

THE AGES DIGITAL LIBRARY
REFERENCE

CYCLOPEDIA of BIBLICAL,
THEOLOGICAL and
ECCLESIASTICAL
LITERATURE

M - Managers

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

M

Ma'acah

(Heb. *Maikah'*, *ḥkʿl ḥni*, *oppression*, Sept. *Μααχά*, but in ^{<01224>}Genesis 22:24, *Μοχά*; in ^{<13248>}1 Chronicles 2:48; 3:3. *Μωχά*; in ^{<13715>}1 Chronicles 7:15, 16, *Μοοχά*; in ^{<13085>}1 Chronicles 9:35, *Μοωχά*; in ^{<13148>}1 Chronicles 11:43, *Μαχά*; Vulg. *Maacha*; Auth. Vers. "Maacah" only ^{<10118>}2 Samuel 3:3; 10:6, 8), the name of a place and also of nine persons. *SEE BETH-MAACHAH*.

1. A city and region at the foot of Mount Hermon, not far from Geshur, a district of Syria (^{<06513>}Joshua 13:13; ^{<10106>}2 Samuel 10:6, 8; ^{<13907>}1 Chronicles 19:7). Hence the adjacent portion of Syria is called Aram-Maacah, or Syria of Maachah ("Syria-Maachah," ^{<13196>}1 Chronicles 19:6). It appears to have been situated at the southerly junction of Coele-Syria and Damascus-Syria, being bounded by the kingdom of Rehob on the north, by that of Geshur on the south, and by the mountains on either side of the Upper Jordan, on the east and west. *SEE GESHUR*. The little kingdom thus embraced the southern and eastern declivities of Hermon, and a portion of the rocky plateau of Itursea (Porter's *Damascus*, 1:319; comp. *Journ. of Sac. Lit.* July 1854, page 310). The Israelites seem to have considered this territory as included in their grant, but were never able to get possession of it (^{<06513>}Joshua 13:13). In the time of David this petty principality had a king of its own, who contributed 1000 men to the grand alliance of the Syrian nations against the Jewish monarch (^{<10106>}2 Samuel 10:6, 8). The lot of the half-tribe of Manasseh beyond the Jordan extended to this country, as had previously the dominion of Og, king of Bashan (^{<08314>}Deuteronomy 3:14; ^{<06126>}Joshua 12:5). The Gentile name is Maacathite (*ytbeʿl ḥni*, Sept. *Μαχαθί*, but *Μααχαθί* in ^{<12924>}2 Samuel 23:24, *Μαχαθά* in ^{<13149>}1 Chronicles 4:19, *Μιοχαθεί* in ^{<2418>}Jeremiah 40:8; Auth. Version "Maacathite," but "Maachathi" in ^{<08314>}Deuteronomy 3:14), which is also put for the people (^{<08314>}Deuteronomy 3:14; ^{<06126>}Joshua 12:5; 13:11, 13; ^{<12523>}2 Kings 25:23). Near or within the ancient limits of the small state of Maacah was the town called for that reason Abbel beth-maacah, perhaps its metropolis, which is represented by the modern *Abil el-Kamh*, situated on the west side of the

valley and stream that descends from Merj Ayun towards the Huleh, and on a summit, with a large offset on the south. **SEE ABELN-BETH MAACHAH**. Rosenmüller explains the name Maacah *to press, to press together*, which seems to denote a region enclosed and hemmed in by mountains, a land of valleys. The name of this region is Anglicized everywhere "Maachah" in the Auth. Vers., except in ^{<10RB>}2 Samuel 3:3; 10:6, 8. Once (^{<6313>}Joshua 13:13, second clause) it is written in the original *Maacath* (Hebrew *Maakath'*, תַּכְּיָתִי Sept. Μαχαθί, Vulg. *Maachati*, Auth. Vers. "Maachathites"). The identification of the Chaldee version with the district of Epicairus (Ἐπικαίρος), mentioned by Ptolemy (5:16, 9) as lying between Callirrhoe and Livias, as also that of the Syriac (on 1 Chronicles) with Charan, according to Rosenmüller (*Alteth.* 1. 2) a tract in the district of the Ledja (Burckhardt, 1:350), is merely traditionary (Reland, *Palest.* p. 118).

2. The last named of the four children of Nahor by his concubine Reumah, probably a son, although the sex is uncertain (^{<10224>}Genesis 22:24). B.C. cir. 2040. Ewald arbitrarily connects the name with the district of Maachah in the Hermon range (*Gesch.* 1:414, note 1).

3. The sister of Hupham (Huppim) and Shupham (Shuppim), and consequently granddaughter of Benjamin; she married Machir, by whom she had two sons (^{<13715>}1 Chronicles 7:15, 16). B.C. post. 1856. **SEE GILEAD**.

4. The second named of the concubines of Caleb (son of Hezron), by whom she had several children (^{<1128>}1 Chronicles 2:48). B.C. ante 1658.

5. The wife of Jehiel and mother of Gibeon (^{<1383>}1 Chronicles 8:29; 9:35). B.C. cir. 1658.

6. A daughter of Talmai, king of Geshur; she became the wife of David, and mother of Absalom (^{<10RB>}2 Samuel 3:3). B.C. 1053. In ^{<10278>}1 Samuel 27:8, we read of David's invading the land of the Geshurites, and the Jewish commentators (in Jerome, *ad Reg.*) allege that he then took the daughter of the king captive, and, in consequence of her great beauty, married her, after she had been made a proselyte according to the law in Deuteronomy 21. But this is a gross mistake. for the Geshur invaded by David was to the south of Judah, whereas the Geshur over which Talmai ruled was to the north, and was regarded as part of Syria (^{<10198>}2 Samuel 15:8). **SEE GESIHUI**. The fact appears to be that David, having married

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

7. The father of Hanan, which latter was one of David's famous body-guard (^{<1314>}1 Chronicles 11:43). B.C. ante 1046.

8. The father of Shephathiah, which latter was the military chief of the tribe of Simeon under David and Solomon (^{<1327>}1 Chronicles 27:16). B.C. ante 1014.

9. The father of Achish, which latter was the king of Gath, to whom Shimei went in search of his runaway servants, and thus forfeited, his life by transcending the bounds prescribed by Solomon (^{<1103>}1 Kings 2:39). B.C. ante 1010. He appears to have been different from the Maoch of ^{<1070>}1 Samuel 27:2. *SEE ACHISH.*

10. A daughter of Abishalom, the wife of Rehoboam, and mother of Abijam (^{<1150>}1 Kings 15:2). B.C. 973-953. In verse 10 we read that Asa's "mother's name was Maachah, the daughter of Abishalom." It is evident that here "mother" is used in a loose sense, and means "grandmother," which the Maachah named in verse 2 must have been to the Asa of verse 10. It therefore appears to be a great error to make two persons of them, as is done by Calmet and others. The Abishalom who was the father of this Maachah is called Absalom in ^{<412>}2 Chronicles 11:20-22, and is generally supposed by the Jews to have been Absalom, the son of David; which seems not improbable, seeing that Rehoboam's two other wives were of his father's family (^{<4118>}2 Chronicles 11:18). In ^{<413>}2 Chronicles 13:2, she is called "Michaiah, the daughter of Uriel of Gibeah." But Josephus says that she was the daughter of Tamar, the daughter of Absalom (*Ant.* 8:10, 1), and consequently his granddaughter. This seems not unlikely, and in that case this Tamar must have been the wife of Uriel. *SEE ABIJAI.* It would appear that Asa's own mother was dead before he began to reign; for Maachah bore the rank and state of queen-mother (resembling that of the sultanness Valide among the Turks), the powers of which she so much abused to the encouragement of idolatry, that Asa commenced his reforms by "removing her from being queen, because she had made an idol (lit. a fright) in a grove" (^{<1150>}1 Kings 15:10-13; ^{<4156>}2 Chronicles 15:16).

Maacath

SEE MAACAH, 1.

Ma'achah

(^{<0224>}Genesis 22:24; ^{<1029>}1 Kings 2:39; 15:2,10, 13; ^{<1324>}1 Chronicles 2:48; 3:2; 7:15, 16; 8:29; 9:35; 11:43; 19:6, 7; 27:16; ^{<1411>}2 Chronicles 11:20,21, 22; 15:16). SEE MAACAH.

Maach'athi

(^{<0314>}Deuteronomy 3:14),

Maach'athites

(^{<0125>}Joshua 12:5; 13:11, 13 [in the second occurrence it should be *Maacath*]; ^{<1034>}2 Samuel 23:34; ^{<1253>}2 Kings 25:23; ^{<1349>}1 Chronicles 4:19; ^{<2418>}Jeremiah 40:8). SEE MAACAH, 1.

Ma'adai

(Heb. *Maaday'*, **yd[]ni** *ornamental*; Sept. **Μοοδία**), one of the "sons" of Bani who divorced his Gentile wife after the exile (^{<1504>}Ezra 10:34). B.C. 459.

Maaidi'ah

(Heb. *Maadyah'*, **hyd[]ni** *ornament of Jehovah*; Septuag.

Μααδι"αζα, Vulg. *Madia*), one of the priests who returned to Jerusalem with Zerubbabel (^{<1615>}Nehemiah 12:5); evidently the same with the MOADIAH (Heb. *Moady'ah'*, **hyd[]m**, *festival of Jehovah*; Sept.

Μααδαί Vulg. *Moadia*), whose son Piltai is mentioned in verse 17 (where some connection with one Miniamin is obscurely noted); the true pointing being perhaps **hyd[]m** *Moady'ah'*, which will make both forms coincide.

B.C. 536.

Ma'ai

(Heb. *Maay'*, **y[]m**; perhaps compassionate Sept. has two names, **Ίαμά**, **Άία**, the first syllable of the former being apparently taken from the last of the preceding name Gilalai; Vulg. *Maai*), one of the priests appointed to

perform the music at the celebration of the completion of the walls of Jerusalem after the captivity (^{<1626>}Nehemiah 12:36). B.C. 446.

Maa'leh-acrab'bim

(Heb. *Maaleh'-Akrabbim'*, ^μϋ^Βα^αϋ^Ϛ | ^η | ^ϵ | ^η | ^ι ascent of the scorpions, i.q. scorpion-hill; in ^{<6341>}Numbers 34:4, Septuag. (ἀνάβασις Ἀκραβείν, Auth. Vers. "the ascent of Akrabbim;" in ^{<6353>}Joshua 15:3, προσανάβασις Ἀκραβίν; in ^{<0035>}Judges 1:36, ἀνάβασις Ἀκραβίν, "the going up to Akrabbimn;" Vulg. everywhere *ascensus scorpionis*), a pass on the south-eastern border of Palestine. *SEE AKRABBIAI*.

Maä'leh-adum'mim

(Heb. *Micaleh'-Adummim'*, ^μϋ^Μα^α | ^η | ^ϵ | ^η | ^ι ascent of Adummim; Sept. ἀνάβασις [also πρόσβασις and προσανάβασις] Ἀκραβίν, Vulg. *ascensio Adommim*, Auth. Vers. "the going up of Adummim"), a dangerous pass near Gilgal (^{<6357>}Joshua 15:7; 18:17). *SEE ADUMMIM*.

Maan, John,

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

Maa'ini

(^Μαα^νί v.r. ^Βαα^νί), the ancestor of several who had married Gentile wives after the captivity (1 Esdr. 9:34); evidently the BANI *SEE BANI* (q.v.) of the Heb. list (^{<1508>}Ezra 10:38).

Ma'arath

(Heb. *Maarath'*, ^τ | ^ρ | ^Ϛ | ^η | ^ι desolation; Sept. ^Μαα^ρω^θ, Vulg. *Mareth*), a place in the mountains of Judah, mentioned between Gedor and Beth-anoth (^{<6359>}Joshua 15:59). De Saulcy suggests a place which he calls *Kharbet el-Merassas*, south-east of Jerusalem (Narrative, 2:17); and Schwarz declares it is a village called *Magr*, west of Ekron (*Palest.* page 107): both far from

the indications of the text, which require a locality north of Hebron (Keil's *Comment. ad loc.*). It may be represented by the ruins marked as Mersia on Van de Velde's *Map* (1858), on the road from Hebron to Bethlehem, about half way between Bereikut and Solomon's Pools, at Urtas; but on the second edition of his *Map* (1865) this place disappears, and we have in the required region unappropriated only the ruins Merina, on a little stream just north of Kufin, evidently the "ruined tower called Merrina, seen by him on the high ground south of wady Arub" (*Memoir*, page 247).

Maasei'ah

(Heb. *Maaseyah'*, **מַאֲסֵי** or [^{<1315>}1 Chronicles 15:18,20; 23:1; ^{<1451>}2 Chronicles 25:11; 28:7; 34:8; ^{<2074>}Jeremiah 25:4], *Maaseya'hu*, **מַאֲסֵי** the work of Jehovah; Sept. **Μαασία**, with many slight various readings), the name of several men.

1. One of the Levites of the second class, appointed porters of the Temple under David (^{<1315>}1 Chronicles 15:18), and also musicians "with psalteries upon Alamoth" (verse 20). B.C. 1043.
2. The son of Adaiah, and one of the "captains of hundreds" whom Jehoiada associated with himself in restoring the young king Jehoash to the throne (^{<1420>}2 Chronicles 23:1). B.C. 877.
3. A chieftain in the time of Uzziah, who had charge of the military in a subordinate rank (^{<1431>}2 Chronicles 26:11). B.C. 808.
4. The "king's son," killed by Zichri, the Ephraimitish hero, in the invasion of Judah by Pekah, king of Israel, during the reign of Ahaz (^{<1430>}2 Chronicles 28:7). The personage thus designated is twice mentioned in connection with the "governor of the city" (^{<1225>}1 Kings 22:26; ^{<1485>}2 Chronicles 18:25), and appears to have held an office of importance at the Jewish court (perhaps acting as viceroy during the absence of the king), just as the queen dowager was honored with the title of "king's mother" (compare ^{<1242>}2 Kings 24:12 with ^{<2490>}Jeremiah 29:2), or *gebirah*, 1. "mistress," or "powerful lady." **SEE MALCHIAH**. For the conjecture of Geiger, **SEE JOASH**, 4. Perhaps, however, the individual here referred to was literally one of the sons of Ahaz. B.C. cir. 738.
5. The "governor of the city," one of those sent by king Josiah to repair the Temple (^{<1408>}2 Chronicles 34:8). B.C. 623. The date and rank render it not

improbable that he was the *Maaseiah* (Heb. *Machseyah'*, *חַסְיָהוּ* whose *refuge* is *Jehovah*; Sept. *Μαασαΐς* v.r. *Μασσαΐς*, etc.), the father of Neriah, and grandfather of Baruch and Seraiah, which latter were two persons of note to whom Jeremiah had recourse in his divine communications (^{<2492>}Jeremiah 32:12; 51:59): and in that case he is likewise probably identical with MELCHI, the son of Addi, and father of Neri, in Christ's maternal genealogy (^{<4183>}Luke 3:28).

- 6.** The son of Shallum, apparently a priest, since he had a chamber in the Temple, and was one of its custodians (^{<2484>}Jeremiah 35:4). B.C. 606.
- 7.** The father of the priest Zephaniah or Zedekiah, which latter was twice sent by the king with a message of inquiry to Jeremiah, and was denounced by the prophet for falsely encouraging the people (^{<3201>}Jeremiah 21:1; 37:3; 29:21, 25). B.C. ante 589.
- 8.** Son of Ithiel and father of Kolaiah, a Benjamite, one of whose descendants resided at Jerusalem after the exile (^{<16107>}Nehemiah 11:7). B.C. long ante 536.
- 9.** One of the descendants of Judah who resided at Jerusalem after the captivity; he was the son of Baruch, and his genealogy is traced back to one Shiloni (^{<16115>}Nehemiah 11:5). B.C. 536. In the corresponding narrative of ^{<1395>}1 Chronicles 9:5, apparently the same person is called ASIAH.
- 10.** One of the priests of the kindred of Jeshua, who agreed to divorce their Gentile wives after the captivity (^{<1508>}Ezra 10:18). B.C. 459.
- 11.** Another priest, one of the "sons" of Harim, who divorced his Gentile wife after the exile (^{<15021>}Ezra 10:21). B.C. 459. Perhaps it was he (apparently a priest) who formed one of the chorus that celebrated the completion of the new city walls (^{<16122>}Nehemiah 12:42). B.C. 446.
- 12.** Still another priest, of the "sons" of Pashur, who divorced his Gentile wife after the return from Babylon (^{<15022>}Ezra 10:22). B.C. 459. Perhaps the same with one of the priests who celebrated with trumpets the rebuilding of the walls of Jerusalem (^{<161241>}Nehemiah 12:41). B.C. 446.
- 13.** An Israelite, of the "sons" of Pahath-moab, who divorced his Gentile wife after the Babylonian captivity (^{<15030>}Ezra 10:30). B.C. 459.
- 14.** The son of Ananiah, and father of Azariah, which last repaired part of the walls of Jerusalem after the exile (^{<16123>}Nehemiah 3:23). B.C. ante 446.

15. One of the principal Israelites who stood on Ezra's right hand while he read and expounded the law to the people (^{<4604>}Nehemiah 8:4). B.C. cir. 410. He is perhaps identical with one of the popular chiefs who joined in the sacred covenant with Nehemiah (^{<4602>}Nehemiah 10:25). B.C. cir. 410.

16. One of the priests who assisted the Levites in expounding the law to the people as it was read by Ezra (^{<4607>}Nehemiah 8:7). B.C. cir. 410.

Maa'siai

(Heb. *Masay'*, **yc[ׁ]י** or, as it probably should be pointed, *Maasay'*, **yc[ׁ]י** *worker*, or perhaps contracted for *Maaseiah*; Sept. **Μασαί** v.r. **Μαασαία** ; Vulg. *Maasai*), the son of Adiel, a descendant of Immer, and one of the priests resident at Jerusalem at or after the captivity (^{<4392>}1 Chronicles 9:12). B.C. prob. 536.

Maasi'as

(**Μαασαί'ας**), the son of Sedecias and father of Baruch (Bar. 1:1); evidently the same as MAASEIAH (^{<2519>}Jeremiah 51:59), 5 (q.v.).

Ma'ith

(**Μαίθ**, of unknown, but prob. Heb. origin), a person named as the son of Mattathias and father of Nagge (Neariah), in Christ's maternal ancestry (^{<4085>}Luke 3:26); but, as no such name occurs in the pedigree in the O.T., and as it would here unduly extend the time of the lineage, we may reasonably conjecture this name has been accidentally interpolated from the *Matthat* of verse 24. (See Dr. Barrett, in Clarke's *Comment.* ad loc.)

Ma'az

(Heb. *Ma'aits*, **/[ׁ]י** *wrath*; Sept. **Μαάζ**) the first named of the three sons of Ram, the son of Jerahmeel, of the descendants of Judah (^{<4327>}1 Chronicles 2:27). B.C. post 1658.

Maazi'ah

(Heb. *Maazyah'*, **hyz[ׁ]י** ^{<4608>}Nehemiah 10:8, or *Maazyah'*, **Whyz[ׁ]י** ^{<4348>}1 Chronicles 24:18, *strength* [or perh. rather *consolation*, from the Arabic] of Jehovah; Sept. respectively **Μααζία** and **Μααζάλ** [v.r. **Μαασαί**]; Vulg. respectively *Maazia* and *Maazian*), the name of two priests.

1. The head of the last of the twenty-four sacerdotal "courses" as arranged by David (^{<1318>}1 Chronicles 24:18). B.C. 1014.

2. One of the priests who signed the sacred covenant with Nehemiah (^{<1608>}Nehemiah 10:8). B.C. cir. 410. "From the coincidence between many of the names of the priests in the lists of the twenty-four courses established by David, of those who signed the covenant with Nehemiah (Nehemiah 12), it would seem either that these names were hereditary in families, or that they were applied to the families themselves. This is evidently the case with the names of the 'heads of the people' enumerated in ^{<1604>}Nehemiah 10:14-27."

Mab'dai

(Μαβδαί), one of "the sons of Maani" who divorced their Gentile wives after the captivity (1 Esdr. 9:34); evidently the BENAIAH *SEE BENAIAH* (q.v.) of the Hebrew list (^{<1508>}Ezra 10:35).

Mabillon, Jean

a celebrated Benedictine preacher, and one of the most distinguished men of the 17th century. was born at St. Pierremont, in the diocese of Rheims, November 23, 1632, studied at the college of Rheims, and joined the congregation of St. Maur in 1651. He began his literary career by assisting D'Achery in his labors upon his vast historic recueil entitled *Spicilegium*. and by an edition of the works of St. Bernard, "which attracted the notice of ecclesiastical scholars, and furnished a sure pledge of the value of his future labors" (Dowling). In 1668 he came forward with a part of his original production, *Acta Sanctorum Ordinis S. Benedicti* (completed in 1702), one of the greatest historical works extant. He now became the general favorite of ecclesiastical students, and soon was brought to the notice also of his sovereign, Louis XIV, who sent him on literary missions, as the result of which we have from him *Museum Italicum* (1689), a kind of antiquarian itinerary of Italy. Besides descriptions of the towns and their attractions, it contains valuable dissertations on ecclesiastical history and paleography; also a very explicit commentary on the ritual of the various services, or liturgy, and rites of the Roman Church. (He had previously published *De Liturgi Gallicana libri tres* [1685], in which he compares the Gallican with the Mozarabic liturgy). Another work of great importance from the pen of Mabillon is the *Lettres et Ecrits sur les Etudes Monastiques*, containing a curious controversy between the abbé De

Rancé, the founder of the order of the Trappists (q.v.) and the Benedictines. De Rance, in his ascetic enthusiasm, had forbidden his monks all scientific studies, and, indeed, all reading except the Breviary and a few monastic tracts. The rest of the clergy, both secular and regular, took the alarm, and Mabillon was requested to defend monastic studies and learning as perfectly compatible with piety and religious discipline, as the Benedictine order had fully proved. Mabillon promptly complied with the request, and published his *Traite* in 1691. It was received with great applause, and was at once translated into Latin and other languages. See RANCÉ for the reply. His fame spread rapidly, and he was recognized as one of the leading scholars of his day. In 1701 he was chosen member of the Academy of Inscriptions. In 1703 he came before the public with the first volume of his chef-d'oeuvre, *Annales Ordinis S. Benedicti*. Henceforth, until the day of his death (December 27, 1707), Mabillon faithfully applied himself to the completion of this work, which all critics are agreed is "among the most important works which have been written on the history of the Church" (Dowling). It should certainly be found on the shelves of every real student of Church History. It commences with the year 480 — that of the birth of St. Benedict — and goes down to 1157 (covering in all 6 volumes folio. Mabillon himself completed volumes 1-4, extending to 1066; Massuet completed volume 5 [published in 1713], and Martene volume 6 [published in 1739]; for the different editions, see Ceillier, *Hist. des Auteurs sacres*, 14:498). It contains an account of St. Benedict, discusses his rules, and everything in any way pertaining to the order. The work, besides including a somewhat complete history of the secular affairs of the times, contains a minute account of the doctrines, the ceremonies, the controversies of the Church age by age, with a statement of the writings of each individual whose life is depicted. Of the manner in which the work is done we will let Dowling (*Introd. to the Crit. Study of Eccles. History*, page 144 sq.) speak. "His (Mabillon's) unbounded learning, and his penetrating and comprehensive mind, enabled him to discover new truths, and detect and expose inveterate errors. His amiable moderation and unaffected candor introduced into the discussion of ecclesiastical subjects a better tone and spirit. But this was not the full extent of the services which he rendered to Church History. The monastic habit could not restrain his mental independence, nor his religious peculiarities make him feel as a vulgar controversialist. He was the most prominent of a new race of scholars, who communicated to the whole subject a different character; who separated it from polemical theology,

and assumed as a first principle that its subject-matter was not controversy, but facts. It was a new thing to see a congregation of monks taking a lead in a literary movement; but such was the case. The genius of Mabillon did much to purify and ennoble Church History. Excited by his example and precepts, the French Benedictines devoted themselves in an admirable spirit to the cultivation of ecclesiastical learning, and distinguished themselves in the republic of letters by the publication of a number of critical, philological, and antiquarian works connected with such studies, not more remarkable for their erudition than for their moderation and candor."

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

Mabon, John Scott

an eminent educator of the (Dutch) Reformed Church, was born in Scotland in 1784; came to this country with his parents in 1796; graduated with high honors at Union College (1806), and at the theological seminary in New Brunswick (1812); was tutor in Union College 1814-15; rector of

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

Maboul, Jacques

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

Mac-

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

Mac'alon

(**Μακάλων**), a place whose natives to the number of 122 returned from the captivity (1 Esdr. 5:21); evidently the MICHMASH *SEE MICHMASH* (q.v.) of the Hebrew lists (^{<1827>}Ezra 2:27; ^{<1873>}Nehemiah 7:31).

Macarius

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

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

2. MACARIUS OF ALEXANDRIA, also called **πολιτικός**, the townsman, a contemporary of the preceding, was by trade a baker, but became subsequently a disciple of St. Antonius, having been baptized when about forty years of age. He also embraced an ascetic life, and became the spiritual adviser of over 5000 monks. Palladius relates a number of miracles said to have been wrought by him. He was likewise one of the victims of the persecution instituted by Valens, and died, according to Tillemont (*Memoires*, 8:626), in 394, but according to Fabricius (*Biblioth. Graeca*, 8:365), in 404, aged nearly a hundred years. He is said to have been the author of some regulations for monks contained in the *Codex regularum, collectus a sancto Benedicto Ananiensi, auctus a Holstenio* (Rome, 1661, 2 volumes, 4to); and a homily, **περὶ ἐξόδου ψυχῆς δικαίων καὶ ἀμαρτωλῶν** (J. Tollius, *Itinerar. Ital.* Traj. 1696; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* 1; Gallandi, 7), which latter, however, is by some ascribed to a monk called Alexander. Mosheim (*Eccles. Hist.* book 2, cent. 4, part 2,

chapter 3) says of him and his work: "Perhaps, before all others who wrote on practical piety, the preference is due to Macarius, the Egyptian monk; from whom, after deducting some superstitious notions, and what savors too much of Origenism, we may collect a beautiful picture of real piety." He is commemorated by the Romish Church January 12, and by the Greek January 19. See Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Rom. Biog. and Mythol.* volume 2, s.v.; Ceillier, *Auteurs sacred*, 7:709, 712.

3. MACARIUS OF ANTIOCH, a patriarch in the Church of Antioch in the 7th century, is noted for his avowal, at the third Constantinopolitan Council (A.D. 680-81), of his belief in the doctrine "that Christ's will was that of a God-man (θεανδρικὴν)." *SEE MONOTHELITES*. He and his followers (known as Afacarians) were banished on this account. His *Travels* were written down by his attendant archdeacon, Paul of Aleppo, in Arabic, and were published in an English dress in 1829-37, in 2 volumes, 4to. See Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Rom. Biog. and Mythol.* 2:875 (4); Milman's Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, 4:553.

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

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

Macassar

the most southern portion of Celebes, situated in lat. 40 35'-50 50' S., and long. 119 25' 1200 30' E., and traversed by a lofty chain of mountains, formerly the greatest naval power among the Malay states, is divided into the Dutch possessions and Malay Proper; the latter, of little importance, is governed by a native king, who pays tribute to the Netherlanders. The

Portuguese were the first Europeans to form a settlement in Macassar, but they were supplanted by the Dutch, who, after many contests with the natives, gradually attained to supreme power. In 1811 it fell into the hands of the British, who in 1814 defeated the king of Boni, and compelled him to give up the regalia of Macassar. In 1816 it was restored to the Dutch, and continues to enjoy a fair share of the mercantile prosperity of the Netherlands' possessions in the Eastern Archipelago.

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

Macaulay, Aulay

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

Macaulay, Zachary

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

Macauley, Thomas, D.D., LL.D.,

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

Macbride, John David, D.C.L., F.S.A.,

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

Mac'abee

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

I. The Name. — The original term Maccabee (ὁ Μακκαβαῖος) has been variously derived. Some have maintained that it was derived from the banner of the tribe of Dan, which contained the last letters of the names of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Others imagine that it was formed from the combination of the initial letters of the Hebrew sentence, "Who among the gods is like unto thee, Jehovah?" (^{<Q151>}Exodus 15:11; Hebrew y, b, k, m), which is supposed to have been inscribed upon the banner of the patriots; or, again, of the initials of the simply descriptive title, "Mattathias, a priest, the son of Johanan." But, even if the custom of forming such words was in use among the Jews at this early time, it is obvious that such a title would not be an individual title in the first instance, as Maccabee undoubtedly was (1 Macc. 2:4), and still remains among the Jews (Raphall, *Hist. of the Jews*, 1:249). Moreover, the orthography of the word in Greek and Syriac (Ewald, *Geschichte*, 4:352, note) points to the form ybqm, and not ybkm. Another derivation has been proposed, which, although direct evidence is wanting, seems satisfactory. According to this, the word is formed from

hbQmi "a hammer" (like Malachi, *Ewald*, 4:353, n.), giving a sense not altogether unlike that in which Charles CMartel derived a surname from his favorite weapon, and still more like the *Malleus Scotorum* and *Malleus Haereticorum* of the Middle Ages.

Although the name *Maccabees* has gained the widest currency, that of *Asmeonaeans*, or *Hasmonans*, is the proper name of the family. The origin of this name also has been disputed; but the obvious derivation from Chashmon (**^mVj i** **Ααμωναίος**; comp. Gesenius, *Thesaur.* page 534 b), great-grandfather of Mattathias, seems certainly correct. How it came to pass that a man, otherwise obscure, gave his name to the family, cannot now be discovered; but no stress can be laid upon this difficulty, nor upon the fact that in Jewish prayers (Herzfeld, *Geschichte c. Jud.* 1:264) Mattathias himself is called ilashmonai. In ^{<1852>}Psalm 68:32 we meet with a word **μNαε2Pvj i** to the supposed singular of which, **^mVj i** the name in question is commonly referred. In this case it might have been given to the priest of the course of Joarib to signify that he was a wealthy or a powerful person. In ^{<1852>}Joshua 15:27 we find a town in the tribe of Judah called **^/mVj**, from which this name might equally be derived. Herzfeld's proposed derivation from **μsj**, "to temper steel," is fanciful and groundless. The word in the first instance appears more like a family than a personal name. The later Hebrew form is **yanwmçj**. See Zipser, *Benennung der Makkabaer* (in the *Ben-Chananjah*, 1860). **SEE ASMONAEAN.**

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

Picture for Maccabee

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

1. The first of this family who attained distinction was the aged priest MATTATHIAS, who dwelt at Modin, a city west of Jerusalem and near the sea, of which the site has yet been but partly identified by modern research. He was the son of John, the son of Simon, the son of Asamonneus, as Josephus tells us, and was himself the father of five sons — John, otherwise called Gaddis; Simon, called Thassi; Judas, called

Maccabaeus; Eleazar, called Avaran; and Jonathan, surnamed Apphus. Ewald remarks that Simon and John were favorite names in this family. After the expulsion of Antiochus Epiphanes from Egypt by the Romans, that monarch proceeded to vent his rage and indignation on the Jews. B.C. 168. *SEE ANTIOCHUS*. He massacred vast numbers of them in Jerusalem on the Sabbath, took the women captives, and built a fortress on Mount Zion, which he used as a central position for harassing the people around. He ordered one Athenaeus to instruct, the inhabitants of Judaea and Samaria in the rites of the Grecian religion, with a view to abolishing all vestiges of the Jewish worship. Having succeeded in bringing the Samaritans to renounce their religion, he further went to Jerusalem, where he prohibited the observance of all Jewish ceremonies, obliged the people to eat swine's flesh and profane the Sabbath, and forbade circumcision. The Temple was dedicated to Olympian Jove, and his altar erected upon the altar of burnt-offering, which the first book of Maccabees, apparently quoting Daniel, calls the setting up of the abomination of desolation. When, therefore, Apelles, the king's officer (Josephus, *Ant.* 12:6, 2), came to Modin to put in force the royal edict against the national religion, he made splendid offers to Mattathias if he would comply. The old man, however, not only refused, but publicly declared his determination to live and die in the religion of his fathers; and when a certain Jew came forward openly to sacrifice in obedience to the edict, he slew him upon the altar. He slew, moreover, the king's commissioner, and destroyed the altar. Then, offering himself as a rallying-point for all who were zealous for the law, he fled to the mountains. Many others, with their wives and children, followed his example, and fled. They were pursued, however, by the officers of Antiochus, and, refusing even to defend themselves on the Sabbath day, were slain to the number of 1000. On this occasion the greatness of Mattathias displayed itself in the wise counsel he gave his companions and countrymen, which passed subsequently into the ordinary custom, that they should not forbear to fight upon the Sabbath day in so far as to defend themselves. While in this position, he was joined by the more austere of the two parties which had sprung up among the Jews after the return from the captivity, viz. the Assidseans, 1. the Hasidim, or pious, *SEE CHASIDIM*; and the Puritans, who subsequently became the Pharisees. They not only observed the written law, but superadded the constitutions and traditions of the elders, and other rigorous observances. The other party were called the Tsaddikim, or righteous, who contented themselves with that only which was written in the Mosaic law. Thus strengthened, Mattathias and

his comrades carried on a sort of guerrilla warfare, and exerted themselves as far as possible to maintain and enforce the observance of the national religion. Feeling, however, that his advancing age rendered him unfit for a life so arduous, while it warned him of his approaching end, he gathered his sons together like the patriarchs of old, exhorted them to valor in a speech of great piety and faithfulness, and having recommended Simon to the office of counselor or father, and Judas to that of captain and leader, died in the year 166, and was buried in the sepulcher of his fathers at Modin. The speech which he is said to have addressed to his sons before his death is remarkable as containing the first distinct allusion to the contents of Daniel, a book which seems to have exercised the most powerful influence on the Maccabean conflict (1 Macc. 2:60; comp. Josephus, *Ant.* 12:6, 3).

2. Mattathias himself named JUDAS, apparently his third son, as his successor in directing the war of independence (1 Macc. 2:66). The energy and skill of "THE MACCABEE" (ὁ Μακκαβαῖος), as Judas is often called in 2 Macc., fully justified his father's preference. It appears that he had already taken a prominent part in the first secession to the mountains (2 Macc. 5:27, where Mattathias is not mentioned), and on receiving the chief command he devoted himself to the task of combining for common action those who were still faithful to the religion of their fathers (2 Macc. 8:1). His first enterprises were night-attacks and sudden surprises, which were best suited to the troops at his disposal (2 Macc. 8:6,7), and, when his men were encouraged by these means, he ventured on more important operations, and met Apollonitus (1 Macc. 3:10-12), the king's general, who had gathered a large army at Samaria, of which place he was governor, in the open field. He totally defeated his army, and slew him. He then divided the spoils, and took the sword of Apollonius for a trophy, which he used all his life afterwards in battle. Exasperated at the defeat of Apollonius, Seron (1 Macc 3:13-24), who was general of the army of Coele-Syria, got together a force, partly composed of Jews, and came against Judas as far as Bethoron, where he pitched his camps. This place, which had been rendered memorable many centuries before as the site of Joshua's great victory over the allied forces of the Canaanites, was destined now to witness a victory scarcely less glorious, wrought by a small band of Jews, spent and hungry, against the disciplined troops of Syria. Seron was completely overthrown, and his army scattered. Antiochus, though greatly enraged at this dishonor to his arms, was nevertheless compelled, by the condition of his treasury, to undertake an expedition to Armenia and

Persia, with a view to recruiting his exhausted finances (1 Macc. 3:27-31). He therefore left Lysias, one of his highest lieutenants, to take charge of his kingdom, from the River Euphrates to the confines of Egypt, and having entrusted his son Antiochus to his care, and enjoined Lysias to conquer Judaea and destroy the nation of the Jews, he went into Persia. The success of Judas called for immediate attention. The governor of Jerusalem was urgent in his entreaties for assistance; Lysias therefore sent an army of 20,000 men, under the command of Nicanor and Gorgias, into Judaea. It was followed by another of the same number, with an addition of 7000 horse, under Ptolemy Macron, the son of Dorymènes, as commander-in-chief. The united forces encamped in the plains of Emmaus. To oppose this formidable host Judas could only muster 6000 men at Mizpeh. Here, as Samuel had done a thousand years before at a like period of national calamity, he fasted and prayed, and, in compliance with the Mosaic injunction, advised those who were newly married, or had built houses, and the like, to return to their homes. This reduced his number to one half. The heroic spirit of Judas, however, rose against every difficulty, and he marched towards Emmaus. B.C. 166. Having heard that Gorgias had been dispatched with a force of 6000 men to surprise him in the passes by night, he instantly resolved to attack the enemies' camp. He rushed upon them unexpectedly, and completely routed them; so that when Gorgias returned, baffled and weary, he was dismayed at finding his camp in flames. In the brief struggle which ensued the Jews were victorious, and took much spoil. The year following, Lysias gathered together an army of 60,000 chosen men, with 5000 horse, went up in person to the hill-country of Judaea, and pitched his camp at a place called Bethsura, the Bethzur of the Old Test. Here Judas met him with 10,000 men, attacked his vanguard, and slew 5000 of them, whereupon Lysias retreated with the remainder of his army to Antioch. After this series of triumphs Judas proceeded to Jerusalem. There he found the sanctuary desolate, shrubs growing in the courts of it, and the chambers of the priests thrown down; so he set to work at once to purify the holy places and restore the worship of God (1 Macc. 4:36, 41-53) on the 25th of Kislev, exactly three years after its profanation (1 Macc. 1:59; Grimm on 1 Macc. 4:59). In commemoration of this cleansing of the Temple, the Jews afterwards kept for eight days annually a festival which was called Lights, and was known as the Feast of Dedication (~~<6KID>~~John 10:22). *SEE DEDICATION, FEAST OF*. Judas, having strongly fortified the citadel of Mount Zion, and placed a garrison at Bethsura, made an expedition into Idumaea. The Syrians meanwhile, frustrated in their efforts

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

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

Menelaus, the high-priest at this time, had purchased his elevation to that rank by selling the sacred vessels of the Temple. Hoping to serve his own ends, he joined himself to the army of Lysias, but was slain by command of Antiochus. Onias, the son of the high-priest whom Menelaus had

supplanted, fled into Egypt, and Alcimus or Jacimus, not of the high-priestly family, was raised to the dignity of high-priest. By taking this man under his protection, Demetrius hoped to weaken the power of the Jews. He dispatched Bacchides with Alcimus to Jerusalem, with orders to slay the Maccabees and their followers. Jerusalem yielded to one who came with the authority of the high-priest, but Alcimus murdered sixty of the elders as soon as he got them into his power. Bacchides also committed sundry atrocities in other parts. No sooner, however, had he left Judaea than Maccabaeus again rose against Alcimus, and drove him to Antioch, where he endeavored as far as possible to injure Judas with the king. Upon this Demetrius sent Nicanor with a large army to reinstate Alcimus, and when he came to Jerusalem, which was still held by the Syrians. he endeavored to get Judas into his power by stratagem, but the plot being discovered, he was compelled to meet him in the field. They joined battle at Capharsalama, and Nicanor lost about 5000 men; the rest fled to the stronghold of Zion. Here he revenged himself with great cruelty, and threatened yet further barbarities unless Judas was delivered up. As the people refused to betray their champion, Nicanor was again compelled to fight. He pitched his camp ominously enough in Bethhoron; his troops were completely routed, and he himself slain. The next act of Judas was to make an alliance with the Romans, who entered into it eagerly; but no sooner was it contracted than the king made one more determined effort for the subjugation of Palestine, sending Alcimus and Bacchides, with all the flower of his army, to a place called Berea or Bethzetho, apparently near Jerusalem. The Roman alliance seems to have alienated many of the extreme Jewish party from Judas (*Midr. Hhanuka*, quoted by Raphall, *Hist. of Jews*, 1:325). Moreover, the terror inspired by this host was such that Judas found himself deserted by all but 800 followers, who would fain have dissuaded him from encountering the enemy. His reply was worthy of him: "If our time be come, let us die manfully for our brethren, and let us not stain our honor." He fought with such valor that the right wing, commanded by Bacchides, was repulsed and driven to a hill called Azotus or Aza, but the left wing doubled upon the pursuers from behind, so that they were shut in, as it were, between two armies. The battle lasted from morning till night. Judas was killed, and his followers, overborne by numbers, were dispersed. His brothers Jonathan and Simon received his body by a treaty from the enemy, and buried it in the sepulcher of his fathers at Modin, B.C. 161. Thus fell the greatest of the Maccabees, a hero worthy of being ranked with the noblest of his country, and conspicuous

among all, in any age or clime, who have drawn the sword of liberty in defense of their dearest and most sacred rights.

