as Zacharias, Simeon,

Anna, and Joseph (~~406~~Luke 1:67-79; 2:25-30; 23:50-51). But the Jews at large gave to these prophecies a temporal meaning, and expected a Messiah who should come in the clouds of heaven, and, as king of the Jewish nation, restore the ancient religion and worship, reform the corrupt morals of the people, make expiation for their sins, free them from the yoke of foreign dominion, and at length reign over the whole earth in peace and glory (~~4159~~Matthew 5:19; 8:12; 18:1; 20:21; ~~4271~~Luke 17:20; 19:11; ~~4006~~Acts 1:6). This Jewish temporal sense appears to have been also held by the apostles before the day of Pentecost.

It has been well observed by Knobel, in his work *On the Prophets*, that " Jesus did not acknowledge himself called upon to fulfil those theocratic announcements which had an earthly political character, in the sense in which they were uttered; for his plan was spiritual and universal, neither including worldly interests, nor contracted within national and political limits. He gave, accordingly, to all such announcements a higher and more general meaning, so as to realize them in accordance with such a scheme. Thus, 1. The prophets had announced that Jehovah would deliver his people from the political calamities into which, through the conquering might of their foes, they had been brought. This Jesus fulfilled, but in a higher sense. He beheld the Jewish and heathen world under the thralldom of error and of sin, in circumstances of moral calamity, and he regarded himself as sent to effect its deliverance. In this sense he announced himself as the Redeemer, who had come to save the world, to destroy the works of the devil, to annihilate the powers of evil, and to bring men from the kingdom of darkness to the kingdom of light.

**2.** The prophets had predicted that Jehovah would again be united to his restored people, would dwell among them, and no more give up the theocratic relation. This also Jesus fulfilled in a higher sense. He found mankind in a state of estrangement from God, arising from their lying in sin, and he viewed it as his vocation to bring them back to God. He reconciled men to God gave them access to God-united them to him as his dear children, and made his people one with God as he himself is one.

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

blessings which he offers are of a spiritual kind, consisting in internal and unending fellowship with God. This is the *life*, the *life eternal*. In the passages where he seems to speak of temporal blessings (e.g. <sup><4181></sup>Matthew 8:11; 19:27, etc.) he either speaks metaphorically or in reference to the ideas of those whom he addressed, and who were not quite emancipated from carnal hopes.

4. The prophets had predicted, in general, the re-establishment of their people into a mighty state, which should endure upon the earth in imperishable splendor as an outward community. This prospect Jesus realized again in a higher and a spiritual sense by establishing a religious invisible community, internally united by oneness of faith in God and of pure desire, which ever grows and reaches its perfection only in another life. 'he rise and progress of this man cannot observe, for its existence is in the invisible life of the spirit (<sup><2171></sup>Luke 17:20), yet the opposition of the wicked is an evidence of its approach (<sup><4128></sup>Matthew 12:28). It has no political designs, for it 'is not of this world;' and there are found in it no such gradations of rank as in earthly political communities (<sup><4115></sup>Matthew 20:25). What is external is not essential to it; its prime element is mind, pious, devoted to God, and pleasing God. Hence the kingdom of Jesus is composed of those who turn to God and his ambassadors. and in faith and life abide true to them. From this it is clear how sometimes this kingdom maybe spoken of as present, and sometimes as future. Religious and moral truth works forever, and draws under its influence one after another, until at length it shall reign over all. In designating this community, Jesus made use of terms having a relation to the ancient theocracy; it is the *kingdom of God* or *of heaven*, though, at the same time, it is represented rather as *the family* than as the *state* of God. This appears from many other phrases. The head of the ancient community was called *Lord* and *King*; that of the new is called *Father*; the members of the former were *servants*, i.e. *subjects of Jd'hovah*; those of the latter are *sons of God*; the feeling of the former towards God is described as the *fear of Jehovah*; that of the latter is *believing confidence* or *love*; the chief duty of the former was *righteousness*; the first duty of the latter is *love*. All these expressions are adapted to the constitution of the sacred community, either as *a divine state* or as *a divine family*. It needs hardly to be mentioned that Jesus extended its fulfilment of these ancient prophecies in this spiritual sense to all men."

Referring to the Old-Testament idea, we may therefore regard the "kingdom of heaven," etc., in the New Testament, as designating, in its Christian sense, the *Christian dispensation*, or the community of those who receive Jesus as the Messiah, and who, united by his Spirit under him as their Head, rejoice in the truth, and live a holy life in love and in communion with him (<sup><408D></sup>Matthew 3:2; 4:17, 23; 9:35; 10:7; <sup><4014></sup>Mark 1:14, 15; <sup><4009></sup>Luke 10:9, 11; 23:51; <sup><4273></sup>Acts 27:31'). This spiritual kingdom has both an *internal* and *external* form. As internal and spiritual, it already exists and rules in the hearts of all Christians, and is therefore present (<sup><5147></sup>Romans 14:17; <sup><4063></sup>Matthew 6:33; <sup><4105></sup>Mark 10:15; <sup><4072></sup>Luke 17:21; 18:17; <sup><4083></sup>John 3:3,5; <sup><4040></sup>1 Corinthians 4:20). It "suffereth violence," implying the eagerness with which the Gospel was received in the agitated state of men's minds (<sup><4012></sup>Matthew 11:12; <sup><4066></sup>Luke 16:6). As external, it is either embodied in the visible Church of Christ, and in so far is present and progressive (<sup><4060></sup>Matthew 6:10; 12:28; 13:24, 31, 33, 41, 47; 16:19, 28; <sup><4043></sup>Mark 4:30; 11:10; <sup><4038></sup>Luke 13:18, 20; <sup><4408></sup>Acts 19:8; <sup><5128></sup>Hebrews 12:28), or it is to be perfected in the coming of the Messiah to judgment and his subsequent spiritual reign in bliss and glory, in which view it is future (<sup><4038></sup>Matthew 13:43; 26:29; <sup><4145></sup>Mark 14:25; <sup><4023></sup>Luke 22:29, 30; <sup><6011></sup>2 Peter 1:11; <sup><6120></sup>Revelation 12:10). In this latter view it denotes especially *the bliss of heaven, eternal life*, which is to be enjoyed in the Redeemer's kingdom (<sup><4081></sup>Matthew 8:11; 25:34; <sup><4047></sup>Mark 9:47; <sup><4038></sup>Luke 13:18, 29; <sup><4112></sup>Acts 11:22; <sup><4049></sup>1 Corinthians 6:9,20; 15:50; <sup><4062></sup>Galatians 5:21; <sup><4085></sup>Ephesians 5:5; <sup><5006></sup>2 Thessalonians 1:5; <sup><5048></sup>2 Timothy 4:18; <sup><4015></sup>James 2:5). But these different aspects are not always distinguished, the expression often embracing both the internal and external sense, and referring both to its commencement in this world and its completion in the world to come (<sup><4083></sup>Matthew 5:3, 10, 20; 7:21; 11:11; 13:11, 52; 18:3,4; <sup><5013></sup>Colossians 1:13; <sup><5012></sup>1 Thessalonians 2:12). In Luke i, 33, it is said of the kingdom of Christ "there shall be no end;" whereas in <sup><4154></sup>1 Corinthians 15:24-26, it is said "he shall deliver up the kingdom to God, even the Father." The contradiction is only in appearance. The latter passage refers to the *mediatorial* dominion of Christ; and when the mediatorial work of the Saviour is accomplished, then, at the final judgment, he will resign forever his mediatorial office, while the reign of Christ as God supreme will never cease. "His throne," in the empire of the universe, "is forever and ever" (<sup><5008></sup>Hebrews 1:8).

"There is reason to believe not only that the expression *kingdom of heaven*, as used in the New Test., was employed as synonymous with *kingdom of God*, as referred to in the Old Test., but that the former expression had become common among the Jews of our Lord's time for denoting the state of things expected to be brought in by the Messiah. The mere use of the expression as it first occurs in Matthew, uttered apparently by John Baptist, and our Lord himself, without a note of explanation, as if all perfectly understood what was meant by it, seems alone conclusive evidence of this. The Old-Testament constitution, and the writings belonging to it, had familiarized the Jews with the application of the terms *king* and *kingdom* to God, not merely with reference to his universal sovereignty, but also to his special connection with the people he had chosen for himself (<sup><4922></sup>1 Samuel 12:12; <sup><4916></sup>Psalms 2:6; 5:2; 20:9; <sup><4391></sup>1 Chronicles 29:11; <sup><4438></sup>2 Chronicles 13:8, etc.). In Daniel, however, where pointed expression required to be given to the difference in this respect between what is of earth and what is of heaven, we find matters ordered on a certain occasion with a view to bring out the specific lesson that 'the heavens do rule' (iv, 26); and in the interpretation given to the vision, which had been granted to Nebuchadnezzar, it was said, with more special reference to New Testament times, that 'in the days of those (earthly) kings the God of heaven (lit. of the heavens) should set up a kingdom that should never be destroyed (2:44). In still another vision granted to Daniel himself, this divine kingdom was represented under the image of 'one like a Son of man coming with the clouds of heaven, and there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages should serve him' (7:13, 14). It appears to have been in consequence of the phraseology thus introduced and sanctioned by Daniel that the expression 'kingdom of heaven' ( $\mu\upsilon\alpha\delta\eta\iota\tau\omega\kappa\lambda\eta\iota$  *malkuth hashamayim*) passed into common usage among the Jews, and was but another name with them for a state of fellowship with God and devotedness to his service. Many examples of this are given by Wetstein on <sup><4192></sup>Matthew 3:2 from Jewish writings: thus, 'He who confesses God to be one, and repeats <sup><4194></sup>Deuteronomy 6:4, takes up the kingdom of heaven;' 'Jacob called his sons and commanded them concerning the ways of God, and they took upon them the kingdom of heaven;' 'The sons of Ahasius did not take upon them the yoke of the kingdom of heaven; they did not acknowledge the Lord, for they said, There is not a kingdom in heaven,' etc. The expression, indeed, does not seem to have been used specifically with reference to the Messiah's coming, or the state to be introduced by him (for

the examples produced by Schottgen [*De Messia*, ch. ii] are scarcely in point); but when the Lord himself was declared to be at hand to remodel everything, and visibly take the government, as it were, on his shoulder, it would be understood of itself that here the kingdom of heaven should be found concentrating itself, and that to join one's self to Messiah would be in the truest sense to take up the yoke of that kingdom. *SEE KINGLY OFFICE OF CHRIST.*

The scriptural and popular usages of the term "kingdom of God," kingdom of heaven," etc., serve as a clew to the otherwise rather abrupt proclamation of the Baptist and Jesus at the very beginning of their public ministrations. It is true that in the Old Testament the kingdom or reign of God usually signifies his infinite power, or, more properly, his sovereign authority over all creatures, kingdoms, and hearts. *SEE KING.* Thus Wisdom says (x, 10), God showed his kingdom to Jacob, i.e. he opened the kingdom of heaven to him in showing him the mysterious ladder by which the angels ascended and descended ; and Ecclesiasticus (47:13) says, God gave to David the covenant assurance, or promise of the kingdom, for himself and his successors. Still the transition from this to the moral and religious sphere was so natural that it was silently and continually made, especially as Jehovah was perpetually represented as the supreme and sole legitimate sovereign of his people. Indeed, the theocracy was the central idea of the Jewish state, *SEE JUDGE*, and hence the first announcements of the Gospel sounded with thrilling effect upon the ears of the people, proverbially impatient of foreign rule, and yet, at the time, apparently bound in a hopeless vassalage to Rome. It was to the populace like a trumpet-call to a war for independence, or rather like one of the old paeans of deliverance sung by Miriam and Deborah. *SEE THEOCRACY.*

Copious lists of monographs on this subject may be seen in Danz, *Woirterbuch*, s.v. Himmel-Reich, Messias Reich; Volbeding, *Index Programmatum*, p. 37; Hase, *Leben Jesu*, p. 72, 77. *SEE MESSIAH.*