3. After the death of Judas the patriotic party seems to have been for a short time wholly disorganized, and it was only by the pressure of unparalleled sufferings that they were driven to renew the conflict. For this purpose they offered the command to JONATHAN, surnamed Apphus (*ϸϰϰϰ j the wary*), the youngest son of Mattathias. The policy of Jonathan shows the greatness of the loss involved in his brother's death. He was glad to see safety from Bacchides among the pools and marshes of the Jordan (1 Macc. 9:42), whither he was pursued by him. At the same time, also, his brother John was killed by a neighboring Arab tribe. Jonathan took occasion to revenge his brother's death upon a marriage-party, for which he lay in wait, and then repulsed an attack of Bacchides, and slew a thousand of his men. At this point Alcimus died, and Bacchides, after fortifying the strong towns of Judaea, returned to Antioch; but upon Jonathan again emerging from his hiding-place, Bacchides came back with a formidable army, and was for some time exposed to the desultory attacks of Jonathan, till weary of this mode of fighting, or for other reasons, he thought it fit to conclude a peace with him, and returned to his master. B.C. 158. The Maccabee was thus left in possession of Judaea (1 Macc. 9:73), and had not long afterwards an opportunity offered him of consolidating his position; for there sprung up one Alexander Balas, who was believed to be a son of Antiochus Epiphanes, and laid claim to the throne of Syria. Demetrius and Alexander mutually competed for the alliance of Jonathan, but Alexander was successful, having offered him the high-priesthood, and sent him a purple robe and a golden crown — the insignia of royalty — and promised him exemption from tribute as well as other advantages. Jonathan thereupon assumed the high-priesthood, and became the friend of Alexander, who forthwith met Demetrius in the field, slew him, usurped his crown, and allied himself (B.C. 150) in marriage with Cleopatra, the daughter of Ptolemy Philometor, king of Egypt. Jonathan was invited to the wedding, and was made much of at court. In return, he attacked and defeated Apollonius, the general of Demetrius Nicator, who aspired to his father's throne, besieged Joppa, captured Azotus, and destroyed the temple of Dagon. The prosperity, however, of Alexander was of short duration, for Ptolemy, being jealous of his power, marched with a large army against him, and after putting him to flight, seized his crown, and gave his wife to Demetrius. On the other hand, the overthrow

of Alexander was speedily followed by the death of Ptolemy, and Demetrius was left in possession of the throne of Syria. Jonathan, meanwhile, besieged Jerusalem, and, leaving it invested, repaired to Antioch. Demetrius not only welcomed, but entered into a treaty with him, upon terms that greatly augmented the power of the Maccabee. After this Demetrius disbanded the greater part of his army and lessened their pay, which being a course contrary to that pursued by former kings of Syria, who kept up large standing armies in time of peace, created great dissatisfaction, so that upon the occasion of Jonathan writing to him to withdraw his soldiers from the strongholds of Judaea, he not only complied, but was glad to ask for the assistance of 3000 men, who were forthwith sent to Antioch. Here they rendered him signal service in rescuing him from an insurrection of his own citizens which his behavior to them had aroused. His friendship for Jonathan, however, was soon at an end, and, contrary to his promises, he threatened to make war upon him unless he paid the tribute which previous kings had exacted. This menace might have been carried out had not a formidable antagonist at home arisen in the person of Trypho, who had formerly been an officer of Alexander Balas, and had espoused the cause of his young son Antiochus Theos. This man attacked Demetrius, defeated him in battle, captured his city, drove him into exile, and placed his crown on the head of Antiochus, B.C. 144. One of the first acts of the new king was to ingratiate himself with Jonathan; he therefore confirmed him in the highpriesthood, and appointed him governor over Judaea and its provinces, besides showing him other marks of favor. His brother Simon he appointed to be general over the king's forces from what was called the Ladder of Tyre, viz., a mountain lying on the sea-coast between Tyre and Ptolemais, even to the borders of Egypt. Jonathan, in return, rendered good service to Antiochus, and twice defeated the armies of Demetrius. He then proceeded to establish his own power by renewing the treaty with Rome, entering into one also with Lacedamon, and strengthening the fortifications in Judaea. He was destined, however, to fall by treachery, for Trypho, having persuaded him to dismiss a large army he had assembled to support Antiochus, decoyed him into the city of Ptolemais, and then took him prisoner. The Jews immediately raised Simon to the command, and paid a large sum to ransom Jonathan. Trypho, however, took the money, but, instead of releasing Jonathan, put him to death, and then, thinking that the main hinderance to his own ambitious designs was removed, caused Antiochus to be treated in the same manner. Thus fell the third of the illustrious Maccabaeen race,

who distinguished himself nobly in the defense of his country, B.C. 143. When Simon heard of his brother's death he fetched his bones from Bascama, where he had been buried, and had them interred at Modin. Here he erected to his memory a famous monument of a great height, built of white marble, elaborately wrought, near which he placed seven pyramids, for his father and mother and their five sons, the whole being surrounded with a stately portico. For many years afterwards this monument served the purpose of a beacon for sailors, and it was standing in the time of Eusebius. *SEE MODIN.*

4. The last remaining brother of the Maccabee family was thus SIMON, surnamed "Thassi" (Θασσί, Θασσίς; the meaning of the title is uncertain. Michaelis [Grimm, on 1 Maccabees 2] thinks that it represents the Chaldee *yvæṯ*). As above related, when he heard of the detention of Jonathan in Ptolemais by Trypho, he placed himself at the head of the patriot party, who were already beginning to despond, and effectually opposed the progress of the Syrians. His skill in war had been proved in the lifetime of Judas (1 Maccabees 5:17-23), and he had taken an active share in the campaigns of Jonathan, when he was entrusted with a distinct command (1 Maccabees 11:59). He was soon enabled to consummate the object for which his family had fought gloriously, but ill vain. When Trypho, after having put Jonathan to death, murdered Antiochus, and seized the throne, Simon made overtures to Demetrius II (B.C. 143) against Trypho. He was consequently confirmed in his position of sovereign high-priest. He then turned his attention to establishing the internal peace and security of his kingdom. He fortified Bethsura, Jamnia, Joppa, and Gaza, and garrisoned them with Jewish soldiers. The Lacedaemonians sent him a flattering embassy, desiring to renew their treaty; to Rome also he sent a shield of gold of immense value, and ratified his league with that nation. See SPARTAN. He moreover took the citadel of Jerusalem by siege, which up to this time had always been occupied by the Syrian faction; and, besides pulling it down, even levelled the hill on which it was built, with immense labor, that so the Temple might not be exposed to attacks from it. Under the wise government of this member of the Asmonaeon family Judaea seems to have attained the greatest height of prosperity and freedom she had known for centuries, or even knew afterwards. The writer of the first book of the Maccabees evidently rejoices to remember and record it. "The ancient men," he says, "sat all in the streets communing together of good things, and the young men put on glorious and warlike apparel. He made

peace in the land, and Israel rejoiced with great joy. For every man sat under his vine and his fig-tree, and there was none to fray them” (14:9, 11, 12). This time of quiet repose Simon employed in administering justice and restoring the operation of the law. He also beautified the sanctuary, and refurnished it with sacred vessels.

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

and sustain their glory, B.C. 135. He likewise had been included in the treacherous designs of Ptolemy, but found means to elude them. With the death of Simon the narrative of the first book of the Maccabees concludes.

5. We trace now the fortunes of the next member of the family, JOHN HYRCANUS. Having been unanimously proclaimed high-priest and ruler at Jerusalem, his first step was to march against Jericho, and avenge the death of his father and brothers. Ptolemy held there in his power the mother of Hyrcanus and her surviving sons, and, shutting himself up in a fortress near to Jericho — which Josephus calls Dagon, and Ewald Dok he exposed them upon the wall, scourged and tormented them, and threatened to throw them down headlong unless Hyrcanus would desist from the siege. This had the effect of paralyzing the efforts of Hyrcanus, and, in spite of his heroic mother's entreaties to prosecute it with vigor, and disregard her sufferings, caused him to protract it till the approach of the sabbatical year obliged him to raise the siege. Ptolemy, after killing the mother and brethren of Hyrcanus, fled to Philadelphia ("Rabbath, of the children of Ammon"), which is the last we hear of him. It is not easy to see why Milman calls this reason of the sabbatical year, which is the one assigned by Josephus, "improbable." Ewald assigns the approach of that year as a reason for the flight of Ptolemy to Zeno, the tyrant of Philadelphia, because it had already raised the price of provisions, so that it became impossible for him to remain. Antiochus meanwhile, alarmed at the energy displayed by John, invaded Judaea, burning up and desolating the country on his march, and at last besieging him in Jerusalem. He compassed the city with seven encampments and a double ditch, and Hyrcanus was reduced to the last extremities. On the recurrence, however, of the Feast of Tabernacles, Antiochus granted a truce for a week, and supplied the besieged with sacrifices for the occasion, and ended with conceding a peace, on condition that the Jews surrendered their arms, paid tribute for Joppa and other towns, and gave him 500 talents of silver and hostages. On this occasion Josephus says that Hyrcanus opened the sepulcher of David, and took out of it 3000 talents, which he used for his present needs and the payment of foreign mercenaries. This story is utterly discredited by Prideaux, passed over in silence by Milman, but apparently believed by Ewald. Some time afterwards, having made a league with Attiochus, he marched with him on an expedition to Parthia, to deliver Demetrius Nicator, the king's captive brother. This expedition proved fatal to Antiochus, who was killed in battle. Demetrius, however, made his escape, and succeeded him on the

throne of Syria, whereupon Hyrcanus availed himself of the opportunity to shake off the Syrian yoke, and establish the independence of Judaea, which was maintained till the time of the subjugation by the Romans. He took two towns beyond the Jordan, Samega and Medaba, as well as the city of Sichem, and destroyed the hated Samaritan temple on Mount Gerizim, which for 200 years had been an object of abhorrence to the Jews. He then turned his arms towards Ilumsea, where he captured the towns of Dora (Ewald spells it Adora) and Marissa, and forced the rite of circumcision on the Idumaeans, who ever afterwards retained it. He proceeded further to strengthen himself by renewing a treaty, offensive and defensive, with the Romans. Demetrius, meanwhile, had little enjoyment of his kingdom. He was unacceptable to the army, who besought Ptolemy Physcon to send them a sovereign of the family of Seleucus, and he accordingly chose for them Alexander Zebina, a pretended son of Alexander Balas. Demetrius was beaten in the fight which ensued between them, and subsequently slain; whereupon Alexander took the kingdom and made a league with Hyrcanus. He found a rival, however, in the person of Antiochus Grypus, the son of Demetrius, who defeated and slew him. The struggle which now took place between the brothers Grypus and Cyzicenus, rivals for the throne, only tended to consolidate the power of Hyrcanus, who quietly enjoyed his independence and amassed great wealth. He likewise made an expedition to Samaria, and reduced the place to great distress by siege. His sons Antigonus and Aristobulus were appointed to conduct it; and when Antiochus Cvzicenus came to the relief of the Samaritans, he was defeated and put to flight by Aristobulus. Cvzicenus, however, returned with a reinforcement of 6000 Egyptians, and ravaged the country, thinking to compel Hyrcanus to raise the siege. The attempt, was unsuccessful, and he retired, leaving the prosecution of the Jewish war to two of his officers. They likewise failed, and, after a year, Samaria fell into the hands of Hyrcanus, who entirely demolished it, and, having dug trenches on the site, flooded it with water. After this, Hyrcanus, who himself belonged to the sect of the Pharisees, was exposed to some indignity from one of their party during a banquet, which exasperated him so far that he openly renounced them, and joined himself to the opposite faction of the Sadducees. This occurrence, however, does not seem to have prevented him from passing the remainder of his days happily. He built the palace or castle of Baris on a rock within the fortifications of the Temple. Here the princes of his line held their court. It was identical with what Herod afterwards called Antonia. There is some confusion as to the length of his

reign. It probably lasted about thirty years. He left five sons. With him terminates the upper house of the Asmoneans or Maccabees, B.C. 107.

6. ARISTOBULUS succeeded his father as high-priest and supreme governor. He was the first, also, after the captivity, who openly assumed the title of king. He threw his mother, who claimed the throne, into prison, and starved her to death. Three of his brothers, also, he held in bonds. Antigonus, the other one, by whose help he subdued Iturnea or Auranitis, a district at the foot of the Anti-Libanus, was killed by treachery; and, after a year of misery and crime, Aristobulus died. His wife, Salome or Alexandra, immediately released his brethren, and Alexander Janneus was made king. One of his brothers, who showed signs of ambition, he slew, the other one he left alone. His first military act was the siege of Ptolemais, which was in the hands of the Syrians. The inhabitants sought help from Ptolemy Lathyrus, who governed Cyprus, but fearing the army of 30,000 men he brought with him, declined to open their gates to him, whereupon he attacked Gaza and Dora. Alexander pretended to treat with him for the surrender of these places, and at the same time sent to Cleopatra, the widow of Physcon, for a large army to drive him from Palestine. He detected the duplicity of this conduct, and took ample vengeance on Alexander by ravaging the country. He also defeated him with the loss of 30,000 men. Judaea was saved by a large army from Cleopatra, commanded by Chelcias and Ananias, two Jews of Alexandria. They pursued Ptolemy into Coele-Syria, and besieged Ptolemais, which was reduced. Alexander next invaded the country beyond Jordan. Here, also, he was defeated, but not thereby discouraged from attacking Gaza, which, after some fruitless attempts, he captured and totally destroyed. His worst enemies, however, were the Pharisees, who had great influence with the people, and a sedition arose during the Feast of Tabernacles, in which the troops slew 6000 of the mob. He again invaded the transJordanic country, and was again defeated. The Jews rose in rebellion, and for some years the land suffered the horrors of civil war. The rebels applied for aid to Demetrius Eucnemus, brother of Ptolemy Lathyrus, and king of Damascus, who completely routed Alexander. A sudden change of fortune, however, put him at the head of 60,000 men, and he marched in triumph to Jerusalem, where he took signal vengeance on his subjects. The rest of his life was peaceful. After a reign of twenty-seven years he died, B.C. 79, solemnly charging his wife Alexandra to espouse the Pharisaic party if she wished to retain her kingdom. His eldest son, Heranus II, became high-

priest. Aristobulus, the younger son, espoused the opposite party to his mother. In order to employ his active mind, the queen sent him northwards to check the operations of Ptolemy, king of Chalcis. He got possession of Damascus, and won the affections of the army. After a reign of nine years his mother died, B.C. 70, and Aristobulus forthwith marched towards Jerusalem. Hyrcanus and the Pharisees seized his wife and children as hostages, and met his army at Jericho, but were discomfited, and Aristobulus entered Jerusalem and besieged his brother in the tower of Baris. At length they agreed that Hyrcanus should retire to a private station, and that Aristobulus should be king. This was a fatal blow to the Pharisees. But there was a worse enemy waiting for the conqueror. This was none other than Antipater, the Idumacan, who had been made general of all Idumnea by Alexander Jannaeus. He was wealthy, active, and seditious, and possessed, moreover, of great influence with the deposed Hyrcanus. Suspicious of the power, successes, and designs of Aristobulus, he persuaded his brother Hyrcanus to fly to Petra, to Aretas, king of Arabia, and with his help an army of 50,000 men was marched against Aristobulus. The Jews were defeated, and the usurper fled to Jerusalem, where he was closely besieged by Aretas, Antipater, and Hyrcanus. Here, however, deliverance was at length brought by Scaurus, the general of Pompeys who, having come to Damascus, and finding that the city had been taken by Metellus and Lollius, himself proceeded hastily into Judaea. His assistance was eagerly sought by both parties. Aristobulus offered him 400 talents, and Hyrcanus the same; but as the former was in possession of the treasure, Scaurus thought that his promises were the most likely to be fulfilled, and consequently made an agreement with Aristobulus, raised the siege, and ordered Aretas to depart. He then returned to Damascus; whereupon Aristobulus gathered an army, defeated Aretas and Hyrcanus, and slew 6000 of the enemy, together with Phalion, the brother of Antipater. Shortly after Pompey himself came to Damascus, when both the brothers eagerly solicited his protection. Antipater represented the cause of Hyrcanus. Pompey, however, who was intent on the subjugation of Petra, dismissed the messengers of both, and on his return from Arabia marched directly into Judaea. Aristobulus fled to Jerusalem, but, finding the city too distracted to make good its defense, offered to surrender. Gabinius was sent forward to take possession; meanwhile the soldiery had resolved to resist, and when he came he was surprised to find that the gates were shut and the walls manned. Pompey, enraged at this apparent treachery, threw Aristobulus into chains, and advanced to Jerusalem. The fortress of the

Temple was impregnable except on the north, and, notwithstanding his engines, Pompey was unable to reduce it for three months; neither could he have done so then had it not been for the Jewish scruples about observing the Sabbath. The Romans soon found that they could prosecute their operations on that day without disturbance, and after a time the battering-rams knocked down one of the towers, and the soldiers effected an entrance (midsummer, B.C. 63) on the anniversary of the capture of the city by Nebuchadnezzar. Great was the astonishment of Pompey at finding the Holy of Holies empty, without an image or a statue. The wealth he found in the building he magnanimously left untouched; Hyrcanus he reinstated in the high-priesthood; the country he laid under tribute; the walls he demolished; Aristobulus and his family he carried captives to Rome. Alexander, the son of Aristobulus, on the journey made his escape, and, raising a considerable force, garrisoned Macherus, Hyrcania, and the stronghold of Alexandrion. Gabinius, however, subdued him, but had no sooner done so than Aristobulus likewise escaped from Rome, and intrenched himself in Alexandrion. He was taken prisoner, and sent in chains to Rome. At the entreaty of his wife, who had always espoused the Roman cause, Antigonus his son was released, but he remained a prisoner. Alexander, with 80,000 men, once more tried his strength with the Romans on the field of battle, but was put to flight. He was subsequently executed by Metellus Scipio at Antioch, B.C. 49. Thus Hyrcanus retained the sovereignty, but Antipater enjoyed the real power; he contrived to ingratiate himself with Caesar, who made him a Roman citizen and procurator of all Judaea. He began to rebuild the walls of Jerusalem, and made his eldest son, Phasaël, governor of that city; and his younger son, Herod, governor of Galilee. The latter soon began to distinguish himself against the banditti that invested the hills. He carefully contrived also to make friends with the Roman governor of Syria, as a step to his own aggrandizement. His riches enabled him to do this by means of enormous bribes. He found, however, a troublesome enemy in Antigonus, the son of Aristobulus, who allied himself with the Parthians, and for a time held Jerusalem and kept Herod in check. At Masada, also, a city on the west coast of the Dead Sea, Antigonus was nearly successful, until Herod at last compelled him to raise the siege. He afterwards suffered a defeat by Herod, and was finally vanquished by the Roman general Sosius, who, in derision, called him by the female name Antigona, and sent him in chains to Antony, by whom, at the request of Herod, he was put to death, B.C. 37. Thus fell the last of the Maccabees, who seemed to inherit something of their ancient

spirit. Hyrcanus, who, before this, had been incapacitated for the priesthood by having his ears cut off, was subsequently, B.C. 30, in his eightieth year, put to death by Herod. The latter, meanwhile, by Augustus and Antony, was made king of Judaea, and consolidated his throne by his marriage with Mariamne, a woman of incomparable beauty, the daughter of Alexander, son of Aristobulus, by Alexandra, the daughter of Hyrcanus II, and therefore granddaughter to both brothers. In her the race of the Asmonmeans came to an end, and by her marriage passed into the Idumaeen line of the Herodians.

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

III. *National Effects of the Maccabaeen Revolution, —*

1. The great outlines of the Maccabaeen contest, which are somewhat hidden in the annals thus briefly epitomized, admit of being traced with fair distinctness, though many points must always remain obscure from our ignorance of the numbers and distribution of the Jewish population, and of the general condition of the people at the time. The disputed succession to the Syrian throne (B.C. 153) was the political turning-point of the struggle, which may thus be divided into two great periods. During the first period (B.C. 168-153) the patriots maintained their cause with varying success against the whole strength of Syria; during the second (B.C. 153-139) they were courted by rival factions, and their independence was acknowledged from time to time, though pledges given in times of danger were often broken when the danger was over. The paramount importance of Jerusalem is conspicuous throughout the whole war. The loss of the Holy City reduced the patriotic party at once to the condition of mere guerrilla bands, issuing from “the mountains” or “the wilderness” to make sudden forays on the neighboring towns. This was the first aspect of the war (2 Maccabees 7:1-7; comp. 1 Maccabees 2:45); and the scene of the early exploits of Judas was the hill-country to the north-east of Jerusalem, from which he

drove the invading armies at the famous battle-fields of Beth-horon and Emmaus (Nicopolis). The occupation of Jerusalem closed the first act of the war (B.C. 165); and after this Judas made rapid attacks on every side—in Idumaea, Ammon, Gilead, Galilee—but he made no permanent settlement in the countries which he ravaged. Bethsura was fortified as a defense of Jerusalem on the south; but the authority of Judas seems to have been limited to the immediate neighborhood of Jerusalem, though the influence of his name extended more widely (1 Maccabees 7:50, ἡ γῆ Ἰούδα). On the death of Judas the patriots were reduced to as great distress as at their first rising; and, as Bacchides held the keys of the “mountains of Ephraim” (9:50), they were forced to find a refuge in the lowlands of Jericho, and, after some slight successes, Jonathan was allowed to settle at Michmash I undisturbed, though the whole country remained absolutely under the sovereignty of Syria. So far it seemed that little had been gained when the contest between Alexander Balas and Demetrius I opened a new period (B.C. 153). Jonathan was empowered to raise troops: the Jewish hostages were restored, many of the fortresses were abandoned, and apparently a definite district was assigned to the government of the high-priest. The former unfruitful conflicts at length produced their full harvest. The defeat at Eleasa, like the Swiss St. Jacob, had shown the worth of men who could face all odds, and no price seemed too great to secure their aid. When the Jewish leaders had once obtained legitimate power they proved able to maintain it, though their general success was checkered by some reverses. The solid power of the national party was seen by the slight effect which was produced by the treacherous murder of Jonathan. Simon was able at once to occupy his place and carry out his plans. The Syrian garrison was withdrawn from Jerusalem, Joppa was occupied as a sea-port, and “four governments” (τέσσαρες νομοί, 11:57; 13:37)—probably the central parts of the old kingdom of Judah, with three districts taken from Samaria (10:38, 39), were subjected to the sovereign authority of the high-priest.

2. The war, thus brought to a noble issue, if less famous, is not less glorious than any of those in which a few brave men have successfully maintained the cause of freedom or religion against overpowering might. The answer of Judas to those who counselled retreat (1 Maccabees 9:10) was as true-hearted as that of Leonidas; and the exploits of his followers will bear favorable comparison with those of the Swiss, or the Dutch, or the Americans. It would be easy to point out parallels in Maccabean history to the noblest traits of patriots and martyrs in other countries; but it

may be enough here to claim for the contest the attention which it rarely receives. It seems, indeed, as if the indifference of classical writers were perpetuated in our own days, though there is no struggle — not even the wars of Joshua or David — which is more profoundly interesting to the Christian student; for it is not only in their victory over external difficulties that the heroism of the Maccabees is conspicuous: their real success was as much imperilled by internal divisions as by foreign force. They had to contend on the one hand against open and subtle attempts to introduce Greek customs, and on the other against an extreme Pharisaic party, which is seen from time to time opposing their counsels (1 Maccabees 7:12-18). It was from Judas and those whom he inspired that the old faith received its last development and final impress before the coming of our Lord.

3. For that view of the Maccabean war which regards it only as a civil and not as a religious conflict is essentially one-sided. If there were no other evidence than the book of Daniel — whatever opinion be held as to the (late of it — that alone would show how deeply the noblest hopes of the theocracy were centered in the success of the struggle. When the feelings of the nation were thus again turned with fresh power to their ancient faith, we might expect that there would be a new creative epoch in the national literature; or, if the form of Hebrew composition was already fixed by sacred types, a prophet or psalmist would express the thoughts of the new age after the models of old time. Yet, in part at least, the leaders of Maccabean times felt that they were separated by a real chasm from the times of the kingdom or of the exile. If they looked for a prophet in the future, they acknowledged that the spirit of prophecy was not among them. The volume of the prophetic writings was completed, and, as far as appears, no one ventured to imitate its contents. But the Hagiographa, though they were already long fixed as a definite collection, *SEE CANON*, were equally far removed from imitation. The apocalyptic visions of Daniel, *SEE DANIEL*, served as a pattern for the visions incorporated in the book of Enoch, *SEE ENOCH, BOOK OF*; and it has been commonly supposed that the Psalter contains compositions of the Maccabean date. This supposition, which is at variance with the best evidence that can be obtained on the history of the Canon, can only be received upon the clearest internal proof; and it may well be questioned whether the hypothesis not as much at variance with sound interpretation as with the history of the Canon. The extreme forms of the hypothesis, as that of Hitzig, who represents Psalm 1, 2, 44, 60, and all the last three books of

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

4. The collection of the so-called *Psalms of Solomon* furnishes a strong confirmation of the belief that all the canonical Psalms are earlier than the Maccabaeen era. This collection, which bears the clearest traces of unity of authorship, is, almost beyond question, a true Maccabaeen work. There is every reason to believe (Ewald, *Geschichte*, 4:343) that the book was originally composed in Hebrew; and it presents exactly those

characteristics which are wanting in the other (conjectural) Maccabaeian Psalms. “The holy ones” (οἱ ὅσιοι, *mdysj μ* *SEE ASSIDAEANS*; οἱ φοβούμενοι τὸν Κύριον), appear throughout as a distinct class, struggling against hypocrites and men-pleasers, who make the observance of the law subservient to their own interests (^{<22413>}Song of Solomon 4:13-15). The sanctuary is polluted by the abominations of professing servants of God before it is polluted by the heathen (^{<22108>}Song of Solomon 1:8; 2:1 sq.; 8:8 sq.; 17:15 sq.). National unfaithfulness is the cause of national punishment; and the end of trial is the “justification” of God (^{<22116>}Song of Solomon 2:16; 3:3; 4:9; 8:7 sq.; 9). On the other hand, there is a holiness of works set up in some passages which violates the divine mean of Scripture (^{<22102>}Song of Solomon 1:2, 3; 3:9); and, while the language is full of echoes of the Old Testament, it is impossible not *to feel* that it wants something which we find in all the canonical writings. The historical allusions in the Psalms of Solomon are as unequivocal as the description which they give of the state of the Jewish nation. An enemy “threw down the strong walls of Jerusalem,” and “Gentiles went up to the altar” (^{<22116>}Song of Solomon 2:1-3; comp. 1 Maccabees 1:31). In his pride “he wrought all things in Jerusalem, as the Gentiles in their cities do for their gods” (Song of Solomon 17:16). “Those who loved the assemblies of the saints (συναγωγὰς ὁσίων), wandered (lege *ἐπλανῶντο*) in deserts” (Song of Solomon 27:19; comp. 1 Maccabees 1:54; 2:28); and there “was no one in the midst of Jerusalem who did mercy and truth” (Song of Solomon 17:17; comp. 1 Maccabees 1:38). One psalm (8) appears to refer to a somewhat later period. The people wrought wickedly, and God sent upon them a spirit of error. He brought one “from the extremity of the earth” (8:16; compare 1 Maccabees 7:1 — “Demetrius from Rome”). “The princes of the land met him with joy” (1 Maccabees 7:5-8); and he entered the land in safety (1 Maccabees 7:9-12-Bacchides, his general), “as a father in peace” (1 Maccabees 7:15). Then “he slew the princes and every one wise in counsel” (1 Maccabees 7:16), and “poured out the blood of those who dwelt in Jerusalem” (1 Maccabees 7:17). The purport of these evils, as a retributive and purifying judgment, leads to the most remarkable feature of the Psalms, the distinct expression of Messianic hopes. In this respect they offer a direct contrast to the books of Maccabees (1 Maccabees 14:41). The sorrow and the triumph are seen together in their spiritual aspect, and the expectation of “an anointed Lord” (χριστὸς Κύριος, Song of Solomon 17:36 [18:8]; comp. ^{<4211>}Luke 2:11) follows directly after the description of the impious assaults of Gentile enemies (Song of Solomon

17; comp. ⁽²⁷¹⁴⁵⁾Daniel 11:45; 12). “Blessed,” it is said, “are they who are born in those days, to see the good things which the Lord shall do for the generation to come. [When men are brought] beneath the rod of correction of an anointed Lord (*or* the Lord’s anointed, ὑπὸ ῥάβδον παιδείας χριστοῦ Κυρίου) in the fear of his God, in wisdom of spirit, and of righteousness, and of might”... then there shall be a “good generation the fear of God, in the days of mercy” (Song of Solomon 18:6-10).

5. Elsewhere there is little which marks the distinguishing religious character of the era. The notice of the Maccabaeen heroes in the book of Daniel is much more general and brief than the corresponding notice of their great adversary, but it is not, on that account, less important as illustrating the relation of the famous chapter to the simple history of the period which it embraces. Nowhere is it more evident that facts are shadowed forth by the prophet only in their typical bearing on the development of God’s kingdom. In this aspect the passage itself (⁽²⁷¹²⁹⁾Daniel 11:29-35) will supersede in a great measure the necessity of a detailed comment: “*At the time appointed* [in the spring of B.C. 168] *he* [Antiochus Epiph.] *shall return and come toward the south* [Egypt]; *but it shall not be as the first time, so also the last time* [though his first attempts shall be successful, in the end he shall fail]. *For the ships of Chittim* [the Romans] *shall come against him, and he shall be cast down, and return, and be very wroth against the holy covenant; and he shall do* [his will]; *yea, he shall return, and have intelligence with them that forsake the holy covenant* (compare ⁽²⁷¹³⁹⁾Daniel 8:24, 25). *And forces from him* [at his bidding] *shall stand* [remain in Judaea as garrisons; comp. 1 Maccabees 1:33, 34]; *and they shall pollute the sanctuary, the stronghold, and shall take away the daily* [sacrifice]; *and they shall set up the abomination that maketh desolate* [1 Maccabees 1:45-47]. *And such as do wickedly against* (or rather *such as condemn*) *the covenant shall be corrupt* [to apostasy] *by smooth words; but the people that know their God shall be strong and do* [exploits]. *And they that understand* [know God and his law] *among the people shall instruct many: yet they shall fall by the sword and by flame, by captivity and by spoil* [some] *days* (1 Maccabees 1:60-64). *Now when they shall fall, they shall be holpen with a little help* (1 Maccabees 1:28; 2 Maccabees 5:27; Judas Maccabees with nine others . . .); *and maney shall cleave to them* [the faithful followers of the law] *with hypocrisy* [dreading the prowess of Judas: 1 Maccabees 2:46, and yet ready to fall away at the first opportunity, 1 Maccabees 7:6]. *And some of them of understanding*

shall fall, to make trial among them, and to purge and to snake them white, unto the time of the end; because [the end is] yet for a time appointed.” From this point the prophet describes in detail the godlessness of the great oppressor (ver. 36-39), and then his last fortunes and death (ver. 40-45), but says nothing of the triumph of the Maccabees or of the restoration of the Temple, which preceded the last event by some months. This omission is scarcely intelligible unless we regard the facts as symbolizing a higher struggle — a truth wrongly held by those who from early times referred ver. 36-45 only to Antichrist, the antitype of Antiochus-in which that recovery of the earthly temple had no place. At any rate, it shows the imperfection of that view of the whole chapter by which it is regarded as a mere transcription of history.

6. The history of the Maccabees does not contain much which illustrates in detail the religious or social progress of the Jews. It is obvious that the period must not only have intensified old beliefs, but also have called out elements which were latent in them. One doctrine at least, that of a resurrection, and even of a material resurrection (2 Maccabees 14:46), was brought out into the most distinct apprehension by suffering. “It is good to look for the hope from God, to be raised up again by him” (πάλιν ἀναστήσεσθαι ὑπὸ αὐτοῦ), was the substance of the martyr’s answer to his judge; “as for thee, thou shalt have no resurrection to life” (ἀνάστασις εἰς ζωὴν, 2 Maccabees 7:14; comp. 6:26; 14:46). “Our brethren,” says another, “have fallen, having endured a short pain leading to everlasting life, being under the covenant of God” (2 Maccabees 7:36, πόνον, ἀεννάου ζωῆς). As it was believed that an interval elapsed between death and judgment, the dead were supposed to be in some measure still capable of profiting by the intercession of the living. Thus much is certainly expressed in the famous passage, 2 Maccabees 12:43-45, though the secondary notion of a purgatorial state is in no way implied in it. On the other hand, it is not very clear how far the future judgment was supposed to extend. If the punishment of the wicked heathen in another life had formed a definite article of belief, it might have been expected to be put forward more prominently (2 Maccabees 7:17, 19, 35, etc.), though the passages in question may be understood of sufferings after death, and not only of earthly sufferings; but for the apostate Jews there was a certain judgment in reserve (6:26). The firm faith in the righteous providence of God shown in the chastening of his people, as contrasted with his neglect of other nations, is another proof of the widening view of the spiritual

world which is characteristic of the epoch (2 Maccabees 4:16, 17; 5:17-20; 6:12-16, etc.). The lessons of the captivity were reduced to moral teaching; and in the same way the doctrine of the ministry of angels assumed an importance which is without parallel except in patriarchal times. *SEE 2 MACCABEES*. It was perhaps from this cause also that the Messianic hope was limited in its range. The vivid perception of spiritual truths hindered the spread of a hope which had been cherished in a material form; and a pause, as it were, was made, in which men gained new points of sight from which to contemplate the old promises.

7. The various glimpses of national life which can be gained during the period show, on the whole, a steady adherence to the Mosaic law. Probably the law was never more rigorously fulfilled. The importance of the Antiochian persecution in fixing the canon of the Old Testament has already been noticed. *SEE CANON*. The books of the law were specially sought out for destruction (1 Maccabees 1:56, 57; 3:48), and their distinctive value was in consequence proportionately increased. To use the words of 1 Maccabees, “the holy books” (τὰ βιβλία τὰ ἅγια τὰ ἐν χερσίν ἡμῶν) were felt to make all other comfort superfluous (1 Maccabees 12:9). The strict observance of the Sabbath (1 Maccabees 2:32; 2 Maccabees 6:11; 8:26, etc.) and of the sabbatical year (1 Maccabees 6:53), the law of the Nazarites (1 Maccabees 3:49), and the exemptions from military service (1 Maccabees 3:56), the solemn prayer and fasting (1 Maccabees 3:47; 2 Maccabees 10:25, etc.), carry us back to early times. The provision for the maimed, the aged, and the bereaved (2 Maccabees 8:28,30), was in the spirit of the law; and the new Feast of the Dedication was a homage to the old rites (2 Maccabees 1:9), while it was a proof of independent life. The interruption of the succession to the high-priesthood was the most important innovation which was made, and one which prepared the way for the dissolution of the state. After various arbitrary changes the office was left vacant for seven years upon the death of Alcimus. The last descendant of Jozadak (Onias), in whose family it had been for nearly four centuries, fled to Egypt, and established a schismatic worship; and at last, when the support of the Jews became important, the Maccabaeian leader, Jonathan, of the family of Joarib, was elected to the dignity by the nomination of the Syrian king (1 Maccabees 10:20), whose will was confirmed, as it appears, by the voice of the people (comp. 1 Maccabees 14:35).

8. Little can be said of the condition of literature and the arts which has not been already anticipated. In common intercourse the Jews used the Aramaic dialect which was established after the return: this was “their own language” (2 Maccabees 7:8, 21, 27; 12:37); but it is evident from the narrative quoted that they understood Greek, which must have spread widely through the influence of Syrian officers. There is not, however, the slightest evidence that Greek was employed in Palestinian literature till a much later date. The description of the monument which was erected by Simon at Modin in memory of his family (1 Maccabees 13:27-30) is the only record of the architecture of the time. The description is obscure, but in some features the structure appears to have presented a resemblance to the tombs of Porsena and the Curiatii (Pliny, *H. N.*, 36:13), and perhaps to one still found in Idumsea. An oblong basement, of which the two chief faces were built of polished white marble (Josephus, *Ant.* 13:6, 5), supported “seven pyramids in a line ranged one against another,” equal in number to the members of the Maccabaeian family, including Simon himself. To these he added other works of art (*μηχανήματα*), placing round (on the two chief faces?) great columns (Josephus adds, each of a single block), bearing trophies of arms and sculptured ships, which might be visible from the sea below.” The language of 1 Maccabees and Josephus implies that these columns were placed upon the basement, otherwise it might be supposed that the columns rose only to the height of the basement supporting, the trophies on the same level as the pyramids. So much, at least, is evident, that the characteristics of this work and probably of later Jewish architecture generally bore closer affinity to the styles of Asia Minor and Greece than to that of Egypt or the East, a result which would follow equally from the Syrian dominion and the commerce which Simon opened by the Mediterranean (1 Maccabees 14:5). *SEE MODIN.*

9. The only recognized relics of the time are the coins which bear the name of “Simon,” or Simon, prince (*nasi*) of Israel,” in Samaritan letters. The privilege of a national coinage was granted to Simon by Antiochus VII, Sidetes (1 Maccabees 15:6, *κόμμα ἴδιον νόμισμα τῆ χώρῃ*); and numerous examples occur which have the dates of the first, second, third, and fourth years of the liberation of Jerusalem (Israel, Zion); and it is a remarkable confirmation of their genuineness, that in the first year the name Zion does not occur, as the citadel was not recovered till the second year of Simon’s supremacy, while after the second year Zion alone is found (Bayer, *De Nummis*, p. 171). The privilege was first definitely accorded to

Simon in B.C. 140, while the first year of Simon was B.C. 143 (1 Maccabees 13:42); but this discrepancy causes little difficulty, as it is not unlikely that the concession of Antiochus was made in favor of a practice already existing. No date is given later than the fourth year, but coins of Simon occur without a date, which may belong to the last four years of his life. The emblems which the coins bear have generally a connection with Jewish history — a vine-leaf, a cluster of grapes, a vase (of manna?), a trifid flowering rod, a palm branch surrounded by a wreath of laurel, a lyre (1 Maccabees 13:51), a bundle of branches symbolic of the Feast of Tabernacles. The coins issued in the last war of independence by Bar-cochba repeat many of these emblems, and there is considerable difficulty in distinguishing the two series. The authenticity of all the Maccabaean coins was impugned by Tychsen (*Die Unächtheit d. Jud. Münzen... bewiesen...* O. G. Tychsen, 1779), but on insufficient grounds. He was answered by Bayer, whose admirable essays (*De Nummimis e br. Saunaritanis*, Val. Ed. 1781; *Vindiciae...* 1790) give the most complete account of the coins, though he reckons some apparently later types as Maccabaean. Eckhel (*Doctr. Numim.* 3:455 sq.) has given a good account of the controversy, and an accurate description of the chief types of the coins. Compare De Saulcy, *Numism. Judaique*; Ewald, *Gesch.* 7:366,476. **SEE MONEY.**

IV. Literature. — The original authorities for the history of the Maccabees are extremely scanty; but for the course of the war itself the first book of Maccabees is a most trustworthy, if an incomplete witness. **SEE MACCABEES, BOOKS OF.** The second book adds some important details to the history of the earlier part of the struggle, and of the events which immediately preceded it; but all the statements which it contains require close examination, and must be received with caution. Josephus follows 1 Maccabees, for the period which it embraces, very closely, but slight additions of names and minute particulars indicate that he was in possession of other materials, probably oral traditions, which have not been elsewhere preserved. On the other hand, there are cases in which, from haste or carelessness, he has misinterpreted his authority. From other sources little can be gleaned. Hebrew and classical literature furnishes nothing more than a few trifling fragments which illustrate Maccabean history. So long an interval elapsed before the Hebrew traditions were committed to writing, that facts, when not embodied in rites or precepts, became wholly distorted. Classical writers, again, were little likely to

chronicle a conflict which probably they could not have understood. Of the great work of Polybius — who alone might have been expected to appreciate the importance of the Jewish war — only fragments remain which refer to this period; but the omission of all mention of the Maccabean campaign in the corresponding sections of Livy, who follows very closely in the track of the Greek historian seems to prove that Polybius also omitted them. The account of the Syrian kings in Appian is too meagre to make his silence remarkable; but indifference or contempt must be the explanation of a general silence which is too widespread to be accidental. Even when the fall of Jerusalem had directed unusual attention to the past fortunes of its defenders. Tacitus was able to dismiss the Maccabean conflict in a sentence remarkable for scornful carelessness. “During the dominion of the Assyrians, the Medes, and the Persians, the Jews,” he says, “were the most abject of their dependent subjects. After the Macedonians obtained the supremacy of the East, king Antiochus endeavored to do away with their superstition, and introduce Greek habits, but was hindered by a Parthian war from reforming a most repulsive people” (*teterrimam gentem*, Tacitus, *Hist.* v. 8).

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

Maccabees, Books Of

(*Μακκαβαίων α, β*, etc.). Four books which bear the common title of “Maccabees” are found in some MSS. of the Sept.; a fifth is found in an Arabic version. Two of these were included in the early current Latin versions of the Bible, and hence passed into the Vulgate. As forming part of the Vulgate, they were received as canonical by the Council of Trent, and retained among the *Apocrypha* by the Reformed churches. The two other books obtained no such wide circulation, and have only a secondary connection with the Maccabean history. But all the books, though they differ most widely in character, and date, and worth, possess points of interest which make them a fruitful field for study. If the historic order were observed, the so-called *third* book would come first, the *fourth*

would be an appendix to the *second*, which would retain its place, and the *first* would come last; but it will be more convenient to examine the books in the order in which they are found in the MSS., which was probably decided by some vague tradition of their relative antiquity. In the following account of these books we adopt much of the matter found in the dictionaries of Kitto and Smith.