### Kingdom Of Israel.

*SEE ISRAEL, KINGDOM OF.*

### Kingdom Of Judah.

*SEE JUDAH, KINGDOM OF.*

## Kingly Office Of Christ,

one of the three great relations which Jesus sustains to his people, namely, as prophet, priest, and king, and to which he was solemnly inaugurated at his baptism by John. *SEE ANOINTING*. It is by virtue of this that he became head of the Church, which is the sphere of his realm. *SEE KINGDOM OF GOD*. This is that spiritual, evangelical, and eternal empire to which he himself referred when interrogated before Pontius Pilate, and in reference to which he said, " My kingdom is not of this world" (<sup><4936></sup>John 18:36, 37). His empire, indeed, extends to every creature, for " all authority is committed into his hands, both in heaven and on earth," and he is " head over all things to the Church ;" but his kingdom primarily imports the Gospel Church, which is the subject of his laws, the seat of his government, and the object of his care, and, being surrounded with powerful opposers, he is represented as ruling in the midst of his enemies. This kingdom is not of a worldly origin or nature, nor has it this world for its end or object (<sup><547></sup>Romans 14:17; <sup><601></sup>1 Corinthians 4:20). It can neither be promoted nor defended by worldly power, influence, or carnal weapons, but by bearing witness unto the truth, or by the preaching of the Gospel with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven (<sup><706></sup>2 Corinthians 10:4, 5). Its establishment among men is progressive, but it is destined at last to fill the whole earth (Daniel 2; <sup><6115></sup>Revelation 11:15). Its real subjects are only those who are of the truth, and hear Christ's voice; for none can enter it but such as are born from above (<sup><493></sup>John 3:3-5; <sup><483></sup>Matthew 18:3; 19:14; <sup><4105></sup>Mark 10:15), nor can any be visible subjects of it but such as appear to be regenerated by a credible profession of faith and obedience (<sup><2166></sup>Luke 16:16; <sup><4113></sup>Matthew 20:28-44). Its privileges and immunities are not of this world, but such as are spiritual and heavenly; they are all spiritual blessings in heavenly things in Christ Jesus (<sup><4003></sup>Ephesians 1:3). Over this glorious kingdom death has no power; it extends as well to the future as the present world; and though entered here by renewing grace (<sup><5113></sup>Colossians 1:13), it is inherited in its perfection in the world of glory (<sup><4234></sup>Matthew 25:34; <sup><4650></sup>1 Corinthians 15:50; <sup><6011></sup>2 Peter 1:11). Hypocrites and false brethren may indeed insinuate themselves into it here, but they will have no possible place in it hereafter (<sup><4034></sup>Matthew 13:41, 47-50; 22:11-14; <sup><2138></sup>Luke 13:28, 29; <sup><410></sup>1 Corinthians 6:9, 10; <sup><4621></sup>Galatians 5:21; <sup><6217></sup>Revelation 21:27). Its rule is one of love (Tholuck, *Sermon on the Mount*, i, 103). *SEE CHRIST, OFFICE OF*.

## Kings, First And Second Books Of,

the second of the series of Hebrew royal annals, the books of Samuel forming the introductory series, and the books of Chronicles being a parallel series. In the Hebrew Bible the first two series alone form part of "the Former Prophets," like Joshua, Judges, and Ruth. *SEE BIBLE*. In the Authorized English Version it is added to their titles: "commonly called the Third [and the Fourth] Book of the Kings." *SEE SAMUEL, BOOKS OF*.

**I. Number and Title.** — The two books of Kings formed anciently but one book in the Jewish Scriptures, as is affirmed by Origen (apud Euseb. *Prep. Evang.* 6:25, βασιλείων τρίτη, τετάρτη, ἐν ἐνὶ Οὐραμμέλεχ Δαβίδ), Jerome (*Proloy. Gal.*), Josephus (*Cont. Apion.* i, 8), and others. The present division, following the Septuagint and Latin versions, has been common in the Hebrew Bibles since the Venetian editions of Bomberg.

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

**II. Independent Form.**—The question has been raised and minutely discussed whether the books of Kings (1 and 2) constitute an entire work of themselves, or whether they originally formed part of a larger historical work embracing the principal parts of the Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings, out of which these several books, as we now have them, have been formed. Ewald regards the books of Judges (with Ruth), 1 and 2 Samuel, and I and 2 Kings, as forming parts of one whole work,



which he calls "The great book of the Kings." The grounds on which this supposition has been built are partly the following:

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

(2.) The recurrence in Judges of the phrases, "And in those days there was no king in Israel" (*וְלֹא־מֶלֶךְ* Judges 17:6; 18:1; 21:25); "It came to pass in those days when there was no king" (*וַיְהִי־כֵן* Judges 19:1); and in Ruth (*וְכֵן* Ruth 1:1), "Now it came to pass in the days when the judges ruled," shows that this portion of the work was written in the times when there *were* kings in Israel. The writer therefore was in a position to pass under review the whole period of the times of the judges, and we find that he estimates the conduct of the people according to the degree of their conformity to the law of the Lord, after the manner of the writer of Kings (*וְכֵן* Judges 2:11-19; *וְכֵן* 2 Kings 17:7-23).

Again, in *וְכֵן* Judges 1:21, it is said that the Jebusites dwell with the children of Benjamin in Jerusalem *unto this day*; and in *וְכֵן* 2 Samuel 24:16, mention is made of Araunah the *Jebusite* as an inhabitant of Jerusalem, from which it is inferred that the writer intended these facts to explain each other. (But see *וְכֵן* Joshua 15:63.) So there is a reference in *וְכֵן* Judges 20:27 to the removal of the ark of the covenant from Shiloh to Jerusalem; and the expression "in those days" points, as in 17:6, etc., to remote times. There is thought to be a reference in *וְכֵן* Judges 18:30 to the captivity of Israel in the days of Hoshea, in which case that book must have been written subsequently to that time, as well as the books of Kings.

(3.) The books of Kings take up the narrative where 2 Samuel breaks off, and proceed in the same spirit and manner to continue the history, with the earlier parts of which the writer gives proof of being well acquainted (comp. *וְכֵן* 1 Kings 2:11 with *וְכֵן* 2 Samuel 5:4, 5; so also *וְכֵן* 2 Kings 17:41 with *וְכֵן* Judges 2:11-19, etc.; *וְכֵן* 1 Samuel 2:27 with *וְכֵן* Judges 13:6; *וְכֵן* 2 Samuel 14:17-20, 19:27, with *וְכֵן* Judges 13:6; *וְכֵן* 1 Samuel 9:21 with

<065> Judges 6:15, and Judges 20; <1001> 1 Kings 8:1 with <1067> 2 Samuel 6:17, and 5:7, 9; <0772> 1 Samuel 17:12 with <0847> Ruth 4:17; <0800> Ruth 1:1 with <0770> Judges 17:7, 8, 9; 19:1, 2 [Bethlehem-Judah]). Other links connecting the books of Kings with the preceding may be found in the comparison, suggested by De Wette, of <1025> 1 Kings 2:26 with <0925> 1 Samuel 2:35; <1003> 1 Kings 2:3, 4; 5:17, 18; 8:18, 19, 25, with <1072> 2 Samuel 7:12-16; and <1001> 1 Kings 4:1-6 with <1085> 2 Samuel 8:15-18.

(4.) Similarity of diction has been observed throughout, indicating identity of authorship. The phrase "Spirit of Jehovah" occurs first in Judges, and frequently afterwards in Samuel and Kings (<0780> Judges 3:10; 6:34, etc.; <0906> 1 Samuel 10:6, etc.; <1224> 1 Kings 22:24; <1216> 2 Kings 2:16, etc.). So "Man of God," to designate a prophet, and "God do so to me and more also," are common to them; and "till they were ashamed" to Judges and Kings (<0925> Judges 3:25; <1217> 2 Kings 2:17; 8:11).

(5.) Generally the style of the narrative, ordinarily quiet and simple, but rising to great vigor and spirit when stirring deeds are described (as in Judges 4, 7, 11, etc.; 1 Samuel 4, 17, 31, etc.; 1 Kings 8, 18, 19, etc.), and the introduction of poetry or poetic style in the midst of the narrative (as in <0781> Judges 5:1 Samuel 2, <1017> 2 Samuel 1:17, etc., <1227> 1 Kings 22:17, etc.), constitute such strong features of resemblance as lead to the conclusion that these several books form but one work.

But these reasons are not conclusive. Many of the resemblances may be accounted for in other ways, while there are important and wide differences.

(1.) If the arguments were sufficient to join Judges, Samuel, and Kings together in one work, for the same reasons Joshua must be added (Joshua i, 1; 15:63; xxiii and xxiv; <0700> Judges 1:1).

(2.) The writer of Kings might be well acquainted with the previous history of his people, and even with the contents of Judges and Samuel, without being himself the author of those books.

(3.) Such similarity of diction as exists may be ascribed to the use by the writer of Kings of earlier documents, to which also the writer of Samuel had access.

(4.) There are good reasons for regarding the Kings as together forming an entire and independent work, such as the similarity of style and language,

both vocabulary and grammar, which pervades the two books, but distinguishes them from others-the uniform system of quotation observed in them, but not in the books which precede them -the same careful attention to chronology-the recurrence of certain phrases and forms of speech peculiar to them. A great number of words occur in Kings, which are found in them only; such are chiefly names of materials and utensils, and architectural terms. Words, and unusual forms of words, occur, which are only found here and in writers of the same period, as Isaiah and Jeremiah, but not in Samuel or Judges. See § 5, below.

**III.** *Contents, Character, and Design.*-The books of Kings contain the brief annals of a long period, from the accession of Solomon till the dissolution of the commonwealth. The first chapters describe the reign of Solomon over the united kingdom, and the revolt under Rehoboam. The history of the rival states is next narrated in parallel sections till the period of Israel's downfall on the invasion of Shalmanezar. Then the remaining years of the principality of Judah are recorded till the conquest of Nebuchadnezzar and the commencement of the Babylonian captivity. *SEE ISRAEL; SEE JUDAH.* For an adjustment of the years of the respective reigns in each line, *SEE CHRONOLOGY.*

There are some peculiarities in this succinct history worthy of attention. It is summary, but very suggestive. It is not a biography of the sovereigns, nor a mere record of political occurrences, nor yet an ecclesiastical register. King, Church, and State are all comprised in their sacred relations. It is a theocratic history, a retrospective survey of the kingdom as existing under a theocratic government. The character of the sovereign is tested by his fidelity to the religious obligations of his office, and this decision in reference to his conduct is generally added to the notice of his accession. The new king's religious character is generally portrayed by its similarity or opposition to the way of David, of his father, or of Jeroboam, son of Nebat, " who made Israel to sin." Ecclesiastical affairs are noticed with a similar purpose, and in contrast with past or prevalent apostasy, especially as manifested in the popular superstitions, whose shrines were on the " high places." Political or national incidents are introduced in general for the sake of illustrating the influence of religion on civic prosperity; of showing how the theocracy maintained a vigilant and vengeful guardianship over its rights and privileges-adherence to its principles securing peace and plenty, disobedience to them bringing along with it sudden and severe retribution. The books of Kings are a verification of the Mosaic warnings, and the

author of them has kept this steadily in view. He has given a brief history of his people, arranged under the various political chiefs in such a manner as to show that the government was essentially theocratic; that its spirit, as developed in the Mosaic writings, was never extinct, however modified or inactive it might sometimes appear. Thus the books of Kings appear in a religious costume, quite different from the form they would have assumed either as a political or ecclesiastical narrative. In the one case legislative enactments, royal edicts, popular movements, would have occupied a prominent place; in the other, sacerdotal arrangements, Levitical service, music, and pageantry, would have filled the leading sections of the treatise. In either view the points adduced would have had a restricted reference to the palace or the temple, the sovereign or the pontiff, the court or the priesthood, the throne or the altar, the tribute or tithes, the nation on its farms, or the tribes in the courts of the sacred edifice. But the theocracy conjoined both the political and religious elements, and the inspired annalist unites them as essential to his design. The agency of divinity is constantly recognised, the hand of Jehovah is continually acknowledged. The chief organ of theocratic influence enjoys peculiar prominence. We refer to the incessant agency of the prophets, their great power and peculiar modes of action as detailed by the composer of the books of Kings. They interfered with the succession, and their instrumentality was apparent in the schism. They roused the people, and they braved the sovereign. The balance of power was in their hands; the regal dignity seemed to be sometimes at their disposal. In times of emergency they dispensed with usual modes of procedure, and assumed an authority with which no subject in an ordinary state can safely be intrusted. executing the law with a summary promptness which rendered opposition impossible, or at least unavailing. They felt their divine commission, and that they were the custodians of the rights of Jehovah. At the same time they protected the interests of the nation, and, could we divest the term of its association with unprincipled turbulence and sedition, we would, like Winer (*Real Vortearb* . s.v. Prophet), style them the demagogues of Israel. The divine prerogative was to them a vested right, guarded with a sacred jealousy from royal usurpation or popular invasion; and the interests of the people were as religiously protected against encroachments, too easily made under a form of government which had not the safeguard of popular representation or aristocratic privilege. The priesthood were in many instances, though there are some illustrious exceptions, merely the creatures of the crown, and therefore it became the prophetic office to assert its dignity and stand forth in the majestic

insignia of an embassy from heaven. The truth of these sentiments, as to the method, design, and composition of the books of Kings, is confirmed by ample evidence.

**(1.)** Large space is occupied with the building of the Temple-the palace of the divine Protector-his throne in it being above the mercy-seat and between the cherubim (ch. v-viii). Care is taken to record the miraculous phenomenon of the descent of the Shekinah (viii. 10). The prayer of Solomon at the dedication of the house is full of theocratic views and aspirations.

**(2.)** Reference is often made to the Mosaic law, with its provisions, and allusions to the earlier history of the people frequently occur (<sup><1108></sup>1 Kings 2:3; 3:14; 6:11,12; 8:58, etc.; <sup><1208></sup>2 Kings 10:31; 14:6; 17:13, 15,37; 18:4-6; 21:1-8). Allusions to the Mosaic code are found more frequently towards the end of the second book when the kingdom was drawing near its termination, as if to account for its decay and approaching fate.

**(3.)** Phrases expressive of divine interference are frequently introduced (<sup><1113></sup>1 Kings 11:31; 12:15; 13:1, 2, 9; and 20:13, etc.).

**(4.)** Prophetic interposition is a very prominent theme of record. It fills the vivid foreground of the historical picture. Nathan was occupied in the succession of Solomon (<sup><1105></sup>1 Kings 1:45); Ahijah was concerned in the revolt (<sup><1112></sup>1 Kings 11:29-40). Shemaiah disbanded the troops which Rehoboam had mustered (<sup><1122></sup>1 Kings 12:21). Ahijah predicted the ruin of Jeroboam, whose elevation he had promoted (<sup><1147></sup>1 Kings 14:7). Jehu, the prophet, doomed the house of Baasha (<sup><1160></sup>1 Kings 16:1). The reigns of Ahab and Ahaziah are marked by the bold, rapid, mysterious movements of Elijah. Under Ahab occurs the prediction of Micaiah (<sup><1218></sup>1 Kings 22:8). The actions and oracles of Elisha form the marvellous topics of narration under several reigns. The agency of Isaiah is also recognised (<sup><1260></sup>2 Kings 19:20; 20:16). Besides, 1 Kings 13 presents another instance of prophetic operation; and in 20:35, the oracle of an unknown prophet is also rehearsed. Huldah the prophetess was an important personage under the government of Josiah (<sup><1224></sup>2 Kings 22:14). Care is also taken to report the fulfilment of striking prophecies, in the usual phrase, "according to the word of the Lord" (<sup><1125></sup>1 Kings 12:15; 15:29; 16:12; <sup><1235></sup>2 Kings 23:15-18; 9:36; 24:2). So, too, the old Syriac version prefixes, "Here follows the book of the kings who flourished among the ancient people; and in this is

also exhibited the history of the prophets who flourished during their times."

(5.) Theocratic influence is recognised both in the deposition and succession of kings (<sup><1133></sup>1 Kings 13:33; 15:4, 5, 29, 30 <sup><1117></sup>2 Kings 11:17, etc.). Compare, on the whole of this view, Huvernick, *Einleit.* § 168; Jahn, *Introduct.* § 46; Gesenius, *Ueber Jes.* i, 934. It is thus apparent that the object of the author of the Books of Kings was to describe the history of the kingdoms, especially in connection with the theocratic element. This design accounts for what De Wette (*Einleit.* § 185) terms the mythical character of these books.

As to what has been termed the anti-Israelitish spirit of the work (Bertholdt, *Einleit.* p. 949), we do not perceive it. Truth required that the kingdom of Israel should be described in its real character. Idol-worship was connected with its foundation; moscholatry was a state provision; fidelity obliged the annalist to state that all its kings patronized the institutions of Bethel and Dan, while eight, at least, of the Jewish sovereigns adhered to the true religion, and that the majority of its kings perished in insurrection, while those of Judah in general were exempted from seditious tumults and assassination.

**IV. Relation of Kings to Chronicles.** — The more obvious differences between the books of Kings and of Chronicles are,

(1.) In respect of language, by which the former are shown to be of earlier date than the latter.

(2.) Of periods embraced in each work. The Chronicles are much more comprehensive than Kings, containing genealogical lists from Adam downwards, and a full account of the reign of David. The portions of the Chronicles synchronistic with Kings are 1 Chronicles 28, <sup><1102></sup>2 Chronicles 36:22.

(3.) In the Kings greater prominence is given to the prophetic office; in Chronicles, to the priestly or Levitical. In the books of the Kings we have the active influence of Nathan in regard to the succession to the throne; and the remarkable lives of Elijah and Elisha, of whom numerous and extraordinary miracles are related, of which scarcely the slightest mention is made in Chronicles, although in Kings about fourteen chapters are taken up with them. Besides these, other prophets are mentioned, and their acts

and sayings are recorded; as, 1 Kings 13, the prophet who came to Bethel from Judah in the reign of Jeroboam, and his predictions; and in 2 Kings 23, the fulfilment of them in the days of Josiah; 1 Kings 13, the old prophet who lived at Bethel with his sons. Ahijah the prophet, also, in the days of Jeroboam, 1 Kings 14; Jehu, the son of Hanani, 1 Kings 16; Jonah, in the time of Jeroboam, <sup><1245></sup>2 Kings 14:25; and Isaiah in relation to the sickness of Hezekiah, 2 Kings 20. Of these there is either no mention, or much slighter in Chronicles, where the priestly or Levitical element is more observable; as, for example, the full account, in 2 Chronicles 29-31, of the purification of the Temple by Hezekiah; of the services and sacrifices then made, and of the names of the Levites who took part in it, and the restoration of the courses and orders of the priesthood, and the supplies for the daily, weekly, and yearly sacrifices; also, the circumstantial account of the Passover observed by command of Josiah, <sup><1481></sup>2 Chronicles 35:1-19. In this way we may account not only for the omission of much that relates to the prophets, but also for the less remarkable prominence given to the history of Israel, and the greater to Judah and Jerusalem; and for the frequent omission of details respecting the idolatrous practices of some of the kings, as of Solomon, Rehoboam, and Ahaz; and the destruction of idolatry by Josiah, showing that the books of Chronicles were written in times in which the people less needed to be warned against idolatry; to which, after the captivity, they had ceased to be so prone as before.

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

### V. Peculiarities of Diction.

1. The words noticed by De Wette (*Einkl.* § 185) as indicating their modern date are the following: **ʔTʔi** for **Tʔi** <sup><1142></sup>1 Kings 14:2. (But this form is also found in <sup><0772></sup>Judges 17:2; <sup><2403></sup>Jeremiah 4:30; <sup><3563></sup>Ezekiel 36:13, and not once in the later books.) **wtwa** for **wTæ** <sup><1115></sup>2 Kings 1:15. (But this form of **tæ** is found in <sup><6158></sup>Leviticus 15:18, 24; <sup><6442></sup>Joshua 14:12; <sup><1224></sup>2 Samuel 24:24; <sup><3221></sup>Isaiah 59:21; <sup><2416></sup>Jeremiah 10:5; 12:1; 19:10; 20:11; 23:9; 35:2; <sup><5404></sup>Ezekiel 14:4; 27:26.) **μCʔæ** for **μvʔ** <sup><1008></sup>1 Kings 9:8. (But <sup><2498></sup>Jeremiah 19:8; 49:17, are identical in phrase and orthography.) **ʔxæ** for **μyxæ** <sup><2113></sup>2 Kings 11:13. (But everywhere else in Kings, e.g. <sup><2106></sup>2 Kings 11:6, etc., **μyxæ**, which is also universal in Chronicles, an avowedly later book; and here, as in **ʔyntæ** <sup><1113></sup>1 Kings 11:33, there is every appearance of the **w**

being a clerical error for the copulative **w**; see Thenius, 1. c.) **twoydæ]** <sup><1174></sup>1 Kings 20:14. (But this word occurs in <sup><2310></sup>Lamentations 1:1, and there is every appearance of its being a technical word in <sup><1174></sup>1 Kings 20:14, and therefore as old as the reign of Ahab.) **rK**for **rmj p** <sup><1102></sup>1 Kings 4:22. (But **rK**is used by Ezekiel xlv, 14, and *homer* seems to have been then already obsolete.) **μyrjæ** <sup><1208></sup>1 Kings 21:8, 11. (Occurs in Isaiah and Jeremiah.) **bri** <sup><1278></sup>2 Kings 25:8. (But as the term evidently came in with the Chaldees, as seen in Rab-shakeh, Rab-saris, Rab-mag, its application to the Chaldee general is no evidence of a time later than the person to whom the title is given.) **μl e**; <sup><1065></sup>1 Kings 8:61, etc. (But there is not a particle of evidence that this expression belongs to late Hebrew. It is found, among other places, in <sup><2303></sup>Isaiah 38:3, a passage against the authenticity of which there is also not a shadow of proof, except upon the presumption that prophetic intimations and supernatural interventions on the part of God are impossible.) **lyKæhæ** <sup><1207></sup>2 Kings 18:7. (On what grounds this word is adduced it is impossible to guess, since it occurs in this sense in Joshua, Isaiah, Samuel, and Jeremiah: see Gesenius.) **wpFBæ** <sup><1289></sup>2 Kings 18:19. (<sup><2304></sup>Isaiah 36:4; <sup><2104></sup>Ecclesiastes 9:4.) **tydWay]** <sup><1285></sup>2 Kings 18:26. (But why should not a *Jew*, in Hezekiah's reign as well as in the time of Nehemiah, have called his mother-tongue "the *Jews'* language," in opposition to the *Aanzcean* ? There was nothing in the Babylonian captivity to give it the name if it had it not before, nor is there a single earlier instance-<sup><2308></sup>Isaiah 19:18 might have furnished one-of *any* name given to the language spoken by all the Israelites, and which, in later times, was called Hebrew: **Εβριστί**, Prolog. Ecclus.; <sup><2338></sup>Luke 23:38; <sup><4102></sup>John 5:2, etc.) **fPv]nætæe** **rBðæ** <sup><1276></sup>2 Kings 25:6. (Frequent in <sup><2402></sup>Jeremiah 4:12; 39:5, etc.) Theod. Parker adds **hj P**, (see, too, Thenius, *Einl.* § 6), <sup><1105></sup>1 Kings 10:15; 20:24; <sup><1284></sup>2 Kings 18:24, on the presumption, probably, of its being of Persian derivation; but the etymology and origin of the word are quite uncertain, and it is repeatedly used in Jeremiah 51, as well as <sup><2339></sup>Isaiah 36:9. With better reason might **adB** have been adduced, <sup><1123></sup>1 Kings 12:33. The expression **rhNhirb[ein** <sup><1104></sup>1 Kings 4:24, is also a difficult one to form an impartial opinion about. It is doubtful, as De Wette admits, whether the phrase necessarily implies its being used by one to the east of the Euphrates, because the use varies in <sup><0629></sup>Numbers 32:19; 35:14; <sup><0614></sup>Joshua 1:14 sq.; 5:1; 12:1, 7; 22:7; <sup><1351></sup>1 Chronicles 26:30; <sup><0101></sup>Deuteronomy 1:1,



5, etc. It is also conceivable that the phrase might be used as a mere geographical designation by those who belonged to one of "the provinces beyond the river" subject to Babylon; and, at the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, Judaea had been such a province for at least 23 years, and probably longer. We may safely affirm, therefore, that, on the whole, the peculiarities of diction in these books do not indicate a time after the captivity, or towards the close of it, but, on the contrary, point pretty distinctly to the age of Jeremiah. It may be added that the marked and systematic differences between the language of Chronicles and that of Kings, taken with the fact that all attempts to prove the Chronicles, in the main, later than Ezra, have utterly failed, lead to the same conclusion. (See many examples in Movers, p. 200 sq.)