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

For a copious list of original editions, translations, and commentaries on the first three books of Maccabees, see Fürst, *Bibliotheca Judaica*, 2:316 sq.

Maccabees, The First Book Of,

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

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

- 1.** Into **yrç 2êrç** (or **rç**) **l a ynb**, *History of the Princes of the Sons of God*, that is, *of Israel* (Michaelis, *Orient. Biblioth.* 12:115, and most modern commentators).
- 2.** Into **ynb rç fybrç l a**, *The Sceptre of the Prince of the Sons of God*, i.e. *of Simon*, who is called prince in 1 Maccabees 13:41; 14:47 (Bochart, Buddeus, and Ewald, *Geschichte d. V. Israel* 4:528). But this makes chapters 13-16 the principal part of the book, and the rest a mere introduction.
- 3.** Into **l a ynb rç tyb rç**, *Princeps templi* (i.e. epontifex maximus), *Princeps filiorum Dei* (i.e. dux populi Judaici), based upon the words Σίμωνος ἀρχιερέως μεγάλου καὶ στρατηγοῦ καὶ ἡγουμένου Ἰουδαίων, 1 Maccabees 13:42; and ἐπὶ Σίμωνος ἀρχιερέως ἐν Σαραμέλ, *ibid.* 14:27 (Wernsdorf, *Comment. de fide libb. Maccab.* p. 173).
- 4.** Into **l a ynbrs fybrç**, *Sceptrum rebellium Dei*. i.e. of the Syrian kings, who were regarded as rebelling against God because they persecuted the Jews (Junius, Huetium, etc.), or as Herzfeld, who espouses this solution of the words, explains it, *the chastising rod of the apostates*, which he

submits is an appropriate appellation of the Maccabaeans (*Geschichte d. V. Israel*, 1:265). We incline to the first explanation, because it escapes the censure which the second incurs, and is less artificial than the third and fourth. It must, however, be remarked that this title does not occur in the Hebrew literature, and that both the ancient and modern Jews call the book $\mu\text{yanwm}\text{qj h rps}$, *The Book of the Hashmonaeans*; $\text{yanwm}\text{qj l } \hat{\text{w}}\text{qar}$, *Hashmoneans*; $\text{yanwm}\text{qj tyb tl gm}$, *The Scroll of the Family of the Hashmonaeans*, or simply $\text{yanwm}\text{qj tl gm}$, *The Scroll of the Hashmonaeans*, after the title *Hashmonaeans* or *Ashmoneans*, by which the Maccabmean family are denominated. *SEE MACCABEE.*

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

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

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

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

3. The *third part*, of which Jonathan, the high-priest, surnamed Apphus ($\text{\AA}\text{π}\text{ρ}\text{ο}\text{ϋ}\text{ς}\ \text{Ϛ}\text{ω}\text{ρ}\text{j}$, the *simulaltor*, the *sly* one), is the hero, comprises ch. 9:23-12:50, and records the events which transpired during the period of his government, B.C. 160-143.

4. *The fourth part*, of which Simon, surnamed *Thassi* (θασσάι=γϰδτ, *the flourishing*) is the hero, comprises ch. 13, 1-16, 24, and records the events which occurred during his period of government, B.C. 143-135.

III. Historical and Religious Character. — There is no book among all the Apocrypha which is distinguished by greater marks of trustworthiness than 1 Maccabees. Simplicity, credibility, and candor alike characterize its description of friends and foes, victories and defeats, hopes and fears. When the theme so animates the writer that he gives expression to his feelings in lyric effusions (e.g. 1:25-28, 37-40; 2:7-13, 49-68; 3:3-9, 18-22; 4:8-11, 30-33, 38; 6:10-13; 7:37, 38, 41, 42), no poetic exaggerations and hyperboles deprive the description of its substantially historic character. When recording the victories of his heroes, struggling for their liberties and their religion, he wrests no laws of nature from their regular course to aid the handful of Jewish champions against the fearful odds of their heathen oppressors; and when speaking of the arch-enemy, Antiochus Epiphanes (1:10, etc.), he indulges in no unjust and passionate vituperations against him. Yet he marks in one expressive phrase (ρίζα ἀμαρτωλός) the character of the Syrian type of Antichrist (comp. ²³¹¹⁰Isaiah 11:10; ²⁷¹¹³⁵Daniel 11:36). If no mention is made of the reckless profligacy of Alexander Balas, it must be remembered that his relations to the Jews were honorable and liberal, and these alone fall within the scope of the history. So far as the circumstances admit, the general accuracy of the book is established by the evidence of other authorities; but for a considerable period it is the single source of our information. Even the few historical and geographical inaccuracies in the description of foreign nations and countries, such as the foundation of the Greek empire in the East (1 Maccabees 1:5-9), the power and constitution of Rome (8:1-16), “the great city Elymais, in the country of Persia” (6:1), etc., so far from impairing the general truthfulness of the narrative when it confines itself to home and the immediate past, only show how faithfully the writer has depicted the general notions of the time, and for this reason are of intrinsic value and instructive. The subjugation of the Galatians, who were the terror of the neighboring people (comp. Livy, 38:37), and the conquest of Spain, the Tarshish (ch. 8:3) of Phoenician merchants, are noticed, as would be natural from the immediate interest of the events; but the wars with Carthage are wholly omitted (Josephus adds these in his narrative, *Ant.* 12:10, 6). The errors in detail — as the capture of Antiochus the Great by the Romans (ver. 7), the numbers of his armament (ver. 6), the

constitution of the Roman senate (ver. 15), the *one* supreme yearly officer at Rome (ver. 16; compare 15:16) — are only such as might be expected in oral accounts; and the endurance (ver. 4, μακροθυμία), the good faith (ver. 112), and the simplicity of the republic (ver. 14, οὐκ ἐπέθετο οὐδείς αὐτῶν διάδημα καὶ οὐ περιεβάλοντο πορφύραν στε ἄδρυνθῆναι ἐν αὐτῇ, contrast 1:9), were features likely to arrest the attention of Orientals.

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

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

Dr. Geiger, rabbi at Breslau, that the author of this book was a Sadducee (comp. *Urschrift und Uebersetzung der Bibel*, p. 216 sq.).

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

Not so certain, however, is its date. Prideaux, Michaelis, Hengstenberg, Bertheau, Welte. Scholtz. Keil. and others, though discarding the notion of Lapede, Huet, etc., that John Hyrcanus was the author, are yet of opinion that the concluding words, τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν λόγων Ἰωάννου καὶ τῶν πολέμων αὐτοῦ... ἰδοὺ ταῦτα γέγραπται ἐπὶ βιβλίῳ ἡμερῶν ἀρχιερωσύνης αὐτοῦ, ἃ ὅπου ἐγενήθη ἀρχιερεὺς μετὰ τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ (16:24), plainly show that the book was written during the government of this high-priest, perhaps about B.C. 120/106. inasmuch as this passage only gives the *terminus a quo* of the high-priesthood of John, without the *terminus ad quem*, thus indicating that John was still living, and that his pontificate was not as yet terminated. After the close of the priesthood, or after the death of John, this remark would be superfluous, because no reader could take the words, “*diary of his priesthood*,” in any other sense than that they denote a chronicle of the whole duration of it from the beginning to the end. Nor can the words ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης, in 13:30, be adduced as implying a later date; for it was something remarkable that, in those days of war and devastation, the sepulcher which Simon made for his family in Modin remained between twenty and thirty years unhurt. Eichhorn, Bertholdt, De Wette, Ewald, Grimm, and others, however, maintain that the book was written after the death of John Hyrcanus oscillating between B.C. 105 and 64.

The language of the book does not present any striking peculiarities. Both in diction and structure it is generally simple and unaffected, with a marked and yet not harsh Hebraistic character. The number of peculiar words is not very considerable, especially when compared with those in 2 Maccabees. Some of these are late forms, as ψογέω (ψογίζω), 11:5, 11; ἔξουδένωσις, 39; ὀπλοδοτεω, 14:32; ἀσπίδίσκη, 4:57; δειλόμοι, 4:8, 21; 5:4; 16:6; ὄμηρα, 8:7; 9:53, etc.; ἀφαίρεμα, 15:5; τελωνεῖσθαι, 13:39; ἔξουσιάζεσθαι, 10:70; or compounds, such as ἀποσκορίζω, 11:55; ἐπισυστρέφω, 14:44; δειόψυχος, 8:15; 16:5;

tyrant, ruled over Israel 206 years, thus following the chronology of the Talmud (comp. *Aboda Zaru*, 9 a; *Seder Olam Sutta*; De Rossi, *Meor Enajim*, c. xxvi; Zunz, *Gottesdienst. Vortrage*, p. 134). That the Aramaic (Chaldee). which was for the first time published by Filipowski, together with the Hebrew and an English version (London, 1851), is the original, and that the Hebrew is a translation, may be seen from a most cursory comparison of the two texts. — The Hebrew version slavishly imitates the phrases of the Aramaic original instead of giving the Hebrew idioms. Thus, for instance, the Chaldee at[ç hb is rendered in the Hebrew version by h[ç htwab, instead of ayhh t [b; ^yl al ^yl a by hl al hl a, instead of wyj a l a çya or wh[r l a çya, etc. It is perfectly astonishing that this document, which was evidently got up about the 7th century of the Christian sera. to be recited on the Feast of Dedication in commemoration of the Maccabean victories over the enemies of Israel, should be regarded by Hengstenberg (*Genuineness of Daniel*. English transl., p. 237) as the identical “Chaldee copy of the first book of Maccabees to which Origen and Jerome refer.” Hengstenberg, moreover, most blunderingly calls *the Hebrew* version published by Bartolucci *the Chaldee*.

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

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

But, though the Protestant Church rejects the decisions of these councils, and abides by the ancient Jewish canon, yet both the leaders of the Reformation and modern expositors rightly attach great importance to this

book. The great value of it will be duly appreciated when it is remembered that it is one of the very few surviving records of the most important, but very obscure period of Jewish history between the close of the O.T. and the beginning of the N.T. It is, therefore, not to be wondered at that the far-seeing Luther remarks, in his introduction to the translation of this book — “This is another of those books not included in the Hebrew Scriptures, although in its discourses and description it almost equals the other sacred books of Scripture, and would not have been unworthy to be reckoned among them, because it is a very necessary and useful book for the understanding of the prophet Daniel in the eleventh chapter” (*Vorraede aufidas erste Buch Maccabaorum*, German Bible, ed. 1536). It is rather surprising that the Anglican Church has not prescribed any lessons to be read from this book. A reference to 1 Maccabees 4:59, however, is to be found in the margin of the A. V., ^{<B12>}John 10:22.

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

Of commentaries and exegetical helps we specially mention the works of Drusius and Grotius, reprinted in the *Critici Sacri*; Calmet, *Commentaire Litelal*, etc., vol. 8 (Paris, 1724); Michaelis, *Deutsche Uebersetzung des 1 Maccab. B.’s mit Amerkk.* (Gottingen und Leipsic, 1778); Eichhorn, *Einleit. in die apokryphischen Schrift. d. A. T.* (Leipsic, 1795), p. 218-248; Hengstenberg, *Genuineness of Daniel* (English transl., Edinburgh, 1847), p. 235-239, 267-270; Cotton, *The five Books of Maccabees* (Oxford, 1832); Ewald, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, 4:526 sq.; the masterly work

of Grimm, *Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zu den Apokryphen* (Leipsic, 1853); Geiger, *Urschrift und Uebersetzung der Bibel* (Breslau, 1857), p. 206-219. *SEE APOCRYPHA.*

Maccabees, The Second Book Of,

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

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

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

1. The first section (1:1-2:32) comprises two epistles, the relation of which to the substance of the book is extremely obscure. The first (1:1-9) is a solemn invitation to the Egyptian Jews to celebrate “the feast of tabernacles in the month Casleu” (i.e. the feast of the dedication, 1:9), as before they had sympathized with their brethren in Judaea in “the extremity of their trouble” (1:7). The second (1:10-2:18, according to the received

division), which bears a formal salutation from “the council and Judas” to “Aristobulus... and the Jews in Egypt,” is a strange, rambling collection of legendary stories of the death of “Antiochus,” of the preservation of the sacred fire and its recovery by Nehemiah, of the hiding of the vessels of the sanctuary by Jeremiah, ending, if, indeed, the letter can be said to have any end — with the same exhortation to observe the feast of dedication (2:10-18). Then follows an account given by the writer of this book of the sources from which he derived his information, and of the trouble he had in compiling it (2:19-32).

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

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

This is followed by an epilogue (15:38-40) which is wanting in Coverdale’s (after the Zurich) Bible; in Matthew’s, 1537; in Cranmer’s, 1539; and in the various reprints of these editions; and which the Geneva Bible, 1560, followed by the Bishops’, 1568, was the first to insert.

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

15:37); and they correspond, in fact, with distinct stages in the national struggle.

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

As a Cyrenian Jew, Jason most naturally composed his work in Greek; and Jerome’s testimony, “*Secundus [Machabaeorum liber] Graecus est, quod ex ipsa quoque phrasi probari potest*” (*Prol. Gal.*), is fully borne out by the style of the epitome. (See below.) The epitomator or compiler of the present book was a Hellenistic Jew, residing in Palestine, and must have lived a considerable period after the events transpired. The date of the compilation is put within the limits B.C. 150-124. The two epistles with which the book begins do not proceed from Jason, and are of a much later date, though the first purports to have been written B.C. 124, or 188 of the Seleucidae; and the second, by mentioning a recent deliverance from great perils, evidently implies that it was written after the news of the death of Antiochus Epiphanes, i.e. 148 of the Seleucidae. The original language of these letters seems to be Hebrew. Indeed, Geiger shows that the difficult

passage, ἀφ' οὗ ἀπέστη Ἰάσων καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῆς ἁγίας γῆς καὶ τῆς βασιλείας (1:7), which is ambiguous, and, as commonly understood, represents Jason and his companions as apostatizing from *the land and the kingdom* is, when retranslated into Hebrew, **ʾwsay rs th hkwl mhw ʕdqh tmdam wta rʕaw**, shown to mean, *from the time that Jason and those who sided with him front the holy land and the kingdom, apostatized*; **hkwl mj** either standing for **hkwl mh [rz**, *royal descent* (comp. ^{<1225>}2 Kings 25:25; ^{<2401>}Jeremiah 41:1; ^{<2373>}Ezekiel 17:13; ^{<2003>}Daniel 1:3), or referring back to **tmda** in the sense of **hkwl mh ry[** (^{<1023>}2 Samuel 12:26), i.e. those who call themselves after the sacred ground of the royal residence. The same is the case with 1:9, 18, where *the Feast of Dedication* is most extraordinarily called *the Feast of Tabernacles*, which can only be explained when the passages are retranslated into Hebrew. Now the Hebrew for ἵνα ἄγητε τὰς ἡμέρας τῆς σκηνοπηγίας τοῦ Χασελεὺ μηνός (1:9) is **wyl sk ʕdj gj ymy wj t ʿ[ml**; and for ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ ἄγητε τῆς σκηνοπηγίας (καὶ) τοῦ πυρός (1:18) is **ʕah gj ta mta mj wj t ʿ[ml**. When it is borne in mind that the expression **gj**, which is the general term for *feast* in earlier Hebrew (^{<1009>}Exodus 10:9; 12:14; ^{<1029>}Leviticus 23:39), was afterwards used for the feast of tabernacles (^{<1002>}1 Kings 8:2; ^{<1483>}2 Chronicles 5:3; Josephus, *Ant.* 8:4, 1), it will at once be seen that the translator of these epistles, instead of rendering the word in question simply by test, attached to it the later sense of the specific festival, which he was evidently led to do by the fact that both these festivals are of eight days' duration, and that the feast of tabernacles is mentioned in 10:6. So also διαοίξαι τὴν καρδίαν ὑμῶν ἐν τῷ νόμῳ αὐτοῦ (1:4) is a translation of **mkbl htry wtrwtb**

The style of the book is extremely uneven. At times it is elaborately ornate (3:15-39; 5:20; 6:12-16, 23-28; 7, etc.), and, again, it is so rude and broken as to seem more like notes for an epitome than a finished composition (13:19-26); but it nowhere attains to the simple energy and pathos of the first book. The vocabulary corresponds to the style. It abounds in new or unusual words. Many of these are forms which belong to the decay of a language, as ἄλλοφυλισμός, 4:13; 6:24; Ἑλληνισμός, 6:13 (ἐμφανισμός, 3:9); ἔτασμός, 7:37; θωρακισμός, 5:3; σπλαγχνισμός, 6, 7, 21; 7:42; or compounds which betray a false pursuit of emphasis or precision: διεμπίμπλημι, 4:40; ἐπευλαβεῖσθαι, 14:18; κατευθικτεῖν, 14:43; προσαναλέγεσθαι, 3:19; προσυπομιμνήσκω,

15:9; *συνεκκεντεῖν*, 26. Other words are employed in novel senses, as *δευτερολογεῖν*, 13:22; *εἰσκυκλείσθαι*, 2:24; *εὐαπάντητος*, 14:9; *πεφρενωμένος*, 11:4; *ψυχικῶς*, 4:37; 14:24. Others bear a sense which is common in late Greek, as *ἀκλερεῖν*, 14:8; *ἀναζυγή*, 9:2; 13:26; *διάληψις*, 3:32; *ἐναπερείδω*, 9:4; *φρυάσσομαι*, 34; *περισκυθόζω*, 7:4. Others appear to be peculiar to this book, as *διάστασις*, 13:25; *δυσπέτημα*, 5:20; *προσπυροῦν*, 14:11; *πολεμοτροφεῖν*, 10:14, 15; -*όπλολογεῖν*, 8:27, 31; *ἀπενθανατίζειν*, 6:28; *δοξικός*, 8:35; *ἀνδρολογία*, 12:43. Hebraisms are very rare (8:15; 9:5; 14:24). Idiomatic Greek phrases are much more common (4:40; 12:22; 15:12, etc.); and the writer evidently had a considerable command over the Greek language, though his taste was deformed by a love of rhetorical effect.

IV. Historical and Religious Character. — As the avowed design of the book is religio-didactic and parnetic, the aim of the writer was not to recount a series of dry facts in chronological order, but rather to select such events from the period on which he treats, and arrange, embellish, and comment upon them in such a manner as should most strikingly set forth to his Egyptian brethren the marvelous interposition of God to preserve the only legitimate and theocratic sanctuary in Jerusalem. Hence the desire to point out the signal punishment of the wicked according to the principle in *eo genere quisque punitur. in quo peccavit* (5:9, 10; 9:5, 6; 13:8; 15:32, 33); the moral reflections (5:17-20; 6:12-16; 9:8-10; 12:43-45); the colored descriptions (3:14-23; 5:11-20); the exaggerated account of the martyrdom of the seven brothers and their mother, which king Antiochus, for the sake of effect, is made to witness in Jerusalem (6:18-7:42); the enormous numbers of the enemy slain by a handful of Jews (8:24, 30; 10:23, 31; 11:11; 12:16, 19, 23, 26, 28; 15:27); the numerous and strange miracles (3:25-27; 5:2, 3; 10:29-31; 11:8-10; 15:12, etc.); the historical and chronological inaccuracies, making Antiochus witness the death of the Jewish martyrs (7:3); the death of Antiochus (ch. 9); the representing of the sacrifices as having been renewed after two years' interruption (2 Maccabees 10:3, comp. with 1 Maccabees 4:52, 54; 1:54, 59); the description of the different battles which the Jews fought between the purification of the Temple and the death of Antiochus (2 Maccabees 8:30; 10:15-38; 12:243, comp. with 1 Maccabees 5); the campaign of Lysias (2 Maccabees 11:12, comp. with 1 Maccabees 4:26-32); etc. But apart from these embellishments, traditional stories, inversions of events, etc., which, in accordance with ancient usage, the author adopted in order to carry out

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

The religious character of the book is one of its most important and interesting features. God is throughout recognized as ordaining even the most minute affairs of his people; the calamities which befel them are looked upon by the Jews as a temporary visitation for their sins (4:16,17; 5:17-20; 6:12-17; 7:32, 33; 12:40); and the sufferings which come upon the righteous in this common visitation are regarded as atoning for the sins of the rest of the people, and staying the anger of God (7:38). The book. moreover, shows that the interposition of angels for the salvation of the people (10:29, etc.; 13:2, etc.), and supernatural manifestations (3:25; 5:2, etc.; 13:2, etc.), which play a very important part in the N.T., were of no common occurrence. What is, however, most striking, is, that not only did the Jews then believe in the surviving of the soul after the death of the body, in the resurrection of the dead, and in their reunion with those near and dear to them (7:6, 9, 11, 14, 23, 29, 36), but that God does not irrevocably seal the eternal doom of man immediately after his departure, and that the decision of our heavenly Father may be influenced by the prayers and sacrifices of the surviving friends of the departed (12:43-45). This passage also shows that the offering of sacrifices for the dead must have been common in those days, inasmuch as it is spoken of in very commendable terms. The striking distinction between the religious

sentiments of this book and those of the former goes far to justify Geiger's conclusion that "the two books of Maccabees are party productions; the author of the first was a Sadducee, and a friend of the Maccabman dynasty while the author or epitomator of the second was a Pharisee, who looked upon the Maccabees with suspicion" (*Urschrijf*, p. 206). Still the second book, like the first, contains no hopes about the coming of a *Messiah*.

V. Canonicity. — Though portions of this book are incorporated in the Jewish writings, and form a part of the ritual, viz., the martyrdom of the seven brothers and their mother (ch. 6:1-42), which is not only mentioned in the Talmud (*Gittin*, 57, b), the Midrash of the ten commandments (ed. Jellinek; *Beth Ha-Midrash*, 1:70, etc.), Midrash Jalkut (*On Deuteronomy* section **abt**, 301, b), etc., but is interwoven in the service for the Feast of Dedication (compare *The Jozer*, **tpna ykbwa**); the martyrdom of Eleazar (ch. 6:18-31), also embodied in the same service, and described by Josippon, who also speaks of the wonderful appearance of the horsemen, and other circumstances narrated in 2 Maccabees (compare *Josippon*, lib. ii, c. ii-iv, ed. Breithaupt, p. 172 sq.), yet the book was never part of the Jewish canon. Hence, even if it could be shown more unquestionably that the apparent parallels between 2 Maccabees and diverse passages in the N.T. (compare 2 Maccabees 1:4, with ^{<4164>}Acts 16:14; 2 Maccabees 5:19, with ^{<4127>}Mark 2:27; 2 Maccabees 6:19; 7:2, etc., with ^{<5135>}Hebrews 11:35; 2 Maccabees 7:14, with ^{<4169>}John 5:29; 2 Maccabees 7:22, etc.; 14:46, with ^{<4174>}Acts 17:24-26; 2 Maccabees 7:36, with ^{<4189>}Revelation 6:9; 2 Maccabees 8:2, with ^{<4214>}Luke 21:24; ^{<4102>}Revelation 11:2; 2 Maccabees 10:7, with ^{<4109>}Revelation 7:9; 2 Maccabees 15:3-5, with ^{<4089>}Ephesians 6:9) are actual quotations, it would only prove that the apostles, like the rest of their Jewish brethren, alluded to the incidents recorded in this book without regarding the book itself as canonical. The only references, however, to be found in the A. V. are from ^{<5135>}Hebrews 11:35, 36, to 2 Maccabees 6:18, 19; 7:7, etc.; and 7:1-7; but even these are disputed, and it is quite possible that the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews refers to the sufferings of the Essenes (compare Ginsburg, *The Essenes*, etc., Longman, 1864, p. 36). In harmony with the decisions of the Jewish Church, this book is excluded from the canon of sacred books in the catalogues of Melito, Origen, the Council of Laodicea, St. Cyril, St. Hilary, etc. (compare Du Pin, *History of the Canon*, London, 1699, 1:12). Jerome emphatically declares: "*Maccabaeorum libros legit quidem ecclesia, sed eos inter canonicas scripturas non recipit*" (*Praef. in Prov.*); and

Augustine, though stating that this book, like 1 Maccabees, was regarded by the Christians as not unuseful, yet expressly states that the Jews did not receive it into the canon (*Contra ep. Gaudent.* 1:31), and draws a distinction between it and the canonical Scriptures (*De Civ. Dei*, 18:36). The Council of Trent, however, has settled (April 8, 1546) the canonicity of it for the Roman Church. The Protestant Church generally agrees with Luther, who remarks, "We tolerate it because of the beautiful history of the Maccabean seven martyrs and their mother, and other pieces. It is evident, however, that the writer was no great master, but produced a patchwork of various books; he has likewise a perplexing knot in ch. 14, in Razis, who committed suicide, which was also troublesome to Augustine and other fathers. For such example is of no use, and is not to be commended, though it may be tolerated and charitably explained. It also describes the death of Antiochus, in ch. 1, differently from 1 Maccabees To sum it all up: Just as 1 Maccabees deserves to be adopted in the number of sacred Scriptures, so 2 Maccabees deserves to be thrown out, though there is something good in it" (*Vorrede auf das Zweite Buch Maccabaeorum*, in the German Bible, ed. 1536).

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

Of commentaries and exegetical helps, we may mention Whitaker, *A Disputations on Holy Scripture*, Parker Society (Cambridge, 1849), p. 93-102; Whiston, *A Collection of Authentick Records* (London, 1727), 1:200-232; Hasse, *Das and. Buck der Makhk. neu iibers. nm. Anmerk.* (Jena, 1786); Eichhorn, *Einleitung in die apok. Schriften d. Alten Test.* (Leipzig, 1795), p. 249-278; Bertheau, *De Secundo Maccabceor. libro* (Getting. 1829); Cotton, *The Five Books of Maccabees* (Oxford, 1832), p. 148-217; Ewald, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, 4:530 sq.; Schliinkes, *Epistolce que Secundo Maccab. libro, cap. i-ii. 9, legitur explicatio, commentat. crit.* (Colon. 1854); Herzfeld, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel* (Nordhausen, 1854), 1:443-456; Patritius, *De Consensu utriusque libri Macctbceor.* (Romans 1856); Geiger, *Urschrift und Uebersetzanqen der*

Bibel (Breslau, 1857), p. 219-230; and, above all, the valuable work of Grimm, *Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zu d. Apokryphen d. A Iten Testaments*, pt. 4 (Leipz. 1857). *SEE APOCRYPHA.*

Maccabees, The Third Book Of,

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

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

II. *Design and Contents.* — The design of this book is to comfort the Alexandrian Jews in their sufferings for their faith in the God of Abraham, and to encourage them to steadfastness and perseverance by recounting to them the experience of the past, which most unquestionably shows that the theocracy cannot perish; that, though tyrants might vent their rage on the chosen people, the Lord will not suffer the enemy to triumph over them, but will appear for their deliverance, and avenge himself on their persecutors, as well as put to confusion those of the Israelites who have apostatized from their ancestral religion. To illustrate this, the writer narrates the following incident from the dealings of Providence with his covenant people: Ptolemy IV (Philopator), on returning from his victory over Antiochus the Great (B.C. 217), was waited upon by envoys from

Jerusalem to congratulate him on his success, which made him visit the Holy City and offer sacrifices in the Temple; but he was seized with a desire to penetrate into; the Holy of Holies (1:1-11), and as the entreaties of the people failed to make the king relinquish his outrageous desire, the high-priest Simon prayed to the King of kings, who immediately chastised this insolent heathen; by throwing him down paralyzed on the ground (2:123). Enraged at this, the king wreaked his vengeance, on. his arrival in Egypt, on the Alexandrian Jews, ordering that they should be deprived of their citizenship and be branded with an ivy leaf unless they agreed to be initiated into the orgies of Bacchus (ver. 24-30). *SEE DIONYSUS*. A few complied, but the bulk of the chosen people refused to apostatize from their ancestral religion (ver. 31, 32). Not content with this order, which was thus generally evaded or despised, he commanded all the Jews in the country to be arrested and sent to Alexandria (ch. 3). This was done as well as might be, though the greater part escaped (4:18), and the gathered multitudes were confined in the Hippodrome outside the city (comp. Josephus, *Ant.* 17:6, 5). The resident Jews, who showed sympathy for their countrymen, were imprisoned with them, and the king ordered the names of all to be taken down preparatory to their execution. Here the first marvel happened: the scribes to whom the task was assigned toiled for forty days from morning till evening, till at last reeds and paper failed them, and the king's plan was defeated (ch. 4). However, regardless of this, the king ordered the keeper of his elephants to drug the animals, five hundred in number, with wine and incense, that they might trample the prisoners to death on the morrow. The Jews had no help but in prayer, and here a second marvel happened: the king was overpowered by a deep sleep, and when he awoke the next day it was already time for the banquet which he had ordered to be prepared, so that the execution was deferred. The Jews still prayed for help; but when the dawn came, the multitudes were assembled to witness their destruction, and the elephants stood ready for their bloody work. Then was there another marvel: the king was visited by deep forgetfulness, and chided the keeper of the elephants for the preparations which he had made, and the Jews were again saved. But at the evening banquet the king recalled his purpose, and with terrible threats prepared for its immediate accomplishment at daybreak (ch. 5). Then Eleazar, an aged priest, earnestly prayed for his people (6:1-15), and, just as he finished praying, the royal train and the elephants arrived at the Hippodrome, when suddenly two angels appeared in terrible form, visible to all but the Jews, making the affrighted elephants go backwards and

crush the soldiers (ver. 16-21). This changed the king's anger into pity, and, with tears in his eyes, he at once "set free the sons of the Almighty, heavenly, living God," and made a great feast for them (ver. 22-30). To commemorate this marvelous interposition of their heavenly Father, the Jews instituted an annual festival, to be celebrated "through all the dwellings of their pilgrimage for after generations" (ver. 31-41). The faithful Jews had not only their mourning turned into joy, and the royal protection for the future, but were permitted by the king to inflict condign punishment on those of their brethren who had forsaken the religion of their fathers in order to escape the temporary sufferings; "thus the most high God worked wonders throughout for their deliverance" (7:1-23).

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

- 1.** The account it gives of Ptolemy's expedition to Coele-Syria, and his victory over Antiochus at Raphia (i., 1-7), is corroborated both by Polybius (5. 40, 58-71, 79-87) and Justin (30:1).
- 2.** The character which it ascribes to Ptolemy — that he was cruel, vicious, and given to the orgies and mysteries of Bacchus — is literally confirmed both by Plutarch, who, in his essay *How to distinguish Flatterers from Friends*, says, "Such praise was the ruin of Egypt, because it called the effeminacy of Ptolemy, his wild extravagances, loud prayers, his marking with an ivy leaf (κρίωνω), and his drums, piety" (cap. 12; compare also *In Cleomene*, cap. 33 and 36), and by the author of the Greek *Elymologicon*, who tells us that Philopator was called *Gallus* because he was marked with the leaf of an ivy, like the priests called Galli, for in all the Bacchanalian solemnities they were crowned with ivy (Γάλλος ὁ φιλοπάτωρ Πτολεμαῖος διὰ τὸ φύλλα κισσοῦ καταστιχθαι ὡς οἱ Γάλλοι, etc.).
- 3.** Josephus's deviating account (*Apion*, 3:5) of the events here recorded, which shows that he has derived his information from an independent source, proves that something of the sort did actually take place, although

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

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

again the words of inspiration stand ennobled by the presence of their later counterpart.

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

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

V. Canonicity. — Like the other Apocrypha, this book was never part of the Jewish canon. In the Apostolic canons, however, which are assigned to the 3d century, it is considered as *sacred* writing (*Can.* 85); Theodoret, too

(died cir. A.D. 457), quotes it as such (*in* ~~2111~~ Daniel 11:7). Still it was never accepted in the Western churches, and formed no part of the Roman Vulgate; it was therefore not received into the canon of the Catholic Church, nor inserted as a rubric in the Apocrypha contained in the translation of the Bible made by the Reformers.

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

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

Maccabees, The Fourth Book Of

(a), though not given in the Roman Vulgate, and therefore not inserted in the Apocrypha contained in the Bibles translated by the Reformers, yet

exists in Greek in two leading texts. One, which, on account of its more extensive circulation, may be called *the received* or *common* text, is contained in the early edition of the Sept. printed at Strasburg, 1.526, Basel, 1545 and 1550, Frankfurt, 1597, Basel, 1582, and in the editions of Josephus's work, and is given in its purest form in Bekker's edition of Josephus (Leips. 1855-56, 6 vols.). The other is the Alexandrian, or that of the Codex Alexandrinus, and is the more ancient and preferable one; it is contained in the editions of the Sept. by Grabe and Breitinger, and is adopted, with some few alterations after the common text, in Apel's edition of the Apocrypha (Leipsic, 1837). See Schaack, *De libro εἰς Μακκαβαίους qui Josepho tribuitur* (Kopenhagen, 1814).

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

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

1. The introduction, comprising ch. 1:1-12, contains the resumd of the whole book, and the grand problem for discussion, viz. whether the rational will, permeated and regulated by true piety, has perfect mastery over the passions (ὅτι ἀντοδέσποτός ἑ ἀντοκράτωρ] ἔστι τῶν παθῶν εὐσεβῆς λογιόμος).

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

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

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

1. In 4 Maccabees all the proper names in the Bible, except Ἱεροσόλυμα and Ἐλεάζαρος, are retained in their Hebrew form, and treated as indeclinable (e.g. Ἀβραάμ, Ἰσαάκ Νῶε), whereas Josephus gives them a Greek termination.

2. Fourth Maccabees derives its historical matter from 2 Maccabees, as we have seen in the preceding section, or perhaps from the original work of

Jason; while Josephus manifests utter ignorance about the existence of this work.

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

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

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

IV. *Canonicity and Importance.* — Among the Jews this book is hardly known, and though some of the fathers were acquainted with it, and Gregory of Nazianzum, Augustin Jere, Jerome, etc., quoted with respect its description of the Maccabsean martyrs, yet it was never regarded as canonical or sacred. As a historical document the narrative is of no value. Its interest centers in the fact that it is a unique example of the didactic use which the Jews made of their history. Ewald (*Geschichte*, 4:556) rightly compares it with the sermon of later times, in which a scriptural theme becomes the subject of an elaborate and practical comment. The philosophical tone of the book is essentially stoical, but the stoicism is that of a stern legalist. The dictates of reason are supported by the remembrance of noble traditions, and by the hope of a glorious future. The prospect of the life to come is clear and wide. The faithful are seen to rise to endless bliss; the wicked to descend to endless torment, varying in

intensity. But while the writer shows, in this respect, the effects of the full culture of the Alexandrian school, and in part advances beyond his predecessors, he offers no trace of that deep spiritual insight which was quickened by Christianity. The Jew stands alone, isolated by character and by blessing (comp. Gfrorer, *Philo*, etc., 2:173). Still the book is of great importance, inasmuch as it illustrates the history, doctrines, and moral philosophy of the Jewish people prior to the advent of Christ. It shows that the Jews believed that human reason, in its natural state, has no power to subdue the passions of the heart, and that it is only able to do it when sanctified by the religion of the Bible (5:21, 23; 6:17; 10:18); that the souls of all men continue to live after the death of the body; that all will rise, both righteous and wicked, to receive their judgment for the deeds done in the body (5:35; 9:8; 12:13,14; 16:22; 17:17, 18); that this is taught in the Pentateuch (comp. 17:18, with ^{<4133>}Deuteronomy 33:3); and that the death of the righteous is a vicarious atonement (6:29). Allusion seems also to be made in the N.T. to some passages of this book (comp. 7:18, with ^{<4137>}Luke 20:37; ^{<4123>}Matthew 22:32; ^{<4123>}Mark 12:26; ^{<4160>}Romans 6:10; 14:8; Galatians 11:19; 4 Maccabees 12:11, with ^{<4175>}Acts 17:26; 4 Maccabees 13:14, with ^{<4162>}Luke 16:22, 23; 4 Maccabees 16:22, with ^{<4137>}Luke 20:37).

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

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

Maccabees, The Fourth Book Of (B)

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

Maccabees, The Fifth Book Of,

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

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

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

Picture for Maccabees

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

IV. Author, Date, and Original Language — This book is a compilation, made in Hebrew, by a Jew who lived after the destruction of Jerusalem,

from ancient Hebrew memoirs or chronicles, which were written shortly after the events transpired. This is evident from the whole complexion of the document, even in the translation for the original has not as yet come to light—as may be seen from the few features here offered for consideration:

1. When speaking of the (lead (15:11, 15; 12:1; 21:17) the compiler uses the well-known euphemisms, *God be merciful to him* — *wyl [μj ry μyhI a*; *to whom be peace* = *μwl çh wyl [*, which came into vogue among the Jews in the Talmudic period (comp. *Tosiphta Chullin*, 100, a; Zunz, *Zur Geschichte*, p. 338), and are used among the Jews to the present day, thus showing that the compiler was a Jew, and lived after the destruction of the Temple.
2. He calls the Hebrew Scriptures (3:3, 9) *the twenty-four books* = *[braw μyrç[*, a name which is thoroughly Jewish, and came into use long after the close of the Hebrew canon; leaves *Torah* (*hrwt*), the Hebrew name for the Pentateuch, untranslated (21:9), in accordance with the Jewish custom; speaks of the deity as *the great and good God* — *bwfw I wdg I a* (1:8, 13, 15; 5:27; 7:21, 22; 8:5, 11; 9:4; 10:15; 11:8; 12:1; 15:4; 16:24; 28:4; 35:9; 48:14; 57:35; 59:58); and names Jerusalem *the city of the holy house* (20:17; 21:1; 23:5; 28:23, 34, 37; 30:8; 35:4, 33; 36:6, 38, 39; 37:3, 5; 38:5; 52:7, 24; 59:68); *city of the holy house of God* (31:10); or simply *holy city* (16:11, 17; 20:18; 21:26; 34:7; 35:32; 36:9, 19, 25; 38:3; 41:15; 43:12; 49:5; 1, 16; 54:13, 26; 55:27; 57:22; 59:2); *holy house* (20:7, 17; 23:3; 36:35; 1, 8; 52:19; 53:6; 56:17, 44; 59:35, 68); *house of God* (7:21; 9:7; 11:7; 15:14; 16:16, 17; 21:11; 27:4; 34:10; 51:5; 52:31; 54:13; 55:20); the Temple he calls *the house of the sanctuary* *çdqmh tyb* (8:11), in accordance with the later Hebrew idiom.
3. This later date of the compilation of the book is corroborated by the fact that the compiler refers to the destruction of Jerusalem (21:30), and to the period of the second Temple, as something past (22:9).
4. He speaks of the original author of the book as a distinct person (25:5; 55:25), and explains the original writer's allusions (56:45).
5. The original writer of the work must have lived *before* to destruction of Jerusalem, for he terminates his narrative six years before this catastrophe, and does not know of any of the calamities which befell his brethren after the conquest of Palestine by Titus. His name is unknown; all that we can

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

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

Maccabees, Festival of the

In the 4th century, when fasts and festivals had greatly multiplied, not only were festivals of Christian martyrs celebrated, but also those of some of the more eminent martyrs of the Old Testament. The conduct of the Maccabees (q.v.) in opposing Antiochus Epiphanes (q.v.), and dying in

defense of the Jewish law, seems to have been generally celebrated at this time. The authors of that period are extravagant in their commendations of these patriots. Chrysostom has three homilies on the subject. At Antioch there was a church called by the name of the Maccabees; and Augustine, who wrote two sermons on their festival, calls them Christian martyrs. The reason assigned for the adoption of this festival was that, as these men had suffered martyrdom so bravely before Christ's coming, what would they not have done had they lived after him, and been favored with the death of Christ for their example? The Roman Martyrology places this festival on August 1st. Augustine and Gregory Nazianzen allude to this feast. — Farrar, *Eccles. Dict.* s.v.; Eadie, *Eccles. Cyclop.* s.v.

Maccarthy, Nicholas Tuite De

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

Maccarty, Thaddeus

a Congregational minister, was born in Boston in 1721; graduated from Harvard University in 1739; studied theology three years, and was ordained pastor of the Congregational Church at Kingston, Mass., on Nov. 3, 1742. When Whitefield appeared in that region in 1745, he appointed a committee "to prevent the intrusion of roving exhorters." A false report

spread that Whitefield was to open communion for him, whereupon his parishioners nailed the doors and windows, and Maccarthy's request for dismissal was granted. He then preached in Worcester, Mass., from Nov. 27, 1746, until the time of his death, July 20, 1784. His publications are, *Farewell Sermon at Kingston* (1745): -*Two Discourses on the Day of the Annual Fast* (before the expedition into Canada, 1759); and other sermons. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 1:423.

Macclintock, Samuel, D.D.