2. Other peculiar or rare expressions in these books are the proverbial ones: **ryqBj yTæni**, found only in them and in <sup><1057></sup>1 Samuel 25:22, 34; "slept with his fathers," "him that dieth in the city the dogs shall eat," etc.; **I Ī hc[ŷihKø** <sup><1023></sup>1 Kings 2:23, etc.; also **hyrḡad** Kings i,4 4, 45; elsewhere only in poetry and in the composition of proper names, except <sup><826></sup>Deuteronomy 2:36; **hl j zol**:9. Also the following isolated terms: **µyrBæβi**; "fowl," 4:23; **twoau**"stalls," 5:6; <sup><405></sup>2 Chronicles 9:25; **smi hl [h**, 5:13; 9:15, 21; **[Simj** "a stone-quarry" (Gesenius), 6:7; **ynp]** <sup>æ</sup>6:17; **^Tetæj** 19; **µy[æp]** and **twḡQβi**; "wild cucumbers," 6:18; 7:24; <sup><1049></sup>2 Kings 4:39; **hyqinæ** 10:28; the names of the months, **µyntææ** 8:2; **wzæWB**, 6:37, 38; K3, **adB**; "to invent," 12:33; <sup><408></sup>Nehemiah 6:8, in both cases joined with **bLææx] p]næ** "an idol," 15:13; , **r [Bæ** and **ry[ b]hæ** followed by **yrjæi** "to destroy," 14:10; 16:3; 21:21; **µyqβæj** "joints of the armor," 22:34; **gycæ** "a pursuit," 18:27; **rḡfæ**; "to bend one's self," 18:42; <sup><1064></sup>2 Kings 4:34, 35; **sNææ** "to gird up," 18:46; **rpa}** "a head-band," 20:38, 42; **qptc**; "to suffice," 20:10; **fl j**; uncert. signif., 20:33; **hkWl m]hv[**; 'to reign," 21:7; **tyj bæj** "a dish," <sup><1021></sup>2 Kings 2:20; **µl fæ**; "to fold up," ib. 8; **dqæp** "a herdsman," 3:4; <sup><1000></sup>Amos 1:1; **ËWsa**; "an oil-cup," 4:2; **l a, drj**; "to have a care for," 13; **rææp** "to sneeze," 35; **^wbq]kæ** "a bag," 42; **fyrjæ** "a money-bag," 5:23; **t/nj ]i** "a camp" (?), 6:8; **hrkæ** "a feast," 23; **µyTjæp** "descending," 9; **bqi** "a cab," 25; **µynæp yrjæ}** "d dove's dung," ib.; **rBk]ni** perhaps "a fly-net," 8:15; **µrḡ**, (in sense of "self," as in Chald. and Samar.), 9:13; **rWBxæ** "a heap," 10:8; **hj ]i ]n**, "a vestry," 22; **harj ]n**; "a

draught-house," 27; **yrkē** "Cherethites," 11:4, 19, and <sup><1023></sup>2 Samuel 20:23 (kethib); **j Smi** "a keeping off," 11:6; **rKmi** "an acquaintance," 12:6; the form **rwp** from **hry**; "to shoot," 13:17; **twbrūJThiynB** "hostages," 14:14; <sup><1024></sup>2 Chronicles 25:24; **tyvǫj hi tyBe** "sick-house," 15:5; <sup><1025></sup>2 Chronicles 26:21 ; **l bq**; before," 15:10; **qcmld**, "Damascus," 16:10 (perhaps only a false reading); **tpxrjmi** "a pavement," 16:17; **Ēsllm** or **Ēsjmē** "a covered way," 16:18; **apj** ; in Piel "to do secretly," 17:9; **hryvæ** with **y**, 16, only besides <sup><1006></sup>Deuteronomy 7:5, <sup><3054></sup>Micah 5:14; **adn**; i. q. **hdn**; 17:21 (kethib); **μυνᾶντο** "Samaritans," 29; **^Tvj ũ** "Nehustan," 18:4; **hnmǫo** "a pillar," 16; **hkrb]hc[**; "to make peace," 31; <sup><2366></sup>Isaiah 36:16; **vj æ** "that which grows up the third year," 19:29; <sup><2370></sup>Isaiah 37:30; **tkōj tyBe** "treasure-house," 20:13; <sup><2382></sup>Isaiah 39:2; **hnyjnap** part of Jerusalem so called, 21:14; <sup><3010></sup>Zephaniah 1:10; <sup><3619></sup>Nehemiah 11:9; **twbZmi** "-signs of the zodiac," 23:5; **rwrPi** "a suburb," 23:11; **μyβᾶ** "ploughmen," 25:12 (kethib); **allvæ** for **hlvæ** "to change," 25:9; **hkyæ** for **wkyæ** <sup><1063></sup>2 Kings 6:13; **hl ykæ** "meat," <sup><1198></sup>1 Kings 19:8; **μyGæuǫi** "almug trees," <sup><1101></sup>1 Kings 10:11, 12; **rhG**; "to stretch one's self," <sup><1182></sup>1 Kings 18:42; <sup><1064></sup>2 Kings 4:34,35; **rpa** } a "turban" ("ashes"), 1 Kings 20, 38, 41; **twobDō** "floats," <sup><1069></sup>1 Kings 5:9; **[yxæ** "chambers," <sup><1065></sup>1 Kings 6:5, 6, 10; **hb[ ]mi** "clay," <sup><1076></sup>1 Kings 7:46; **rve** "debt," <sup><1007></sup>2 Kings 4:7; **rsi** "heavy," <sup><1128></sup>1 Kings 20:43; 21:4, 5; **tr.tk**, "chapter," only in Kings, Chronicles, and Jeremiah; **twomZim** "snuffers," only in Kings, Chronicles, and Jeremiah; **hnwǫm]** "base," only in Kings, Chronicles, Jeremiah, and Ezra. To these may be added the architectural terms in <sup><1007></sup>1 Kings 6:7: and the names of foreign idols in 2 Kings xvii. The general character of the language is most distinctly that of the time before the Babylonian captivity.

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

**1.** The most important *transpositions* are the history of Shimei's death, <sup><1026></sup>1 Kings 2:36-46, which in the Sept. (Cod. Vat.) comes after 3:1, and divers scraps from ch. 4, 5, and 9, accompanied by one or two remarks of the translators. The sections <sup><1002></sup>1 Kings 4:20-25, 2-6, 26, 21, 1, are strung together and precede <sup><1002></sup>1 Kings 3:2-28, but many of them are repeated

again in their proper places. The sections <1001>1 Kings 3:1, 9:16, 17, are strung together, and placed between 4:34 and 5:1. The section <1001>1 Kings 7:1-12, is placed after 7:51. Section 8:12, 13, is placed after 53. Section 9:15-22, is placed after 10:22. Section 11:43, 12:1, 2, 3, is much transposed and confused in Sept. 11:43, 44, 12:1-3. Section 14:1-21, is placed in the midst of the long addition to Chronicles 12 mentioned below. Section 22:42-50, is placed after 16:28. Chap. 20 and 21 are transposed. Section <1201>2 Kings 3:1-3, is placed after <1201>2 Kings 1:18.

**2.** The *omissions* are few. Section <1051>1 Kings 6:11-14, is entirely omitted, and 37, 38 are only slightly alluded to at the opening of chap. 3. The erroneous clause <1156>1 Kings 15:6, is omitted; and so are the dates of Asa's reign in 16:8 and 15; and there are a few verbal omissions of no consequence.

**3.** The chief interest lies in the *additions*, of which the principal are the following. The supposed mention of a fountain as among Solomon's works in the Temple in the passage after 1 Kings ii, 35; of a paved causeway on Lebanon, 3:46; of Solomon pointing to the sun at the dedication of the Temple, before he uttered the prayer, 'The Lord said he would dwell in the thick darkness.' etc., 8:12, 13 (after 53, Sept.), with a reference to the βίβλιον τῆς ψῆδης, a passage on which Thenius relies as proving that the Alexandrian had access to original documents now lost; the information that "Joram his brother" perished with Tibni, 16:22; an additional date "in the twenty-fourth year of Jeroboam," 15:8; numerous verbal additions, as 11:29, 17:1, etc.; and, lastly, the long passage concerning Jeroboam, the son of Nebat, inserted between 12:24 and 25. There are also many glosses of the translator, explanatory, or necessary in consequence of transpositions, as <1025>1 Kings 2:35, 8:1, 11:43, 17:20, 19:2, etc. Of the above, from the recapitulatory character of the passage after <1025>1 Kings 2:35, containing in brief the sum of the things detailed in <1021>1 Kings 7:21-23, it seems far more probable that ΚΡΗΝΗΝ ΤΗΣ ΑΥΛΗΣ is only a corruption of ΚΡΙΝΟΝ ΤΟΥ ΑΙΛΑΜ, there mentioned. The obscure passage about Lebanon after 3:46 seems no less certainly to represent what in the Heb. is 9:18, 19, as appears by the triple concurrence of Tadmor, Lebanon, and δυναστεύματα, representing wTI Ἰνμῆ. The strange mention of the sun seems to be introduced by the translator to give significance to Solomon's mention of the house which he had built for God, who had said he would dwell in *the thick darkness*; not therefore under the unveiled light of the sun; and the reference to "the book of song" can

surely mean nothing else than to point out that the passage to which Solomon referred was <sup><197D></sup>Psalm 97:2. Of the other additions, the mention of Tibni's brother Joram is the one which has most the semblance of an historical fact, or makes the existence of any other source of history probable. See, too, <sup><1219></sup>1 Kings 20:19; <sup><1255></sup>2 Kings 15:25.

There remains only the long passage about Jeroboam. That this account is only an apocryphal version, made up of the existing materials in the Hebrew Scriptures, after the manner of I Esdras, Bel and the Dragon, the apocryphal Esther, the Targums, etc., may be inferred on the following grounds. The framework of the story is given in the very words of the Hebrew narrative, and that very copiously, and the new matter is only worked in here and there. Demonstrably, therefore, the Hebrew account existed when the Greek one was framed, and was the original one. The principal new facts introduced, the marriage of Jeroboam to the sister of Shishak's wife, and his request to be permitted to return, is a manifest imitation of the story of Hadad. The misplacement of the story of Abijah's sickness, and the visit of Jeroboam's wife to Ahijah the Shilonite, makes the whole history out of keeping—the disguise of the queen, the rebuke of Jeroboam's idolatry (which is accordingly left out from Ahijah's prophecy, as is the mention at 5:2 of his having told Jeroboam he should be king), and the king's anxiety about the recovery of his son and heir. The embellishments of the story, Jeroboam's chariots, the amplification of Ahijah's address to Ano, the request asked of Pharaoh, the new garment *not washed in water*, are precisely such as an embellisher would add, as we may see by the apocryphal books above cited. Then the fusing down the three Hebrew names, **hdx** and **h[Wr]** and **hxr** into one, **Σαριρά**, thus giving the same name to the mother of Jeroboam, and to the city where she dwelt, shows how comparatively modern the story is, and how completely of Greek growth. A yet plainer indication is its confounding the Shemaiah of <sup><1122></sup>1 Kings 12:22 with Shemaiah the Nehelamite of <sup><1224></sup>Jeremiah 29:24, 31, and putting Ahijah's prophecy into his mouth; for, beyond all question, **Ἐνλαμί** (1 Kings 12) is only another form of **Ἀιλαμίτης** (<sup><1224></sup>Jeremiah 36:24, Sept.). Then, again, the story is selfcontradictory; for, if Jeroboam's child Abijam was not born till a year or so after Solomon's death, how could "any good thing toward the Lord God of Israel" have been found in him before Jeroboam became king? The one thing in the story that is more like truth than the Hebrew narrative is the age given to Rehoboam, sixteen years, which may have been preserved in the MS. which the writer of this

romance had before him. The calling Jeroboam's mother  $\gamma\upsilon\nu\eta\ \acute{\rho}\acute{o}\rho\nu\eta$  instead of  $\gamma\upsilon\nu\eta\ \chi\eta\rho\alpha$  was probably accidental.

On the whole, then, it appears that the great variations in the Sept. contribute little or nothing to the elucidation of the history contained in these books, nor much even to the text. The Hebrew text and arrangement is not in the least shaken in its main points, nor is there the slightest cloud cast on the accuracy of the history, or the truthfulness of the prophecies contained in it. But these variations illustrate a characteristic tendency of the Jewish mind to make interesting portions of the Scriptures the groundwork of separate religious tales, which they altered or added to according to their fancy, without any regard to history or chronology, and in which they exercised a peculiar kind of ingenuity in working up the Scripture materials, or in inventing circumstances calculated, as they thought, to make the main history more probable. The story of Zerubbabel's answer in I Esdras about truth, to prepare the way for his mission by Darius; of the discovery of the imposture of Bel's priests by Daniel, in Bel and the Dragon; of Mordecai's dream in the apocryphal Esther, and the paragraph in the Talmud inserted to connect <sup><1164></sup>1 Kings 16:34 with 17:1 (Smith's *Sacr. Ann.* ii, 421), are instances of this. The reign of Solomon, and the remarkable rise of Jeroboam, were not unlikely to exercise this propensity of the Hellenistic Jews. It is to the existence of such works that the variations in the Sept. account of Solomon and Jeroboam may most probably be attributed.