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

Maccovius Or Makowsky, John,

a Polish Reformed theologian and writer, was born at Lobzenic in 1588; studied at the principal German universities; was received doctor of theology at Franeker in 1614; appointed extraordinary professor of theology in that university in 1615; ordinary professor in 1616; and died in 1644. He was particularly renowned as an opponent of the Jesuits, Socinians, and Arminians, and by his severity against the latter created many enemies. In his own Church he caused much disturbance by his attempts to restore the use of the scholastic method in the treatment of dogmatics. He used it first in his lectures, and afterwards also in his writings. See his *Collegia theologica* (Amstelod. 1623,1631): — *Loci communes theologici* (Fran. 1626): — *Disinctiones et regulæ theologicae et philosophicae* (published by Nicholas Arnold, Amsterd. 1656; Geneva, 1661). He was thereupon accused of heresy before the States of Friesland,

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

Macdill, David, D.D.

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

Macé, Francois,

a French theologian and Biblical writer, was born in Paris in 1640, and became successively canon and curate of Sainte-Opportune. He was also counsellor and almoner to the king. He died in Paris Feb. 5, 1721. His works are, *Psaumes et Cantiques de l'glise* (Paris, 1677): — *Abrege historique, chronologique, et moral de l'Ancien et du Nouveau Testament*

(Par. 1704, 2 vols. 12mo): — *La Science de l'Ecriture Sainte, reduite en quatre tables generatees* (Paris, 1708, 8vo), containing a comparison of the Old with the New Testament: — *Les Testaments des douze Patriarches* (Par. 1713, 12mo): — *Meditations* (of Busee, 2 vols. 12mo): — *Limitation de Jesus-Christ* (Par. 1698-9): — *Epitres et Evangiles des dimanches et fetes, et pour le Careme et Advent* (2d ed. Par. 2 vols. 12mo): — *Melanie, ou la veuve charitable*: — *L'Esprit de Saint Augustin, ou analyse de tout les outrages de ce pire* (5007 pages 8vo): — *Explication des Propheties de l'Ancien et du Nouveau Testament qui prouvent que Jesus-Christ est le Fils de Dieu, le veritable Messie et que la Religion Chretienne est la vraie et seule religion, ouvrage en deux parties et destine "a confondre les athdes, les impies, les libertins, les Juifs, les heretiques:"* — *Histoire critique des papes depuis Saint Pierrejusqu'a Alexandre VII*. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, vol. 32, s.v.

Macedo, Antonio

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

Macedo, Francisco de

a Portuguese Jesuit and prolific writer, was born at Coimbra in 1596, entered the Jesuit order at fourteen, and became successively teacher of rhetoric, philosophy, and chronology. In 1630 he left the Jesuits and entered the order of Cordeliers, with the surname *Francois de Saint-Augustin*, under which most of his works are published. He was called to the professorship of polemic theology in the College of the Propaganda at Rome, and afterwards (1657) visited Venice, lecturing *de omnzi re scibili*. He occupied the chair of moral philosophy at the University of Padua from 1667 until the time of his death in May, 1680. In 1675 he had composed 53 panegyrics, 60 Latin discourses, 32 funeral orations, 123 elegies, 115

epitaphs, 212 dedicatory epistles, 700 familiar epistles, 2600 epic poems, 110 odes, 3000 epigrams, 4 Latin comedies, 2 tragedies, and 1 Spanish satire. He had a sharp discussion with cardinal Bona on the subject of consubstantiation, and with cardinal Noris on the monachism of St. Augustine. Among his writings are *Apotheosis S. Francisci Xaverii* (Lisbon, 1620, 8vo), an epic poem: — *Thesaurus Eruditionis pro sole, Viridarium eloquentie* (denoting the author's vanity): — *Scrinium S. Augustini de predestinatione gratiae et libero arbitrio* (Paris, 1648, 4to; 3d edit. Lond. 1654): — *Controversia ecclesiastica inter F. F. Minores* (1653, 8vo): — *Lituus Lusitanus, contra tubam Anglicanam* (Lond. 1652, 4to): — *Encyclopaedia in Agonem litteratorum producta* (Rome, 1657): — *De clavibus Patri*, 4 lib. (Rome, 1660): — *Theatrum Meteorologicum* (Rome, 1661, 8vo): — *Scholae Theologiae positivae* (Rome, 1664): — *Medulla historice ecclesiasticae emaculata*: — *Collationes doctrinae S. Thomae et Scoti, cum differentiis inter utrumque* (Padua, 1671, 2 vols.): — *Joannis Bona Doctrina de usu fermentati in sacrificio missae* (Ingolstadt [Venice], 1673, 8vo; reprint Verona): — *Disquisitio de ritu azymi fermentati* (Verona, 1673, 4to): — *Myrothecium morale documentorum xiii* (Padua, 1675, 4to): — *Schema Congregationis S. Qulcii Romani cum elogis cardinalium et corollarium de infallibili auctoritate summi pontificis in mysteriis fidei proponendis* (Padua, 1676, 4to): — *Elogia poetica in Remp. Venetam, cum iconibus* (Padua, 1680); — *De Incarnationis Mysterio* (Padua, 1681), containing also *itinerarium sancti Augustini*. See Hoefer, *Noev. Biog. Generale*, s.v.; Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, 12:748.

Macedo'nia

Picture for Macedonia 1

(*Μακεδονία*, from a supposed founder *Macenus* or *Macedon*), a name originally confined to the district lying north of Thessaly, east of the Cardanian mountains (a prolongation of Mount Pindus), and west of the River Axios; but afterwards extended to the country lying to the north of Greece Proper, having on the east Thrace and the AEGæan Sea, on the west the Adriatic and Illyria, on the north Dardania and Moesia, and on the south Thessaly and Epirus. "In a rough and popular description it is enough to say that Macedonia is the region bounded inland by the range of Haemus or the Balkan northwards and the chain of Pindus westwards, beyond which the streams flow respectively to the Danube and Adriatic; that it is

separated from Thessaly on the south by the Cambunian hills, running easterly from Pindus to Olympus and the AEgmean; and that it is divided on the east from 'Thrace by a less definite mountain boundary running southwards from Haemus. Of the space thus enclosed, two of the most remarkable physical features are two great plains, one watered by the Axios, which comes to the sea at the Thermaic Gulf, not far from Thessalonica; the other by the Strymon, which, after passing near Philippi, flows out below Amphipolis. Between the mouths of these two rivers a remarkable peninsula projects, dividing itself into three points, on the farthest of which Mount Athos rises nearly into the region of perpetual snow." The whole region was intersected by mountains (among these were the famous Olympus and Athos), which supplied numerous streams (especially the Strymon and Axios), rendering the intervening valleys and plains highly fruitful (Pliny, 4:17; Mela, 2:3; Ptol. 3:13). The natives were celebrated from the earliest times for their hardy independence and military discipline. The country is supposed to have been first peopled by Chittim or Kittim, a son of Javan (^{Q104}Genesis 10:4), and in that case it is probable that the Macedonians are sometimes intended when the word CHITTIM occurs in the Old Testament. Macedonia was the original kingdom of Philip and Alexander, by means of whose victories the name of the Macedonians became celebrated throughout the East. The rise of the great empire formed by Alexander is described by the prophet Daniel under the emblem of a goat with one horn (²⁰⁸³Daniel 8:3-8). As the horn was a general symbol of power, the oneness of the horn implies merely the unity of that power. It is, however, curious and interesting to know that Daniel did describe Macedonia under its usual symbol, as gems and other antique objects still exist in which that country is represented under the figure of a one-horned goat. (See Murray's *Truth of Revelation Illustrated*, and the art. Macedonia, in Taylor's *Calmet*.) **SEE GOAT**. Monuments are still extant in which this symbol occurs, as one of the pilasters of Persepolis, where a goat is depicted with one immense horn on his forehead, and a Persian holding the horn, by which is intended the subjection of Macedon by Persia. In Esther 16:10, Haman is described as a Macedonian, and in 16:14 he is said to have contrived his plot for the purpose of transferring the kingdom of the Persians to the Macedonians. This sufficiently betrays the late date and spurious character of these apocryphal chapters; but it is curious thus to have our attention turned to the early struggle of Persia and Greece. Macedonia played a great part in this struggle, and there is little doubt that Ahasuerus is Xerxes. The history of the Maccabees opens with

vivid allusions to Alexander, the son of Philip, the Macedonian king (Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ τοῦ Φιλιππου ὁ βασιλεὺς ὁ Μακεδών), who came out of the land of Chettiim and smote Darius, king of the Persians and Medes (1 Maccabees 1:1), and who reigned first among the Grecians (ib. 6:2). A little later we have the Roman conquest of Perseus, “king of the Citims,” recorded (ib. 8:5). Subsequently in these Jewish annals we find the term “Macedonians” used for the soldiers of the Seleucid successors of Alexander (2 Maccabees 8:20). In what is called the Fifth Book of Maccabees this usage of the word is very frequent, and is applied not only to the Seleucid princes at Antioch, but to the Ptolemies at Alexandria (see Cotton’s *Five Books of Maccabees*, Oxf. 1832). When subdued by the Romans (Livy, 44) under Paulus AEmilius (B.C. 168), Macedonia was divided into four provinces (Livy, 45:29). Macedonia Prima was on the east of the Strymon, and had Amphipolis for the capital. Macedonia Secunda stretched between the Strymon and the Axius, with Thessalonica for its metropolis. The third and fourth districts lay to the south and the west. Of two, if not three of these districts, coins are still extant (Akerman, *Numismatic Illust. of the N.T.* p. 43). Afterwards (B.C. 142) the whole of Greece was divided into two great provinces, Macedonia and Achaia. **SEE ACHAIAS; SEE GREECE.** Macedonia therefore constituted a Roman province, governed by a propraetor, with the title of proconsul (*provincia proconsularis*; Tacit. *Annal.* 1:76; Sueton. *Claud.* 26), in the time of Christ and his apostles. (See fully in Smith’s *Dict. of Class. Geog.* s.v.) The apostle Paul being summoned in a vision, while at Troas, to preach the Gospel in Macedonia, proceeded thither, and founded the churches of Thessalonica and Philippi (^{<416>}Acts 16:9), A.D. 48. This occasions repeated mention of the name, either alone (^{<418>}Acts 18:5; 19:21; ^{<513>}Romans 15:26; ^{<416>}2 Corinthians 1:16; 11:9; ^{<514>}Philippians 4:15), or along with Achaia (^{<416>}2 Corinthians 9:2; ^{<508>}1 Thessalonians 1:8). The principal cities of Macedonia were Amphipolis, Thessalonica, Pella, and Pelagonia (Livy, 45:29); the towns of the province named in the New Testament are Philippi, Amphipolis, Thessalonica, Neapolis, Apollonia, and Beroea. When the Roman empire was divided, Macedonia fell to the share of the emperor of the East, but in the 15th century it fell into the hands of the Turks. It now forms a part of Turkey in Europe, and is called *Makdonia*. It is inhabited by Wallachians, Turks, Greeks, and Albanians. The south-eastern part is under the pasha of Salonika; the northern under beys or agas, or forms free communities. The capital, Salonika, the ancient Thessalonica, is a commercial town, and the only one of any consequence,

containing about 70,000 inhabitants. (See Cellarii *Notit.* 2:828 sq.; Mannert, 7:420 sq.; Conybeare and Howson, 1:315.) On the question whether Luke includes Thrace in Macedonia, *SEE THRACE*. “Nothing can exceed the interest and impressiveness of the occasion (^{<4160>}Acts 16:9) when a new and religious meaning was given to the well-known ἄνῆρ Μακεδών of Demosthenes (*Philippians* i, p. 43), and when this part of Europe was designated as the first to be trodden by an apostle. The account of St. Paul’s first journey through Macedonia (^{<4160>}Acts 16:10-17:15) is marked by copious detail and well-defined incidents. At the close of this journey he returned from Corinth to Syria by sea. On the next occasion of visiting Europe, though he both went and returned through Macedonia (^{<4166>}Acts 20:16), the narrative is a very slight sketch, and the route is left uncertain except as regards Philippi. Many years elapsed before St. Paul visited this province again; but from ^{<5008>}1 Timothy 1:3, it is evident that he did accomplish the wish expressed during his first imprisonment (^{<50724>}Philippians 2:24). The character of the Macedonian Christians is set before us in Scripture in a very favorable light. The candor of the Bereans is highly commended (^{<4171>}Acts 17:11); the Thessalonians were evidently objects of St. Paul’s peculiar affection (^{<5108>}1 Thessalonians 2:8, 17-20; 3:10); and the Philippians, besides their general freedom from blame, are noted as remarkable for their liberality and self-denial (^{<5100>}Philippians 4:10, 14-19; see ^{<4102>}2 Corinthians 9:2; 11:9). It is worth noticing, as a fact almost typical of the change which Christianity has produced in the social life of Europe, that the female element is conspicuous in the records of its introduction into Macedonia. The Gospel was first preached there to a small congregation of women (^{<4163>}Acts 16:13); the first convert was a woman (ib. ver. 14); and, at least at Philippi, women were prominent as active workers in the cause of religion (^{<5102>}Philippians 4:2, 3). It should be observed that, in St. Paul’s time, Macedonia was well intersected by Roman roads. especially by the great Via Egnatia, which connected Philippi and Thessalonica, and also led towards Illyricum (^{<5159>}Romans 15:19).” For the antiquities of this region, see Cousinery, *Voyage dans le Macedoine* (Paris, 1831); Leake, *Travels in Northern Greece* (London, 1835); compare also Holland, *Travels in the Ionian Isles*, etc. (Lond. 1812-13).

Picture for Macedonia 2

Macedo'nian

(Μακεδών) occurs in the A.V. of the N.T. only in <47E>Acts 27:2. In the other cases (<44E>Acts 16:9; 19:29; <47E>2 Corinthians 9:2, 4) our translators render it “of Macedonia.” The “Macedonians” are also mentioned in the Apocrypha (Esther 16:10, 14; 1 Maccabees 1:1; 2 Maccabees 8:20). *SEE MACEDONIA.*

Macedonians

SEE MACEDONIUS.

Macedonius

a patriarch of Constantinople, flourished in the 4th century. After the death of bishop Alexander, of Constantinople, in 336, Macedonius and Paulus became candidates for his succession. The latter was elected by the Athanasian party, but was soon after (338) deposed by the emperor Constance, who put Eusebius of Nicomedia in his place. Upon the death of Eusebius, Paulus was reinstated, but was again deposed by the Semi-Arian emperor, who in 342 pronounced Macedonius patriarch, notwithstanding the opposition of the people, who rose in insurrection, resulting in great bloodshed (comp. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* [Milman's ed.], 2. 357 sq.). The orthodox rival, however, succeeded, after a time, in making his influence felt throughout the country, and Macedonius was finally obliged to yield him the patriarchate. In 350, after having thoroughly reorganized his party, Macedonius returned, and by the aid of the civil authorities regained the superintendence over the churches. His decided connection with the Semi-Arians, and the widening of the gulf between the Arians and Semi-Arians, proved, however, fatal to his credit, and in 360 his enemies succeeded in securing his deposition by a synod at Constantinople. He is supposed to have died soon after. His followers at once adopted his name. The *Macedonians* are generally regarded as Semi-Arians of that period, especially those in and around Constantinople, in Thrace, and in the surrounding provinces of Asia Minor (Sozomen, 4:27). There is, however, one point in which the Macedonians, although not opposed to, are yet distinguished from the Semi-Arians; it is their idea of the antagonism of the divinity and the homoousia of the Holy Spirit. On this point the Macedonians are identical with the Pneumatomaachians, and

therefore the latter finally joined the former. They professed that the Holy Spirit is a divine energy diffused throughout the universe, but denied its being distinct, as a *person*, from the Father and the Son (Epiphanius, *Haeres.* 74; Augustine, *De Haeres.* c. 52). In 381 Theodosius the Great assembled a council of one hundred and fifty bishops at Constantinople (second oecumenical), which condemned this doctrine, and the *Macedonians* soon after disappeared. See Mosheim, *Eccles. Hist.* 1:305 sq. (N. Y. 1854, 3 vols. 8vo); Hase, *Hist. of the Christ. Church*, p. 115 (N. York, 1855); Basilius, *De Spiritu S. opp.* (ed. Garn.), 3:1 sq.; Thilo, *Bibl. pp. Gr. dogyn.* 1:666 s.; 2:182 s.; A. Maji, *Nov.patr. bibl.* t. iv (Romans 1847); Didymus, *De Spir. Scto. interpr. Hier.* (in *Opp. Hier.* ed. Mart. IV, 1:494 sq.); Walch, *Ketzergeschichte*, vol. iii; Bauer, *Dreieinigkeitslehre*, vol. i; Neander, *Hist. of Christ. Dogmas*, 1:350 sq.: Milman, *Lat. Christianity*, I, 334, 338 sq. (J. H.W.)

Mac Gill, Stevenson, D.D.

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

Dictionary of Religious Biography, s.v.; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.

Machaerus

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

Machar, John, D.D.

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

literature, and could read with ease Hebrew, Greek, and the modern languages. He was always a close student, an earnest preacher, and a faithful pastor. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1864, p. 388.

Machaut, Jacques

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

Machault, Jean de

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

Machault, Jean-Baptiste de

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

Mach'banai

(Heb. *Makbannay'*, *יִנְבְּכַנְי* binding, or perhaps *clad with a mantle*; Sept. *Μαχαβαναι* v. r. *Μελχαβαναι*; Vulg. *IMachbanai*). the eleventh of the Gadite braves who joined David's troop in the wilderness of Adullam (^{<1313>}1 Chronicles 12:13). B.C. cir. 1061.

Mach'benah

(Heb. *Makbena'*, **אַבְנֵי־מַכְבְּנָה** something *bound* on, perh. a *cloak*; Sept. **Μαχαβηνά** v. r. **Μαχαμηνά**; Vulg. *Maochbena*), apparently a place in the tribe of Judah founded by (a person of that name, the son of) Sheva (^{<1329>}1 Chronicles 2:49), and probably situated in the vicinity of Gibeah, in connection with which it is mentioned. It is thought to have been the same with CABBON (^{<6154>}Joshua 15:40).

Machet, Gerard Or Girard,

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

Ma'chi

(Heb. *Maki'*, **מַכִּי** *smiting*; Sept. **Μαχίλ**, Vulg. *Machi*), the father of Geuel, which latter was the commissioner on the part of the tribe of Gad to explore Canaan (^{<41315>}Numbers 13:15). B.C. ante 1657.

Ma'chir

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

1. The oldest son of Manasseh (^{<6170>}Joshua 17:1), who even had children born to him during the lifetime of Joseph (Genesis 1, 23). B.C. 1802. His descendants were called MACHIRITES (**מַכִּירִים**, Sept. **Μαχειρί**, ^{<4629>}Numbers 26:29), being the offspring of Gilead (^{<1377>}1 Chronicles 7:17), whose posterity settled in the land taken from the Amorites (^{<4629>}Numbers 32:39, 40; ^{<6185>}Deuteronomy 3:15; ^{<6131>}Joshua 13:31; ^{<1322>}1 Chronicles 2:23),

but required a special enactment as to their inheritance, owing to the fact that the grandson Zelophehad had only daughters (^{<0470>}Numbers 27:1; 36:1; ^{<0670>}Joshua 17:3). Once the name of Machir is put poetically as a representative of the tribe of Manasseh east (^{<0754>}Judges 5:14). His daughter became the mother of Segub by Hezron in his old age (^{<1322>}1 Chronicles 2:21). The mother of Machir was an Aramitess, and his wife was Maachah, the granddaughter of Benjamin, by whom he had several sons (^{<1374>}1 Chronicles 7:14-16). “The family of Machir come forward prominently in the history of the conquest of the trans-Jordanic portion of the Promised Land. In the joint expedition of Israel and Ammon, their warlike prowess expelled the Amoritish inhabitants from the rugged and difficult range of Gilead, and their bravery was rewarded by Moses by the assignment to them of a large portion of the district, ‘half Gilead’ (^{<0633>}Joshua 13:31), with its rich mountain pastures, and the towns of Ashtaroth and Edrei, the capitals of Og’s kingdom (^{<0623>}Numbers 32:39, 40; ^{<0815>}Deuteronomy 3:15; ^{<0633>}Joshua 13:31; 17:1). The warlike renown of the family of Machir is given as the reason for this grant (^{<0670>}Joshua 17:1), and we can see the sound policy of assigning a frontier land of so much importance to the safety of the whole country, exposed at the same time to the first brunt of the Syrian and Assyrian invasions, and to the never-ceasing predatory inroads of the wild desert tribes, to a clan whose prowess and skill in battle had been full proved in the subjugation of so difficult a tract (Stanley, *S. and Pal.* p. 327).” “The connection with Benjamin *may* perhaps have led to the selection by Abner of Maahanaim, which lay on the boundary between Gad and Mansasseh, as the residence of Ishbosheth (^{<1018>}2 Samuel 2:8); and that with Judah may have also influenced David to go so far north when driven out of his kingdom.”

2. A descendant of the preceding, son of Ammiel, residing at Lo-debar, who maintained the lame son of Jonathan until provision was made for him by David’s care (^{<1090>}2 Samuel 9:4, 5), and afterwards extended his hospitality to the fugitive monarch himself (^{<1072>}2 Samuel 17:27). B.C. 1037-1023. Josephus calls him the chief of the country of Gilead (*Ant.* 7:9, 8). *SEE DAVID.*

Ma’chirite

(^{<0859>}Numbers 26:29). *SEE MACHIR*, 1.

Mach'mas

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

Machnad'ebai

(Heb. *Maknadbsay'*, **יבדלךבני** perh. *what is like the liberal?* other copies read **יבדלךבני** *Mabnadbay'*; Sept. Μαχναδααβού v. r. Μαχαδναβού; Vulg. *Mechnedebai*), an Israelite of the sons of Bani who divorced his Gentile wife after the exile (^{<5104>}Ezra 10:40). B.C. 459.

Machpe'lah

Picture for Machpelah

(Heb. *Makpelah'*, **חל פקלה** probably a *portion*, but, according to others, *double*, and so the Sept. διπλοῦς, Vulg. *duplex*), the name of the plot of ground in Hebron containing the cave which Abraham bought of Ephron the Hittite for a family sepulcher (^{<0239>}Genesis 23:9), where it is described as being located in one extremity of the field, and in ver. 17 it is stated to have been situated “before Mamre,” and to have likewise contained trees. *SEE MAMRE*. The only persons mentioned in Scripture as buried in this cemetery are Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, with their wives Sarah, Rebekah, and Leah (^{<0239>}Genesis 23:19; 25:9; 49:30; 1, 13). “Beyond the passages already cited, the Bible contains no mention either of the name Machpelah or of the sepulcher of the patriarchs. Unless this was the sanctuary of Jehovah to which Absalom had vowed, or pretended to have vowed, a pilgrimage, when absent in the remote Geshur (^{<0057>}2 Samuel 15:7), no allusion to it has been discovered in the records of David’s residence at Hebron, nor yet in the struggles of the Maccabees, so many of whose battles were fought in and around it” (Smith). “It is a remarkable fact that none of the sacred writers refer to this celebrated tomb after the burial of Jacob, though it was unquestionably held in reverence by the Jews in all ages. Josephus, in his short notice of the burial of Sarah, says that both Abraham and his descendants *built themselves sepulchres* at Hebron (*Ant.* 1:14), and in another passage he states that the monuments of the patriarchs ‘are *to this very time* shown in Hebron, the structure of which is of beautiful marble, wrought after the most elegant manner’ (*War.* 4:9,7). Jerome mentions the *mausoleum* of Abraham at Hebron as standing in his

day (*Onomast.* s.v. Arboch); and in the *Jerusalem Itinerary*, a work of the 4th century, it is described as a quadrangular structure built of stones of wonderful beauty (*Itin. Hieros.* ed. Wessel. p. 599). It is also mentioned by Antoninus Martyr in the beginning of the 7th century (*Itin.* 30); by Arculf towards its close (*Early Travels in Pal.*, Bohn, p. 7); by Willibald in the 8th (*ib.* p. 20); by Sewulf in the 12th (*ib.* p. 45); and by numerous others (see Ritter, *Pal. und Syr.* 3:237 sq.). From these notices, it appears to be certain that the venerable building which still stands is the same which Josephus describes. Hebron lies in a narrow valley which runs from north to south between low ridges of rocky hills. The modern town is built partly in the bottom of the vale and partly along the lower slope of the eastern ridge. On the hill-side, above the latter section of the town, rise the massive walls of the Haram, forming the one distinguishing feature of Hebron, conspicuous from all points. The building is rectangular, about 200 feet long by 115 wide, and 50 high. The walls are constructed of massive stones varying from 12 to 20 feet in length, and from 4 to 5 in depth. Dr. Wilson mentions one stone 38 feet long and 3 feet 4 inches in depth, of ancient workmanship (*Lands of the Bible*, 1:366). The edges of the stones are grooved to the depth of about two inches, so that the whole wall has the appearance of being formed of raised panels, like the Temple-wall at Jerusalem. **SEE MASONRY.** The exterior is further ornamented with pilasters, supporting without capitals a plain molded cornice. The building is thus unique; there is nothing like it in Syria. The style of its architecture, independent even of the historical notices above given, proves it to be of Jewish origin; and it cannot be much, if at all, later than the days of Solomon. The interior of this massive and most interesting building was described about fifty years ago by a Spaniard, who conformed to Islamism and assumed the name of Ali Bey (*Travels*, 1:232). The Rev. J. L. Porter was assured when at Hebron, and subsequently by a mollah of rank who had visited the tombs of the patriarchs, that there is an entrance to the cave, which consists of two compartments, and that the guardian can on special occasions enter the outer one (*Handbook*, p. 69). With this agree the statements of M. Pierotti, of Benjamin of Tudela, who gives a description of the caves (*Itin.* by Asher, p. 76 sq.), and of others (Wilson, *Lands of the Bible*, 1:364 sq.). We cannot doubt that the cave of Machpelah, in which the patriarchs were buried, is beneath this venerable building, and that it has been guarded with religious jealousy from the earliest ages; consequently, it is quite possible that some remains of the patriarchs may still lie there. Jacob was embalmed in Egypt, and his body

deposited in this place (Genesis 1, 2-13). It may still be there perfect as an Egyptian mummy. The Moslem traditions and the cenotaphs within the Haram agree exactly with the Biblical narrative, and form an interesting commentary on Jacob's dying command — 'And he charged them... bury me with my fathers... in the cave which is in the field of Machpelah, which is before Mamre... *There they buried Abraham, and Sarah his wife; there they buried Isaac, and Rebekah his wife; and there I buried Leah*' (⁽⁴⁴²⁾Genesis 49:29-31). There also they buried Jacob. Now within the enclosure are the six cenotaphs only, while the belief is universal among the Mohammedans that the real tombs are in the cave below. Projecting from the west side of the Haram is a little building containing the tomb of Joseph—a Moslem tradition states that his body was first buried at Shechem, but was subsequently transferred to this place (Stanley, *Jewish Church*, 1:498). The Jews cling around this building still, as they do around the ruins of their ancient Temple-taking pleasure in its stones, and loving its very dust. Beside the principal entrance is a little hole in the wall, at which they are permitted at certain times to pray." "A belief seems to prevail in the town that the cave communicates with some one of the modern sepulchers at a considerable distance outside of Hebron (Lowe, in *Zeitung des Judenth.*, June 1, 1839). The ancient Jewish tradition ascribes the erection of the mosque to David (*Jichus ha-Aboth* in Hottinger, *Cippi Hebr.* 30), thus making it coeval with the pool in the valley below; but, whatever the worth of this tradition, it may well be of the age of Solomon, for the masonry is even more antique in its character than that of the lower portion of the south and south-western walls of the Haram at Jerusalem, which many critics ascribe to Solomon, while even the severest allows it to be of the date of Herod. The date must always remain a mystery, but there are two considerations which may weigh in favor of fixing it very early.

- 1.** That, often as the town of Hebron may have been destroyed, this, being a tomb, would always be spared.
- 2.** It cannot, on architectural grounds, be later than Herod's time, while, on the other hand, it is omitted from the catalogue given by Josephus of the places which he rebuilt or adorned." The fullest historical notices of Machpelah will be found in Ritter, *Pal. und Syr.* vol. 3, and Robinson, *Bib. Res.* vol. 2. The chief authorities are Arculf (A.D. 700); Benjamin of Tudela (A.D. cir. 1170); the Jewish tract *Jichlus ha-Aboth* (in Hottinger, *Cippi hebraici*; and also in Wilson, 1:365); Ali Bey (*Travels*, A.D. 1807, 2:232,233); Giovanni Finati (*Life by Bankes*, 2:236); Monro (*Summer*

Ramble in 1833, 1:243); Lowe, in *Zeitung des Judenth.*, 1839, p. 272, 288. In a note by Asher to his edition of Benjamin of Tudela (2:92), mention is made of an Arabic MS. in the Bibliotheque Royale at Paris, containing an account of the condition of the mosque under Saladin. This MS. has not yet been published. The travels of Ibrahim el-Khijari in 166970, a small portion of which, from the manuscript in the Ducal Library at Gotha, has been published by Tuch, with translation, etc. (Leipzig, 1850), are said to contain a minute description of the mosque (Tuch, p. 2). The best description of the interior is that of Stanley, *Jewish Church and Sermons in the East* (the two are identical), in which he gives the singular narrative of rabbi Benjamin, and a letter of M. Pierotti, which appeared in the *Times* immediately after the prince of Wales's visit. A plan of the mosque is attached to Stanley's narrative. The description given by Ali Bey (*Travels*, vol. 2) is substantially the same as that of Dean Stanley. A few words about the exterior, a sketch of the masonry, and a view of the town, showing the enclosure standing prominently in the foreground, will be found in Bartlett's *Walks*, etc., p. 216-219. A photograph of the exterior, from the East (?), is given as No. 63 of *Palestine as it is*, by Rev. G. W. Bridges. A ground-plan exhibiting considerable detail, made by two Moslem architects who lately superintended some repairs in the Haram, and given by them to Dr. Barclay of Jerusalem, is engraved in Osborn's *Palestine, Past and Present*, p. 364. Thomson, *Land and Book*, 2:385 sq., gives some additional particulars; also Tristram, *Land of Israel*, p. 393 sq. **SEE HEBRON.**

Machzor

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

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

Mac Ilvaine

SEE MCILVAINE.

Mackee

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

volume entitled *A Critical Examination of the Offices of Christ*. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1868, p. 117.

Mackellar, Angus

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

Mackenzie, Charles Frederick

D.D., a prelate of the Church of England, and one of the noblest characters of our day, was born at Marcus Cottage, Peebleshire, Scotland, April 10, 1825, and was educated at Cambridge University, where he graduated with honor in 1848. After lecturing for a time at his alma mater, he decided upon the ministry, and was ordained by the bishop of Ely, and labored for some time in England as a parish minister. In 1854, bishop Selwyn, of New Zealand, returned to England, and pleaded earnestly for more laborers in the missionary field. Mackenzie felt persuaded that his duty lay in this direction, and in 1855 he accepted the position of archdeacon of Natal, and went out with the noted Colenso. His zeal in this new field, and his exemplary piety, are attested by all who knew Mackenzie at this time. In 1859 he returned to England to propose the establishment of other missions in Africa. Livingstone had just preceded him on a visit to England, and personally, as well as by the publication of his book on Central Africa, had awakened an unprecedented enthusiasm for that country. The establishment of a mission on the ground lately explored by Livingstone had just been determined upon, and Mackenzie's arrival at this time led to his appointment as the head of it. He was consequently consecrated bishop at Cape Town Jan. 1, 1861; four days after he sailed for the Zambesi, and, after some necessary explorations, settled for his work at a village named Magomero. The climate, which in his former work he had withstood so well, here soon undermined his health, and he died Jan. 31, 1862. "In any

calling Mackenzie would have been distinguished for his fine natural qualities. His cheerfulness, gentleness, and simplicity, supported as they were by manly candor and enduring firmness of purpose, and guided by an innate purity and integrity that shrank from the faintest touch of wrong, could not fail to excite the admiration of the most worldly-minded. Consecrated as these qualities were to the service of religion, and warmed by a glowing zeal that had nothing in common with fanaticism, they assume something like heroic proportions. Nor are the battles he fought, the victories he won, the sacrifices he made, for the great objects to which he devoted his life, and the sufferings he endured, unworthy of a record among the achievements of England's illustrious sons." The Christian spirit which the bishop manifested towards his Christian brethren of other churches is worthy of special mention. He labored in concurrence with them with cordiality and good will. His opposition to the slave-trade was decided, and made him many enemies. See Goodwin, *Memoir of Bishop Mackenzie* (Cambr. 1864, 8vo); *Spectator* (Lond.), March 5, 1864, p. 269; Mrs. Yonge, *Pioneers and Founders* (Lond. 1871, 12mo), p. 285 sq. (J. H. W.)

Mackenzie, Sir George

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

Mackey, James Love

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Lancaster County, Pa., Jan. 26, 1820. His early educational privileges were few, but, being fond of study, he

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

Mackie, Josias

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

Mackintosh, Sir James,

one of the most celebrated literary characters of the 19th century, distinguished alike as a philosopher, jurist, statesman, and historian was born at Aldourie, in the county of Inverness, Scotland, October 24, 1765. His early instruction and training fell into the hands of his grandfather, a man of great excellence. In 1783 he entered King's College, Aberdeen, where he formed an intimate acquaintance with the celebrated Robert Hall — a happy association which told upon the whole career of Mackintosh. He himself records the great influence which Hall's society and conversation had on his mind. They lived in the same house, were

constantly together, and led each other into controversies on the most abstruse points of theology and metaphysics. By their fellow students they were regarded as the intellectual leaders of the university, and under their auspices a society was formed in King's College, which was commonly designated "The Hall and Mackintosh Club." In 1784 he quitted King's College as IM.A., and removed to Edinburgh. His own inclinations were to the bar; family circumstances, however, obliged him to enter upon the study of medicine. But he by no means confined himself to his professional studies. "He mingled freely with the intellectual society of the place; divided his studious hours between medicine, metaphysics, and politics, intermingling with each excursions into its lighter literature and passing or past controversies, and he became a prominent speaker in the medical, physical, and speculative societies." Three years had been thus pleasantly spent when the time for his examination came, and, with diploma in hand, he turned southwards, and settled at London. It was a season of great political excitement when Mackintosh arrived in the great English metropolis, and, as the political arena was much more to his taste and inclination than walking the wards of a hospital, he improved the opportunity, and determined upon a strictly literary life. He supported himself for a while by writing for the newspapers, at the same time engaged in philosophical studies. In 1791 he finally published his *Vindiciae Gallicae*, in reply to Burke's *Reflections on the French Revolution* — a work which, though containing juvenile errors, at once gave him great renown; three editions were sold within the first year of its appearance before the public. "In sober philosophic thought, sound feeling, and common sense, it greatly surpassed the splendid philippic against which it was directed, and was enthusiastically lauded." The leading statesmen of England, among them Fox, Sheridan, and others, sought the author's acquaintance; and when the "Association of the Friends of the People" was formed, he was appointed secretary. Encouraged by this success, he turned to the legal profession in 1789, was called to the bar in 1795, and attained high eminence as a forensic lawyer. In 1799 he delivered a course of lectures on the *Law of Nature and of Nations* before the benchers of Lincoln's Inn, which were attended by audiences of the most brilliant description. Later he was made recorder of Bombay, and in 1806 was appointed judge of the Admiralty Court. His Indian career was highly creditable to his capacity and honorable to his character. After his return to England he entered Parliament as Whig member for Nairn (1813). In 1818 he accepted the professorship of law in the college of Haileybury,

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

We have thus far sketched the life of Sir James Mackintosh somewhat more in detail than the limited space of our Cyclopaedia really warrants, in order to enable our readers fully to appreciate the valuable services of this master-mind in the department of philosophy, not only so far as they were exerted directly, but also indirectly. It is not without reason that his distinguished friend Robert Hall said "that if Sir James Mackintosh had enjoyed leisure, and had exerted himself, he would have completely outdone Jeffrey and Stewart, and all the metaphysical writers of our time" (*Works* [Gregory's edition, New York, 1833, 3 vols. 8vo], 3:80). Neither can we afford to pass hastily by the man whom so eminent an authority as Morell (*Hist. and Crit. View of the Speculative Philosophy of Europe in the 19th Century* [N. Y. 1849, 8vo], p. 405) points out as one of the most eminent moralists of our day. "The ardor, the depth, and the learning," says Morell, "with which he combated the selfish systems, and pleaded for the

authority and sanctity of the moral faculty in man, contributed perhaps more than any single cause, not of a religious nature, to oppose the bold advances of utilitarianism, and infuse a healthier tone into the moral principles of the country. Without signifying our adherence to his peculiar theory respecting conscience [viz. “that conscience, or the moral faculty, is not an original part of our constitution, but a ‘secondary formation,’ created at a later period of life by the effect of the association of ideas out of a variety of elements existing in the mind” (comp. *N. A. Rev.* 35:451; also M’Cosh, *Intuitions of the Mind*, p. 253)], we still regard his thoughts and speculations as taking eminently the right direction, and had he obtained leisure to mature his views, and give them to the world in his own forcible and glowing style, it is the opinion of some best able to judge upon the subject (e.g. Robert Hall and Dr. Chalmers) that he would have placed the whole theory of morals upon a higher and more commanding position than it had ever occupied before in this country [England].” Besides this work on *Ethical Philosophy* (republished Philad. 1834, 8vo), Mackintosh’s chief metaphysical writings were published in the *Edinburgh Review*, to which he frequently contributed (for a list of them, see Allibone). His *Miscellaneous Works*, including the contributions to the *Edinburgh Review*, were published in 1846, 3 vols. 8vo, and also in a single volume sq. crown 8vo. See *Memoirs of the Life of the Right Hon. Sir James Mackintosh*, edited by his son, Robert James Mackintosh, Esq. (1835, 2 vols. 8vo); *Edinb. Rev.* 1835 (Oct.); *Brit. Quart. Rev.* 1846 (Nov.); *North Am. Rev.* 1832 (Oct.); and especially the very elaborate and able article in Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Am. Authors*, 2:1179-1188. (J. H. W.)

Macklaurin, John

an eminent Scotch divine, was born in October, 1693, at Glendarnel, Argyleshire, where his father was then pastor. John was unfortunately early made an orphan, and he was taken in care by his uncle, the Rev. David Macklaurin, who educated John for the ministry, first at Glasgow, and later at Leyden, Holland. In 1717 he was licensed by the Presbytery of Dumbarton, and two years after was appointed minister at Luss, on the west bank of Loch Lomond. In 1723 he was promoted to a more responsible charge, the north-west parish of Glasgow. Here he died, Sept. 8, 1754, ‘deeply regretted by a numerous and attached congregation, as well as by the general community of Christians in Britain.’ His sermons and essays, many of which have been published, have received the highest commendations, and are even in our day in general favor with the clergy of

Great Britain. The most valuable are *An Essay on the Prophecies relating to the Messiah, and three Sermons* (Edinb. 1773, 8vo), said to have been the germ of the large and valuable work of bishop Hurd *On Prophecy; Prejudices against the Gospel*; and his sermons *On the Sins of Men not chargeable to God, and Glorifying in the Cross of Christ*, all contained in his *Sermons and Essays*, published by the Rev. John Gillies (2d ed. London, 1772, 12mo), where may also be found an account of the life of John Macklaurin. See Jamieson, *Cyclopaedia of Religious Biography*, s.v.; Brown, *Introductory Essay in Works of Macklaurin* (1824).

Macklin, Alexander, D.D.

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

Macknight, James, D.D.,

an eminent Scotch divine, was born in Ayrshire in 1721. He studied in the University of Glasgow, but, like many of the Presbyterian divines both of his own country and of England, went abroad, and finished his studies at Leyden. On his return he entered the ministry in the Scotch Church (in 1753) as pastor of Maybole, in Ayrshire. Here he spent sixteen years, during which time he prepared three works: *A Harmony of the Gospels* (Land. 1756, 2 vols. 4to), with copious illustrations, being, in fact, a life of Christ, embracing everything which the evangelists have related concerning him: — *A new Translation of the Epistles* (published in 1795 in 4 vols. 4to, and later in 6 vols. 8vo): — and *Truth of Gospel History* (1763, 4to). These works were favorably received, and are to this day highly esteemed. The *Harmony* has been repeatedly printed, and to the later editions there are added several dissertations on curious points in the history or

antiquities of the Jews. The theology of them is what is called moderately orthodox. For these his valuable services to sacred literature Dr. Macknight received the rewards in the power of the Presbyterian Church to give. The degree of D.D. was conferred upon him by the University of Edinburgh. In 1769 he was removed from Maybole to the more desirable parish of Jedburgh, and in 1772 he became one of the ministers at Edinburgh. Here he continued for the remainder of his life, useful in the ministry and an ornament of the Church. He died Jan. 13, 1800. Of Dr. Macknight's translation of the epistles, universally regarded as his best production, Horne says that it is "a work of theological labor not often paralleled. If we cannot always coincide with the author in opinion, we can always praise his diligence, his learning, and his piety-qualities which confer no trifling rank on any scriptural interpreter or commentator." Dr. W. L. Alexander, however, is not quite so commendatory of Dr. Macknight's scholarship: "This work, which was the result of thirty years' labor, soon obtained and long kept a high reputation. Of late years it has perhaps sunk into unmerited neglect, for there is much in it well deserving the attention of the Biblical student. Its greatest defects are traceable to two causes — the author's imperfect knowledge of the original languages of the Bible, and the want of fixed hermeneutical principles. In tracing out, however, the *connection* of a passage, especially of an argumentative kind, he often shows great ability." See *Life*, by his son, prefixed to the *Epistles* (in the editions since 1806); Kitto, *Bibl. Cyclop.* s.v.; *English Cyclop.*

Maclaine, Archibald, D.D.

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

Maclay, Archibald, D.D.

or, as he was familiarly known by Christians of all denominations, "Father Maclay," a noted Baptist minister, was born in Killlearn, Scotland, May 14, 1778, and in 1802 entered the ministry at Kirkaldy, in Fifeshire. In 1804 he was appointed a missionary to the East Indies, but the government objected, and he was obliged to stay at home. By advice of his friends he

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

Maclean, Archibald

an English Baptist minister, was born May 1, 1733 (O. S.), at East Kilbride, in Lanarkshire. He was for many years pastor of the Baptist Church in Edinburgh, and was founder of the Baptist congregations in Scotland. He died in Edinburgh Dec. 12, 1812. Mr. Maclean published *Paraphrase and Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Edinb. 1811-17, 2 vols. 12mo; Lond. 1819, 2 vols. 12mo; Aberdeen, 1847, 2 vols. 12mo). A collective edition of Maclean's works, including the above work,

sermons, etc., with a memoir of his life and writings by Rev. W. Jones, was published (Lond. 1823, 6 vols. 8vo; vol. 7, 1852, 18mo; Edinb. 6 vols. 12mo). — Kitto, *Cyclop. Of Bibl. Lit.* vol. 2, s.v.; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Am. Authors*, s.v.

Maclennan, James,

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

Macmillanites

SEE SCOTLAND, REFORMED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN.

Macneile, Hugh, D.D.,

an Irish divine of note, was born in 1793, at Ballycastle, in the county of Antrim, Ireland; was educated at Trinity College, Dublin, where he received both the degree of A.M. and D.D.; also the appointment of canon of Chester. In 1822 he married the daughter of Dr. Magee, late archbishop of Dublin, in whose family he had been tutor. After preaching for some years in London, where he attracted large congregations, chiefly at Charlotte-Street Chapel, Fitzroy Square, he became successively incumbent of St. Jude's, Liverpool, and of St. Paul's, Prince's Park, near

Liverpool. In 1868 he was made dean of Ripon. He died in 1872. He published *The Church and the Churches, or the Church of God in Christ militant here on Earth* (1847, 8vo): — *Lectures on the Church of England* (12mo): — *Lectures on the Prophecies of the Jews* (1842, 12mo): — *Lectures on the Sympathies, etc., of our Saviour*: — (12mo): — *Letters on Seceding from the Church* (12mo): — *Sermons on the Second Advent* (12mo): — *Seventeen Sermons* (12mo). He also published several separate sermons, addresses, and controversial pamphlets.

Macon, Councils Of

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

Macrobius

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

Ma'cron

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

Macurdy

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

Macwhorter, Alexander, D.D.,

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

Mad

SEE MADNESS.

Madagascar

an island situated to the south-east of the African continent, in lat. $11^{\circ} 57' - 25^{\circ} 38' S.$, and longitude about 430 - 510; length, 1030 miles; greatest breadth, 350 miles; area estimated at 240,000 square miles, therefore

covering a territory larger than the British Isles, contains a population of nearly five millions.

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

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

The religion of these natives not converts to Christianity, is strictly heathen. Mohammedanism never made its way to them, and has no converts among them. Aside from Christianity, they have no accurate conception of God. The Supreme Being they style *Fragrant Prince*. “Their ideas of a future state, and, indeed, their whole religious system, is indefinite, discordant, and puerile; it is a compound of heterogeneous

elements, borrowed in part from the superstitious fears and practices of Africa, the opinions of the ancient Egyptians, and the prevalent idolatrous systems of India, blended with the usages of the Malayan Archipelago. There are no public temples in honor of any divinity, nor any order of men exclusively devoted to the priesthood, but the keeper of idols receives the offerings of the people, presents their requests, and pretends to give the response of the god. They worship also at the grave or the tomb of their ancestors” (Newcomb, p. 521). They practice circumcision, have the division of weeks into seven days, abstain from swine’s flesh, and follow other Jewish practices. Marriage is general, but polygamy prevails, and conjugal fidelity scarcely exists among the non-Christianized.

Introduction of Christianity. — In 1816, Radama, the king of the Hovas, virtually even then the prince of all Madagascar, entered into diplomatic and commercial relations with the English. Only two years later — in 1818 Protestant missionaries set out for it, and ultimately this African isle became “one of the countries where the rapid and easy triumph of Christianity equals the most brilliant episodes in the history of Christian propagandism,” and a lasting rebuke to those Roman Catholics who have dared to pronounce Protestant missions *a failure*. The first Protestant missionaries were sent out by the London Missionary Society; and their mission, from the beginning, was very successful. The whole Bible was circulated in the native language; about one hundred schools were established, and from ten to fifteen thousand persons received Christian instruction. Suddenly, however, Radama died (July 27, 1828), and was succeeded by Ranavala Manjaka, a woman of great cruelty, and inimical to Europeans. With her accession to the throne of Madagascar opened a fiery ordeal of persecution, lasting for nearly thirty years. Europeans were banished from the isle; the public profession of Christianity was forbidden; churches and schools were closed, and many of the members of the churches were persecuted to death. The conduct of the converts was most exemplary; by their constancy, and many by their death, they refuted the slanders of Romanists that the converts of the Protestant mission churches consist, for a large part, of men who seek to obtain a lucrative position. In 1862 queen Ranavala Manjaka died, and her son was proclaimed king under the title of Radama II. With his accession to the throne of Madagascar the period of religious toleration recommenced, and, although for a moment the assassination of the king (in 1863; he was strangled, and his own wife selected as his successor, the government having been

modified into a constitutional form) spread alarm among the Christians, the missionaries of the London Society resumed their labors, and they were agreeably surprised in seeing that, in spite of all persecution, the Christian congregations had maintained themselves. . In 1867, the erection of four memorial churches on places where the first martyrs of Christianity fell a prey to heathen superstitions of Madagascar was projected; three of these have already been completed, and the fourth is in progress. (See *Christian Advocate*, Nashville, Tenn., Dec. 2, 1871.) But the greatest triumph the Gospel achieved in Madagascar in 1869 was when the now reigning queen, Ranavala II (she succeeded to the throne April 11 1868), and, with her, a majority of the natives, threw away their idols, and embraced Christianity much in the same way as the ancient Britons did many centuries ago. See the *Missionary Advocate* (N. Y., Feb. 15, 1870).

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

The number of Christians in Madagascar is now estimated at more than 325,000. In 1888, the English missionaries (Episcopalians, Methodists, and Friends), — who have their head-quarters at the adjoining island of

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

Ma'dai

(Heb. *Maday'*, *ydm*; Sept. *Μαδοί*, ^{<0102>}Genesis 10:2, a MEDE *SEE MEDE* [q.v.], as elsewhere rendered), the third son of Japhet (^{<0102>}Genesis 10:2), from whom the Medes, etc., are supposed to have descended. B.C. post 2514. *SEE ETHNOLOGY*.

Madan, Martin

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

Madan, Spencer

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

Madan, Spencer

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

Madeira

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

The Roman Catholic Church is the established religion of Madeira, and until recently none other was tolerated. In 1839, Dr. Kalley, a physician,

began to disseminate Protestant doctrines, and ultimately the Scotch Church took up the work most successfully began by Dr. Kalley. The spirit of persecution, so general in Romish countries, was not wanting here, and there was great opposition to Protestantism. The first missionary to the island was the Rev. W. Hewitson, who arrived there in 1845, but for a long time the opposition of the government was so severe that he was obliged to confine his labors mainly to Dr. Kalley's converts. So uncomfortable were natives who chose the Protestant communion, that in 1846 some 800 of them left for Trinidad and for the United States. At present the Protestants have quite a hold on the country. Besides an English Church, there are other places of worship, including a Presbyterian Church in connection with the Free Church of Scotland. The educational institutions comprise the Portuguese College, and Lancasterian and government schools. See White, *Madeira, its Climate and Scenery*; Schultze, *Die Insel Madeiras* (Stuttg. 1864); Chambers's *Eyncyclop. s.v.*; Newcomb, *Cyclopaedia of Missions, s.v.*

Madhava

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

Mâdhavâchârya

(i.e. Madhava, the Acharya or *spiritual teacher*), one of the greatest Hindu scholars and divines of the mediaeval literature of India, is said to have been born at Pampa, a village situated on the bank of the river Tungabhadra, probably near the beginning of the 14th century. He was prime minister of Sangama, the son of Kampa, whose reign at Vijayanagara commenced about 1336, and also under king Bukka I, who succeeded Harihara I about 1361. He died at the age of ninety, probably towards the close of the 14th century. Maldhavacharya is famed for his numerous and important works on Vedic, philosophical, legal, and grammatical writings of the ancient Hindus. The most important of these are his great commentaries on the Rig-, Yajur-, and Sima-veda, **SEE VEDA**; an exposition of the Mimhnsa philosophy; a summary account of fifteen religious and philosophical systems of Indian speculation; some treatises on the Vedanta philosophy; another on salvation; a history of Sankara's (q.v.) polemics against multifarious misbelievers and heretics; a commentary on Parasara's code of law; a work on determining time, especially in reference

to the observation of religious acts; and a grammatical commentary on Sanscrit radicals and their derivatives. The chief performance of Mcdhava is doubtless the series of his great commentaries on the Vedas, for without them no conscientious scholar could attempt to penetrate the sense of those ancient Hindu works. In these commentaries Mhdhava labors to account for the grammatical properties of Vedic words and forms, records their traditional sense, and explains the drift of the Vedic hymns, legends, and rites. So great was Madhavacharya's learning and wisdom that popular superstition assigned them a supernatural origin. He was supposed to have received them from the goddess Bhuvaneswari, the consort of Siva, who, gratified by his incessant devotions, became manifest to him in a human shape, conferred on him the gift of extraordinary knowledge, and changed his name to *Vidyâranya* (the "Forest of Learning"), a title by which he is sometimes designated in Hindu writings.

Madi'abun

([Ἰησοῦ] Ἡμαβαδούν v. r. Μαδιαβούν; Vulg. omits), a name interpolated in 1 Esdras V, 38 as that of a Levite whose "sons" assisted at the restoration of the Temple under Zorobabel; but the Heb. list (^{<1818D>}Ezra 3:9) has nothing resembling or corresponding to it.

Ma'dian

(Judith 2:26; ^{<4172>}Acts 7:29). *SEE MIDIAN.*

Madison, James, D.D.,

an early Episcopal prelate in America, was born near Port Republic, Rockingham County, Va., Aug. 27, 1749; passed A.B. in the College of William and Mary in 1772; was soon after admitted to the bar, which he abandoned for the ministry; in 1773 became professor of mathematics in his alma mater; in 1775 proceeded to England for ordination, was licensed for Virginia, but on his return resumed his duties as professor in his alma mater, of which he became president in 1777. He afterwards revisited England to see Cavallo and other scientific men. In 1784 he was changed to the chair of natural and moral philosophy. In 1788 he was chosen bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Virginia, and in 1790 was consecrated in England. Under his care the College of William and Mary advanced steadily in reputation. He discharged his duties with zeal and fidelity until his death, March 6, 1812. In his theology bishop Madison was

much of a rationalist, and is charged by bishop Coxe (*Am. Ch. Rev.* Jan. 1872, p. 35 and 46) with having given “something worse than a negative support” to this dangerous element in the Church. He published some *Sermons, Letters, and Addresses*; also *A Eulogy on Washington* (1800). See Sprague, *Annals*, v. 318; Drake, *Dict. of Am. Biog.* S. v.

Madman

SEE MADNESS.

Madmann'nah

(Hebrew *Madmannah'*, חַמְדַּמְנָה *dunghill*; Sept. **Μεδεμηνά** and **Μαδμηνά**, v. r. **Μαχαρίμ** and **Βέδ**; Vulg. *Medemena* and *hadnmena*), a town in the extreme south of Judah (^{<1351>}Joshua 15:31, where it is mentioned between Ziklag and Sansannah), hence included in the territory afterwards assigned to Simeon. From ^{<1351>}1 Chronicles 2:49, it appears to have been founded or, rather, occupied by Shaaph (or perhaps by a son of his whose name it bore), the son of Caleb's concubine Maachah. Eusebius and Jerome identify it with a town of their time called *Menois* (**Μηνώϊς**), near the city of Gaza (*Onomast.* p. 89). SEE **MADMENAH**. Instead of Madmannah and Sansannah of ^{<1351>}Joshua 15:31, the parallel passage (^{<1351>}Joshua 19:5; comp. ^{<1351>}1 Chronicles 4:31), enumerating the Simeonitish cities, has BETH-MARCABOTH and Hazar-susim, probably the same respectively (Keil's *Joshua*, ad loc.). Schwarz thinks (*Palestine*, p. 101) that it was the Levitical city *Mandah*, in which, according to the “Book of Jasher,” Simeon was buried; but this locality is wholly apocryphal. The first stage southward from Gaza is now el-Minyây (Robinson, *Researches*, 1:563), which, in default of a better, is suggested by Kiepert (in his *Map*, 1856) as the modern representative of Menois, and therefore of Madmannah.' A more plausible identification, however, is that of Van de Velde (*Travels*, 2:130) of the modern ruined village *Mirkihb*, west of the south end of the Dead Sea, as a representative of the ancient Beth-marcaboth.

Mad'men

(Heb. *Madmen'*, חַמְדַּמְנָה *dunghill*; Sept. **παῦσις** v. r. **Μαδαιβημά**, **Μαδαμημά**, and **Μαδενηβά**; Vulg. *silens*), a Moabitish town, threatened with destruction by the sword from the Babylonian invasion in connection with the neighboring Heshbon (^{<1351>}Jeremiah 48:2). Some (as Hitzig, after

the Sept., Vulg., etc.) regard it as an appellative; and in some editions of the Auth. Vers. it is actually printed “O madmen!” The slight notice only affords an approximate location opposite the northern extremity of the Dead Sea. *SEE MADMENAH.*

Madme’ nah

(Heb. *Madmenah*’, *hnmelæj* *dunghill*; Sept. *Μαδεβηνά*, *Vulg.* *Medemena*), a town named in ^{<2301>}Isaiah 10:31, where it is placed on the route of the Assyrian invaders, in the northern vicinity of Jerusalem, between Nob and Gibeah. It has been confounded by Eusebius and Jerome with MADMANNAH, which is much too far southward to suit the context. “Gesenius (*Jesaias*, p. 414) points out that the verb in the sentence is active — ‘Madmenah flies,’ not, as in the A. Vers., ‘is removed’ (so also Michaelis, *Bibelfii- Ungelehrten*). Madmenah is not impossibly alluded to by Isaiah (25:10) in his denunciation of Moab, where the word rendered in the Auth. Vers. ‘dunghill’ is identical with that name. The original text (or *Kethib*), by a variation in the preposition (*ymb* for *wmb*), reads the ‘waters of Madmenah.’ If this is so, the reference may be either to the Madmenah of Benjamin — one of the towns in a district abounding with corn and threshing-floors — or, more appropriately still, to MADMEN, the Moabitish town. Gesenius (*Jesaias*, p. 786) appears to have overlooked this, which might have induced him to regard with more favor a suggestion that seems to have been first made by Joseph Kimchi.”

Madness

The words rendered by “mad,” “madman,” “madness,” etc., in the A. Vers., vary considerably in the Hebrew of the O.T. In ^{<6338>}Deuteronomy 28:28, 34; ^{<9213>}1 Samuel 21:13,14,15, etc. (*μανία*, etc., in the Sept.), they are derivatives of the root *[gñ; shaga*’, “to be stirred or excited;” in ^{<2516>}Jeremiah 25:16; 1, 38; 51:7; ^{<2017>}Ecclesiastes 1:17, etc. (Sept. *περιφορά*), from the root *l l h; hal*’, “to flash out,” applied (like the Greek *φλέγειν*) either to light or sound; in ^{<2445>}Isaiah 44:25, from *l Ksj sakkal*’, “to make void or foolish” (Sept. *μωραίνειν*); in ^{<8124>}Zechariah 12:4, from *Tmiĭ; tamah*’, “to wander” (Sept. *ἔκστασις*). In the N.T. they are generally used to render *μαίνεσθαι* or *μανία* (as in ^{<6011>}John 10:20; ^{<4921>}Acts 26:24; ^{<6423>}1 Corinthians 14:23); but in ^{<6026>}2 Peter 2:16 the word is *παραφρονία*, and in ^{<6011>}Luke 6:11, *ἄνοια*. The term is used in Scripture

in its proper and old sense of a raving maniac or demented person (^{<633>}Deuteronomy 28:34; ^{<921>}1 Samuel 21:13; ^{<600>}John 10:20; ^{<643>}1 Corinthians 14:23), and may be medically defined to be delirium without fever. Our Lord cured by his word several who were deprived of the exercise of their rational powers, and the circumstances of their histories prove that there could neither be mistake nor collusion respecting them. See LUNATIC. How far madness may be allied to, or connected with demoniacal possession (as implied in one passage, ^{<600>}John 10:20), is a very intricate inquiry; and whether in the present day (as perhaps anciently) evil spirits may not take advantage from distemperature of the bodily frame to augment evils endured by the patient is more than may be affirmed, though the idea seems to be not absolutely repugnant to reason (see Thomson, *Land and Book*. 1:213). *SEE DAEMONIAC*. The term “mad” is likewise applied in Scripture, as in common life, to any subordinate but violent disturbance of the mental faculties, whether springing from a disordered intellect (as by over-study, ^{<454>}Acts 26:24, 25; from startling intelligence, ^{<415>}Acts 12:15; from preternatural excitement, ^{<397>}Hosea 9:7; ^{<345>}Isaiah 44:25; from resistance of oppression, ^{<207>}Ecclesiastes 7:7; from inebriety, ^{<256>}Jeremiah 25:16; 51:7; or simple fatuity, ^{<191>}2 Kings 9:11; ^{<226>}Jeremiah 29:26), or from irregular and furious passion (e.g. as a persecutor, ^{<451>}Acts 26:11; ^{<947>}Psalm 102:8; from idolatrous hallucination, Jeremiah 1, 38; or wicked and extravagant jollity, ^{<202>}Ecclesiastes 2:2). In like manner, “madness” expresses not only proper insanity (^{<633>}Deuteronomy 28:28, and so “madman,” ^{<921>}1 Samuel 21:15; ^{<268>}Proverbs 26:18). but also a reckless state of mind (^{<203>}Ecclesiastes 10:13), bordering on delirium (^{<326>}Zechariah 12:4), whether induced by overstrained intellectual efforts (^{<207>}Ecclesiastes 1:17; 2:12), from blind rage (^{<462>}Luke 6:12), or the effect of depraved tempers (^{<205>}Ecclesiastes 7:25; 9:3; ^{<606>}2 Peter 2:6). David’s madness (^{<921>}1 Samuel 21:13) is by many supposed not to have been feigned, but a real epilepsy or falling sickness; and the Sept. uses words which strongly indicate this sense (ἐπιπτεν ἐπὶ τὰς θύρας). It is urged in support of this opinion that the troubles which David underwent might very naturally weaken his constitutional strength, and that the force he suffered in being obliged to seek shelter in a foreign court would disturb his imagination in the highest degree. A due consideration, however, of the context and all the circumstances only serves to strengthen the opinion that it was feigned for obvious reasons (see Kitto’s *Daily Bible Illustr.* ad loc.). “It is well known that among Oriental, as among most semi-civilized nations, madmen were

looked upon with a kind of reverence, as possessed of a quasi-sacred character (see Lane, in *od* E. 2:346). This arises partly, no doubt, from the feeling that one on whom God's hand is laid heavily should be safe from all other harm, but partly also from the belief that the loss of reason and self-control opened the mind to supernatural influence, and gave it therefore a supernatural sacredness. This belief was strengthened by the enthusiastic expression of idolatrous worship (see ^{<1183>}1 Kings 18:26, 28), and (occasionally) of real inspiration (see ^{<992>}1 Samuel 19:21-24; comp. the application of 'mad fellow' in ^{<1291>}2 Kings 9:11, and see ^{<2926>}Jeremiah 29:26; ^{<4423>}Acts 2:13.)”

Ma'don

(Heb. hadon', [^]/dm; *strife*, as in ^{<1518>}Proverbs 15:18, etc.; Sept. Μαδών v. r. Μαρῶν), a Canaanitish city in the north of Palestine, ruled over by a king named Jobab in the time of Joshua, who captured it (^{<610>}Joshua 11:1; 12:19). Calmet (*Dict. s.v.*), arbitrarily conjecturing that *Maron* is the true reading, refers to *Maronia*, a small village of Syria thirty miles east of Antioch (Jerome, *Vit. Malachi* 2), probably the place alluded to by Ptolemy (5:15, 8, Μαρωνιάς) as lying in the province of Chalcidice. Schwarz infers (*Palest.* p. 90, 173) from rabbinical notices (chiefly a statement of the early Jewish traveler hap-Parchi in Asher's *Benj. of Tudela*, p. 430) that the site is that of the present *Kefrenda*, a considerable village at the foot of the hills north of Diocaesarea, containing a very deep well and some traces of antiquity, which Dr. Robinson (new edit. of *Researches*, 3:109-111) is inclined to regard as marking the place of the Asochis of Josephus (Lije, 41, 45, 68; *War*, 1:4, 2; *int.* 13:12, 4), although admitting that the latter may be referred to Tell ed-Bedawiveh, in the vicinity.

“In the Sept. version of ^{<1021>}2 Samuel 21:20, the Hebrew words [^]/dm; vyaéa man of stature,’ are rendered ἀνὴρ Μαδών, ‘a man of Madon.’ This may refer to the town Madon, or may be merely an instance of the habit which these translators had of rendering literally in (Greek letters Hebrew words which they did not understand. Other instances will be found in ^{<1218>}2 Kings 6:8; 9:13; 12:9; 15:16, etc.”

Madonna

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

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

Madox, Isaac, D.D.

an English divine, was born in London in 1697; was educated at one of the universities of Scotland, and at Queen's College, Cambridge; was successively curate of St. Bride's, domestic chaplain to Dr. Waddington, bishop of Chichester; rector of St. Vedast, in Foster Lane, London. In 1729 he was appointed clerk of the closet to queen Caroline; in 1733 became dean of Wells; in 1736, bishop of St. Asaph; was translated to the see of Worcester in 1743, and died in 1759. Dr. Madox published a number of *Sermons* (London, 1734-53), and a review of the first volume of Neal's *Hist. of the Puritans*, entitled *A Vindication of the Government*,

Doctrine, and Worship of the Church of England established in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth (1733, 8vo). — Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.; Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* 7:208.

Madras

one of the three presidencies of the Indian Empire, occupies the greater part of the south of the peninsula of Hindustan, including the coast lands, Malabar, the Laccadive Islands, and the Coromandel coast, in all covering an area of 138,856 square miles, with 31,672,613 inhabitants in 1885 (according to Behm, *Geoagr. Jahrbuch*, 1870, eleven twelfths are Hindus, and some 80,000 adherents of Mohammedanism). The tributary states Mysore, Cochin, Travancore, Pudocotta, and Djayapur are virtually a part of Madras, and are therefore included in our statistics of Madras. The capital of this presidency is a city of like name, and is situated on the Coromandel coast, the western shore of the Bay of Bengal, in lat. 13^o 5' N. It stretches along the coast, with its nine suburbs, for nine miles, with an average breadth of three and one half miles. Its inhabitants number 405,948 (1887), among them about 30,000 native Christians. Madras was the first hold of the English secured by the occupation of Fort George (situated on the coast midway between the north and south extremities of the city) in 1639. It is now truly an Indo-European city. Like Calcutta and Bombay, it is a gathering-place for the missionaries of the different denominations and associations, and the basis for all missionary enterprise in southern India. Madras is the seat of the Anglican see of Madras, established in 1835. The missionary societies at work there are the "Society for the Propagation of the Gospel," the "London Missionary Society," the "Church Missionary Society" (which started in 1805), the "Wesleyan Missionary Society," the "Church of Scotland," the "American Board" (commenced there in 1836), and the "Free Church of Scotland." Its principal buildings and institutions are the Government House, a handsome edifice, though much inferior to the similar establishments in Calcutta, and even in Bombay; one of the finest light-houses in the world; the Scotch Church of St. Andrew, founded in 1818, a stately and beautiful edifice; a university, with three European professors, and numerous teachers both European and native, and containing a valuable museum and a library; St. George's Cathedral, from which a magnificent view of the city and its vicinity may be obtained, and containing several monuments by Chantrey (including one of bishop Heber), and some figures by Flaxman. There are also male, military, and female orphan asylums, a medical school, a branch of the Royal Asiatic

Society, the Madras Polytechnic Institution, the Government Observatory, a mint, eight established Episcopal churches, among them a cathedral, besides numerous places of worship of other Christian denominations, and the Madras Club, to which members of the Bengal and Bombay clubs are admitted as honorary members. See Grundemann, *Missions-Atlas*, No. 14 and 15; Newcomb, *Cyclop. of Missions*, s.v., also under Hindostan; Wheeler, *Madras in the Olden Times* (Madras, 1861-62, 3 vols. 8vo); Aikman, *Cyclop. of Missions*, p. 148, 272. **SEE INDIA.**

Madruzzius, Christopher,

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

Madura

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

Madura

(2), a maritime district in the south of British India, in the presidency of Madras (q.v.), has an area of about 10,700 square miles, and a population of 1,790,000. Eastward from the shore runs a narrow ridge of sand and rocks, mostly dry, and which almost connects Ceylon with the continent. Cotton is the chief commercial crop; and sugar-cane, betel-nut, and

tobacco are also grown. In this district the “American Board” began its labors in 1834, and now sustains a very successful mission in fourteen stations. The Roman Catholics gained a strong hold here by the accommodation theory of Roberto dei Nobili in the opening of the 17th century. A vicariate, formerly a part of Pondicherry, was established for Madura in 1846, and is in the care of the Jesuits, who recommenced labors there in 1836. The principal town is Madura, on the river Vygat, with several noteworthy public buildings, and the seat of a Roman Catholic and a Protestant mission. Madura, in former days, was the capital of a kingdom, the center of South Indian culture and learning. See Grundemann, *Missions-Atlas*, No. 14 and 15. *SEE INDIA*.

Mae’lus

(Μαῆλος v. r. Μίληλος, Vulg. *Michelus*), given (1 Esdras 9:26) as the name of an Israelite whose posterity returned from Babylon, in place of the MIAMIN (q.v.) of the Hebrew text (^{<51025>}Ezra 10:25).

Maffei, Bernard

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

Maffei, Francesco Scipione de

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

collected works were published at Venice (1790, 18 vols. 8vo). — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 8:661; *Life and Times of Palleario* (Rome, 1860, 2 vols. 8vo), vol. 1 and 2.

Maffei, Giovanni Pietro

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

Maffei, Vegius

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

Maffit, John Newland

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born of Episcopal parentage at Dublin, Ireland, Dec. 28, 1794; was destined for the mercantile profession by his parents, but, joining the Wesleyans in 1813, he

determined upon the ministry. Opposed by his friends and family at home, he emigrated to this country in 1819, and not long after his arrival became a member of the New England Conference. For twelve succeeding years he was stationed in the different cities of New England, then removed to New York, acting thereafter only as a local preacher, moving at his own discretion, and preaching and lecturing at such points as offered. In 1835, conjointly with Rev. Lewis Garrett, he issued in Nashville, Tenn., the first number of *The Western Methodist* (now *The Christian Advocate*, the central organ of the Methodist Episcopal Church South). In 1836-1837 he was agent for La Grange College, in Alabama, and subsequently was elected to the chair of elocution and belles-lettres in that institution; but he gave little attention to its duties, and the chair was soon discontinued. In 1841 he was chaplain of the lower house of Congress. His advent West and South-west was marked by a quickened religious interest in the popular mind. Vast assemblies gathered to hear him, and thousands, directly through his instrumentality, were added to the Church. Returning to New York, he became somewhat lax in his Church relations, and consequently lost his membership. In 1847 he removed to Arkansas, and there joined the Methodist Episcopal Church South, and was licensed to preach *de novo*. After laboring for a year or two with a success small in comparison with his previous history, he left Arkansas for the Gulf cities. His last days were spent in carrying on a religious meeting, in a small chapel of a suburban villa of Mobile, Ala. Public interest could no more be evoked by him who had been its master in the wilderness and in the city, as well as the street-preacher, the lecturer, or the camp-meeting leader. The spell was broken, or the spirit of the man. He died suddenly, of heart rupture, near Mobile, May 28, 1850. "Though amiable, he had the appearance of vanity, which provoked criticisms; and, though forgiving and gentle, his zeal in the prosecution of his Master's cause and his boldness in the rebuke of sin often waked up enemies. His social relaxations were thought by many to run into indiscretions and follies that marred his character and his influence in private life. See Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, vol. 7.

Mag

SEE RAB-MAG.

Magalhaeus, Gabriel de

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

Magalhaeus, Pedro de

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

Magarita, Magarites

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

Mag'bish

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

Mag'dala

(**Μαγδαλά** [v. r. **Μαγαδᾶν**], prob. the Chald. emphatic form of the Hebrew **ל מגידל** *Migdal, a tower*; see Paulus, *Comm.* 2:437 sq.), a town in Galilee opposite the Sea of Tiberias (Otho, *Lex. Rabb.* p. 401). It is mentioned only in ^{<4159>}Matthew 15:39, as a place to which Jesus repaired after having crossed the lake, “though the best MSS. (Sin., Vat., D.) read *Magadan*, which, Alford observes, ‘appears to have been the original reading, but the better-known name Magdala was substituted for it.’ It is not unusual, however, for Syrian villages to have two names, and for the same name to have different forms. The parallel passage in ^{<4180>}Mark 8:10 has *Dalmanutha* (**Δαλμανουθά**), though here also some MSS. read *Magdalas* and some *Magada* (Alford, ad loc.). A close examination of the Gospel narrative, and a comparison of the parallel passages in Matthew and Mark (^{<4159>}Matthew 15:39; 16:1-13, with ^{<4180>}Mark 8:10-27), prove that Magdala or Magadan must have been situated on the western shore of the Sea of Galilee, and Dalmanutha was probably a village near it, for the whole shore of the lake was then lined with towns and villages. Eusebius and Jerome locate this place, which they call *Magedan*, on the east of the Sea of Galilee, and they say there was in their day a district of *Magedena* around Gerasa (**καί ἐστι νῦν ἡ Μαγαιδανὴ περὶ τὴν Γεράσσαν**; *Onomast.* s.v. Magedan). They also state that Mark (8:10) reads **Μαγαιδᾶν**, though Jerome’s version has *Dalmanutha*. The old Latin version has *Magada*. In some editions of Josephus a *Magdala* is mentioned on the east side of the lake (*Life*, p. 24), but the best MSS. read *Gamala* (Robinson, *B.* R. 2:397; *Josephus*, by Hudson, ad loc.). Lightfoot places Magdala beyond Jordan, but his reasons are not satisfactory (*Operat.* 2:413)” (Kitto). The above position on the western shore, although it has usually been located on the eastern (see Robinson’s *Researches*, 3:278; Strong’s *Harmony of the Gospels*, § 70), is confirmed by the Jerusalem Talmud (compiled at Tiberias), which several times speaks of Magdala as being adjacent to Tiberias and Hamath, or the hot springs (Lightfoot, *Choaog. Cent.* cap. lxxvi). It was a seat of Jewish learning after the destruction of Jerusalem, and the rabbins of Magdala are often mentioned in the Talmud (Lightfoot, *I. c.*). M. De Saulcy, however, takes an opposite view on all these points (*Narrative*, 2:355-357), as Pococke had done before (*Observations*, 2:71). In the Gospels it is principally referred to as probably the birthplace of Mary Magdalen, i.e. the *Magdalene* (q.v.), or of Magdala. A small Moslem village, bearing the name of *Illejdel*, is now

found on the shore of the lake about three miles north by west of Tiberias, and the name and situation are very strongly in favor of the conclusion that it represents the Magdala of Scripture. It evidently (like the ancient town) derived its name from a tower or castle, and here Buckingham found the ruins of an old structure of this kind (*Trav.* 1:404). He speaks of it as being a small village close to the edge of the lake, beneath a range of high cliffs, in which small grottoes are seen, with the remains of an old square tower, and some larger buildings of rude construction, apparently of great antiquity. "A large solitary thorn-tree stands beside it. The situation, otherwise unmarked, is dignified by the high limestone rock which overhangs it on the south-west, perforated with caves, recalling, by a curious though doubtless unintentional coincidence, the scene of Correggio's celebrated picture. These caves are said by Schwarz (p. 189) — though on no clear authority — to bear the name of Teliman, i.e. Talmanutha. 'A clear stream rushes past the rock into the sea, issuing in a tangled thicket of thorn and willow from a deep ravine at the back of the plain' (Stanley, *S. and P.* p. 382, 383). Jerome, although he plays upon the name Magdalene — 'recte vocatam Magdalenen, id est Turritam, ob ejuls singularem fidei ac ardoris constantiam does not appear to connect it with the place in question. By the Jews the word **al rgm** is used to denote a person who platted or twisted hair, a practice then much in use among women of loose character. A certain 'Miriam Magdala' is mentioned by the Talmudists, who is probably intended for Mary Magdalene. (See Otho, *Lex, Rua*). s.v. Maria; and Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm.* col. 389, 1459.) Magdalum is mentioned as between Tiberias and Capernaum as early as by Willibald, A.D. 722; since that time it is occasionally named by travelers, among others Quaresmius, *Elucidatio*, p. 866 *b*; Sir R. Guyltorde, *Pilgrimage*; Breydenbach, p. 29; Bonar, *Land of Promise*, p. 433, 434, and 549. Buchanan (*Clerical Furlough*, p. 375) describes well the striking view of the northern part of the lake which is obtained from el-Mejdel." This was probably also the MIGDAL-EL (q.v.) in the tribe of Naphtali, mentioned in ~~6698~~ Joshua 19:38. See Burckhardt, *Syria*, p. 559; Seetzen, in *Monat. Corresp.* 18:349; Fisk, *Life*, p. 316; Tobler, *Dritte Wanderung*, p. 46; Schubert, 3:250.

Mag'dalen

(or Magdalene) (**Μαγδαληνή**, fem. adj. from *Magdala*), a surname regularly applied to one of the Marys in the Gospels, derived from her

place of nativity or former residence, in order to distinguish her from the other Marys (^{<1276>}Matthew 27:56, 61; 28:1; ^{<1154>}Mark 15:40, 47; 16:1, 9; ^{<1121>}Luke 8:2; 24:10; ^{<1125>}John 19:25; 20:1, 18). *SEE MAGDALA.*

Magdalen, Religious Order Of

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

Magdalena De Pazzi

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

Magdeburg Centuries

SEE CENTURIES OF MAGDEBURG.

Mag'diel

(Heb. *Magdiea*, **מגדיאל** *endowed of God*; Sept. **Μαγεδιήλ** and **Μεδιήλ** v. r. **Μετοδιήλ**), the successor of Mibzar, and predecessor of Iram among the Edomitish chiefs who held sway along with the native princes in Mount Seir (^{<0136>}Genesis 36:43; ^{<0305>}1 Chronicles 1:54). B.C. ante 1619.

Ma'ged

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

Magee, Thomas

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

Magee, William

D.D., a noted Anglican prelate, was born March 18, 1766, in the county of Fermanat, Ireland, and was educated at the University of Dublin (Trinity College). He obtained all the college honors, and graduated A.B. in 1785, and in 1788 was elected a fellow. His friends desired him to enter the legal profession, but he himself inclined to the ministry, and in 1790 he was ordained, acting at this time as a tutor in his alma mater; later he became assistant professor of the Oriental languages, and in 1806 senior fellow and professor of mathematics. In 1812 he retired from the university, and accepted the livings of Kappagh, in Tyrone, and Killyleagh, in Down; in

1814 he was appointed dean of Cork, and there became greatly celebrated as a pulpit orator. Notwithstanding the length of his discourses (he never preached less than one hour) he was followed by crowds, though no man less courted popularity. His sermons, his biographer says, “might be characterized as solid Gospel truth, strongly and plainly enforced in simplicity and sincerity.” Bishop Barrington, a contemporary, thus comments upon Dr. Magee’s eloquence: “I have often heard and admired Mr. Pitt, but while I am listening to my friend dean Magee I feel that if I were to shut my eyes I could fancy that Mr. Pitt was speaking.” In 1819 Dr. Magee was promoted to the bishopric of Raphoe; in 1821, when George IV visited Dublin, he was appointed by the king dean of the Viceregal Chapel at the castle; and in 1822, after declining the archbishopric of Cashel, he became archbishop of Dublin. He died Aug. 18, 1831. Archbishop Magee is noted particularly for his opposition to Romanism and Unitarianism. Against the latter he sent forth his *Discourses on the Atonement and Sacrifice* (1811, 8vo; 2d edit. 1812, 2 vols. 8vo; 3d edit. 1816, 3 vols. 8vo; 7th edit. 1841, 1 vol. royal 8vo), universally pronounced one of the ablest critical and controversial works of modern times. His *Works* were published in 1842, in 2 vols. 8vo, with a memoir of his life by Arthur H. Kinney, D.D. See, besides this Memoir in *Works*, the *Dublin University Magazine*, 26:480 sq.; 27:750 sq.; *Christian Observer*, 1843 (May and June); *Christian examiner*, 28:63 sq.; Allibone, *Dict. of British and American Authors*, s.v. (J. H. W.)

Maghrebi

SEE AARON HA-RISSON.

Magi

is the Latin form of the Greek term μάγοι, *magians*, rendered “wise men” in [Ⓜ]Matthew 2:11 7, 16, and occurring likewise in the singular μάγος, “sorcerer,” with reference to Elymas ([Ⓜ]Acts 12:6, 8). Compare the epithet Simon *Magus*. The term is still extant on the cuneiform inscriptions (see Olshausen, ad loc. Matt.). It corresponds to the Heb. *gmiMag*. The term *magi* was used as the name for priests and wise men among the Medes, Persians, and Babylonians. So the word *Rabmag*, in our version of [Ⓜ]Jeremiah 39:3, used as a proper name, properly signifies *the prince magus* or *chief of the magi*. While the priests and literati were known by the general name of *magi*, they were also known by the name of *wise men*,

and likewise *Chaldaeans* (^{234B}Isaiah 44:52; Jeremiah 1, 35; ^{271D}Daniel 2:12-27; 4:6,18; 5, 7, 11,12, 15). To their number doubtless belonged the astrologers and star-gazers (^{237I3}Isaiah 47:13). So, also, the Chaldee soothsayers and dream-interpreters either denote various orders of magi, or they are merely different names of the same general class (^{201B}Daniel 1:20; 2:2; 10:27; 4:7; 5:7, 11). **SEE MAGICIAN**. In the following account of this important and interesting class, we supplement what we have elsewhere said upon the subject.

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

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

The earliest notice extant of the magi is in the prophecies of Jeremiah (^{234B}Jeremiah 39:3, 13), where mention is made of Rab-mag, a term which, though regarded in the A.V. as a proper name, is a compound of **br** and **gm**, and signifies *chief nmagus*, after the analogy of such terms as **syra**Abri(ch (*chief eunuch*), **hqa**Abri(*chiefbufler*), etc. (See below, § iv.) The Rab-mag of Jeremiah is the same as the *Rab Signin al kol Chakimin* (I [^wngs br wymqj I k) of Daniel (2:48); the τῶν ἱερέων

ἐπισημότητα οὐά Βαβυλώνιοι καλοῦσι Χαλδαίους of Diodorus Sic. (2:24); and the ἀρχίμαγος of the later Greek writers (Sozomen, *Hist. Eccles.* 1:13). This indicates the existence among the Chaldaeans of the magian institute in a regular form, and as a recognized element in the state, at a period not later than 600 years B.C. In Jeremiah 1, 35, ittevidently the same class that is referred to under the designation of the “wise men of Babylon.” In the time of Daniel we find the institute in full force in Babylon (^{271B}Daniel 2:2, 12, 18, 24; 4:3, 15; 5:7, 8). From him we learn that it comprised five classes—the *Chartumsinim*, expounders of sacred writings and interpreters of signs (1:20; 2:2; 5:4); the *Ashaphim*, conjurors (2:10; 5:7, 11; comp. 47:9,12); the *Meekashephim*, exorcists, soothsayers, magicians, diviners (2:2; comp. ^{271B}Isaiah 47:9,13; ^{271B}Jeremiah 27:9); the *Gozerim*, casters of nativities, astrologists (2:27; 5:7,11); and the *Chasdin*, Chaldaeans in the narrower sense (2:5, 10; 4:4; 5:7, etc.; compare Hengstenberg, *Beitrag*e, 1:343 sq.; Havernick, *Comment iib. Daniel*, p. 52; Gesenius, *Thes. ad voc.*). So much was Magism a Chaldeptean institution that the term *Chaldaean* came to be applied as a synonym for the class (Diod. Sic. 2:29 sq.; Strabo, 16:762; Diog. Laertius, *Proaem.* 1; Cicero, *de Divinat.* 1:1; Curtius, *Hist.* 3:3, 6; Josephus, *War*, 2:7, 3; Aul. Gellius, 15:20, 2; Apuleius, *Asin.* 2:228, etc.).