**VII.** Another feature in the literary condition of our books must be noticed, viz., that the compiler, in arranging his materials, and adopting the very words of the documents used by him, has not always been careful to avoid the *appearance* of contradiction. Thus the mention of the staves of the ark remaining in their place "unto this day" (<sup><1108></sup>1 Kings 8:8) does not accord with the account of the destruction of the Temple (<sup><1229></sup>2 Kings 25:9). The mention of Elijah as the only prophet of the Lord left (<sup><1182></sup>1 Kings 18:22; 19:10) has an appearance of disagreement with 20:13, 28, 35, etc., though 18:4, 19:18 supply, it is true, a ready answer. In <sup><1213></sup>1 Kings 21:13 only Naboth is mentioned, while in <sup><1306></sup>2 Kings 9:26 his sons are added. The prediction in <sup><1195></sup>1 Kings 19:15-17 has no perfect fulfilment in the following chapters. <sup><1228></sup>1 Kings 22:38 does not seem to be a fulfilment of 21:19. The declaration in <sup><1092></sup>1 Kings 9:22 does not seem in harmony with 11:28. There are also some singular repetitions, as <sup><1142></sup>1 Kings 14:21 compared with 31; <sup><1309></sup>2 Kings 9:29 with 8:25; 14:15, 16, with 13:12, 13.

But it is enough just to have pointed these out, as no real difficulty can be found in them.

**VIII.** As regards the *sources of information*, it may truly be said that in the books of Kings we have the narrative of contemporary writers throughout. It has already been observed, *SEE CHRONICLES*, that there was a regular series of state annals both for the kingdom of Judah and for that of Israel, which embraced the whole time comprehended in the books of Kings, or at least to the end of the reign of Jehoiakim (<sup><1245></sup>2 Kings 24:5). These annals are constantly cited by name as "the Book of the Acts of Solomon" (<sup><1114></sup>1 Kings 11:41); and, after Solomon, "the Book of the Chronicles of the kings of Judah, *or* Israel" (e.g. <sup><1149></sup>1 Kings 14:29; 15:7; 16:5, 14, 20; <sup><1208></sup>2 Kings 10:34; 24:5, etc.); and it is manifest that the author of Kings had them both before him while he drew up his history, in which the reigns of the two kingdoms are harmonized, and these annals constantly appealed to. (Similar phraseology is used in <sup><1700></sup>Esther 10:2, 6:1, to denote the official annals of the Persian empire. Public documents are spoken of in the same way in <sup><1622></sup>Nehemiah 12:23). But, in addition to these national annals, there were also extant, at the time that the books of Kings were compiled, separate works of the several prophets who had lived in Judah and Israel, and which probably bore the same relation to the annals as the historical parts of Isaiah and Jeremiah bear to those portions of the annals preserved in the books of Kings, i.e. were, in some instances at least, fuller and more copious accounts of the current events, by the same hands which drew up the more concise narrative of the annals, though in others perhaps mere duplicates. Thus the acts of Uzziah, written by Isaiah, were very likely identical for substance with the history of his reign in the national chronicles; and part of the history of Hezekiah we know was identical in the chronicles and in the prophet. The chapter in Jeremiah relating to the destruction of the Temple (ch. 52) is identical with that in 2 Kings 24, 25. In later times some have supposed that a chapter in the prophecies of Daniel was used for the national chronicles, and appears as Ezra 1. (Comp. also <sup><1265></sup>2 Kings 16:5 with <sup><2001></sup>Isaiah 7:1; <sup><1208></sup>2 Kings 18:8 with <sup><2143></sup>Isaiah 14:28-32). As an instance of verbal agreement, coupled with greater fulness in the prophetic account, see 2 Kings 20 compared with Isaiah 38, in which latter alone is Hezekiah's *writing* given.

These other works, then, as far as the memory of them has been preserved to us. were as follows (see Keil's *Apolog. Vers.*). For the time of David, the book of Samuel the seer, the book of Nathan the prophet, and the book of

Gad the seer (2 Samuel 21-24 with 1 Kings 1, being probably extracted from Nathan's book), which seem to have been collected—at least that portion of them relating to David—into one work called "the Acts of David the king" (<sup><1329></sup>1 Chronicles 29:29). For the time of Solomon, "the Book of the Acts of Solomon" (<sup><1114></sup>1 Kings 11:41), consisting probably of parts of the "Book of Nathan the prophet, the prophecy of Ahijah the Shilonite, and the visions of Iddo the seer" (<sup><1029></sup>2 Chronicles 9:29). For the time of Rehoboam, "the words of Shemaiah the prophet, and of Iddo the seer concerning genealogies" (<sup><1425></sup>2 Chronicles 12:15). For the time of Abijah, "the story (Vrdnæ) of the prophet Iddo" (<sup><1432></sup>2 Chronicles 13:22). For the time of Jehoshaphat, "the words of Jehu, the son of Hanani" (<sup><1478></sup>2 Chronicles 20:34). For the time of Uzziah, "the writings of Isaiah the prophet" (<sup><1492></sup>2 Chronicles 26:22). For the time of Hezekiah, "the vision of Isaiah the prophet, the son of Amoz" (<sup><1492></sup>2 Chronicles 32:32). For the time of Manasseh, a book called "the sayings of the seers," as the A.V., following the Sept., Vulg., Kimchi, etc., rightly renders the passage, in accordance with ver. 18 (<sup><1499></sup>2 Chronicles 33:19), though others, following the grammar too servilely, make *Chozai* a proper name, because of the absence of the article. For the time of Jeroboam II, a prophecy of "Jonah, the son of Amittai the prophet, of Gath-hepher," is cited (<sup><1205></sup>2 Kings 14:25); and it seems likely that there were books containing special histories of the acts of Elijah and Elisha, seeing that the times of these prophets are described with such copiousness. Of the latter Gehazi might well have been the author, to judge from <sup><1304></sup>2 Kings 8:4, 5, as Elisha himself might have been of the former. Possibly, too, the prophecies of Azariah, the son of Oded, in Asa's reign (<sup><1450></sup>2 Chronicles 15:1), and of Hanani (<sup><1467></sup>2 Chronicles 16:7) (unless this latter is the same as Jehu, son of Hianani, as Oded is put for Azariah in 15:8), and Micaiah, the son of Imlah, in Ahab's reign; and Eliezer, the son of Dodavah, in Jehoshaphat's; and Zechariah, the son of Jehoiada, in Jehoash's; and Oded, in Pekah's; and Zechariah, in Uzziah's reign; of the prophetess Huldah, in Josiah's, and others, may have been preserved in writing, some or all of them. These works, or at least many of them, must have been extant at the time when the books of Kings were compiled, as they certainly were extant much later when the books of Chronicles were put together by Ezra. But whether the author used them all, or only those duplicate portions of them which were embodied in the national chronicles, it is impossible to say, seeing he quotes none of them by name except the acts of Solomon and the prophecy of Jonah. On the other hand, we cannot infer from his silence that these

books were unused by him, seeing that neither does he quote by name the Vision of Isaiah as the chronicler does, though he must, from its recent date, have been familiar with it, and seeing that so many parts of his narrative have every appearance of being extracted from these books of the prophets, and contain narratives which it is not likely would have found a place in the chronicles of the kings. See <sup><1144></sup>1 Kings 14:4, etc.; 16:1, etc., 11; 2 Kings 17, etc.

With regard to the work so often cited in the Chronicles as " the Book of the Kings of Israel and Judah" (<sup><1300></sup>1 Chronicles 9:1; <sup><1461></sup>2 Chronicles 16:11; 27:7; 28:26; 32:32; 35:27; 36:8), it has been thought by some that it was a separate collection containing the joint histories of the two kingdoms; by others, that it is our books of Kings which answer to this description; but by Eichhorm, that it is the same as the Chronicles of the kings of Judah so constantly cited in the books of Kings; and this last opinion seems to be the best founded. For in <sup><1461></sup>2 Chronicles 16:11, the same book is called " the Book of the Kings of Judah and Israel," which in the parallel passage, <sup><1153></sup>1 Kings 15:23; is called " the Book of the Chronicles of the kings of Judah." So, again, <sup><1470></sup>2 Chronicles 27:7, comp. with <sup><1256></sup>2 Kings 15:36; <sup><1486></sup>2 Chronicles 28:26, comp. with <sup><1269></sup>2 Kings 16:19; <sup><1482></sup>2 Chronicles 32:32, comp. with <sup><1270></sup>2 Kings 20:20; <sup><1487></sup>2 Chronicles 35:27, with <sup><1238></sup>2 Kings 23:28; <sup><1488></sup>2 Chronicles 36:8, with <sup><1245></sup>2 Kings 24:5. Moreover, the book so quoted refers exclusively to the affairs of Judah; and even in the one passage where reference is made to it as "the Book of the Kings of Israel" (<sup><1418></sup>2 Chronicles 20:34), it is for the reign of Jehoshaphat that it is cited. Obviously, therefore, it is the same work which is elsewhere described as the *Chronicles of Israel and Judah*, and of *Judah and Israel*. Nor is this an unreasonable title to give to these chronicles. Saul, David, Solomon, and in some sense Hezekiah (<sup><1400></sup>2 Chronicles 30:1, 5, 6), and all his successors, were kings of Israel as well as of Judah, and therefore it is very conceivable that in Ezra's time the chronicles of Judah should have acquired the name of the Book of the Kings of Israel and Judah. Even with regard to a portion of Israel in the days of Rehoboam, the chronicler remarks, apparently as a matter of gratulation, that "Rehoboam reigned over them" (<sup><1407></sup>2 Chronicles 10:17); he notices Abijah's authority in portions of the Israelitish territory (<sup><1438></sup>2 Chronicles 13:18,19; 15:8, 9); he not unfrequently speaks of Israel, when the kingdom of Judah is the matter in hand (as <sup><1412></sup>2 Chronicles 12:1; 21:4; 23:2, etc.), and even calls Jehoshaphat " king of Israel" (<sup><1402></sup>2 Chronicles 21:2), and



distilnguishes "Israel and Judah" from "Ephraim and Manasseh" (30:1); he notices Hezekiah's authority from Dan to Beersheba (<sup><4416></sup>2 Chronicles 30:5), and Josiah's destruction of idols throughout all the land of Israel (34:6-9), and his Passover for all Israel (35:17,18), and seems to parade the title "*king of Israel*" in connection with David and Solomon (35:3, 4), and the relation of the Levites to "all Israel" (ver. 3); and therefore it is only in accordance with the feeling displayed in such passages that the name, "the Book of the Kings of Israel and Judah," should be given to the chronicles of the Jewish kingdom. The use of this term in speaking of the "kings of Israel and Judah who were carried away to Babylon for their transgression" (<sup><3300></sup>1 Chronicles 9:1) would be conclusive if the construction of the sentence were certain. But though it is absurd to separate the words "and Judah" from Israel, as Bertheau does (*Curzgef Exeg. Handb.*), following the Masoretic punctuation, seeing that the "*Book of the Kings of Israel and Judath*" is cited in at least six other places in Chronicles, still it is possible that Israel and Judah might be the antecedent to the pronoun understood before **Wl gh**; It seems, however, much more likely that the antecedent to **rva'is 8hyw 8çy ykè'ini** *On the whole, therefore, there is no evidence of the existence in the time of the chronicler of a history, since lost, of the two kingdoms, nor are the books of Kings the work so quoted by the chronicler, seeing he often refers to it for "the rest of the acts" of Kings, when he has already given all that is contained in our books of Kings. He refers, therefore, to the chronicles of Judah.*

From the above authentic sources, then, was compiled the history in the books under consideration. Judging from the facts that we have in 2 Kings 17, 19, 20 the history of Hezekiah in the very words of Isaiah, 36-39; that, as stated above, we have several passages from Jeremiah in duplicate in 2 Kings, and the whole of Jeremiah 52 in <sup><12348></sup>2 Kings 24:18, etc., 25; that so large a portion of the books of Kings is repeated in the books of Chronicles, though the writer of Chronicles had the original Chronicles also before him, as well as from the whole internal character of the narrative, and even some of the blemishes referred to under the second head—we may conclude with certainty that we have in the books of Kings, not only in the main the history faithfully preserved to us from the ancient chronicles but most frequently whole passages transferred verbatim into them. Occasionally, no doubt, we have the compiler's own comments, or reflections thrown in. as at <sup><12110></sup>2 Kings 21:10-16; 17:10-15; 13:23; 17:7-41,

etc. We connect the insertion of the prophecy in 1 Kings 13 with the fact that the compiler himself was an eye-witness of the fulfilment of it. and can even see how the *words* ascribed to the old prophet are of the age of the compiler. We can perhaps see his hand in the frequent repetition, on the review of each reign, of the remark, "The high places were not taken away; the people still sacrificed and burnt incense on the high places" (<sup><1224B></sup>1 Kings 22:43; <sup><122B></sup>2 Kings 12:3; 14:4; 15:4, 35; comp. <sup><122B></sup>1 Kings 3:3), and in the repeated observation that such and such things, as the staves by which the ark was borne, the revolt of the ten tribes, the rebellion of Edom, etc., continue "unto this day," though it may be perhaps doubted in some cases whether these words were not in the old chronicle (<sup><448B></sup>2 Chronicles 5:9). See <sup><108B></sup>1 Kings 8:8; 9:13 21; 10:12; 12:19; <sup><1222></sup>2 Kings 2:22; 8:22; 10:27; 13:23; 14:7; 16:6; 17:23, 34, 41; 23:25. It is remarkable, however, that in no instance does the use of this phrase lead us to suppose that it was penned after the destruction of the Temple: in several of the above instances the phrase necessarily supposes that the Temple and the kingdom of Judah were still standing. If the phrase, then, is the compiler's, it proves him to have written before the Babylonian captivity; if it was a part of the chronicle he was quoting, it shows how exactly he transferred its contents to his own pages.