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

Indo-Germanic than in the Shemitic tongues (see above, § 1); but this can hardly be allowed to weigh much against the historical evidence of the existence of the magi in Shemitic nations anterior to their existence among those of the Aryan stock.

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

1. The word does not appear to have existed in the Zend language; at any rate, it does not occur in the Zend-Avesta.
2. The religious system of the ancient Persians was a system of Dualism, as the most ancient documents concur with the monumental evidence to prove (see Rawlinson's *Herodotus*, 1:426), but with this Magism had no affinity.
3. In the Zend-Avesta, the *Yatus*, the practicer of magical arts, is vehemently denounced, and men are enjoined to pray and present offerings against his arts, as an invention of the Dews.
4. Xenophon informs us (*Cyrop.* 8:1, 23) that the magi were first established in Persia by Cyrus (comp. also Ammian. Marc. 23:6; Porphyr. *De abstin.* 4:16, etc.), a statement which can be understood only, as Haeren suggests (I, 1:451 sq.), as intimating that the magian institute, which existed long before this among the Medes, was introduced by Cyrus among the Persians also.
5. Herodotus (1:101) states that the magi formed one of the tribes of the Medes; and he also attributes the placing of the pseudo-Smerdis on the Persian throne to the magi, who were moved thereto by a desire to substitute the Median for the Persian rule (3:61 sq.; compare Ctesias, *Persica*, c. 10-15; Justin, *Hist.* 1:9; and the Behistun inscription as translated by Sir H. Rawlinson; see Rawlinson's *Herodotus*, 1:427).
6. Herodotus mentions that, after this attempt of the magi had been frustrated, it became a usage among the Persians to observe a festival in celebration of the overthrow of the magi, to which they gave the name of Magoplonia (μαγοπονία), and during which it was not safe for any magus to leave the house (3:79; Agathias, 2:25), a usage which could have had its origin only at a time when Magism was foreign to Persian beliefs and institutions.

7. We find no allusion to the magi in connection with any of the Medo-Persian kings mentioned in Scripture, a circumstance which, though not of itself of much importance, falls in with the supposition that Magism was not at that time a predominant Persian institution. The probability is, that this system had its source in Chaldaea, was thence propagated to Assyria, Media, and the adjoining countries, and was brought from Media into Persia, where it came at first into collision both with the national prejudices and with the ancient religious faith of the people. With this accord the traditions which impute to Zoroaster, after he came to be regarded as the apostle of Magism, sometimes a Parthian and sometimes a Bactrian origin. *SEE ZOROASTER*. Eventually, however, Magism seems to have been adopted into or reconciled with Zoroasterism, perhaps by losing its original theosophic character, and taking on a more practical or thaumaturgic phase.

III. Profane Accounts of the Order. — The magi were originally one of the six tribes (Herod. 1:101; Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* v. 29) into which the nation of the Medes was divided, who, like the Levites under the Mosaic institutions, were entrusted with the care of religion, an office which naturally, in those early times, made this caste likewise the chief depositaries of science and cultivators of art. Little in detail is known of the magi during the independent existence of the Median government; but under the Medo-Persian sway the magi formed a sacred caste or college, which was very famous in the ancient world (Xenoph. *Cyrop.* 8:1, 23; Ammian. Marcell. 23:6; Heeren. *Ideen*, 1:451; Schlosser, *Universal Uebers.* 1:278). Porphyry (*Abst.* 4:16) says, “The learned men who are engaged among the Persians in the service of the Deity are called magi;” and Suidas, “Among the Persians the lovers of wisdom (φιλόσοφοι) and the servants of God are called magi.” According to Strabo (2:1084, ed. Falcon.), the magi practiced different sorts of divination — 1, by evoking the dead; 2, by cups or dishes (Joseph’s divining-cup, ^{Gen 44:5}Genesis 44:5); 3, by means of water. By the employment of these means the magi affected to disclose the future, to influence the present, and to call the past to their aid. Even the visions of the night they were accustomed to interpret, not empirically, but according to such established and systematic rules as a learned priesthood might be expected to employ (Strabo, 16:762; Cicero, *De Divin.* 1:41; *AElian. V. H.* 2:17). The success, however, of their efforts over the invisible world, as well as the holy office which they exercised, demanded in themselves peculiar cleanliness of body, a due regard to which

and to the general principles of their caste would naturally be followed by professional prosperity, and this, in its turn, conspired with prevailing superstition to give the magi great social consideration, and make them of high importance before kings and princes (Diog. Laert. 9:7, 2) — an influence which they appear to have sometimes abused, when, descending from the peculiar duties of their high office, they took part in the strife and competitions of politics, and found themselves sufficiently powerful even to overturn thrones (Herod. 3:61 sq.). These abuses were reformed by Zoroaster, who appeared, according to many authorities, in the second half of the 7th century before Christ. He was not the founder of a new system, but the renovator of an old and corrupt one, being, as he himself intimates (Zend-Avesta, 1:43), the restorer of the word which Ormuzd had formerly revealed, but which the influence of Dews had degraded into a false and deceptive magic. After much and long-continued opposition on the part of the adherents and defenders of existing corruptions, he succeeded in his virtuous purposes. and caused his system eventually to prevail. He appears to have remodeled the institute of the magian caste, dividing it into three great classes: 1, Herbeds, or learners; 2, Mobeds, or masters; 3, Destur Mobeds, or perfect scholars (Zend-Av. 2:171,261). The magi alone he allowed to perform the religious rites; they possessed the forms of prayer and worship; they knew the ceremonies which availed to conciliate Ormuzd, and were obligatory in the public offerings (Herod. 1:132). They accordingly became the sole medium of communication between the Deity and his creatures, and through them alone Ormuzd made his will known; none but them could see into the future, and they disclosed their knowledge to those only who were so fortunate as to conciliate their good will. Hence the power which the magian priesthood possessed. The general belief in the trustworthiness of their predictions, especially when founded on astrological calculations, the all but universal custom of consulting the will of the divinity before entering on any important undertaking, and the blind faith which was reposed in all that the magi did, reported, or commanded, combined to create for that sacerdotal caste a power, both in public and in private concerns, which has probably never been exceeded. Indeed the soothsayer was a public officer, a member, if not the president, of the privy council in the Medo-Persian court, demanded alike for show, in order to influence the people, and for use, in order to guide the state. Hence the person of the monarch was surrounded by priests, who, in different ranks and with different offices, conspired to sustain the throne, uphold the established religion, and conciliate or enforce the obedience of

the subject. The fitness of the magi for, and their usefulness to, an Oriental court were not a little enhanced by the pomp of their dress, the splendor of their ceremonial, and the number and gradation of the sacred associates. Well may Cyrus, in uniting the Medes to his Persian subjects, have adopted, in all its magnificent details, a priesthood which would go far to transfer to him the affections of his conquered subjects, and promote, more than any other thing, his own aggrandizement and that of his empire. Neither the functions nor the influence of this sacred caste were reserved for peculiar, rare, and extraordinary occasions, but ran through the web of human life. At the break of day they had to chant the divine hymns. This office being performed, then came the daily sacrifice to be offered, not indiscriminately, but to the divinities whose day in each case it was an office, therefore, which none but the initiated could fulfill. As an illustration of the high estimation in which the magi were held, it may be mentioned that it was considered a necessary part of a princely education to have been instructed in the peculiar learning of their sacred order, which was an honor conceded to no other but royal personages, except in very rare and very peculiar instances (Cicero, *De Divin.* 1:23; Plutarch, *Themistocles*). This magian learning embraced everything which regarded the higher culture of the nation, being known in history under the designation of “the law of the Medes and Persians.” It comprised the knowledge of all the sacred rites, customs, usages, and observances, which related not merely to the worship of the gods, but to the whole private life of every worshipper of Ormuzd — the duties which, as such, he had to observe, and the punishments which followed the neglect of these obligations, whence may be learned how necessary the act of the priest on all occasions was. Under the veil of religion the priest had bound himself up with the entire public and domestic life. The judicial office, too, appears to have been, in the time of Cambyses, in the hands of the magi, for from them was chosen the college or bench of royal judges, which makes its appearance in the history of that monarch (Herod. 4:31; 7:194; comp. [Ⓢ]Esther 1:13). Men who held these offices, possessed this learning, and exerted this influence with the people, may have proved a check to Oriental despotism no less powerful than constitutional, though they were sometimes unable to guarantee their own lives against the wrath of the monarch (Herod. 7:194; compare [Ⓢ]Daniel 2:12); and they appear to have been well versed in those courtly arts by which the hand that bears the sword is won to protect instead of destroying. Thus Cambyses, wishing to marry his sister, inquired of the magi (like Henry VIII) if the laws permitted such a union: “We

have,” they adroitly answered, “no law to that effect; but a law there is which declares that the king of the Persians may do what he pleases” (Heeren, *Ideen*, I, 1:451 sq.; Hyde, *Rel. Vet. Persarum*, ch. 31, p. 372 sq.; Brisson, *Princip. Pers.* p. 179 sq.).

Among the Greeks and Romans they were known under the name of Chaldseans (Strabo, 16:762; Diog. Laert. *Proaem.* 1), and also of magi (Diog. Laert. 8:1, 3). They lived scattered over the land in different places (Strabo, 16:739; compare ²⁷¹⁴Daniel 2:14), and had possessions of their own. The temple of Belus was employed by them for astronomical observations, but their astronomy was connected with the worship of the heavenly bodies practiced by the Babylonians (Diod. Sic. 2:31; Ephraem Syrus, *Op.* 2:488; consult Ideler, in the *Transactions of the Berlin Academy for 1824-25*), and was specially directed to vain attempts to foretell the future, predict the fate of individuals or of communities, and sway the present, in alliance with augury, incantation, and magic (Aul. Gell. 3:10. 9; 14:1; Am. Marcell. 23:6; p. 352, ed. Bipont; Diod. Sic. 2:29; comp ²³⁷⁰Isaiah 47:9, 13; Daniel 2).

IV. *Position occupied by the Magi in the period covered by the History of the O.T.* — In the Hebrew text the word occurs but twice, and then only incidentally. In ²⁸⁰³Jeremiah 39:3 and 13 we meet, among the Chaldaean officers sent by Nebuchadnezzar to Jerusalem, one with the name or title of Rab-Mag (**gmAbr**). This word is interpreted, after the analogy of Rab-shakeh and Rab-saris, as equivalent to chief of the magi (Ewald, *Propheten*, and Ilitzig, ad loc., taking it as the title of Nergal-Sharezer), and we thus find both the name and the order occupying a conspicuous place under the government of the Chaldieaus. It is clear that there were various kinds of wise men, and it is probable that these were classes belonging to one great order, which comprised, under the general name of magi, all who were engaged in the service of religion; so that we find here an ample priesthood, a sacred college, graduated in rank and honor (see Bertholdt, 3 *Excurs. zumn Daniel*; Gesenius, *Comment. on* ²³¹⁰Isaiah 2:351 sq.). The word Rab-Mag (if the received etymology of magi be correct) presents a hybrid formation. The first syllable is unquestionably Shemitic, the last is all but unquestionably Aryan. The problem thus presented admits of two solutions:

(1.) If we believe the Chaldaeans to have been a Hamitic people, closely connected with the Babylonians, **SEE CHALDAEAN**, we must then

suppose that the colossal schemes of greatness which showed themselves in Nebuchadnezzar's conquests led him to gather round him the wise men and religious teachers of the nations which he subdued, and that thus the sacred tribes of the Medes rose under his rule to favor and power. His treatment of those who bore a like character among the Jews (²⁰⁰⁴Daniel 1:4) makes this hypothesis a natural one: and the alliance which existed between the Medes and the Chaldaeans at the time of the overthrow of the old Assyrian empire would account for the intermixture of religious systems belonging to two different races.

(2.) If, on the other hand, with Renan (*Histoire des Langues Shénitiques*, p. 66, 67), following Lassen and Ritter, we look on the Chaldaeans as themselves belonging to the Aryan family, and possessing strong affinities with the Medes, there is even less difficulty in explaining the presence among the one people of the religious teachers of the other. It is likely enough, in either case, that the simpler Median religion which the magi brought with them, corresponding more or less closely to the faith of the Zend-Avesta, lost some measure of its original purity through this contact with the darker superstitions of the old Babylonian population. From this time onward it is noticeable that the names both of the magi and Chaldaeans are identified with the astrology, divination, and interpretation of dreams, which had impressed themselves on the prophets of Israel as the most characteristic features of the old Babel religion (²³⁴²⁵Isaiah 44:25; 47:13). The magi took their places among “the astrologers, and stargazers, and monthly prognosticators.”

It is with such men that we have to think of Daniel and his fellow-exiles as associated. They are described as “ten times wiser than all the magicians (Sept. μάγους) and astrologers” (²⁰⁰²Daniel 1:20). Daniel himself so far sympathizes with the order into which he is thus, as it were enrolled, as to intercede for them when Nebuchadnezzar gives the order for their death (²⁰²⁴Daniel 2:24), and accepts an office which, as making him “master of the magicians, astrologers, Chaldaeans, soothsayers” (²⁰⁵¹Daniel 5:11), was probably identical with that of the Rab-Mag who first came before us. May we conjecture that he found in the belief which the magi had brought with them some elements of the truth that had been revealed to his fathers, and that the way was thus prepared for the strong sympathy which showed itself in a hundred ways when the purest Aryan and the purest Shemitic faiths were brought face to face with each other (²⁰⁶³Daniel 6:3, 16, 26; ⁵⁰⁰⁴Ezra 1:1-4; ²³⁴²⁸Isaiah 44:28), agreeing as they did in their hatred of

idolatry and in their acknowledgment of the “God of Heaven?” The acts which accompanied his appointment serve as illustrations of the high reverence in which the magi were held: “Then the king, Nebuchadnezzar, fell upon his face and worshipped Daniel, and commanded that they should offer an oblation and sweet odors unto him” (verse 46; see also verse 48). From the 49th verse it would seem not unlikely that the administration of justice in the last resort belonged to this priestly order, as we know it did to the hierarchy of northern and more modern courts. (See Münter, *Antiq. Abhandlung*. p. 144; Bleek, in Schleiermacher’s *Theol. Zeitschr.* 3:277; Hengstenberg’s *Daniel*, p. 341.)

The name of the magi does not meet us in the Biblical account of the Medo-Persian kings. If, however, we identify the Artaxerxes who stopped the building of the Temple (^{<1507>}Ezra 4:17-22) with the pseudo-Smerdis of Herodotus, *SEE ARTAXERXES*, and the Gomates of the Behistun inscription, we may see here also another point of contact. (Compare Sir Henry Rawlinson’s translation of the Behistun inscription: “The rites which Gomates the magian had introduced I prohibited. I restored to the state the chants, and the worship, and to those families which Gomates the magian had deprived of them” [*Journ. of Asiatic Soc.* vol. 10, and Blakesley’s *Herodotus*, Excurs. on 3:74]). The magian attempt to reassert Median supremacy, and with it probably a corrupted Chaldaized form of Magianism, in place of the purer faith in Ormuzd of which Cyrus had been the propagator, would naturally be accompanied by antagonism to the people whom the Persians had protected and supported. The immediate renewal of the suspended work on the triumph of Darius (^{<1508>}Ezra 4:24; 5:1, 2; 6:7, 8) falls in, it need hardly be added, with this hypothesis. The story of the actual massacre of the magi throughout the dominions of Darius, and of the commemorative magophonia (Herod. 3:79), with whatever exaggerations it may be mixed up, indicates in like manner the triumph of the Zoroastrian system. If we accept the traditional date of Zoroaster as a contemporary of Darius, we may see in the changes which he effected a revival of the older system. It is, at any rate, striking that the word magi does not appear in the Zend-Avesta, the priests being there described as *atharva* (guardians of the fire), and that there are multiplied prohibitions in it of all forms of the magic which, in the West, and possibly in the East also, took its name from them, and with which, it would appear, they had already become tainted. All such arts, auguries, necromancy, and the like, are looked on as evil, and emanating from Ahriman, and are

pursued by the hero-king Feridoun with the most persistent hostility (Du Perron, *Zend-Avesta*, vol. 1, part 2, p. 269, 424).

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

V. *Transition-stages in the History of the Word and of the Order between the close of the O.T. and the time of the N.T.* — In the mean while the title magi was acquiring a new and wider signification. It presented itself to the Greeks as connected with a foreign system of divination, and the religion of a foe whom they had conquered, and it soon became a by-word for the worst form of imposture. The rapid growth of this feeling is traceable perhaps in the meanings attached to the word by the two great tragedians. In AEschylus (*Persae*, 291) it retains its old significance as denoting simply a tribe. In Sophocles (*Ed. Tyr.* 387) it appears among the epithets of

reproach which the king heaps upon Tiresias. The fact, however, that the religion with which the word was associated still maintained its ground as the faith of a great nation, kept it from falling into utter disrepute, and it is interesting to notice how at one time the good and at another the bad side of the word is uppermost. Thus the **μαγεία** of Zoroaster is spoken of with respect by Plato as a **θεῶν θεραπέια**, forming the groundwork of an education which he praises as far better than that of the Athenians (*Alcib.* 1:122 *a*). Xenophon, in like manner, idealizes the character and functions of the order (*Cyrop.* 4:5, 16; 6, 6). Both meanings appear in the later lexicographers. The word magos is equivalent to **ἀπατέων καὶ φαρμακευτής**, but it is also used for the **θεοσεβῆς καὶ θεόλογος καὶ ἱερεύς** (Hesych.). The magi, as an order, are **οἱ παρὰ Περσαῖς φιλόσοφοι καὶ φιλόφροι** (Suidas). The word thus passed into the hands of the Sept., and from them into those of the writers of the N.T., oscillating between the two meanings, capable of being used in either. The relations which had existed between the Jews and Persians would perhaps tend to give a prominence to the more favorable associations in their use of it. In Daniel (^{<201>}Daniel 1:20; 2:2, 10, 27; 5:11) it is used, as has been noticed, for the priestly diviners with whom the prophet was associated. Philo, in like manner (*Quod omnis probus liber*, p. 792), mentions the magi with warm praise, as men who gave themselves to the study of nature and the contemplation of the divine perfections, worthy of being the counselors of kings. It was perhaps natural that this aspect of the word should commend itself to the theosophic Jew of Alexandria. There were, however, other influences at work tending to drag it down. The swarms of impostors that were to be met with in every part of the Roman empire, known as “Chaldaei,” “Mathematici,” and the like, bore this name also. Their arts were “artes magicæ.” Though philosophers and men of letters might recognize the better meaning of which the word was capable (Cicero, *De Divin.* 1:23, 41), yet in the language of public documents and of historians they were treated as a class at once hateful and contemptible (Tacitus, *Ann.* 1:32; 2:27; 12:22, 59), and, as such, were the victims of repeated edicts of banishment. See Lenormant, *Chaldaean Magic* (Lond. 1877).

VI. *The Magi as they appear in the N.T.* — We need not wonder, accordingly, to find that this is the predominant meaning of the word as it appears in the N.T. The noun, and the verb derived from it (**μαγεία** and **μαγεύω**), are used by Luke in describing the impostor, who is therefore known distinctively as Simon Magus (^{<418>}Acts 8:9). Another of the same

class (Bar-jesus) is described (~~410B~~ Acts 13:8) as having, in his cognomen Elymas, a title which was equivalent to Magus. *SEE ELYMAS.*

In one memorable instance, however, the word retains (probably, at least) its better meaning. In the Gospel of Matthew, written (according to the general belief of early Christian writers) for the Hebrew Christians of Palestine, we find it, not as embodying the contempt which the frauds of impostors had brought upon it through the whole Roman empire, but in the sense which it had had of old, as associated with a religion which they respected, and an order of which one of their own prophets had been the head. In spite of patristic authorities on the other side, asserting that the *Μάγοι ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν* of ~~401D~~ Matthew 2:1 were sorcerers whose mysterious knowledge came from below, not from above, and who were thus translated out of darkness into light (Justin Martyr, Chrysostom. Theophylact, in Spanheim, *Dub. Evang.* 19; Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.* in Matthew 2), we are justified, not less by the *consensus* of later interpreters (including even Maldonatus) than by the general tenor of Matthew's narrative, in seeing in them men such as those that were in the minds of the Sept. translators of Daniel, and those described by Philo — at once astronomers and astrologers, but not mingling any conscious fraud with their efforts after a higher knowledge. The vagueness of the description leaves their country undefined, and implies that probably the evangelist himself had no certain information. The same phrase is used as in passages where the express object is to include a wide range of country (compare *ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν*, ~~408I~~ Matthew 8:11; 24:27; ~~403B~~ Luke 13:29). Probably the region chiefly present to the mind of the Palestinian Jew would be the tract of country stretching eastward from the Jordan to the Euphrates, the land of “the children of the East” in the early period of the history of the O.T. (~~429I~~ Genesis 29:1; ~~406B~~ Judges 6:3; 7:12; 8:10). It should be remembered, however, that the language of the O.T., and therefore probably that of Matthew, included under this name countries that lay considerably to the north as well as to the east of Palestine. Balaam came from “the mountains of the East,” i.e. from Pethor, on the Euphrates (~~4020T~~ Numbers 23:7; 22:5). Abraham, (or Cyrus?) is the righteous man raised up “from the East” (~~2340D~~ Isaiah 41:2). The Persian conqueror is called “from the East, from a far country” (~~2346I~~ Isaiah 46:11).

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

(1) The feeling of some early writers that the coming of the wise men was the fulfillment of the prophecy which spoke of the gifts of the men of Sheba and Seba (~~1920~~ Psalm 72:10, 15; compare ~~2306~~ Isaiah 60:6) led them to fix on Arabia as the country of the magi (Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Epiphanius, Cyprian, in Spanheim, *Dub. Evang.* 1. c.), and they have been followed by Baronius, Maldonatus, Grotius, and Lightfoot.

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

(3) The historical associations of the word led others again, with greater probability, to fix on Persia, and to see in these magi members of the priestly order, to which the name of magi belonged (Chrysostom, Theophylact, Calvin, Olshausen), while Hyde (*Rel. Pers.* 1. c.) suggests Parthia, as being at that time the conspicuous Eastern monarchy in which the magi were recognized and honored.

It is, perhaps, a legitimate inference from the narrative of Matthew 2 that in these magi we may recognize, as the Church has done from a very early period, the first Gentile worshippers of the Christ. The name, by itself, indeed, applied as it is in ~~4438~~ Acts 13:8 to a Jewish false prophet, would hardly prove this; but the distinctive epithet “from the East” was probably intended to mark them out as different in character and race from the Western magi, Jews, and others, who swarmed over the Roman empire. So, when they come to Jerusalem, it is to ask, not after “our king” or “the king of Israel,” but, as the men of another race might do, after “the king of the Jews.” The language of the O.T. prophets and the traditional interpretation of it are apparently new things to them. The narrative of Matthew 2 supplies us with an outline which we may legitimately endeavor to fill up, as far as our knowledge enables us, with inference and illustration. Some time after the birth of Jesus there appeared among the strangers who visited Jerusalem these men from the far East. They were not idolaters. Their form of worship was looked upon by the Jews with greater tolerance and sympathy than that of any other Gentiles (compare Wisdom of Solomon 13:6, 7). Whatever may have been their country, their statement indicates that they were watchers of the stars, seeking to read in them the destinies of nations. They said that they had seen a star in which they recognized such a prognostic. They were sure that one was born king

of the Jews, and they came to pay their homage. It may have been simply that the quarter of the heavens in which the star appeared indicated the direction of Judaea. It may have been that some form of the prophecy of Balaam, that a “star should rise out of Jacob” (⁴⁰⁴¹⁷Numbers 24:17), had reached them, either through the Jews of the Dispersion, or through traditions running parallel with the O.T., and that this led them to recognize its fulfillment (Origen, *c. Cels.* 1; Hon. in *Numbers* 13; but the hypothesis is neither necessary nor satisfactory; comp. Ellicott, *Hulsean Lectures*, p. 77). It may have been, lastly, that the traditional predictions ascribed to their own prophet Zoroaster, leading them to expect a succession of three deliverers, two working as prophets to reform the world and raise up a kingdom (Tavernier, *Travels*, 4:8), the third (Zosiosh), the greatest of the three, coming to be the head of the kingdom, to conquer Ahriman and to raise the dead (Du Perron, *Zend A v.* 1:2, p. 46; Hyde, c. 31; Ellicott, *Hulsean Lect.* 1. c.), and in strange fantastic ways connecting these redeemers with the seed of Abraham (Tavernier, 1. c.; and D’Herbelot, *Biblioth. Orient.* s.v. Zerdascht), had roused their minds to an attitude of expectancy, and that their contact with a people cherishing like hopes on stronger grounds may have prepared them to see in a king of the Jews the Oshanderbegha (“Homo Mundi,” Hyde, 1. c.) or the Zosiosh whom they expected. In any case they shared the “vetus et constans opinio” which had spread itself over the whole East, that the Jews, as a people, crushed and broken as they were, were yet destined once again to give a ruler to the nations. It is not unlikely that they appeared, occupying the position of Destur-Mobeds in the later Zoroastrian hierarchy, as the representatives of many others who shared the same feeling. They came, at any rate, to pay their homage to the king whose birth was thus indicated, and with the gold, and frankincense, and myrrh which were the customary gifts of subject nations (comp. ⁴⁰⁴³¹Genesis 43:11; ⁴⁹⁷²⁵Psalms 72:15; ⁴¹¹⁰²1 Kings 10:2, 10; ⁴⁰²⁴2 Chronicles 9:24; ²³⁸⁶Song of Solomon 3:6; 4:14). The arrival of such a company, bound on so strange an errand, in the last years of the tyrannous and distrustful Herod, could hardly fail to attract notice and excite a people among whom Messianic expectations had already begun to show themselves (⁴⁰²⁵Luke 2:25, 38). “Herod was troubled, and all Jerusalem with him.” The Sanhedrim was convened, and the question where the Messiah was to be born was formally placed before them. It was in accordance with the subtle, fox-like character of the king that he should pretend to share the expectations of the people in order that he might find in what direction they pointed, and then take whatever steps were

necessary to crush them. *SEE HEROD*. The answer given, based upon the traditional interpretation of ^{<39B>}Micah 5:2, that Bethlehem was to be the birthplace of the Christ, determined the king's plans. He had found out the locality. It remained to determine the time: with what was probably a real belief in astrology, he inquired of them diligently when they had first seen the star. If he assumed that that was contemporaneous with the birth, he could not be far wrong. The magi accordingly were sent on to Bethlehem, as if they were but the forerunners of the king's own homage. As they journeyed they again saw the star. which for a time, it would seem, they had lost sight of, and it guided them on their way. (*SEE STAR IN THE EAST* for this and all other questions connected with its appearance.) The pressure of the crowds, which a fortnight, or four months, or well-nigh two years before, had driven Mary and Joseph to the rude stable of the caravanserai of Bethlehem, had apparently abated, and the magi, entering "the house" (^{<40B>}Matthew 2:11), fell down and paid their homage and offered their gifts. Once more they received guidance through the channel which their work and their studies had made familiar to them. From first to last, in Media, in Babylon, in Persia, the magi had been famous as the interpreters of dreams. That which they received now need not have involved a disclosure of the plans of Herod to them. It was enough that it directed them to "return to their own country another way." With this their history, so far as the N.T. carries us, comes to an end.

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

(1) Assuming the central fact of the early chapters of Matthew, no objection lies against any of its accessories on the ground of their being wonderful and improbable. It would be in harmony with our expectations

that there should be signs and wonders indicating its presence. The objection therefore postulates the absolute incredulity of that fact, and begs the point at issue (compare Trench, *Star of the Wise Men*, p. 124).

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

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

(4) The more perplexing absence of all mention of the magi in Luke's Gospel may yet receive some probable explanation. So far as we cannot explain it, our ignorance of all, or nearly all, the circumstances of the composition of the Gospels is a sufficient answer. It is, however, at least possible that Luke, knowing that the facts related by Matthew were already current among the churches, sought rather to add what was not yet recorded. Something, too, may have been due to the leading thoughts of the two (Gospels. Matthew, dwelling chiefly on the kingly office of Christ as the Son of David, seizes naturally on the first recognition of that character by the magi of the East (comp. on the fitness of this, Mill, *Pantheistic Principles*, p. 375). Luke, portraying the Son of Man in his sympathy with common men, in his compassion on the poor and humble, dwells as naturally on the manifestation to the shepherds on the hills of Bethlehem. It may be added further that everything tends to show that the latter evangelist derived the materials for this part of his history much more

directly from the *mother* of the Lord, or her kindred, than did the former; and, if so, it is not difficult to understand how she might come to dwell on that which connected itself at once with the eternal blessedness of peace, good will, salvation, rather than on the homage and offerings of strangers, which seemed to be the presage of an earthly kingdom, and had proved to be the prelude to a life of poverty, and to the death upon the cross.

VII. *Later Traditions which have gathered round the Magii of Matt. 2:—*

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

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

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

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

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

In the Eastern Church, where, it would seem, there was less desire to find symbolic meanings than to magnify the circumstances of the history, the traditions assume a different character. The magi arrive at Jerusalem with a retinue of 1000 men, having left behind them, on the further bank of the Euphrates, an army of 7000 (Jacob. Edess. and Bar-hebreus, in Hyde, *l. c.*). They have been led to undertake the journey, not by the star only, or by expectations which they shared with the Israelites, but by a prophecy of

the founder of their own faith. Zoroaster had predicted that in the latter days there should be a mighty One and a Redeemer, and that his descendants should see the star which should be the herald of his coming. According to another legend (*Opus imperf. in Matthew ii apud Chrysost.* t. 6, ed. Montfaucon) they came from the remotest East, near the borders of the ocean. They had been taught to expect the star by a writing that bore the name of Seth. That expectation was handed down from father to son. Twelve of the holiest of them were appointed to be ever on the watch. Their post of observation was a rock known as the Mount of Victory. Night by night they washed in pure water, and prayed, and looked out on the heavens. At last the star appeared, and in it the form of a young child bearing a cross. A voice came from it and bade them proceed to Judaea. They started on their two years' journey, and during all that time the meat and the drink with which they started never failed them. The gifts they bring ' are those which Abraham gave to their progenitors the sons of Keturah (this, of course, on the hypothesis that they were Arabians), which the queen of Sheba had in her turn presented to Solomon, and which had found their way back again to the children of the East (Epiphanius. *in Comp. Doctr.* in Moroni, *Dizion. I. c.*). They return from Bethlehem to their own country, and give themselves up to a life of contemplation and prayer. When the twelve apostles leave Jerusalem to carry on their work as preachers, St. Thomas finds them in Parthia. They offer themselves for baptism, and become evangelists of the new faith (*Opus impers: in* ~~Matth~~ *Matthew 2:1. c.*). The pilgrim-feeling of the 4th century includes them also within its range. Among other relics supplied to meet the demands of the market which the devotion of Helena had created, the bodies of the magi are discovered somewhere in the East, are brought to Constantinople, and placed in the great church which, as the Mosque of St. Sophia, still bears in its name the witness of its original dedication to the divine Wisdom. The favor with which the people of Milan had received the emperor's prefect Eustorgius called for some special mark of favor, and on his consecration as bishop of that city he obtained for it the privilege of being the resting-place of the precious relics. There the fame of the three kings increased. The prominence given to all the feasts connected with the season of the Nativity — the transfer to that season of the mirth and joy of the old Saturnalia — the setting apart of a distinct day for the commemoration of the Epiphany in the 4th century all this added to the veneration with which they were regarded. When Milan fell into the hands of Frederick Barbarossa (A.D. 1162), the influence of the archbishop of

Cologne prevailed on the emperor to transfer them to that city. The Milanese, at a later period, consoled themselves by forming a special confraternity for perpetuating their veneration for the magi by the annual performance of a "Mystery" (Moroni. 1. c.); but the glory of possessing the relics of the first Gentile worshippers of Christ remained with Cologne. (For the later medieval developments of the traditions, comp. Joan. von Hildesheim, in *Quart. Rev.* 78. 433.) In that proud cathedral which is the glory of Teutonic art the shrine of the Three Kings has for six centuries been shown as the greatest of its many treasures. The tabernacle in which the bones of some whose real name and history are lost forever lie enshrined in honor, bears witness, in its gold and gems, to the faith with which the story of the wanderings of the Three Kings has been received. The reverence has sometimes taken stranger and more grotesque forms. As the patron saints of travelers they have given a name to the inns of earlier or later date. The names of Melchior, Caspar, and Balthasar were used as a charm against attacks of epilepsy (Spanheim, *Dub. Evaung.* 21).

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

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

Magic

(only occurs in the A.V. at Wisdom of Solomon 17:7, μαγικὴ s.v. τεξνή, "art magic;" but the term "magician" [q.v. is frequent), a word used to designate the power or art of working wonders beyond the range of science or natural skill. It is derived from the Greek, and refers ultimately to the *nmagi* (q.v.), who were anciently regarded as its depositaries or experts. The magical arts spoken of in the Bible are those practiced by the Egyptians, the Canaanites, and their neighbors, the Hebrews, the Chaldaeans, and probably the Greeks. In all ages and parts of the world they have played an important part in popular superstition (q.v.).

I. *Position of Magic in relation to Religion and Philosophy in Ancient Times.* — The degree of the civilization of a nation is not the measure of the importance of magic in its convictions. The natural features of a country are not the primary causes of what is termed superstition in its inhabitants. With nations as with men — and the analogy of Plato in the “Republic” is not always false — the feelings on which magic fixes its hold are essential to the mental constitution. Contrary as are these assertions to the common opinions of our time inductive reasoning forbids our doubting them.

1. With the lowest race magic is the chief part of religion. The Nigritians, or blacks of this race, show this in their extreme use of amulets and their worship of objects which have no other value in their eyes but as having a supposed magical character through the influence of supernatural agents. With the Turanians, or corresponding whites of the same great family — we use the word white for a group of nations mainly yellow, in contradistinction to black incantations and witchcraft occupy the same place, Shamanism characterizing their tribes in both hemispheres. In the days of Herodotus the distinction in this matter between the Nigritians and the Caucasian population of North Africa was what it now is. In his remarkable account of the journey of the Nasamonian young men—the Nasamones, be it remembered, were “a Libyan race,” and dwellers on the northern coast, as the historian here says — we are told that the adventurers passed through the inhabited maritime region, and the tract occupied by wild beasts, and the desert, and at last came upon a plain with trees, where they were seized by men of small stature, who carried them across marshes to a town of such men black in complexion. A great river, running from west to east, and containing crocodiles, flowed by that town, and all that nation were sorcerers (ἐς τοὺς οὗτοι ἀπικοντο ἄνθρωπους, γόητας εἶναι παντας, 2:32, 33). It little matters whether the conjecture that the great river was the Niger be true, which the idea adopted by Herodotus that it was the upper Nile seems to favor: it is quite evident that the Nasamones came upon a nation of Nigritians beyond the Great Desert, and were struck with their fetishism. So, in our own days, the traveler is astonished at the height to which this superstition is carried among the Nigritians, who have no religious practices that are not of the nature of sorcery, nor any priests who are not magicians, and magicians alone. The strength of this belief in magic in these two great divisions of the lowest race is shown in the case of each by its having maintained its hold in an

instance in which is tenacity must have been severely tried. The ancient Egyptians show their partly-Nigritian origin not alone in their physical characteristics and language, but in their religion. They retained the strange, low nature-worship of the Nigritians, forcibly combining it with more intellectual kinds of belief, as they represented their gods with the heads of animals and the bodies of men, and even connecting it with truths which point to a primeval revelation. The Ritual, which was the great treasury of Egyptian belief, and explained the means of gaining future happiness, is full of charms to be said, and contains directions for making and for using amulets. As the Nigritian goes on a journey hung about with amulets, so amulets were placed on the Egyptian's embalmed body, and his soul went on its mysterious way fortified with incantations learned while on earth. In China, although Buddhism has established itself, and the system of Confucius has gained the power its positivism would insure it with a highly-educated people of low type, another belief still maintains itself which there is strong reason to hold to be older than the other two, although it is usually supposed to have been of the same age as Confucianism; in this religion magic is of the highest importance, the distinguishing characteristic by which it is known.

2. With the Shemites magic takes a lower place. Nowhere is it even part of religion, yet it is looked upon as a powerful engine, and generally unlawful or lawful according to the aid invoked. Among many of the Shemitic peoples there linger the remnants of a primitive fetishism. Sacred trees and stones are revered from an old superstition, of which they do not always know the meaning, derived from the nations whose place they have taken. Thus fetishism remains, although in a kind of fossil state. The importance of astrology with the Shemites has tended to raise the character of their magic, which deals rather with the discovery of supposed existing influences than with the production of new influences. The only direct association of magic with religion is where the priests, as the educated class, have taken the functions of magicians; but this is far different from the case of the Nigritians, where the magicians are the only priests. The Shemites, however, when depending on human reason alone, seem never to have doubted the efficacy of magical arts, yet recourse to their aid was not usually with them the first idea of a man in doubt. Though the case of Saul cannot; be taken as applying to the whole race, yet, even with the heathen Shemites, prayers must have been held to be of more value than incantations.

The Iranians assign to magic a still less important position. It can scarcely be traced in the relics of old nature-worship, which they with greater skill than the Egyptians interwove with their more intellectual beliefs, as the Greeks gave the objects of reverence in Arcadia and Crete a place in poetical myths, and the Scandinavians animated the hard remains of primitive superstition. The character of the ancient belief is utterly gone with the assigning of new reasons for the reverence of its sacred objects. Magic always maintained some hold on men's minds, but the stronger intellects despised it, like the Roman commander who threw the sacred chickens overboard, and the Greek who defied an adverse omen at the beginning of a great battle. When any, oppressed by the sight of the calamities of mankind, sought to resolve the mysterious problem, they fixed, like AEschylus, not upon the childish notion of a chance-government by many conflicting agencies, but upon the nobler idea of a dominating fate. Men of highly sensitive temperaments have always inclined to a belief in magic, and there has therefore been a section of Iranian philosophers in all ages who have paid attention to its practice; but, expelled from religion, it has held but a low and precarious place in philosophy.

The Hebrews had no magic of their own. It was so strictly forbidden by the law that it could never afterwards have any recognized existence save in times of general heresy or apostasy, and the same was doubtless the case in the patriarchal ages. The magical practices which obtained among the Hebrews were therefore borrowed from the nations around. The hold they gained was such as we should have expected with a Shemitic race, making allowance for the discredit thrown upon them by the prohibitions of the law. From the first entrance into the Land of Promise until the destruction of Jerusalem we have constant glimpses of magic practiced in secret, or resorted to, not alone by the common, but also by the great. The Talmud abounds in notices of contemporary magic among the Jews, showing that it survived idolatry notwithstanding their original connection, and was supposed to produce real effects. The Koran in like manner treats charms and incantations as capable of producing evil consequences when used against a man. It is a distinctive characteristic of the Bible that from first to last it warrants no such trust or dread. In the Psalms, the most personal of all the books of Scripture, there is no prayer to be protected against magical influences. The believer prays to be delivered from every kind of evil that could hurt the body or the soul, but he says nothing of the machinations of sorcerers. Here and everywhere magic is passed by, or, if

mentioned, mentioned only to be condemned (comp. ~~1948~~ Psalm 106:28). Let those who affirm that they see in the Psalms merely human piety, and in Job and Ecclesiastes merely human philosophy, explain the absence in them, and throughout the Scriptures, of the expression of superstitious feelings that are inherent in the Shemitic mind. Let them explain the luxuriant growth, in the after-literature of the Hebrews and Arabs, and notably in the Talmud and the Koran, of these feelings with no root in those older writings from which that after-literature was derived. If the Bible, the Talmud, and the Koran be but several expressions of the Shemitic mind, differing only through the effect of time, how can this contrast be accounted for? — the very opposite of what obtains elsewhere: for superstitions are generally strongest in the earlier literature of a race, and gradually fade, unless a condition of barbarism restore their vigor. Those who see in the Bible a divine work can understand how a God taught preacher could throw aside the miserable fears of his race, and boldly tell man to trust in his Maker alone. Here, as in all matters, the history of the Bible confirms its doctrine. In the doctrinal Scriptures magic is passed by with contempt, in the historical Scriptures the reasonableness of this contempt is shown. Whenever the practisers of magic attempt to combat the servants of God, they conspicuously fail. Pharaoh's magicians bow to the divine power shown in the wonders wrought by Moses and Aaron. Balaam, the great enchanter, comes from afar to curse Israel, and is forced to bless them.

II. *Biblical Notices.* — In examining the references to magic in the Bible, we must keep in view the curious inquiry whether there be any reality in the art. We would at the outset protest against the idea, once very prevalent, that the conviction that the seen and unseen worlds were often more manifestly in contact in the Biblical ages than now necessitates a belief in the reality of the magic spoken of in the Scriptures. We do indeed see a connection of a supernatural agency with magic in such a case as that of the damsel possessed with a spirit of divination mentioned in the Acts; yet there the agency appears to have been involuntary in the damsel, and shrewdly made profitable by her employers. This does not establish the possibility of man being able at his will to use supernatural powers to gain his own ends, which is what magic has always pretended to accomplish. Thus much we premise, lest we should be thought to hold latitudinarian opinions because we treat the reality of magic as an open question.

Without losing sight of the distinctions we have drawn between the magic of different races, we shall consider the notices of the subject in the Bible in the order in which they occur. It is impossible in every case to assign the magical practice spoken of to a particular nation, or, when this can be done, to determine whether it be native or borrowed, and the general absence of details renders any other system of classification liable to error.

1. The theft and carrying away of Laban's *teraphim* ([μῦρᾶῖ]) by Rachel seems to indicate the practice of magic in Padan-aram at this early time. It appears that Laban attached great value to these objects from what he said as to the theft and his determined search for them ((1319)Genesis 31:19, 30, 32-35). It may be supposed, from the manner in which they were hidden, that these *teraphim* were not very small. The most important point is that Laban calls them his "gods" (ver. 30, 32), although he was not without belief in the true God (ver. 24, 49-53); for this makes it almost certain that we have here, not an indication of the worship of strange gods, but the first notice of a superstition that afterwards obtained among those Israelites who added corrupt practices to the true religion. The derivation of the name "*teraphim*" is extremely obscure. Gesenius takes it from an "unused" root, [āri]; which he supposes, from the Arabic, probably signified "to live pleasantly" (*Thesaur.* s.v.). It may, however, be reasonably conjectured that such a root would have had, if not in Hebrew, in the language whence the Hebrews took it or its derivative, the proper meaning "to dance" corresponding to this, which would then be its tropical meaning. We should prefer, if no other derivation be found, to suppose that the name *teraphim* might mean "dancers" or "causers of dancing," with reference either to primitive nature-worship or its magical rites of the character of Shamanism, rather than that it signifies, as Gesenius suggests, "givers of pleasant life." There seems, however, to be a cognate word, unconnected with the "unused" root just mentioned, in ancient Egyptian, whence we may obtain a conjectural derivation. We do not, of course, trace the worship of *teraphim* to the sojourn in Egypt. They were probably those objects of the pre-Abrahamite idolatry, put away by order of Jacob ((1320)Genesis 35:2-4), yet retained even in Joshua's time ((1324)Joshua 24:14); and, if so, notwithstanding his exhortation, abandoned only for a space (Judges 17, 18); and they were also known to the Babylonians, being used by them for divination ((1325)Ezekiel 21:21). But there is great reason for supposing a close connection between the oldest language and religion of Chaldaea and the ancient Egyptian language and religion. The Egyptian

word *ter* signifies “a shape, type, transformation,” and has for its determinative a mummy: it is used in the Ritual, where the various transformations of the deceased in Hades are described (*Todtenbuch*, ed. Lepsius, ch. 76 sq.). The small mummy-shaped figure, *shebti*, usually made of baked clay covered with a blue vitreous varnish, representing the Egyptian as deceased, is of a nature connecting it with magic, since it was made with the idea that it secured benefits in Hades; and it is connected with the word *ter*, for it represents a mummy, the determinative of that word, and was considered to be of use ill the state in which the deceased passed through transformations, *teru*. The difficulty which forbids our doing more than conjecture a relation between *ter* and teraphim is the want in the former of the third radical of the latter; and in our present state of ignorance respecting the ancient Egyptian and the primitive language of Chaldaea in their *verbal* relations to the Shemitic family, it is impossible to say whether it is likely to be explained. The possible connection with the Egyptian religious magic is, however, not to be slighted, especially as it is not improbable that the household idolatry of the Hebrews was ancestral worship, and the *shebti* was the image of a deceased man or woman, as a mummy. and therefore as an Osiris, bearing the insignia of that divinity, and so in a manner as a deified dead person, although we do not know that it was used in the ancestral worship of the Egyptians. It is important to notice that no singular is found of the word teraphim, and that the plural form is once used where only one statue seems to be meant (^{אֱלֹהִים}1 Samuel 19:13,16): in this case it may be a “plural of excellence.” If the latter inference be true, this word must have become thoroughly Shemiticized. There is no description of these images; but, from the account of Michal’s stratagem to deceive Saul’s messengers, it is evident, if only one image be there meant, as is very probable, that they were at least sometimes of the size of a man, and perhaps in the head and shoulders, if not lower, of human shape, or of a similar form (ver. 13-16).

The worship or use of teraphim after the occupation of the Promised Land cannot be doubted as having been one of the corrupt practices of those Hebrews who leaned to idolatry, but did not abandon their belief in the God of Israel. Although the Scriptures draw no marked distinction between those who forsook their religion and those who added to it such corruptions, it is evident that the latter always professed to be orthodox. Teraphim, therefore, cannot be regarded as among the Hebrews necessarily connected with strange gods, whatever may have been the case with other

nations. The account of Micah's images in the book of Judges, compared with a passage in Hosea, shows our conclusion to be correct. In the earliest days of the occupation of the Promised Land, in the time of anarchy that followed Joshua's rule, Micah, "a man of Mount Ephraim," made certain images and other objects of heretical worship, which were stolen from him by those Danites who took Laish and called it Dan, there setting up idolatry, where it continued the whole time that the ark was at Shiloh, the priests retaining their post "until the day of the captivity of the land" (Judges 17, 18, esp. 30, 31). Probably this worship was somewhat changed, although not in its essential character, when Jeroboam set up the golden calf at Dan. Micah's idolatrous objects were a graven image, a molten image, an ephod, and teraphim (^{<0717B>}Judges 17:3, 4, 5; 18:17, 18, 20). In Hosea there is a retrospect of this period where the prophet takes a harlot, and commands her to be faithful to him "many days." It is added: "For the children of Israel shall abide many days without a king, and without a prince, and without a sacrifice, and without an image [or "pillar," **hbXœi**] and without an ephod, and teraphim: afterward shall the children of Israel return, and seek Jehovah their God, and David their king; and shall fear Jehovah and his goodness in the latter days" (3, esp. 4, 5). The apostate people are long to be without their spurious king and false worship, and in the end are to return to their loyalty to the house of David and their faith in the true God. That Dan should be connected with Jeroboam "who made Israel to sin," and with the kingdom which he founded, is most natural; and it is therefore worthy of note that the images, ephod, and teraphim made by Micah, and stolen and set up by the Danites at Dan, should so nearly correspond with the objects spoken of by the prophet. It has been imagined that the use of teraphim and the similar abominations of the heretical Israelites are not so strongly condemned in the Scriptures as the worship of strange gods. This mistake arises from the mention of pious kings who did not suppress the high places, which proves only their timidity, and not any lesser sinfulness in the spurious religion than in false systems borrowed from the peoples of Canaan and neighboring countries. The cruel rites of the heathen are indeed especially reprobated, but the heresy of the Israelites is too emphatically denounced, by Samuel in a passage soon to be examined, and in the repeated condemnation of Jeroboam, the son of Nebat, "who made Israel to sin," to render it possible that we should take a view of it consistent only with modern sophistry.

We pass to the magical use of teraphim. By the Israelites they were consulted for oracular answers. This was apparently done by the Danites, who asked Micah's Levite to inquire as to the success of their spying expedition (⁰⁷⁸⁵Judges 18:5, 6). In later times this is distinctly stated of the Israelites where Zechariah says "For the teraphim have spoken vanity, and the diviners have seen a lie, and have told false dreams" (³⁸⁰²Zechariah 10:2). It cannot be supposed that, as this first positive mention of the use of teraphim for divination by the Israelites is after the return from Babylon, and as that use obtained with the Babylonians in the time of Nebuchadnezzar, therefore the Israelites borrowed it from their conquerors; for these objects are mentioned in earlier places in such a manner that their connection with divination must be intended, if we bear in mind that this connection is undoubted in a subsequent period. Samuel's reproof of Saul for his disobedience in the matter of Amalek associates "divination" with "vanity," or "idols" (^{wa}), and "teraphim," however we render the difficult passage where these words occur (⁰⁹⁵²1 Samuel 15:22, 23). (The word rendered "vanity," ^{wa}; is especially used with reference to idols. and even in some places stands alone for an idol or idols.) When Saul, having put to death the workers in black arts, finding himself rejected of God in his extremity, sought the witch of Endor, and asked to see Samuel, the prophet's apparition denounced his doom as the punishment of this very disobedience, as to Amalek. The reproof would seem, therefore, to have been a prophecy that the self-confident king would at the last alienate himself from God, and take refuge in the very abominations he despised. This apparent reference tends to confirm the inference we have indicated. As to a later time, when Josiah's reform is related, he is said to have put away "the wizards, and the teraphim, and the idols" (¹²²⁴2 Kings 23:24); where the mention of the teraphim immediately after the wizards, and as distinct from the idols, seems to favor the inference that they are spoken of as objects used in divination.

The only account of the act of divining by teraphim is in a remarkable passage of Ezekiel relating to Nebuchadnezzar's advance against Jerusalem. "Also, thou son of man, appoint thee two ways, that the sword of the king of Babylon may come: both twain [two swords] shall come forth out of one land: and choose thou a place, choose [it] at the head of the way to the city. Appoint a way, that the sword may come to Rabbath of the Ammonites, and to Judah in Jerusalem the defenced. For the king of Babylon stood at the parting of the way, at the head of the two ways, to

use divination: he shuffled arrows, he consulted with teraphim, he looked in the liver. At his right hand was the divination for Jerusalem” (³²¹⁹Ezekiel 21:19-22). The mention together of consulting teraphim and looking into the liver may not indicate that the victim was offered to teraphim and its liver then looked into, but may mean two separate acts of divining. The former explanation seems, however, to have been adopted by the Sept. in its rendering of the account of Michal’s stratagem, as if Michal had been divining, and on the coming of the messengers seized the image and liver and hastily put them in the bed. The accounts which the Rabbins give of divining by teraphim are worthless. *SEE TERAPHIM.*

2. Joseph, when his brethren left after their second visit to buy corn, ordered his steward to hide his silver cup in Benjamin’s sack, and afterwards sent him after them, ordering him to claim it, thus: “[Is] not this [it] in which my lord drinketh, and whereby indeed he divineth?” (⁰⁴⁴⁵Genesis 44:5). The meaning of the latter clause has been contested, Gesenius translating “he could surely foresee it” (ap. Barrett, *Synopsis*, ad loc.), but the other rendering seems far more probable, especially as we read that Joseph afterwards said to his brethren, “Wot ye not that such a man as I can certainly divine?” (⁰⁴⁴⁵Genesis 44:15)-the same word being used. If so, the reference would probably be to the use of the cup in divining, and we should have to infer that here Joseph was acting on his own judgment, *SEE JOSEPH*, divination being not alone doubtless a forbidden act, but one of which he, when called before Pharaoh, had distinctly disclaimed the practice. Two uses of cups or the like for magical purposes have obtained in the East from ancient times. In one use either the cup itself bears engraved inscriptions, supposed to have a magical influence (see D’Herbelot, *Bibliothèque Orientale*, s.v. (Gam), or it is plain, and such inscriptions are written on its inner surface in ink. In both cases water poured into the cup is drunk by those wishing to derive benefit, as, for instance, the cure of diseases, from the inscriptions, which, if written, are dissolved (Lane, *Mod. E9*. ch. 11). This use, in both its forms, obtains among the Arabs in the present day, and cups bearing Chaldaean inscriptions in ink have been discovered by Mr. Layard, and probably show that this practice existed among the Jews in Babylonia in about the 7th century of the Christian aera (*Nineveh and Babylon*, p. 509, etc. There is an excellent paper on these bowls by Dr. Levy, of Breslau, in the *Zeitschrift der Deutsch. Morgenländ. Gesellschaft*, 9:465, etc.). In the other use the cup or bowl was of very secondary importance. It was merely

the receptacle for water, in which, after the performance of magical rites, a boy looked to see what the magician desired. This is precisely the same as the practice of the modern Egyptian magicians, where the difference that ink is employed and is poured into the palm of the boy's hand is merely accidental. A Gnostic papyrus in Greek, written in Egypt in the earlier centuries of the Christian aera, now preserved in the British Museum, describes the practice of the boy with a bowl, and alleges results strikingly similar to the alleged results of the well-known modern Egyptian magician, whose divination would seem, therefore, to be a relic of the famous magic of ancient Egypt. (See Lane, *Mod. Egyptians*, ch. 12, for an account of the performances of this magician, and Mr. Lane's opinion as to the causes of their occasional apparent success.) As this latter use only is of the nature of divination, it is probable that to it Joseph referred. The practice may have been prevalent in his time, and hieroglyphic inscriptions upon the bowl may have given color to the idea that it had magical properties, and perhaps even that it had thus led to the discovery of its place of concealment, a discovery which must have struck Joseph's brethren with the utmost astonishment. *SEE CUP.*

3. The magicians of Egypt are spoken of as a class in the histories of Joseph and Moses. When Pharaoh's officers were troubled by their dreams, being in prison they were at a loss for an interpreter. Before Joseph explained the dreams he disclaimed the power of interpreting save by the divine aid, saying, "[Do] not interpretations [belong] to God? tell me [them], I pray you" (^{<0408>}Genesis 40:8). In like manner, when Pharaoh had his two dreams, we find that he had recourse to those who professed to interpret dreams. We read: "He sent and called for all the scribes of Egypt, and all the wise men thereof: and Pharaoh told them his dream; but [there was] none that could interpret them unto Pharaoh" (41:8; comp. ver. 24). Joseph, being sent for on the report of the chief of the cup-bearers, was told by Pharaoh that he had heard that he could interpret a dream. Joseph said, ' [It is] not in me: God shall give Pharaoh an answer of peace' (ver. 16). Thus, from the expectations of the Egyptians and Joseph's disavowals, we see that the interpretation of dreams was a branch of the knowledge to which the ancient Egyptian magicians pretended. The failure of the Egyptians in the case of Pharaoh's dreams must probably be regarded as the result of their inability to give a satisfactory explanation, for it is unlikely that they refused to attempt to interpret. The two words used to

designate the interpreters sent for by Pharaoh are $\mu\gamma\text{M}\text{f}\alpha\text{j}$ i “scribes” (?) and $\mu\gamma\text{m}\text{k}\alpha\text{j}$ } “wise men.”

We again hear of the magicians of Egypt in the narrative of the events before the exodus. They were summoned by Pharaoh to oppose Moses. The account of what they effected requires to be carefully examined, from its bearing on the question whether magic be an imposture. We read: “And the Lord spake unto Moses and unto Aaron, saying, When Pharaoh shall speak unto you, saying, Show a miracle for you: then thou shalt say unto Aaron, Take thy rod, and cast [it] before Pharaoh, [and] it shall become a serpent.” It is then related that Aaron did thus, and afterwards: “Then Pharaoh also called the wise men and t the enchanters: now they, the scribes of Egypt, did so by their secret arts: for they cast down every man his rod, and they became serpents, but Aaron’s rod swallowed up their rods” (^(~~BRJ~~)Exodus 7:8-12). The rods were probably long staves like those represented on the Egyptian monuments, not much less than the height of a man. If the word used mean here a serpent, the Egyptian magicians may have feigned a change: if it signify a crocodile, they could scarcely have done so. The names by which the magicians are designated are to be noted. That which we render “scribes” seems here to have a general signification, including wise men and enchanters. The last term is more definite in its meaning, denoting users of incantations. On the occasion of the first plague, the turning of the rivers and waters of Egypt into blood, the opposition of the magicians again occurs. “And the scribes of Egypt did so by their secret arts” (^(~~BRJ~~)Exodus 7:22). When the second plague, that of frogs, as sent, the magicians again made the same opposition (^(~~BRJ~~)Exodus 8:7). Once more they appear in the history. The plague of lice came, and we read that when Aaron had worked the wonder the magicians opposed him: “And the scribes did so by their secret arts to bring forth the lice, but they could not: so there were lice upon man and upon beast. And the scribes said unto Pharaoh, This [is] the finger of God: but Pharaoh’s heart was hardened, and he hearkened not unto them, as the Lord had said” (8:18, 19 [Hebrews 14,15]). After this we hear no more of the magicians. All we can gather from the narrative is that the appearances produced by them were sufficient to deceive Pharaoh on three occasions. It is nowhere declared that they actually produced wonders, since the expression “the scribes did so by their secret arts” is used on the occasion of their complete failure. Nor is their statement that in the wonders wrought by Aaron they saw the finger of God any proof that they recognized a power superior to

the native objects of worship they invoked, for we find that the Egyptians frequently spoke of a supreme being as God. It seems rather as if they had said, "Our juggles are of no avail against the work of a divinity." There is one later mention of these transactions, which adds to our information, but does not decide the main question. St. Paul mentions Jannes and Jambres as having "withstood Moses," and says that their folly in doing so became manifest (~~scrib~~ 2 Timothy 3:8, 9). The Egyptian character of these names, the first of which is, in our opinion, found in hieroglyphics, is not inconsistent with the opinion that the apostle cited a prevalent tradition of the Jews.

SEE JANNES AND JAMBRES.

We turn to the Egyptian illustrations of this part of the subject. Magic, as we have before remarked, was inherent in the ancient Egyptian religion. The Ritual is a system of incantations and directions for making amulets, with the object of securing the future happiness of the disembodied soul. However obscure the belief of the Egyptians as to the actual character of the state of the soul after death may be to us, it cannot be doubted that the knowledge and use of the magical amulets and incantations treated of in the Ritual was held to be necessary for future happiness, although it was not believed that they alone could insure it, since to have done good works, or, more strictly, not to have committed certain sins, was an essential condition of the acquittal of the soul in the great trial in Hades. The thoroughly magical character of the Ritual is most strikingly evident in the minute directions given for making amulets (*Todtenbuch*, ch. 100, 119, 134), and the secrecy enjoined in one case on those thus occupied (ch. 133). The later chapters of the Ritual (163-165), held to have been added after the compilation or composition of the rest, which theory, as M. Chabas has well remarked, does not prove their much more modern date (*Le Papyrus Magique Harris*, p. 162), contain mystical names not bearing an Egyptian etymology. These names have been thought to be Ethiopian; they either have no signification, and are mere magical gibberish, or else they are, mainly at least, of foreign origin. Besides the Ritual the ancient Egyptians had books of a purely magical character, such as that which M. Chabas has edited in his work referred to above. The main source of their belief in the efficacy of magic appears to have been the idea that the souls of the dead, whether justified or condemned, had the power of revisiting the earth and taking various forms. This belief is abundantly used in the moral tale of "The Two Brothers," of which the text has recently been published by the trustees of the British Museum (*Select Papyri*, part 2),

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

Like all nations who have practiced magic generally, the Egyptians separated it into a lawful kind and an unlawful. M. Chabas has proved this from a papyrus which he finds to contain an account of the prosecution, in the reign of Rameses III (B.C. cir. 1220), of an official for unlawfully acquiring and using magical books, the king's property. The culprit was convicted and punished with death (p. 169 sq.).

A belief in unlucky and lucky days, in actions to be avoided or done on certain days, and in the fortune attending birth on certain days, was extremely strong, as we learn from a remarkable ancient calendar (*Select Papyri*, part 1) and the evidence of writers of antiquity. A religious prejudice, or the occurrence of some great calamity, probably lay at the root of this observance of days. Of the former the birthday of Typhon, the fifth of the Epagomenae, is an instance. Astrology was also held in high honor, as the calendars of certain of the tombs of the kings, stating the positions of the stars and their influence on different parts of the body, show us; but it seems doubtful whether this branch of magical arts is older than the 18th dynasty, although certain stars were held in reverence in the time of the 4th dynasty. The belief in omens probably did not hold an important place in Egyptian magic, if we may judge from the absence of direct mention of them. The superstition as to “the evil eye” appears to have been known, but there is nothing else that we can class with phenomena of the nature of animal magnetism. Two classes of learned men had the charge of the magical books: one of these, the name of which has not been read phonetically, would seem to correspond to the “scribes,” as we render the word, spoken of in the history of Joseph; whereas the other has the general sense of “wise men,” like the other class there mentioned.

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

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

The Israelites are commanded in the place referred to not to learn the abominations of the peoples of the Promised Land. Then follows this prohibition: “There shall not be found with thee one who offereth his son, or his daughter by fire, a practicer of divinations ($\mu\text{seqy}\mu\text{m}\text{aq}$), a worker of hidden arts ($\text{`n}\acute{\text{e}}\text{[m]}$), an augurer ($\text{v}\text{j}\ \text{m}$), an enchanter ($\text{`}\acute{\text{a}}\text{v}\text{k}\text{m}$), or a

fabricator of charms (ybꜝ ,rbꜝ) or an inquirer by a familiar spirit (bwa hac), or a wizard (ynꜝ) or a consulter of the dead (pytꜝ Al a, vrdꜝ) It is added that these are, abominations, and that on account of their practice the nations of Canaan were to be driven out (⁴⁸⁸Deuteronomy 18:9-14, esp. 10, 11). It is remarkable that the offering of children should be mentioned in connection with magical arts. The passage in Micah, which has been supposed to preserve a question of Balak and an answer of Balaam, when the soothsayer was sent for to curse Israel, should be here noticed, for the questioner asks, after speaking of sacrifices of usual kinds, “Shall I give my first-born [for] my transgression, the fruit of my body [for] the sin of my soul?” (6:5-8). Perhaps, however, child-sacrifice is specified on account of its atrocity, which would connect it with secret arts, such as we know were frequently, in later times, the causes of cruelty. The terms which follow appear to refer properly to eight different kinds of magic, but some of them are elsewhere used in a general sense.

1. **pymsꜝ]psꜝ** is literally “a diviner of divinations.” The verb **psꜝ** is used of false prophets, but also in a general sense for divining, as in the narrative of Saul’s consultation of the witch of Endor, where the king says “divine unto me (**bwaB;yl aꜝAymꜝsꜝ**), I pray thee, by the familiar spirit” (⁴⁸⁸1 Samuel 28:8).
2. **ꜝnꜝ]m** conveys the idea of “one who acts covertly,” and so “a worker of hidden arts.” The meaning of the root **ꜝnꜝ** is *covering*, and the supposed connection with fascination by the eyes, like the notion of “the evil eye,” as though the original root were “the eye” (**wyꜝ**), seems untenable. The ancient Egyptians seem to have held the superstition of the evil eye, for an eye is the determinative of a word which appears to signify some kind of magic (Chabas, *Papyrus Magique Harris*, p. 170 and note 4).
3. **vj ꜝm** which we render “an augurer,” is from **vj ꜝ**, which is literally “he or it hissed or whispered,” and in Piel is applied to the practice of enchantments, but also to divining generally, as in the case of Joseph’s cup, and where, evidently referring to it, he tells his brethren that he could divine, although in both places it has been read more vaguely with the sense *to foresee* or *make trial* (⁴⁴⁵Genesis 44:5,15). We therefore render it by a term which seems appropriate, but not too

definite. The supposed connection of **vj ḥ** with **vj ḥ**; “a serpent,” as though meaning serpent-divination, must be rejected, the latter word rather coming from the former, with the signification “a hisser.” The name Nahshon (**vj ḥ**), of a prince of Judah in the second year after the exodus (^{<0007>}Numbers 1:7; ^{<0023>}Exodus 6:23; ^{<0024>}Ruth 4:20, etc.), means “enchanter:” it was probably used as a proper name in a vague sense.

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

5. **rbh, rbj** seems to mean “a fabricator of material charms or amulets,” if **rbj**; when used of practicing sorcery, means to bind magical knots, and not to bind a person by spells.

6. **bwa l aōis** “an inquirer by a familiar spirit.” The second term signifies a bottle, a familiar spirit consulted by a soothsayer, and a soothsayer having a familiar spirit. The Sept. usually render the plural **twba** by **ἐγγαστριμῦθοι**, which has been rashly translated ventriloquists, for it may not signify what we understand by the latter, but refer to the mode in which soothsayers of this kind gave out their responses: to this subject we shall recur later. The consulting of familiar spirits may mean no more than invoking them; but in the Acts we read of a damsel possessed with a spirit of divination (^{<0016>}Acts 16:16-18) in very distinct terms. This kind of sorcery — divination by a familiar spirit — was practiced by the witch of Endor.

7. **ynēDya** which we render “a wizard,” is properly “a wise man,” but is always applied to wizards and false prophets. Gesenius (*Thesaur.* s.v.) supposes that in ^{<0021>}Leviticus 20:21 it is used of a familiar spirit, but surely the reading “a wizard” is there more probable.

8. The last term, **pytba l a, vrd** is very explicit, meaning “a consulter of the dead:” necromancer is an exact translation if the original signification of the latter is retained, instead of the more general one it now usually bears. In the law it was commanded that a man or woman who had a familiar spirit, or a wizard, should be stoned (^{<0027>}Leviticus 20:27). An “enchantress” (**hpykīm**) was not to live

(⁽¹²²¹⁸⁾Exodus 22:18 [Hebrews 17]). Using augury and hidden arts was also forbidden (⁽¹⁹²¹⁵⁾Leviticus 19:26). *SEE DIVINATION.*

5. The history of Balaam shows the belief of some ancient nations in the powers of soothsayers. When the Israelites had begun to conquer the Land of Promise, Balak, the king of Moab, and the elders of Midian, resorting to Pharaoh's expedient, sent by messengers with "the rewards of divination (? $\mu\text{ym}\alpha\alpha\text{q}$) in their hands" (⁽¹²²¹⁷⁾Numbers 22:7) for Balaam the diviner ($\mu\text{sw}\alpha\text{he}$ ⁽¹⁹²¹²⁾Joshua 13:22), whose fame was known to them, though he dwelt in Aram. Balak's message shows what he believed Balaam's powers to be: "Behold, there is a people come out from Egypt: behold, they cover the face of the earth, and they abide over against me: come now therefore, I pray thee, curse me this people; for they [are] too mighty for me: peradventure I shall prevail, [that] we may smite them, and [that] I may drive them out of the land: for I wot that he whom thou blessest [is] blessed; and he whom thou cursest is cursed" (⁽¹²²¹⁵⁾Numbers 22:5, 6). We are told, however, that Balaam, warned of God, first said that he could not speak of himself, and then by inspiration blessed those whom he had been sent for to curse. He appears to have received inspiration in a vision or a trance. In one place it is said. "And Balaam saw that it was good in the eyes of the Lord to bless Israel, and he went not, now as before, to the meeting of enchantments ($\mu\text{yv}\beta\alpha\eta$), but he set his face to the wilderness" (24:1). From this it would seem that it was his wont to use enchantments, and that when on the occasions he went away after the sacrifices had been offered, he hoped that he could prevail to obtain the wish of those who had sent for him, but was constantly defeated. The building of new altars of the mystic number of seven, and the offering of seven oxen and seven rams, seem to show that Balaam had some such idea; and the marked manner in which he declared "there is no enchantment ($\text{vj } \eta$) against Jacob, and no divination (μsq) against Israel" (23:23), proves that he had come in the hope that they would have availed, the diviner here being made to declare his own powerlessness while he blessed those whom he was sent for to curse. The case is a very difficult one, since it shows a man who was used as all instrument for declaring God's will trusting in practices that could only have incurred his displeasure. The simplest explanation seems to be that Balaam was never a true prophet but on this occasion, when the enemies of Israel were to be signally confounded. This history affords a

notable instance of the failure of magicians in attempting to resist the divine will. *SEE BALAAM.*

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

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

“Now Samuel was dead, and all Israel had lamented him, and buried him in Ramah, even in his own city. And Saul had put away those that had familiar spirits, and the wizards, out of the land. And the Philistines gathered themselves together, and came and pitched in Shunem; and Saul gathered all Israel together, and they pitched in Gilboa.” That the Philistines should have advanced so far, spreading in the plain of Esdraelon, the garden of the Holy Land, shows the straits to which Saul had come. Here, in times of faith, Sisera was defeated by Barak, and the Midianites were smitten by (ideon, some of the army of the former perishing at En-dor itself (¹⁸³⁰ Psalm 83:9,10). “And when Saul saw the host of the Philistines, he was afraid, and his heart greatly trembled. And when Saul inquired of the Lord, the Lord answered him not, neither by dreams, nor by Urim, nor by prophets. Then said Saul unto his servants, Seek me a woman that hath a familiar spirit, that I may go to her, and inquire of her. And his servants said to him, Behold, [there is] a woman that hath a familiar spirit at En-dor. And Saul disguised himself, and put on other raiment, and he went, and two men with him, and they came to the woman by night.” En-dor lay in the territory of Issachar, about seven or eight miles to the northward of Mount Gilboa. Its name, the “fountain of

Dor," may connect it with the Phoenician city Dor, which was on the coast to the westward. If so, it may have retained its stranger-population, and been therefore chosen by the witch as a place where she might with less danger than elsewhere practice her arts. It has been noticed that the mountain on whose slope the modern village stands is hollowed into rock-hewn caverns, in one of which the witch may probably have dwelt. *SEE EN-DOR*. Saul's disguise, and his journeying by night, seem to have been taken that he might not alarm the woman, rather than because he may have passed through a part of the Philistine force. The Philistines held the plain, having their camp at Shunem, whither they had pushed on from Aphek: the Israelites were at first encamped by a fountain at Jezreel, but when their enemies had advanced to Jezreel they appear to have retired to the slopes of Gilboa, whence there was a way of retreat either into the mountains to the south, or across Jordan. The latter seems to have been the line of flight, as, though Saul was slain on Mount Gilboa, his body was fastened to the wall of Bethshan. Thus Saul could scarcely have reached Endor without passing at least very near the army of the Philistines. "And he said, divine unto me, I pray thee, by the familiar spirit, and bring me [him] up whom I shall name unto thee." It is noticeable that here witchcraft, the inquiring by a familiar spirit, and necromancy, are all connected as though but a single art, which favors the idea that the prohibition in Deuteronomy specifies every name by which magical arts were known, rather than so many different kinds of arts, in order that no one should attempt to evade the condemnation of such practices by any subterfuge. It is evident that Saul thought he might be able to call up Samuel by the aid of the witch, but this does not prove what was his own general conviction, or the prevalent conviction of the Israelites on the subject. He was in a great extremity; his kingdom in danger; himself forsaken of God: he was weary with a night-journey, perhaps of risk, perhaps of great length to avoid the enemy, and faint with a day's fasting: he was conscious of wrong as, probably for the first time, he commanded unholy rites and heard in the gloom unholy incantations. In such a strait no man's judgment is steady, and Saul may have asked to see Samuel in a moment of sudden desperation, when he had only meant to demand an oracular answer. It may even be thought that, yearning for the counsel of Samuel, and longing to learn if the net that he felt closing about him were one from which he should never escape, Saul had that keener sense that some say comes in the last hours of life, and so; conscious that the prophet's shade was near, or was about to come, at once sought to see and speak with it, though this had not before been

purposed. Strange things we know occur at the moment when man feels he is about to die, and if there be any time when the unseen world is felt while yet unentered, it is when the soul first comes within the chill of its long-projected shadow. “And the woman said unto him, Behold, thou knowest what Saul hath done, how he hath cut off those that have familiar spirits, and the wizards, out of the land: wherefore, then, layest thou a snare for my life, to cause me to die? And Saul sware to her by the Lord, saying, [As] the Lord liveth, there shall no punishment happen to thee for this thing.” Nothing shows Saul’s desperate resolution more than his thus swearing when engaged in a most unholy act, a terrible profanity that makes the horror of the scene complete. Everything being prepared, the final act takes place. “Then said the woman, Whom shall I bring up unto thee? And he said, Bring me up Samuel. And when the woman saw Samuel, she cried with a loud voice: and the woman spake to Saul, saying, Why hast thou deceived me? for thou [art] Saul. And the king said unto her, Be not afraid: for what sawest thou? And the woman said unto Saul, I saw gods ascending out of the earth. And he said unto her, What [is] his form? And she said, An old man cometh up; and he [is] covered with a mantle. And Saul perceived that it [was] Samuel, and he stooped with his face to the ground, and bowed himself. And Samuel said to Saul, Why hast thou disquieted [or “disturbed”] me, to bring me up? And Saul answered, I am sore distressed; for the Philistines make war against me, and God is departed from me, and answereth me no more, neither by prophets, nor by dreams; therefore I have called thee, that thou mayest make known unto me what I shall do. Then said Samuel, Wherefore, then, dost thou ask of me, seeing the Lord is departed from thee, and is become thine enemy? And the Lord hath done to him as he spake by me, for the Lord hath rent the kingdom out of thine hand, and given it to thy neighbor, [even] to David: because thou obeyedst not the voice of the Lord, nor executedst his fierce wrath upon Amalek, therefore hath the Lord done this thing unto thee this day. Moreover, the Lord will also deliver Israel with thee into the hand of the Philistines; and to-morrow [shalt] thou and thy sons [be] with me: the Lord also shall deliver the host of Israel into the hand of the Philistines. Then Saul fell straightway all along on the earth, and was sore afraid, because of the words of Samuel: and there was no strength in him; for he had eaten no bread all the day, nor all the night” (~~ORB~~ 1 Samuel 28:3-20). The woman clearly was terrified by an unexpected apparition when she saw Samuel. She must, therefore, either have been a mere juggler, or one who had no power of working magical wonders at will. The sight of

Samuel at once showed her who had come to consult her. The prophet's shade seems to have been preceded by some majestic shapes which the witch called gods. Saul, as it seems interrupting her, asked his form, and she described the prophet as he was in his last days on earth, an old man, covered either with a mantle, such as the prophets used to wear, or wrapped in his winding-sheet. Then Saul knew it was Samuel, and bowed to the ground from respect or fear. It seems that the woman saw the appearances, and that Saul only knew of them through her, perhaps not daring to look, else why should he have asked what form Samuel had? The prophet's complaint we cannot understand, in our ignorance as to the separate state: thus much we know, that state is always described as one of perfect rest or sleep. That the woman should have been able to call him up cannot be hence inferred; her astonishment shows the contrary; and it would be explanation enough to suppose that he was sent to give Saul the last warning, or that the earnestness of the king's wish had been permitted to disquiet him in his resting-place. Although the word "disquieted" need not be pushed to an extreme sense, and seems to mean the interruption of a state of rest, our translators wisely, we think, preferring this rendering to "disturbed," it cannot be denied that, if we hold that Samuel appeared, this is a great difficulty. If, however, we suppose that the prophet's coming was ordered, it is not unsurmountable. The declaration of Saul's doom agrees with what Samuel had said before, and was fulfilled the next day, when the king and his sons fell on Mount Gilboa. It may, however, be asked, Was the apparition Samuel himself, or a supernatural messenger in his stead? Some may even object to our holding it to have been aught but a phantom of a sick brain; but, if so, what can we make of the woman's conviction that it was Samuel, and the king's horror at the words he heard, or, as these would say, that he thought he heard? It was not only the hearing his doom, but the hearing it in a voice from the other world that stretched the faithless strong man on the ground. He must have felt the presence of the dead, and heard the sound of a sepulchral voice. How else could the doom have come true, and not the king alone, but his sons, have gone to the place of disembodied souls on the morrow? for to be with the dead concerned the soul, not the body: it is no difficulty that the king's corpse was unburied till the generous men of Jabesh-gilead, mindful of his old kindness, rescued it from the wall of Bethshan. If, then, the apparition was real, should we suppose it Samuel's? A reasonable criticism would say it seems to have been so; for the supposition that a messenger came in his stead must be rejected, as it would make the speech a mixture of truth and

untruth; and if asked what sufficient cause there was for such a sending forth of the prophet from his rest, we may reply that we know not the reason for such warnings as abound in the Bible, and that, perhaps, even at the eleventh hour, the door of repentance was not closed against the king, and his impiety might have been pardoned had he repented. Instead, he went forth in despair, and, when his sons had fallen and his army was put to the rout, sore wounded, he fell on his own sword.

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

7. In the later days of the two kingdoms magical practices of many kinds prevailed among the Hebrews, as we especially learn from the condemnation of them by the prophets. Every form of idolatry which the people had adopted in succession doubtless brought with it its magic, which seems always to have remained with a strange tenacity that probably made it outlive the false worship with which it was connected. Thus the use of teraphim, dating from the patriarchal age, was not abandoned when the worship of the Canaanitish, Phoenician, and Syrian idols had been successively adopted. In the historical books of Scripture there is little notice of magic, except that wherever the false prophets are mentioned we have, no doubt, an indication of the prevalence of magical practices. We are especially told of Josiah that he put away the workers with familiar spirits, the wizards, and the teraphim, as well as the idols and the other abominations of Judah and Jerusalem, in performance of the commands of the book of the law which had been found (⁴²³³⁴2 Kings 23:24). But in the prophets we find several notices of the magic of the Hebrews in their times, and some of the magic of foreign nations. Isaiah says that the people had become workers of hidden arts (μυστικῶν) like the Philistines, and apparently alludes in the same place to the practice of magic by the Bene-Kedem (2:6). The nation had not only abandoned true religion, but had become generally addicted to magic in the manner of the Philistines, whose

Egyptian origin, *SEE CAPHTOR*, is consistent with such a condition. The origin of the Bene-Kedem is doubtful, but it seems certain that as late as the time of the Egyptian wars in Syria, under the 19th dynasty, B.C. cir. 1300, a race, partly at least Mongolian, inhabited the valley of the Orontes, among whom, therefore, we should again expect a national practice of magic, and its prevalence with their neighbors. Balaam, too, dwelt with the Bene-Kedem, though he may not have been of their race. In another place the prophet reproves the people for seeking “unto them that have familiar spirits, and unto the wizards that chirp, and that mutter” (8:19). The practices of one class of magicians are still more distinctly described where it thus said of Jerusalem: “And I will camp against thee round about, and will lay siege against thee with a mount, and I will raise forts against thee. And thou shalt be brought down, [and] shalt speak out of the ground, and thy speech shall be low out of the dust, and thy voice shall be, as of one that hath a familiar spirit, out of the ground, and thy speech shall whisper out of the dust” (29:3, 4). Isaiah alludes to the magic of the Egyptians when he says that in their calamity “they shall seek to the idols, and to the charmings [*μυFææ*], and to them that have familiar spirits, and to the wizards” (^{231B} Isaiah 19:3). And in the same manner he thus taunts Babylon: ‘Stand now with thy charms, and with the multitude of thine enchantments, wherein thou hast labored from thy youth; if so be thou shalt be able to profit, if so be thou mayest prevail. Thou art wearied in the multitude of thy counsels. Let now the viewers of the heavens [or astrologers], the stargazers, the monthly prognosticators, stand up and save thee from [these things] that shall come upon thee’ (^{237C} Isaiah 47:12, 13). The magic of Babylon is here characterized by the prominence given to astrology, no magicians being mentioned excepting practicers of this art; unlike the case of the Egyptians, with whom astrology seems always to have held a lower place than with the Chaldaean nation. In both instances the folly of those who seek the aid of magic is shown.

Micah, declaring the judgments coming for the crimes of his time, speaks of the prevalence of divination among prophets who most probably were such pretended prophets as the opponents of Jeremiah, not avowed prophets of idols, as Ahab’s seem to have been. Concerning these prophets it is said, “Night [shall be] unto you, that ye shall not have a vision; and it shall be dark unto you, that ye shall not divine; and the sun shall go down over the prophets, and the day shall be dark over them. Then shall the seers be ashamed, and the diviners confounded; yea, they shall all cover their lip;

for [there is] no answer of God” (²¹⁸⁶Isaiah 3:6, 7). Later it is said as to Jerusalem, “The heads thereof judge for reward, and the priests thereof teach for hire, and the prophets thereof divine for money; yet will they lean upon the Lord, and say, [Is] not the Lord among us? none evil can come upon us” (ver. 11). These prophets seem to have practiced unlawful arts, and yet to have expected revelations.

Jeremiah was constantly opposed by false prophets, who pretended to speak in the name of the Lord, saying that they had dreamed, when they told false visions, and who practiced various magical arts (²⁴⁴⁴Jeremiah 14:14; 23:25, ad fin.; ²⁶⁷⁰Jeremiah 27:9, 10—where the several designations applied to those who counseled the people not to serve the king of Babylon may be used in contempt of the false prophets — ²⁶⁰⁸Jeremiah 29:8, 9).