**IX. Author and Date.** — The authorship and age of this historical treatise may admit of several suppositions. Whatever were the original sources, the books are evidently the composition of one writer. The style is generally uniform throughout (Dr. Davidson, in *Horne's Introd.*, new edit., ii, 666 sq.). The same forms of expression are used to denote the same thing, e.g. the male sex (<sup><1140></sup>1 Kings 14:10, etc.) ; the death of a king (<sup><1143></sup>1 Kings 11:43, etc.); modes of allusion to the law (<sup><1113></sup>1 Kings 11:13); fidelity to Jehovah (<sup><1083></sup>1 Kings 8:63, etc.; see De Wette, *Eizleit.* § 184, a; Hivernick, *Einleit.* § 171). Similar idioms are ever recurring, so as to produce a uniformity of style (Hivernick, *i. c.*). See § ii, above.

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

**(1.)** The style and diction indicate the later age of the Hebrew language, but not the latest. Attempts to prove a more modern date than the middle of the captivity have signally failed. Nearly all the words which De Wette and others have selected (see § 5, above) are shown- to have been in use, either by the prophets who flourished before the captivity and at its

commencement, or by still earlier writers; but words and phrases abound which were in common use by the writers of the concluding period of the kingdom of Judah, who did not go into captivity, especially by Isaiah and Jeremiah. In this respect there is a manifest difference between Kings and Chronicles. Though neither work is free from Chaldaic forms, they are rare in Kings, but numerous in Chronicles. Their occurrence at all in Kings is sufficiently accounted for from the contiguity of Judah to Syria, and from the frequent intercourse with Assyria which commerce and war involved.

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

2. Calmet ascribes the authorship to Ezra; but there are no decided indications of his authorship, and the names Zif and Bul (<sup><1000></sup>1 Kings 6:1, 37, 38) were not in use after the captivity. The general opinion, however, that Jeremiah was the author is adopted by Grotius, Carpzov, and others, and is lately revindicated by IHaverInick, as also by Graf (*De libror. Sram. et Reguum comnositione*, p. 61 sq.), but is opposed by Keil, Davidson, asnd others. In favor of it are the following strong arguments:

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

(2.) The style and language of Kings resemble those of the acknowledged writings of Jeremiah. In both works there is an unusual number of ἀπαξ λεγόμενα; and also of words peculiar to each work, though used more than once. What is still more to the purpose, there are words and forms of words used in both works, but in them only; as, qWbqBi a "cruse" (<sup><1148></sup>1 Kings 14:3, and <sup><1191></sup>Jeremiah 19:1, 10); bgj; a "husbandman" (<sup><1252></sup>2 Kings 25:12; <sup><2526></sup>Jeremiah 52:16; and <sup><2390></sup>μybgj <sup><2390></sup>Jeremiah 39:10); hbj ; to "hide," used in Niphal only in Kings (<sup><1225></sup>1 Kings 22:25; <sup><1172></sup>2 Kings 7:12) and in Jeremiah (<sup><2490></sup>Jeremiah 49:10); rwl ; to "blind," used in the sense of putting

out the eyes only in <sup><2271></sup>2 Kings 25:7, and <sup><2497></sup>Jeremiah 39:7, and 52:11, etc. See § V above.

(3.) The habit of referring to the Pentateuch, pointed out as characteristic of the books of Kings, is equally so of Jeremiah; and this habit in both is thought to be accounted for on the ground of the discovered copy of the law in the days of Josiah, in which Jeremiah took great interest, traces of which are discoverable in <sup><2410></sup>Jeremiah 11:3-5 (<sup><1572></sup>Deuteronomy 27:26); 32:18-21 (<sup><0216></sup>Exodus 20:6; 6:6); 34:14 (<sup><0512></sup>Deuteronomy 15:12). The same general spirit of solemnity, the same modes of thought and illustration, and the same political principles, are thought to mark the two works.

(4.) Some portions of Kings and of Jeremiah are almost identical, particularly <sup><1248></sup>2 Kings 24:18-2 Kings 25, and Jeremiah 52. The two passages are so much alike, though differing in some respects, as to appear like two narrations of the same event by the same person, in each of which some points are related with more fulness than in the other, for some particular purpose. Parts of this narrative are also contained in nearly the same words in <sup><2491></sup>Jeremiah 39:1-10; 40:7-41:10.

(5.) The impression produced on the reader is that the writer of Kings was not taken away into captivity either in the days of Jehoiachin or of Zedekiah, as the writer of Chronicles appears to have been; and this circumstance agrees with the supposition that Jeremiah was the writer. We know that, after being carried away as far as Ramah with the captives from Jerusalem, he was set free, and permitted to return to his own land with Gedaliah. He was afterwards taken away to Tahpanhes, in Egypt, where we obtain the last certain view of him. Besides this, many other points of agreement, more or less striking, present themselves to the careful reader—the book of Jeremiah serving more than any other part of Scripture to illustrate and explain the contemporaneous portions of the Kings, and the events recorded in Kings serving as a key to many portions of the prophet. In this way a number of undesigned coincidences appear between the supposed and the acknowledged writings of Jeremiah, as the following:

<sup><2271></sup>2 Kings 25:1-3, comp. with <sup><2491></sup>Jeremiah 38:1-9.

<sup><2251></sup>2 Kings 25:11, 12, 18-21, " <sup><2491></sup>Jeremiah 39:10-14; 40:1-5.

<sup><1243></sup>2 Kings 24:13, " <sup><2471></sup>Jeremiah 27:11-20; 28:3-6.

<sup><1244></sup>2 Kings 24:14, " <sup><2491></sup>Jeremiah 24:1.

<sup><1272></sup>2 Kings 21:22:23: " <sup><2475></sup>Jeremiah 7:15 15:4; 19:3.

(6.) The absence of all mention of Jeremiah in the history, although he was so prominently active in the four or five last reigns, both in the court and among the people, is only explicable on the supposition that Jeremiah was himself the writer. Had it been the work of another, he must, as in Chronicles, have had very distinct mention.

(7.) The events singled out for mention in the concise narrative are precisely those of which Jeremiah had personal knowledge, and in which he took special interest. The famine in <sup><125B></sup>2 Kings 25:3 was one which had nearly cost Jeremiah his life (<sup><248B></sup>Jeremiah 38:9). The capture of the city, the flight and capture of Zedekiah, the judgment and punishment of Zedekiah and his sons at Riblah, are related in <sup><125B></sup>2 Kings 25:1-7, in almost the identical words which we read in <sup><249B></sup>Jeremiah 39:1-7. So are the breaking down and burning of the Temple, the king's palace, and the houses of the great men, the deportation to Babylon of the fugitives and the surviving inhabitants of Jerusalem and Judaea. The intimate knowledge of what Nebuzar-adan did, both in respect to those selected for capital punishment and those carried away captive, and those poor whom he left in the land, displayed by the writer of <sup><125B></sup>2 Kings 25:11, 12, 18-21, is fully explained by <sup><249B></sup>Jeremiah 39:10-14, 40:1-5, where we read that Jeremiah was actually one of the captives who followed Nebuzar-adan as far as Ramah, and was very kindly treated by him. The careful enumeration of the pillars and of the sacred vessels of the Temple which were plundered by the Chaldeans tallies exactly with the prediction of Jeremiah concerning them (<sup><247B></sup>Jeremiah 27:19-22). The paragraph concerning the appointment of Gedaliah as governor of the remnant, and his murder by Ishmael, and the flight of the Jews into Egypt, is merely an abridged account of what Jeremiah tells us more fully (Jeremiah 40-43:7), and are events in which personally he was deeply concerned. The writer in Kings has nothing more to tell us concerning the Jews or Chaldees in the land of Judah, which exactly agrees with the hypothesis that he is Jeremiah, who we know was carried down to Egypt with the fugitives. In fact, the date of the writing and the position of the writer seem as clearly marked by the termination of the narrative at 5:26, as in the case of the Acts of the Apostles. It may be added, though the argument is of less weight, that the annexation of this chapter to the writings of Jeremiah so as to form Jeremiah lii (with the additional clause contained in vs. 28-30) is an evidence of a very ancient, if not a contemporary belief, that Jeremiah was the author of it. Again, the special mention of Seraiah the high-priest, and Zephaniah the second priest,

as slain by Nebuzar-adan (v, 18), together with three other priests, is very significant when taken in connection with <sup><201></sup>Jeremiah 21:1, 29:25-29, passages which show that Zephaniah belonged to the faction which opposed the prophet, a faction which was headed by priests and false prophets (<sup><201></sup>Jeremiah 26:7, 8, 11, 16). Going back to the 24th chapter, we find in verse 14 an enumeration of the captives taken with Jehoiachin identical with that in <sup><201></sup>Jeremiah 24:1; in verse 13 a reference to the vessels of the Temple precisely similar to that in <sup><207></sup>Jeremiah 27:18-20, 28:3, 6, and in verse 3, 4, a reference to the idolatries and bloodshed of Manasseh very similar to those in <sup><203></sup>Jeremiah 2:34, 19:4-8, etc., a reference which also connects chap. 24 with 21:6, 13-16. In verse 2 the enumeration of the hostile nations, and the reference to the prophets of God, point directly to <sup><209></sup>Jeremiah 25:9, 20, 21, and the reference to Pharaoh-necho in verse 7 points to verse 19, and to <sup><240></sup>Jeremiah 46:1-12. Brief as the narrative is, it brings out all the chief points in the political events of the time which we know were much in Jeremiah's mind; and yet, which is exceedingly remarkable, Jeremiah is never once named (as he is in <sup><462></sup>2 Chronicles 36:12, 21), although the manner of the writer is frequently to connect the sufferings of Judah with their sins and their neglect of the Word of God (<sup><273></sup>2 Kings 17:13 sq.; 24:2, 3, etc.). This leads to another striking coincidence between that portion of the history which belongs to Jeremiah's times and the writings of Jeremiah himself. De Wette speaks of the superficial character of the history of Jeremiah's times as hostile to the theory of Jeremiah's authorship. Now, considering the nature of these annals, and their conciseness, this criticism seems very unfounded as regards the reigns of Josiah, Jehoahaz, Jehoiachin, and Zedekiah. It must, however, be acknowledged that, as regards Jehoiakim's reign, and especially the latter part of it, and the way in which he came by his death, the narrative is much more meagre than one would have expected from a contemporary writer living on the spot. But exactly the same paucity of information is found in those otherwise copious notices of contemporary events with which Jeremiah's prophecies are interspersed. Let any one open, e.g. Townsend's *Arrangement* or Geneste's *Parallel Histories*, and he will see at a glance how remarkably little light Jeremiah's narrative or prophecies throw upon the latter part of Jehoiakim's reign. The cause of this silence may be difficult to assign, but, whatever it was, whether absence from Jerusalem, possibly on the mission described in Jeremiah 13, or imprisonment, or any other impediment, it operated equally on Jeremiah and on the writer of 2 Kings xxiv. When it is borne in mind that the writer

of 2 Kings was a contemporary writer, and, if not Jeremiah, must have had independent means of information, this coincidence will have great weight.

It has been argued on the other side

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

(2.) That the resemblance of style and diction may be accounted for on the supposition of Jeremiah's familiarity with the ancient records to which the writer of Kings had access, while the similarity of <sup><1240></sup>2 Kings 24:1-18, etc., and Jeremiah 39, might arise from the writer of Kings using that portion of Jeremiah's work. The identity of Jeremiah 52 with the same portion of Kings is probably owing to its being an altered extract from Kings, appended as a supplement to Jeremiah by some later hand. Neither of the suppositions, however, seriously militates against the general authorship of Jeremiah as to the book of Kings. *SEE JEREMIAH*.

**X.** *Place of these Books in the Canon, and References to them in the New Testament.* — Their canonical authority having never been disputed, it is needless to bring forward the testimonies to their authenticity which may be found in Josephus, Eusebius, Jerome, Augustine, etc., or in Bp. Cosin, or any other modern work on the Canon of Scripture. *SEE CANON*. They are reckoned, as has already been noticed, among the Prophets, in the threefold division of the Holy Scriptures; a position in accordance with the supposition that they were compiled by Jeremiah, and contain the narratives of the different prophets in succession. They are frequently cited by our Lord and by the apostles. Thus the allusions to Solomon's glory (<sup><4163></sup>Matthew 6:29); to the queen of Sheba's visit to Solomon to hear his wisdom (12:42); to the Temple (<sup><4174></sup>Acts 7:47, 48); to the great drought in the days of Elijah, and the widow of Sarepta (<sup><4105></sup>Luke 4:25, 26); to the

cleansing of Naaman the Syrian (ver. 27); to the charge of Elisha to Gehazi (~~1209~~ 2 Kings 4:29, comp. with ~~2104~~ Luke 10:4); to the dress of Elijah (~~4006~~ Mark 1:6, comp. with ~~1208~~ 2 Kings 1:8); to the complaint of Elijah, and God's answer to him (~~6113~~ Romans 11:3, 4); to the raising of the Shunammite's son from the dead (~~8115~~ Hebrews 11:35); to the giving and withholding of the rain in answer to Elijah's prayer (~~9157~~ James 5:17, 18; ~~6116~~ Revelation 11:6); to Jezebel (~~6112~~ Revelation 2:20) are all derived from the books of Kings, and, with the statement of Elijah's presence at the Transfiguration, are a striking testimony to their value for the purpose of religious teaching, and to their authenticity as a portion of the Word of God.

On the whole, then, in this portion of the history of the Israelitish people to which the name of the *Books of Kings* has been given, we have (if we except those errors in numbers which are either later additions to the original work, or accidental corruptions of the text) a most important and accurate account of that people during upwards of four hundred years of their national existence, delivered for the most part by contemporary writers, and guaranteed by the authority of one of the most eminent of the Jewish prophets. Considering the conciseness of the narrative and the simplicity of the style, the amount of knowledge which these books convey of the characters, conduct, and manners of kings and people during so long a period is truly wonderful. The insight they give us into the aspect of Judah and Jerusalem, both natural and artificial, into the religious, military, and civil institutions of the people, their arts and manufactures, the state of education and learning among them, their resources, commerce, exploits, alliances, the causes of their decadence, and, finally, of their ruin, is most clear, interesting, and instructive. In a few brief sentences we acquire more accurate knowledge of the affairs of Egypt, Tyre, Syria, Assyria, Babylon, and other neighboring nations, than had been preserved to us in all the other remains of antiquity up to the recent discoveries in hieroglyphical and cuneiform monuments. The synchronisms with these, if they create some difficulties, yet furnish the only real basis for dates of these contemporaneous powers; and if we are content to read accurate and truthful history, substantially with an exact though intricate net-work of chronology, then we shall assuredly find it will abundantly repay the most laborious study which we can bestow upon it.

But it is for their deep religious teaching, and for the insight which they give us into God's providential and moral government of the world, that



these books are above all valuable. Books which describe the wisdom and the glory of Solomon, and yet record his fall; which make us acquainted with the painful ministry of Elijah, and his translation into heaven; and which tell us how the most magnificent temple ever built for God's-glory, and of which he vouchsafed to take possession by a visible symbol of his presence, was consigned to the flames and to desolation for the sins of those who worshipped in it, read us such lessons concerning both God and man as are the best evidence of their divine origin, and make them the richest treasure to every Christian man.

**XI. Commentaries.** — The following are the exegetical helps specially on the two books of Kings, to the most important of which we prefix an asterisk: Ephraem Syrus, *Explanatio* (in Syriac, in his *Opp.* 4:439); Theodoret, *Quæstiones* (in Greek, in his *Opp.* i, edit. Halle, 1769); Procopius of Gaza, *Scholia*- [including Chronicles] (from Theodoret, edit. Meursius, Lugd. Bat. 1620, 4to); Eucherius [falsely attributed to him], *Commentarii* (in the *Max. Bibl. Vet. Patr.* 6:965 sq.); Rashi [i.e. Rab. Sol. Jarchi], *Commentarius* [Joshua-Kings] (trans. by Breithaupt, Gotha, 1714, 4to); Bafolas, **WwrPq** [Joshua-Kings] (with Kimchi's Commentary, Seira, 1494, folio; and in the Rabbinical Bibles); Alscheich, **twarjñi** etc. [Joshua-Kings] (Venice, 1601, fol., and later); Bugenhagen, *Adptationes* (Basil. 1525, 8vo); Weller, *Commentarius* (Francof. 1557, Norib. 1560, fol.); Borrhaus, *Commentarius* [Joshua-Kings] (Basil. 1557, folio); Sarcer, *Commentarius* (Lips. 1559, 8vo); Martyr, *Commentarius* (Tigur. 1666, 1581, Heidelb. 1599, fol.); Strigel, *Commentarius* [Samuel-Chronicles] (Lips. 1583, 1591, fol.); Serarius, *Commentaria* [Joshua-Chronicles] (Mogunt. 1609, 1617, 2 vols. fol.); Leonhardt, *Ilypomnenmta* [Samuel -Chronicles] (Erfurt, 1608, 1614, 8vo; Lips. 1610, 4to); De Mendoza, *Commentaria* [including Samuel] (Lugd. 1622-1631, 3 vols. fol.); Sanctius, *Commentarii* [Samuel-Chronicles] (Antwerp, 1624, Lugd. 1625, fol.); Crommius, *Illustrationes* [RuthChronicles] (Lovan. 1631, 4to); De Vera, *Commentaria* [includ. Samuel] (Limbe, 1335, fol.); \*Bonfrere, *Commentaria* [Samuel-Chronicles] (Tornaci, 1643, 2 vols. fol.; also with his other commentaries, Lugd. 1737); Caussin, *Dissertationes* [includ. Samuel] (Par. 1650, fol.; Colon. 1652, 4to); \*Schmidt, *Adnotationes* (Argent. 1697, 4to); Calmrcet, *Commentaire* (Par. 1711, 4to); A Lapide, *Commentarius* [Joshua-Kings] (Antw. 1718, fol.); Brentano and Dcreser, *Erklärung* (F. a. MI. 1827, 8vo); Tanchur-Jerusalami, *Commentarius* [includ. Samuel] (from the Arabic, by Haarbrucker, Lips. 1844, 8vo);

\*Keil, *Commentar* (Moskau, 1846, 8vo; tr. Edinb. 1857, 8vo, different from that in Keil and Delitzsch's Commentary); \*Thenius, *Erklärung* (in the *Kurzgef. Exeg. Hdbk.* Lpz. 1849, 8vo); Schlisser, *Einleitung in die Bücher der Könige* (Halle, 1861, 8vo). For monographs on particular passages, see Danz, *Wörterbuch*, p. 555. *SEE COMMENTARY.*

## King's Book

is the name of a book published A.D. 1543, under the sanction of Henry VIII, entitled *A necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man*.

The people called it the *King's Book* in contradistinction from the work which furnished the basis for the *King's Book*, and was called the *Bishops' Book*. This latter was an exposition of the Apostles' Creed, the Seven Sacraments, the Ten Commandments, the Pater Noster, and the Ave Maria: to these, in the *King's Book*, was subjoined additional matter touching free will, good works, justification, predestination, and purgatory. A comparison, however, of the two shows that in the *King's Book* there is a falling away from the principles of the Reformation. *SEE INSTITUTION OF A CHRISTIAN MAN.*

## King's Dale

(*Ἐἰ Μῆι qm[εE'mnek ham-Mle'lek*, *Valley of the King*; Sept. τὸ πεδῖον τῶν βασιλέων, ἡ κοιλάς τοῦ βασιλέως), a place incidentally mentioned in two passages of Scripture only. When Abraham was returning with the spoil of Sodom, the king of Sodom went out to meet him "at the valley of Shaveh, which is the king's dale" (<sup>0147</sup>Genesis 14:17); and in the narrative of the death of Absalom the incidental remark is inserted by the historian, "Now Absalom in his lifetime had reared up for himself a pillar which is in the king's dale" (<sup>0088</sup>2 Samuel 18:18). The locality has usually been supposed to be in the Valley of Jehoshaphat or Kidron, and that the well-known monument, now called the tomb of Absalom, is the pillar raised by that prince (Benjamin of Tudela, in *Early Trav. in Pal.* p. 84; Raumer, *Palia:f.* p. 303; Barclay, *City of the Great King*, p. 92). The style of the monument, which is of the later Roman age, militates against this theory, unless we suppose that this structure merely represents the older traditional site. *SEE ABSOLOMS TOMB.* The names given to the valley, *Enouk*, *Shamveh*, prove that a "plain" or broad valley" was meant, and not a *ravine* like the Kidron; but this would tolerably well apply to its broader part at the junction with that of Hinnom. *SEE*

**JEHOSHAPHAT, VALLEY OF.** Others locate the king's dale at Beersheba, others at Lebanon (Reland, *Palest.* p. 357), others near the Jordan (Stanley, *Jewish Church*, i, 44). But if we identify Salem with Jerusalem, then doubtless the king's dale was close to that city; and it seems highly probable besides that Absalom should have raised his memorial pillar in the vicinity of the capital (Krafft, *Die Topographie Jerusalems*, p. 88). Still others regard the place as that elsewhere called the "Valley of Rephaim," and now usually designated as the *Plain of Rephaim*. This is on the direct route from the north to Hebron; a practicable road leads down from it through the wilderness to the shore of the Dead Sea; and it is so close to Jerusalem that Melchisedec, from the heights of Zion, could both see and hear the joyous meeting of the princes of Sodom with the victorious band of Abraham, and the reclaimed captives (comp. Kurtz, *Hist. of the Old Covenant*, i, 218; Wilson, *Lands of the Bible*, i, 488; Kalisch, *On*, <sup><1147></sup>*Genesis 14:17*). **SEE REPHAIM, VALLEY OF.** The epithet "King's," however, seems rather to favor a connection with the "king's garden", **SEE JERUSALEM**, which lay near the Pool of Siloam (<sup><1274></sup>2 Kings 25:4). **SEE SHAVEH.**

King's Evil is the name in England of a disease which the people believed their kings had the power of curing by touch. So strong was the popular conviction that the ecclesiastical authorities devised a special form of religious service to be recited while the king was touching the diseased person. It is as follows:

"The first gospel was exactly the same with that on Ascension Day. At the touching of every infirm person, these words were repeated, 'They shall lay their hands on the sick, and they shall recover.' The second gospel began at the first of St. John, and ended at these words, 'full of grace and truth.' At putting the angel (or gold) about their necks, 'That light was the true light which lights every man that cometh into the world,' was repeated,

Lord have mercy upon us.

*Christ have mercy upon its.*

Lord have mercy upon us.

Our Father which art in heaven, hallowed be thy name, etc.

**Minister.** O Lord, save thy servants.

*Answer.* Which put their trust in thee.

**Minister.** Send unto them help from above.

*Answer.* And evermore mightily defend them.

**Minister.** Help us, O God, our' Saviour.

*Answer.* And for the glory of thy name's sake deliver us; be merciful unto us sinners, for thy name's sake.

**Minister.** O Lord, hear our prayer.

*Answer.* And let our cry come unto thee.

## THE COLLECT

Almighty God, the eternal health of all such as put their trust in thee, hear us, we beseech thee, on the behalf of these thy servants, for whom we call for thy merciful help; that they, receiving health, may give thanks unto thee in thy holy Church, through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

The peace of God, etc."

"The evidence which has sometimes been offered for supposed miraculous cures of the king's evil is none at all for the *miracle*. but goes to prove that patients were touched, and *afterwards recovered*. Symptoms of many diseases abate spontaneously; and especially in the case of scrofula, a strong excitement of mind is supposed by medical men to exert often a reaction in the absorbents. The touch of a hanged man's hand has been held in at least equal repute for scrofula and wens, doubtless for alike reason. If Jesus had laid his hands on many sick persons, and *some* of them had recovered within a week, how different would have been the state of the case! (See Paley on *tentative* miracles and gradual cures.) As the reality of a cure by the touch of a royal hand cannot be believed without the utmost degree of superstition, it is probable that the service was used as a petition for the cure, and that the touching the part affected was a superstitious act, followed by a cure in those cases in which the action of the mind was favorable to such an effect. Thus the cure itself would be explicable from natural causes."

**King's Garden.**

*SEE GARDEN.*

**King's House.**

*SEE PALACE.*

### King's Mother.

*SEE QUEEN.*

### King's Mowings.

*SEE MOWING.*

### King's Pool.

*SEE POOL.*

### King's Primer.

*SEE PRIMER.*

### King's Sepulchre.

*SEE TOMB.*

### Kingsbury, Cyrus

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

### Kingsbury, William

a Congregational minister, was born in London July 12, 1744, and educated first at Christ's Hospital, London, and for the ministry at the educational institution for Congregational ministers at Mile End, where he graduated in 1764. He was ordained in 1765, and became pastor of the Independent Church at Southampton, a position which he most successfully filled for forty-five years. In 1772, in addition to his pastoral duties, he established an academy for the education of young men. In 1787 he declined a position in Homerton College. In 1795 he was one of the prime movers in founding the London Missionary Society, and was the first to preside over its deliberations. He died at Caversham Feb. 18, 1818. He published in 1798

*An Apology for Village Preachers*, in answer to an attack made upon them. Mr. Kingsbury was "one of the brightest ornaments of the ministerial character that has graced the Church of God in modern times—a man of rare and exalted worth, possessed of vigor of intellect, sound critical knowledge, as well as depth of piety."—Morison, *Missionary Fathers*. (H. C.W.)

### Kingsley, Calvin, D.D., LL.D.

a bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born of Presbyterian parentage, at Amnesville, Oneida County, N. Y., Sept. 8, 1812. His early advantages were rather moderate, but his thirst for knowledge made him superior to circumstances, and he secured whatever he could by night study and the careful improvement of the intervals in his working hours. He was converted at the age of eighteen, and avowed it at once as his purpose to enter the ministry. By teaching country schools he saved enough to partially defray the expenses of a collegiate education, and in 1836 entered Alleghany College, whence he was graduated with honor in the year 1841, having held already, in his sophomore year, the appointment of tutor of mathematics. Immediately after graduation he was elected professor of mathematics in the college, and discharged the duties of that position for several years, taking upon himself also the work of preaching; he had been licensed to preach in 1836. In the year 1843, when Alleghany College was deprived of its assistance from Pennsylvania by an enactment withdrawing all appropriation from the high schools of the state, Kingsley, then an ordained deacon in the Church, was appointed agent "for the peculiarly arduous and thankless task of raising funds for the endowment of his college." About this time, also, the future bishop first came prominently before the general public. He had early entertained strong antislavery predilections, and in 1843 was led to open a public discussion with the distinguished preachers Luther Lee (q.v.) and Elias Smith (q.v.), who had formed the "Wesleyan" organization through disaffection at the position assumed by the Methodist Episcopal Church on the subject of the institution of slavery. In these discussions Kingsley proved himself in every respect the equal, if not the superior, of his antagonists—"men by nature able, and by practice trained to the highest point of effectiveness by their zeal for truth, and laborious study of the whole ground of the controversy." From 1844 to 1845 he was also regular pastor in the city of Erie, where a deep religious influence accompanied his ministrations. While here he had a public discussion with a Universalist minister, and also prepared his

lectures on Prof. Bush's work on the *Resurrection*, which were published afterwards under the title *Kingsley on the Resurrection* (1845, and often). Preferring work in the pulpit to that in the rostrum, he resigned his place at Alleghany College in 1846, but the trustees refused to accept the resignation, and, at the most earnest entreaty of many of his friends, he was induced to continue his college relations, even at a considerable pecuniary sacrifice. Besides, however, discharging the duties of his chair, he continued to labor faithfully as a preacher upon the adjacent circuits and stations. In 1852 he was elected a delegate from his Conference to the General Conference, and not only was he at the head of his own Conference delegation, but while in attendance, though a comparative stranger, received, in the election of bishops, some forty votes for this distinguished office. By the next General Conference (1856) he was elected editor of the *Western Christian Advocate*, successor of the celebrated late Dr. Elliott. In this place he displayed much editorial ability, and his paper became a powerful influence in the West. In 1860 he was recognised by the General Conference as the leader of the antislavery movement, and was chosen chairman of the Slavery Committee, and managed the discussion on that subject with great taste. He was at that time reelected editor of *The Advocate*, and at the breaking out of the war brought its whole support to the aid of the government. In 1864, the General Conference, then in session at Philadelphia, promoted him to the high distinction for which he had been a candidate in 1852, and he performed the duties of the position until the summer of 1869, when he took an episcopal tour around the world, but died on his way homeward at Beirut, Syria, April 6, 1870. 'As a bishop, he met the highest expectation of the Church. In the chair his decisions were clear and exact. In making the appointments he manifested great sympathy for the preachers and devotion to the interests of the Church. His ministrations were able and successful, and during the six years of his episcopal labor he gave himself wholly to the work of his great office. As a man, he was simple and unaffected in his manners, genial and social in his spirit. His intellect was strong, keen, and logical. He used a ready pen, and his descriptions were clear, concise, and graphic. His sermons were rich in doctrinal truth, and by their clear conception and earnest delivery held the attention of large congregations. His executive power was of a superior order, and each successive year his talents were unfolding" (*Conference Minutes*, 1870, p. 294). The Rev. Dr. Robert Allyn, in his *Personal Recollections of Bishop Kingsley* (*Central Christian Advocate*, June 1, 1870), speaks of him as " a man genial, charitable,

honest, earnest, shrewd and far-seeing, patient, careful, logical, and bold in defense and in attack. His square form, solid lips, and broad shoulders were an indication of the wrestler. and his keen, quick eye was that of a master offence. While he was one of the most diligent of workers, he had just enough of the phlegmatic about his temperament to make him the pluckiest of fighters. He always looked at a *point*, and not at half of the horizon, as many do when they preach or write. His eagle eye would see the mark, no matter how far away, and his steady hand could point the spear to hit it exactly. In his sermonizing there was no attempt at profundity, or speculation, or rhetorical ornamentation, or even logical force; yet it had all these so far as they are of any account. It was emphatically as the rain that cometh down from heaven falling because the clouds are too full to hold it longer, and never caring on what place it may descend, or what it shall refresh. His thoughts were always clear, and his words exact and often picturesque. He was entirely indifferent to the applause of those to whom he spoke, and was so natural-commonly not graceful in all his manner, that a careless observer would be sure to be deceived into thinking him of less weight than he really had. Every word he chose was a word to help convey his meaning, and he never added another for show; hence a few, who looked for sound rather than sense, might undervalue his preaching; but let a congregation hear him often, and become accustomed to the flash of his eye and the movement of his face as his thoughts came leaping from his heart, and as he attempted to clothe them in words, and they could not fail to be fascinated. He had a magnetic power to keep people awake and to instruct them, and to attach men to him which not many possess. Said he once, 'I cannot soar on the wings of fancy, I can only instruct and convince.' "In a word," says Dr. Wiley, " his whole character was well rounded and symmetrical as his mind was rigorously logical, and his frame robust, compact, and well knit together. He filled with ability all places to which the Church called him, as pastor, educator, editor, and bishop." Bishop Kingsley left in MS. form a series of lectures he delivered while professor at Meadville, in defence of the Orthodox doctrine. It is to be hoped that they will soon be brought out in book form. They certainly would prove a great addition to our literature on those subjects. Since his decease his letters of travel have been published under the title of *Round the World* (Cincinnati, 1870, 2 vols. 12mo), prefaced by a memoir of the bishop. (J. H. W.)



## Kingsley, James Luce, LL.D.,

an eminent and one of the most successful American educators, born in Scotland, Conn., Aug. 28, 1778, was a lineal descendant of John Kingsley, one of the seven men who in 1636 constituted the first Church in Dorchester, Mass. Iel entered Williams College at the age of seventeen, and at the end of the freshman year was transferred to Yale, where he graduated in 1799. After teaching in Windham and Wethersfield for two years Mr. Kingsley was appointed tutor in Yale College in 1801, and in 1805 was promoted to the professorship of the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin languages and of ecclesiastical history, a position which he retained till his death in 1852. His studies were chiefly in language and history, but he was well versed iii mathematics, theology, metaphysics, political science, and general literature. The study of the classics had disciplined his judgment and refined his taste, so that his writings were clear, finished, and forcible to the highest degree. As a writer of English, Dr. Dwight called him the American Addison; in Latin, Prof. Thacher says that 'Cicero was his model, and he was certainly a successful imitator of his style-surprisingly successful, when we consider how he was dependent on himself for instruction." Prof. Kingsley was at the same time remarkably modest and retiring, the usual accompaniments of true greatness. He very rarely made a public address, although so eminently qualified for the task; and the editions of classical authors which he published as text-books, together with the numerous articles which he contributed to quarterly and monthly periodicals, were commonly anonymous. His Latin compositions were numerous, but rarely published. The congratulatory address which he gave at the inauguration of president Day in 1817, and a similar address at the inauguration of president Woolsey in 1846, have not even been found among his papers. The memorandum of one of his associates attributes to him six such monumental tributes, viz. president Dwight, 1817; colonel David Humphreys, 1818; professor Alexander M. Fisher, 1822; professor M. R. Dutton, 1825; tutor Amos Pettingill, 1832; and Osgood Johnson, 1837. The most elaborate of his writings was the address delivered on the two hundredth anniversary of the settlement of New Haven in 1838. It remains a model of thorough investigation and judicious combination. The letters of Prof. Kingsley have been very much admired. With president Sparks, Edward Everett, Dr. Palfrey, Mr. Savage, and other literary gentlemen, he was in constant correspondence, but more particularly with Dr. J. E. Worcester. In the *American Quarterly Register* for April, 1835,

and August, 1836, will be found his sketch of the *History of Yale College*, which was also printed as a separate pamphlet (46 pages 8vo). This is regarded as a chief authority in relation to the early history of this celebrated college. The productions of Prof. Kingsley found a large place in the leading American periodicals; he ranked especially prominent among the contributors to the *New Englander*, the *Christian Spectator*, the *Biblical Repository*, and the *North American Review*. For a complete list of his works, see Allibone, *Diet. Engl. and Am. Auth.* vol. ii, s.v. See also Thacher (Thomas A.), *Commemorative Discourse on Prof. Kingsley* (Oct., 1852).

### Kingsley, Phineas

a Presbyterian minister, born in Rutland, Vt., March 12, 1788, educated in the classics by his uncle, a graduate of Harvard College, was licensed to preach about 1818, and ordained at Highgate, Vt., Oct. 12, 1819, where he remained twelve years. He was next settled for seven years at Underhill, Vt., and for the five years following at Sheldon, Vt. In 1847 he removed to Brooklyn, Ohio, and continued preaching to the day of his death, July 6, 1863. "He was highly esteemed by his ministerial brethren, not for showy talents, but for substantial worth and fidelity."-Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1867.

### Kingsmill, Andrew

an English divine, born at Sidminton, in Hampshire, in 1538, was educated at Corpus Christi College, Oxford, and removed thence to a fellowship of All Souls in 1558. In the year 1563 there were only three preachers in the university, of whom Kingsmill was one; but after some time, when conformity was pressed, he withdrew from the kingdom and went to Geneva, but at the end of three years moved to Lausanne, where he died in the year 1570, in the prime of life, "leaving behind him," says Neale (*Hist. of the Puritans*, i, 116 sq.), "an excellent pattern of piety, devotion, and all manner of virtue." He was an admired preacher, and a scholar of superior attainments. His memory was most remarkable, for it is said that he could readily rehearse, in the Greek language, all St. Paul's epistles to the Romans and Galatians, and other portions of holy Scripture, *memoriter*. His works are:

1. *View of Man's Estate* (1574, 8vo):

2. *Godly Advice touching Marriage* (1580, 8vo):
3. *Treatise for such as are troubled in A Mind or Inflicted in Body :*
4. *A godly Exhortation to bear patiently all Afflictions for the Gospel:*
5. *Conference between a learned Christian and an afflicted Conscience.* (E. de P.)