Ezekiel, as we should have expected, affords some remarkable details of the magic of his time, in the clear and forcible descriptions of his visions. From him we learn that fetishism was among the idolatries which the Hebrews, in the latest days of the kingdom of Judah, had adopted from their neighbors, like the Romans in the age of general corruption that caused the decline of their empire. In a vision, in which the prophet saw the abominations of Jerusalem, he entered the chambers of imagery in the Temple itself: “I went in and saw; and behold, every form of creeping things, and abominable beasts, and all the idols of the house of Israel, portrayed upon the wall round about.” Here seventy elders were offering incense in the dark (²¹⁸⁷Ezekiel 8:7-12). This idolatry was probably borrowed from Egypt, for the description perfectly answers to that of the dark sanctuaries of Egyptian temples, with the sacred animals portrayed upon their walls, and does not accord with the character of the Assyrian sculptures, where creeping things are not represented as objects of worship. With this low form of idolatry an equally low kind of magic obtained, practiced by prophetesses who for small rewards made amulets by which the people were deceived (²⁵³⁷Ezekiel 13:17, ad fin.). The passage must be allowed to be very difficult, but it can scarcely be doubted that amulets are referred to which were made and sold by these women, and perhaps also worn by them. We may probably read: “Woe to the [women] that sew pillows upon all joints of the hands [elbows or armholes’?], and make kerchiefs upon the head of every stature to hunt souls!” (²⁵³⁸Ezekiel 13:18). If so, we have a practice analogous to that of the modern Egyptians, who hang amulets of the kind called hegab upon the right side, and of the Nubians, who hang them on the upper part of the

arm. We cannot, in any case, see how the passage call be explained as simply referring to the luxurious dress of the women of that time, since the prophet distinctly alludes to pretended visions and to divinations (ver. 23), using almost the same expressions that he applies in another place to the practices of the false prophets (^(אֲדֹרָתִים)Ezekiel 22:28). The notice of Nebuchadnezzar's divination by arrows, where it is said "he shuffled arrows" (^(אֲדֹרָתִים)Ezekiel 21:21), must refer to a practice the same or similar to the kind of divination by arrows called El-Meysar, in use among the pagan Arabs, and forbidden in the Koran. *SEE AMULET.*

8. The references to magic in the book of Daniel relate wholly to that of Babylon, and not so much to the art as to those who used it. Daniel, when taken captive, was instructed in the learning of the Chaldeans, and placed among the wise men of Babylon (^(אֲדֹרָתִים)Daniel 2:18), by whom we are to understand the magi (I bb;yməKjə), for the term is used as including magicians (μῦμαῖοι), sorcerers (μῦρῶται), enchanters (μῦρῶται), astrologers (ἄρῶται), and Chaldeans, the last being apparently the most important class (^(אֲדֹרָתִים)Daniel 2:2, 4, 5, 10, 12, 14, 18, 24, 27; comp. 1:20). As in other cases, the true prophet was put to the test with the magicians, and he succeeded where they utterly failed. The case resembled Pharaoh's, excepting that Nebuchadnezzar asked a harder thing of the wise men. Having forgotten his dream, he not only required of them an interpretation, but that they should make known the dream itself. They were perfectly ready to tell the interpretation if only they heard the dream. The king at once saw that they were impostors. and that if they truly had supernatural powers they could as well tell him his dream as its meaning. Therefore he decreed the death of all the wise men of Babylon; but Daniel, praying that he and his fellows might escape this destruction, had a vision in which the matter was revealed to him. He was accordingly brought before the king. Like Joseph, he disavowed any knowledge of his own. "The secret which the king hath demanded, the wise men, the sorcerers, the magicians, the astrologers, cannot show unto the king; but there is a God in heaven that revealeth secrets" (ver. 27, 28). "But as for me, this secret is not revealed to me for [any] wisdom that I have more than any living" (ver. 30). He then related the dream and its interpretation, and was set over the province as well as over all the wise men of Babylon. Again the king dreamed; and, though he told them the dream, the wise men could not interpret it, and Daniel again showed the meaning (4:4 sq.). In the relation of this event we read that the king called him "chief of the scribes," the second part of the

title being the same as that applied to the Egyptian magicians (4:9 [Chald. 6]). A third time, when Belshazzar saw the writing on the wall, the wise men were sent for, and, on their failing, Daniel was brought before the king and the interpretation given (chap. 5). These events are perfectly consistent with what always occurred in all other cases recorded in Scripture when the practicers of magic were placed in opposition to true prophets. It may be asked by some how Daniel could take the post of chief of the wise men when he had himself proved their imposture. If, however, as we cannot doubt, the class were one of the learned generally, among whom some practiced magical arts, the case is very different from what it would have been had these wise men been magicians only. Besides, it seems almost certain that Daniel was providentially thus placed that, like another Joseph, he might further the welfare and ultimate return of his people. *SEE MAGI.*

9. After the Captivity, it is probable that the Jews gradually abandoned the practice of magic. Zechariah speaks indeed of the deceit of teraphim and diviners (^{<380E>}Zechariah 10:2), and foretells a time when the very names of idols should be forgotten, and false prophets have virtually ceased (^{<380E>}Zechariah 13:1-4), yet in neither case does it seem certain that he is alluding to the usages of his own day.

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

11. In the N. Test. we read very little of magic. The coming of magi to worship Christ is indeed related (^{<400E>}Matthew 2:1-12), but we have no warrant for supposing that they were magicians from their name, which the

A. V. not unreasonably renders “wise men.” *SEE MAGI*. Our Lord is not said to have been opposed by magicians, and the apostles and other early teachers of the Gospel seem to have rarely encountered them. Philip the deacon, when he preached at Samaria, found there Simon, a famous magician, commonly known as Simon Magus, who had had great power over the people; but he is not said to have been able to work wonders, nor, had it been so, is it likely that he would have soon been admitted into the Church (^{<HRD>}Acts 8:9-24). When Barnabas and Paul were at Paphos, as they preached to the proconsul Sergius Paulus, Elymas, a Jewish sorcerer and false prophet (τινὰ ἄνδρα μάγον ψευδοπροφήτην) withstood them, and was struck blind for a time at the word of Paul (^{<HRD>}Acts 13:6-12). At Ephesus, certain Jewish exorcists signally failing, both Jews and Greeks were afraid, and abandoned their practice of magical arts. “And many that believed came, and confessed, and showed their deeds. Many of them also which used curious arts brought their books together, and burned them before all: and they counted the price of them, and found [it] fifty thousand [pieces] of silver” (^{<HRD>}Acts 19:18, 19). Here both Jews and Greeks seem to have been greatly addicted to magic, even after they had nominally joined the Church. *SEE EPHESUS*. In all these cases it appears that though the practicers were generally or always Jews, the field of their success was with Gentiles, showing that among the Jews in general, or the educated class, the art had fallen into disrepute. Here, as before, there is no evidence of any real effect produced by the magicians. We have already noticed the remarkable case of the “damsel having a spirit of divination” (ἔχουσαν πνεῦμα πύθωνα) “which brought her masters much gain by foretelling” (μαντευομένη), from whom Paul cast out the spirit of divination (^{<HRD>}Acts 16:16-18). This is a matter belonging to another subject than that of magic. *SEE PROPHECY*.

Our examination of the various notices of magic in the Bible gives us this general result: They do not, as far as we can understand, once state positively that any but illusive results were produced by magical rites. They therefore afford no evidence that man can gain supernatural powers to use at his will. This consequence goes some way towards showing that we may conclude that there is no such thing as real magic; for, although it is dangerous to reason on negative evidence, yet in a case of this kind it is especially strong. Had any but illusions been worked by magicians, surely the Scriptures would not have passed over a fact of so much importance, and one which would have rendered the prohibition of these arts far more

necessary. The general belief of mankind in magic, or things akin to it, is of no worth, since the holding of such current superstition in some of its branches, if we push it to its legitimate consequences, would lead to the rejection of faith in God's government of the world, and the adoption of a creed far below that of Plato.

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

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

Magician

(Chald. $\mu\text{f}\sigma\text{j}$; *chartom*’; Heb. plural $\mu\text{yM}\text{f}\text{a}\text{j}$; *chartumminm*’, thought by Gesenius, *Thesaurp.* 520, to be of Heb. origin, signifying “sacred scribe”), a title “applied to the ‘wise men’ of Egypt (⁴⁴⁰⁸Genesis 41:8, 22; ⁴⁴⁷¹Exodus 7:11; 8:7, 18, 19; 9:11) and of Babylon (²⁷⁰²Daniel 1:20; 2:2). The word ‘magicians’ is not in either case properly applied, as the *magi* proper are usually assigned to Persia rather than to Babylon or Egypt, and should be altogether avoided in such application, seeing that it has acquired a sense different from that which it once bore. The term rather denotes ‘wise men,’ as they called themselves and were called by others; but, as we should call them, ‘men eminent in learning and science,’ their exclusive possession of which in their several countries enabled them occasionally to produce effects which were accounted supernatural by the people. Pythagoras, who was acquainted with Egypt and the East, and who was not unaware of the unfathomable depths of ignorance which lie under the highest attainable conditions of human knowledge, thought the modest title of philosopher ($\phi\text{i}\lambda\acute{o}\sigma\sigma\phi\omicron\varsigma$), ‘lover of wisdom,’ more becoming, and accordingly he brought it into use; but that of ‘wise men’ still retained its hold in the East. It is thought that the Egyptian *chartumminz* were those of the Egyptian priests who had charge of the sacred records. There can be little doubt that they belonged to some branch of the priesthood, seeing that the more recondite departments of learning and science were cultivated exclusively in that powerful caste.” **SEE MAGI.** See Jablonski, *Proleg. in Panth. Agypt.* p. 91 sq.; Creuzer, *Mythologie und Symbolik*, 1:245; Wilkinson, *Anc. Egyptians*, 2:316 sq.; Kenrick, *Egypt under the Pharaohs*, 1:382. **SEE MAGIC.**

Magicians

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

Magid'do

(Μαγεδδῶ, 1 Esdras 1:29). *SEE MEGIDDO.*

Magie, David, D.D.

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

Magill, Charles Beatty

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Wellsville, Ohio, Oct. 3, 1840; graduated at Miami University, Oxford, Ohio, in 1858; studied divinity at the Western Theological Seminary, Allegheny City, Pa., and was licensed to preach in April, 1861. The winter of 1862-63 he spent at Princeton, N. J.; subsequently he preached in Virginia and Illinois; and was finally ordained and installed pastor of the Presbyterian Church of Birmingham, Iowa. He afterwards spent a short time in the service of the Christian

Commission in Georgia, where he contracted the illness of which he died, Aug. 28. 1864. Mr. Magill was thoroughly educated and devoutly pious. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1865, p. 98.

Maginnis, John Sharp, D.D.

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

Magister Disciplinae

(*master of discipline*) was the title of a certain ecclesiastical officer in the ancient Church. It was a custom in Spain, in the time of the Gothic kings, about the end of the 5th century, for parents to dedicate their young children to the service of the Church. They were taken for this purpose into a bishop's family, and educated, under his supervision, by a discreet and grave person, who was generally a presbyter, and was called *magister disciplinae*. The second and fourth councils of Toledo prescribed the duties of this master, the chief of which were, that he should vigilantly watch over the moral character and behavior of the young, and instruct them in the rules and discipline of the Church.

Magister Sacri Palatii

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

Magistrate

(the representative in the Auth. Vers. of several Heb. and Gr. words, as below), a public civil officer invested with authority. Among the Hebrews, Greeks, and Romans, the corresponding terms had a much wider signification than the term magistrate has with us. The Hebrew שופט *shophetimn*, or judges, were a kind of magistrates (¹⁶Deuteronomy 1:16,

17; ^{<13725>}Ezra 7:25). See JUDGE. The phrase in ^{<17817>}Judges 18:7, “And there was no *magistrate* in the land, that might put them to shame in any thing,” ought to be rendered, “And there were none to harm (μὴ Κ) at all in the land; and they *were possessed* (ὑρέψ, *yoresh*) of wealth.” So, also, the terms ἡγεμόνι] ὑφ’ αὐτοῦ; *shaphetin’ ve-dayanin*, rendered “magistrates and judges” (^{<13725>}Ezra 7:25), would be better rendered “judges and rulers.” The ἡγεμόνι] *seگانیم*, rendered “rulers,” properly nobles, were Babylonian magistrates, *prefects* of provinces (^{<25123>}Jeremiah 51:23, 28, 57; ^{<23216>}Ezekiel 23:6). The same name was borne by the Jewish magistrates in the time of Ezra and Nehemiah (^{<13712>}Ezra 9:2; ^{<11216>}Nehemiah 2:16; 4:14; 13:11). The word ἄρχων, *archon*, rendered magistrate (^{<11215>}Luke 11:58; ^{<5101>}Titus 3:1)? properly signifies *one first in power, authority*; hence “a prince” (^{<11215>}Matthew 20:25; ^{<11216>}1 Corinthians 2:6, 8); “a ruler” (^{<11215>}Acts 4:26; ^{<51318>}Romans 13:3). The term is also used of the Messiah as “the prince of the kings of the earth” (^{<11215>}Revelation 1:5); and of Moses as the judge and leader of the Hebrews (^{<11217>}Acts 7:27, 35). It is spoken of magistrates of any kind, e.g. the high-priest (^{<11215>}Acts 23:5); of civil judges (^{<11215>}Luke 12:58; ^{<11215>}Acts 16:19); also of a ruler of the synagogue (^{<11215>}Luke 8:41; ^{<11215>}Matthew 9:18, 23; ^{<11215>}Mark 5:22): and of persons of weight and influence among the Pharisees and other sects at Jerusalem, who also were members of the Sanhedrim (^{<11215>}Luke 14:1; 18:18; 23:13, 35; 24:20; ^{<11215>}John 3:1; 7:26, 48; 12:42; ^{<11215>}Acts 3:17; 4:5, 8; 13:27; 14:5). The term is also used of Satan, the *prince* or *chief* of the fallen angels (^{<11215>}Matthew 9:34; 12:24; ^{<11215>}Mark 3:22; ^{<11215>}Luke 11:15; ^{<11215>}John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11; ^{<11215>}Ephesians 2:2). So likewise the kindred ἄρχη (^{<11215>}Luke 12:11; ^{<11215>}Titus 3:1). The word στρατηγός, rendered “magistrate,” properly signifies *leader of an army, commander, general*. So of the ten Athenian commanders, with whom the *poleamarch* was joined. Afterwards only one or two were sent abroad with the army, as circumstances required, and the others had charge of military affairs at home, i. q. *war-minister*. In other Greek cities the στρατηγός was the chief magistrate, *praefect*. The term is also used of Roman officers, the *consul* and the *praetor*. In Roman colonies and municipal towns, the chief magistrates were usually two in number, called *duumviri*; occasionally four or six, *quatuorviri, seviri*, who also were sometimes *styled prmetors*, the same as the Greek στρατηγοί. Hence, in the New Testament, this term is used for the Roman *dueumviri, praetors*, magistrates of Philippi, which was a Roman colony (^{<11215>}Acts 16:20, 22, 35, 36, 38). The word ἐξουσία is also used collectively for

those invested with power, as in English we might say “*the powers*” for *rulers, magistrates* (^{<Q121>}Luke 12:11; ^{<S132>}Romans 13:2, 3; ^{<S101>}Titus 3:1). The “higher powers” (^{<S131>}Romans 13:1) are “the ruling authorities” — the magistrates in office — all invested with civil power, from the emperor or king, as supreme, to the lowest civil officer—all who are employed in making and executing the laws. The Roman emperor and some of the subordinate magistrates wore a small sword or dagger, the symbol of punishment, as a part of their official costume. *SEE GOVERNOR.*

In the earliest periods of Jewish history the magistrates were the hereditary chieftains, but afterwards the judicial office became elective. In the time of Moses, the larger collections of families were fifty-nine in number, and the heads of these families, together with the twelve princes of the tribes, composed a council of seventy-one members; but the subdivisions afterwards were more numerous, and the number of heads of families greater, for we find no less than two hundred and fifty chiefs of this rank included in the rebellion of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram. The *μυρῆν*, *shoterim*, or genealogists, are mentioned in connection with the elders that is, the princes of tribes and heads of families. *SEE OFFICER.* They kept the genealogical tables. Under Joshua, they communicated the orders of the general to the soldiers; and in the time of the Kings, the chief *shoter* had a certain control over the army, although he was not a military commander. The *shoterims*, who were superintended by this chief, were distributed into every city, and performed the duties of their office for it and the surrounding district. As they kept the genealogical tables, they had an accurate list of the people, and were acquainted with the age, ability, and domestic circumstances of each individual; but they are not to be confounded with another officer who kept the muster-rolls, and whose name had a similar etymology. Moses added a new class of magistrates for the administration of justice, which, he informs us, was not of divine appointment, but was suggested by his father-in-law Jethro. He divided the people into tens, fifties, hundreds, and thousands, and placed wise and prudent judges over each of these divisions. They were selected, for the most part, from the heads of families, genealogists, or other people of rank (^{<D183>}Exodus 18:13, 26). Difficult questions were brought before Moses himself, and, after his death, before the chief magistrate of the nation. These judges Moses included among the rulers, and Joshua summoned them to the general assemblies; and they are mentioned, in one instance, before the genealogists (^{<S123>}Deuteronomy 31:28; ^{<S133>}Joshua 8:33). When

the magistrates of all the cities belonging to any one tribe were collected, they formed the supreme court, or legislative assembly of the tribe; and when the magistrates of all the tribes were convened together, they formed the general council of the nation, and could legislate conjointly for all the tribes they represented. After the settlement in Canaan, although the chief magistrate of the Jewish state was, in reality, Jehovah, the invisible King, a supreme ruler for the whole community could be legally chosen when the necessities of the state required it, who was denominated a judge, or governor. *SEE JUDGE*. In the book of ^{<6174>}Deuteronomy 17:14, 15 we find Jehovah telling the Hebrews that if, when they arrived in the Promised Land, they wished to have a king like the other nations round about them, they were to receive one whom he would appoint, and not a stranger. Josephus and others have correctly understood this passage not to mean that God commanded the Israelites to desire a king when they were settled in Canaan, but that, if they would have a king, he was to be appointed by God, and that he should invariably be a Hebrew, and not a Gentile. *SEE KING*. Judges, genealogists, the heads of families or clans, and those who, from the relation they sustained to the common class of people, may be called the princes of the tribes, retained their authority after as well as before the introduction of a monarchical form of government, and acted the part of a legislative assembly to the respective cities in or near which they resided (^{<1126>}1 Kings 12:1-24; ^{<1374>}1 Chronicles 23:4; 26:29). The headship of the tribes and families was hereditary, though probably subject to the royal approbation: but the judges and genealogists were appointed by the king. Besides these, we read of certain great officers, as “the royal counsellors” (^{<1126>}1 Kings 12:6-12; ^{<1373>}1 Chronicles 27:32; ^{<2318>}Isaiah 3:3), among whom the prophets were included by pious kings (^{<1072>}2 Samuel 7:2; ^{<1127>}1 Kings 22:7, 8; ^{<1292>}2 Kings 19:2-20); while others of a different character imitated the example of heathen princes, and called in to their aid soothsayers and false prophets (^{<1182>}1 Kings 18:22; 22:6; ^{<2013>}Daniel 1:20). The secretary or “scribe” (^{<1086>}2 Samuel 8:16; 20:24; ^{<1043>}1 Kings 4:3) committed to writing not only the edicts and sayings of the king, but everything of a public nature that related to the kingdom; and it was likewise his business to present to the king in writing an account of the state of affairs. The high-priest may be also reckoned among those who had access to the king in the character of counselors (^{<1087>}2 Samuel 8:17; ^{<1316>}1 Chronicles 18:16). *SEE COUNSELLOR*. During the Captivity and after that period the Hebrews continued among them that class of officers denominated heads of families, and perhaps likewise the princes of the

tribes, who, under the direction of the royal governors, ruled their respective tribes (^{<1306>}Ezra 1:5; 4:3, 5; ^{<1426>}Nehemiah 2:16; 6:17, 18; ^{<1341>}Ezekiel 14:1); but it is most probable that Jehoiachin, and afterwards Shealtiel and Zerubbabel, held the first rank among them, or, in other words, were their princes. After their return to their native country the Hebrews obeyed their *h j p*; *pachoh'*, or president. Such were Zerubbabel, Ezra, and Nehemiah, who were invested with ample powers for the purposes of government (^{<1375>}Ezra 7:25). When, from any cause, there was no person authorized by the civil government to act as president, the high-priest commonly undertook the government of the state. This state of things continued while the Jews were under the Persians and Greeks, until the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, in whose reign they appealed to arms, shook off the yoke of foreign subjugation, and, having obtained their freedom, made their high-priests princes, and at length kings. The Jews, likewise, who were scattered abroad, and had taken up their residence in countries at a distance from Palestine, had rulers of their own. The person who sustained the highest office among those who dwelt in Egypt was denominated *alabarch* (q.v.); the magistrate at the head of the Syriaci Jews was denominated *archon*. **SEE RULER**. While the Jews were under the Roman government they enjoyed the privilege of referring litigated questions to referees, whose decisions in reference to them the Roman praetor was bound to see put in execution.

After the subjugation of the Jews by the Romans, certain provinces of Judaea were governed by that class of magistrates denominated *tetrarchs*, an office said to have originated among the Gauls; and this appellation, although originally applied to the chief magistrate of the fourth part of a tribe, subject to the authority of the king, was afterwards extended in its application, and applied to any governors, subject to some king or emperor, without reference to the fact whether they ruled or not precisely the fourth part of a tribe of people. **SEE TETRARCH**. Herod Antipas, accordingly, and Philip, although they did not rule so much as a fourth part of Judaea, were denominated tetrarchs (^{<1401>}Matthew 14:1; ^{<1307>}Luke 9:7; ^{<1411>}Acts 13:1). Although this class of rulers were dependent upon Caesar, that is, the Roman emperor, they nevertheless governed the people who were committed to their immediate jurisdiction as much according to their own choice and discretion as if they had not been thus dependent. They were inferior, however, in point of rank, to the ethnarchs, who, although they did not publicly assume the name of king, were addressed with that

title by their subjects, as was the case with respect to Archelaus (^{<4122>}Matthew 2:22). A class of magistrates well known among the Romans, termed *procurators*, are denominated in the New Testament ἡγεμόνες, but it appears that they are called by Josephus ἐπίτροποι. Judaea, after the termination of the ethnarchate of Archelaus, was governed by rulers of this description, and likewise during the period which immediately succeeded the reign of Herod Agrippa. Augustus made a new partition of the provinces of the Roman empire into *provinciae senatoriae*, which were left under the nominal care of the senate, and *provinciae imperatoriae* vel *Caesarum*, which were under the direct control of the emperor. To their provinces the senate sent officers for one year, called proconsuls, with only a civil power, and neither military command nor authority over the taxes: those sent to command in the imperial provinces were called *legati Cetesris pro consule*, etc., and had much greater powers. In each of these provinces, of both kinds, there was, besides the president, an officer called *procurator Caesaris*, who had the charge of the revenue, and who sometimes discharged the office of a governor or president, especially in a small province, or in a portion of a large one where the president could not reside; as did Pilate, who was procurator of Judaea, which was annexed to the *provincia imperatoria* of Syria; hence he had the power of punishing capitally, which the procurators did not usually possess; so also Felix, Festus, and the other procurators of Judaea. Some of the procurators were dependent on the nearest proconsul or president; for instance, those of Judaea were dependent on the proconsul, governor, or president of Syria. They enjoyed, however, great authority, and possessed the power of life and death. The only privilege, in respect to the officers of government, that was granted by the procurators of Judaea to the nation was the appointment from among them of persons to manage and collect the taxes. In all other things they administered the government themselves, except that they frequently had recourse to the counsel of other persons (^{<4223>}Acts 23:24-35; 25:23). **SEE PROVINCE.**

The military force that was granted to the procurators of Judaea consisted of six cohorts, of which five were stationed at Cesarea, where the procurator usually resided, and one at Jerusalem, in the tower of Antonia, which was so situated as to command the Temple (^{<4401>}Acts 10:1; 21:32). It was the duty of the military cohorts to execute the procurator's commands and to repress seditions (^{<4185>}Matthew 8:5; 27:27; ^{<41516>}Mark 15:16; ^{<4323>}John 19:23). On the return of the great festivals, when there were vast crowds

of people at Jerusalem, the procurators themselves went from Caesarea to that city in order to be at hand to suppress any commotions which might arise (^{477D}Matthew 27:2-65; ^{483D}John 18:29; 19:38). *SEE GOVERNMENT.*

Magistrates

In the early Church, magistrates, whatever the grade of their office, were under the spiritual jurisdiction of the clergy; and if they were impious or profane, they were subject to censure and excommunication. The Council of Aries, called by Constantine, ratified this ecclesiastical power. Synesius, bishop of Ptolemais, excommunicated Andronicus, the governor, for his blasphemies and cruelties, and with him all his accomplices. Athanasius pronounced a similar sentence on the governor of Libya. Ambrose denied the communion to the emperor Theodosius. But such a spiritual sentence did not deprive the magistrate of his lawful civil authority. The Church rendered allegiance to the rightful governor, whether heathen or heretic; but she had a perfect right to exclude from her fellowship any magistrate of erroneous creed or depraved life. She did not attempt to interfere with a magistrate's authority while she refused him ecclesiastical fellowship. The Roman Catholic Church has sought, in this practice of the early Church, an authority for her interference in temporal affairs. *SEE KEYS, POWER OF THE; SEE TEMPORAL POWER OF THE POPE.* In Protestant Churches that are united with the state, these Romish views are manifest, though in a somewhat different form. The state controlling the Church, the magistrate is clothed with authority even in matters really pertaining to the domain of the ecclesiastic. Thus in Scotland the *Westminster Confession* gives to the magistrate extraordinary power in or about sacred things. The earlier Scottish Reformers went still further, as in the first Confession. The *Books of Discipline* are no less explicit. The First Book says, "We dare not prescribe unto you what penalties shall be required of such; but this we feare not to affirme, that the one and the other deserve death; for if he who doth falsifie the seale, subscription, or coine of a king, is judged worthy of death, what shall we think of him who plainly doth falsifie the seales of Christ Jesus, Prince of the kings of the earth? If Darius pronounced that a balk should be taken from the house of that man, and he himselfe hanged upon it, that durst attempt to hinder the re-edifying of the materiall temple, what shall we say of those that contemptuously blaspheme God, and manifestly hinder the temple of God, which is the soules and bodies of the elect, to be purged by the true preaching of Christ Jesus from the superstition and damnable idolatry in which they have bene long plunged

and holden captive? If ye, as God forbid, declare your selves carelesse over the true religion, God will not suffer your negligence unpunished; and therefore more earnestly we require that strait lawes may be made against the stubborne contemners of Christ Jesus, and against such as dare presume to minister his sacraments not orderly called to that office, least while that there be none found to gainstand impiety, the wrath of God be kindled against the whole." Nay, blasphemy was to be tried by the civil judge, but false weights and measures by the kirk. The Scottish Parliament, in 1560, enacted not only that the power and jurisdiction of the pope should cease in Scotland, but that all who either assisted or were present at mass should be punished, for the first offense, by confiscation of goods; for the second, by banishment; for the third, by death. It was believed that the magistrate had the same power in regard to the first *table* as to the second, a theory which, restoring the Jewish theocracy, would justify persecution, and put an end to toleration. For example, the Scottish Parliament in 1579 passed an act ordaining every householder worth three hundred merks of yearly rent, and every burges or yeoman worth £500 stock, to have a Bible and psalm-book in their houses, under a penalty of £10.

Magistris, Simone De,

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

Magnanimity

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

Magnentius, Flavius Magnus,

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

Magni, John

a Swedish prelate, was born at Wexioe in 1583; traveled extensively on the Continent, especially in Germany, and on his return home became professor of history at his alma mater, the University of Upsala. Queen Christina, who succeeded her noble husband, Gustavus Adolphus, the great defender of the Protestant faith, in the government of Sweden (1632), frequently availed herself of the counsels of John Magri, and created him

bishop of Skara. He died in 1651, three years previous to Christina's abdication of the throne. *SEE SWEDEN*. Magni took a great interest in the educational affairs of Sweden, and did much to afford his countrymen far superior advantages than they had enjoyed previous to his day. His writings are of a secular nature. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 32:718; *Biographie Universelle*, s.v.

Magni, Valerian

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

Magnificat

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

Magnus

The Roman Catholic Church commemorates several saints of this name.

1. ST. MAGNUS, *Magnoald*, *Maginald*, *Mangold*, of whom we possess two biographical notices, one by Perth, ii, according to which he was an Alleman by birth, and became the pupil, companion, and successor of St. Gall in the convent of that name. The other, to be found in the Bollandists,

Sept. 3:700 sq., states that he was a native of Ireland, built the convent of Fissen after the destruction of St. Gall, converted the inhabitants of Augsburg and surrounding parts, and finally died about 655. He is commemorated Sept. 6. See Koch-Stermfeld, *Der h. Mangold in Oberschwaben* (Passau, 1825); F. B. Tafrathshofer, *Der h. Magnus* (Kempten, 1842); F. W. Rettberg, *Kirchengesch. Deutschlands*, 2:148 sq.; Friedrich, *Kirchengesch. Deutschlands* (Bamb. 1868), ii (see Index); J. H. Kurtz, *Handbuch d. allg. K. Gesch.* 2:1, p. 115 sq.

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

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

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

Magnus, John Or Jonas

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

Upsaliensium (Rome, 1557,1560, fol.). See Niceron, *Memoires*, 35, s.v.; Chauffepid, *Diction. Hist. s.v.*; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 32:732.

Magnus, Olaus

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

Ma'gog

(Heb. *Magog*, *gwm*; *region of Gog* [see below]; Sept. *Μαγώγ*, Vulg. *Magog*), the second son of Japhet (^{<0102>}Genesis 10:2; ^{<1005>}1 Chronicles 1:5). B.C. post 2514. "Various etymologies of the name have been suggested. Knobel (*Vilke: t. p. 63*) proposes the Sanscrit *mah* or *malha*, 'great,' and a Persian word signifying 'mountain,' in which case the reference would be to the Caucasian range. The terms *ghogh* and *noghef* are still applied to some of the heights of that range. This etymology is supported by Von Bohlen (*Introd. to* ^{<0021>}*Genesis* 2:211). On the other hand, Hitzig (*Comm. in Ez.*) connects the first syllable with the Coptic *ma*, 'place,' or the Sanscrit *maha*, 'land,' and the second with a Persian root, *koka*, 'the moon,' as though the term had reference to moon-worshippers." In Ezekiel (38:2; 39:6) it occurs as the name of a nation, and, from the associated names in all the passages where it occurs, it is supposed to represent certain Scythian or Tartar tribes descended from the son of Japhet. **SEE ETHNOLOGY.** Thus, in Genesis, it is coupled with Gomer (the Cimmerians) and Madai (the Medes), among the Japhetites, while Ezekiel joins it with Meshech and Jubal (*vao aycæ* "chief prince," should be

prince of Rosh), as the name of a great and powerful people, dwelling in the extreme recesses of the north, who are to invade the Holy Land at a future time. Their king is there called Gog. The people of Magog further appear as having a force of cavalry (²³⁸⁵Ezekiel 38:15), and as armed with the bow (²³⁸⁸Ezekiel 39:3). The oldest versions give the word unchanged; but Josephus (*Ant.* 1:6, 3) interprets it by *Scythians* (Σκύθαι), and so Jerome; but Suidas renders it *Persians*. “Michaelis (*Suppl. ad Lex. Heb.* 1471), Rosenmueller (*Scholia in* ⁴¹⁰⁰*Genesis* 10:2), and Gesenius (*Thesaurus*, s.v.) adopt the view that the Scythians generally are intended. Bochart (*Phaleg*, 3:19) suggests that the name *Gog* appears in Ἰωγαρηνή, the name of a district near to that through which the Araxes flows (Strabo, p. 528); and this falls in with the supposition that the Magogites were Scythians, for the traditions of the latter represent their nation as coming originally from the vicinity of the Araxes (Diod. Sic. 2:43). Since Bochart’s time the general consent of scholars has been in favor of regarding the eastern Scythians as the Magog of Genesis; but Kiepert associates the name with *Macija*, or *MAaka*. and applies it to Scythian nomad tribes which forced themselves in between the Arian or Arianized Medes, Kurds, and Armenians’ (Keil and Delitzsch, *Bibl. Comment. on the O.T.* [Clark], 1:163); while Bunsen places Magog in Armenia; though in the map accompanying his *Bibelwerk* it is placed to the north of the Emuxine. Knobel also places Magog there, and connects the Scythian tribes thus named with those which spread into Europe, and were allied to the Sarmatians, who gave their name ultimately to the whole north-east of Europe, and are the ancestors of the Slavic nations now existing” (Kitto). It is certain that the term *Scythian* was a collective title of the remote savage tribes of the north in a similar manner to the use of Magcog (Cellarii *Notit.* 2:753 sq.). **SEE SCYTHIAN**. There appears to have been from the earliest times a legend that the enemies of religion and civilization lived in that quarter (*Haxthausen’s Tribes of the Caucasus*, p. 55). From the accounts found among the Arabians, Persians, and Syrians. some of which are embellished with various fables. we learn that they comprehended under the designation *Yajuj and Majuj* all the less known barbarous people of the north-east and north-west of Asia. (See the Koran, 18:94-99; 21:96; Assemani, *Bibl. Orient.* III, 2:1, 17, 20; Hylander, *Spec. op. cnsmog.* pt. 20-22 [Lond. 1803]; Klaproth, *Asiat. Magaz.* 1:138 sq.; Herbelot, *Biblioth. Orient.* 2:281 sq.; Flügel, in the *Halle Encycl.* II, 14:78 sq.) Yet, though the Gog and Magog of the Hebrews may have had an equally vague acceptation, it nevertheless seems to have pointed more

precisely to the *northern tribes of the Caucasus*, between the Euxine and the Caspian Seas. The people of that region, it seems, were a terror to middle Asia; and they have often been named the Scythians of the East. Jerome says of Magog that it means “Scythian nations, fierce and innumerable, who live beyond the Caucasus and the lake Maeotis, and near the Caspian Sea, and spread out even onward to India.” The people dwelling among the Caucasian Mountains have preserved their original character down to the present hour, as is evident from their recent long-continued contests with the Russians. The famous Caucasian wall, probably erected by some of the successors of Alexander the Great, as a defense against the incursions of the northern barbarians, and which extended from Derbend, on the western shore of the Caspian, to near the Euxine or Black Sea, is still called “*the wall of Gog and Magog.*” (See Reinegg, *Beschr. d. Caucasus*, 2:79.) The traveler Gmelin visited this wall in 1770, in the course of the scientific mission upon which he was sent by the Russian government. From Derbend, on the Caspian Sea, the headquarters of the Russian military guard in that country, Gmelin directed his course westward, towards the Euxine, and he soon met with some ruins of the ancient wall, which he describes as in some places thirty feet high, and for large distances nearly entire, and in other places partially or wholly fallen down. There are watch-towers along the wall at signal distances; two of these he ascended, and from their tops he could descry the snowy ridges of Caucasus. This wall seems to have been built in almost a straight line from the Caspian to the Euxine, and the watch-towers and fortresses were probably erected as a means of keeping up communication between Derbend, the garrison at the eastern extremity, and the fastnesses in the mountains. (See Bayer, *De Muro Caucasio*, in *Acta Acad. Scientiar. Petropsol.* 1:425; Ker Porter, *Travels*, 2:520; Ritter, *Erdik.* 2:834 sq.) In Revelation 20:7, 9, the terms Gog and Magog are evidently used tropically, as names of the enemies of Christianity, who will endeavor to extirpate it from the earth, but will thereby bring upon themselves signal destruction. But that Ezekiel, in his prophecy, meant to be understood as predicting the invasion of Palestine by Gog and Magog in the literal sense, is hardly credible. He uses these names to designate distant and savage nations; and in the same way John employs them. Just in the same manner we now employ the word *barbarians*. That both writers should employ these two names in a tropical way is no more strange than that we should employ the words Scythian, Tartar, Indian, etc., in the same manner. Nothing could be more natural than for Ezekiel, who lived in

Mesopotamia, to speak of Gog and Magog, since they were the formidable enemies of all that region; and that John, writing on the same subject, should retain the same names, was equally natural. (See Stuart's *Comment. on the Apoc.* ad loc.) **SEE GOG.**

Ma'gor-mis'sabib

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

Mag'piash

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

Magyars

SEE HUNGARY.

Maha-bharata

(from the Sans. mahat — changed to *mahâ* — *great*, and *Bhârata*, a famous Hindu prince) is the name of a great epic poem of ancient India. As its main story relates to the contest between two rival families. both descendants of a king, Bharata, the title probably implies "the great history of the descendants of Bharata." In its present shape the poem consists of upwards of 100,000 verses, each containing 32 syllables. and is divided into 18 parvans or books. That this huge composition was not the work of one single individual, but a production of successive ages, clearly appears from the multifariousness of its contents, from the difference of style which characterizes its various parts, and even from the contradictions which disturb its harmony. Hindu tradition ascribes it to Vsyasa; but as Vyvsa means "the distributor or arranger," and as the same individual is also the

reputed compiler of the Vedas, Puranas, and several other works, it is obvious that no historical value can be assigned to this generic name.

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

Maha-deva

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

Mahadi or Mehdi

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

Maha-Kala

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

Maha-Kali

SEE KALI

Maha-kasyapa

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

Ma'halah

(^{<13718>}1 Chronicles 7:18). *SEE MAHLAH*.

Mahal'aleel

(*Heb. Mahalel'*, **l aē] h̄m̄i** *praise of God*; Sept. and N.T. **Μαλελεήλ**), the name of two men.

1. The son of the antediluvian patriarch Cainan, of the line of Seth, born when his father was seventy years old; he became the father of Jared at sixty-five years of age, and lived to the age of eight hundred and sixty-five years (^{<01512>}Genesis 5:12-17; ^{<13102>}1 Chronicles 1:2; ^{<01857>}Luke 3:37 in which last passage the name is Anglicized "Maleleël"). B.C. 3777-2881. "Ewald recognizes in Mahalaleel the sun-god, or Apollo of the antediluvian mythology, and in his son Jared the god of water, the Indian Varuna (*Gesch.* 1:357), but, his assertions are perfectly arbitrary."

2. A Judiate of the family of Pharez, father of Shephatiah, and ancestor of one Athaiall, who resided at Jerusalem after the exile (^{<16104>}Nehemiah 11:4). . B.C. much ante 536.

Ma'halath

(*Heb. Machcalath'*, **t l h̄m̄i** *a lute*, otherwise the title of a song) the name of two women. See below.

1. (Sept. **Μαελέθ**, Vulg. *Maheleth*.) The daughter of Ishmael, and third wife of Esau (^{<01209>}Genesis 28:9); elsewhere called BASHMATH (^{<01313>}Genesis 36:3); but the Samar. Pent. has Mahalath in both passages. *SEE ESAU*.

2. (Septuag. **Μολάθ** v. r. **Μοολάθ**, Vulg. *Malhalath*.) The daughter of Jerimoth. granddaughter of David. and wife of Kehoboam (2 Chronicles xi.

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

Ma’halath Mas’chil

occurs in the title of Psalm 53, and MA’HALATH LEAN’NOTH MAS’CHIL in the title of Psalm 88. For these latter names, see each in its alphabetical order. The term MAHALATH (Heb. *Machalath*’, תלך חיל Sept.

Μαελέθ, Vulg. *Maeleth*, *Mahleth*) is thought by Gesenius (*Thesaur. Heb.* p. 476) to be for חלך חיל from חלך ; *to be sweet*, spoken of musical sounds; hence signifying a stringed instrument, e.g. a lute or *yuitar*, accompanied by the voice. Furst however, denies (*Heb. Lex.* s.v.) that it denotes an instrument at all, and maintains that it was the title of an old *air* to which the psalms in question were to be sung. Ludolph (p. 272) compares the equivalent AETHIOPIC, signifying a song or hymn. The use of Leannoth in the same connection would perhaps favor the reference to some kind of instrument; but the versions render no assistance as to the meaning of either word, and most interpreters resort either to vague conjecture or mystical allusions. The use of the particle ל [l] “s upon,” before “Mahalath,” in each case, seems to indicate some kind of instrument. *SEE PSALMS.*

Ma’hali

(¹⁰⁶⁹Exodus 6:19). *SEE MAHLI.*

Maha-maya

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

Mahana’im

(Hebrew *Machana’yin*, מצה חיל *two camps*, as often, and explained in ¹⁰³²Genesis 32:2 as meaning the heavenly *army* of God; where the Sept. has Παρεμβολαί, Vulg. *Mahanaim*, *id est Castra*; elsewhere Μαανά μ or

Μααναΐμ, once **Μαναέμ**, sometimes **παρεμβολαί**; Vulg. *Manaim*, but usually *castra*), a place beyond the Jordan, north of the river Jabbok, which derived its name from Jacob's having been there met by the angels (Josephus, **Θεοῦ στρατόπεδον**, *Ant.* 1:20, 1) on his return from Padan-aram (^{<0332>}Genesis 32:2). **SEE JACOB**. The name was eventually extended to the town which then existed, or which afterwards arose in the neighborhood. This town was on the confines of the tribes of Gad and Manasseh, as well as on the southern boundary of Bashan (^{<0335>}Joshua 13:26, 30), and was a city of the Levites (^{<0238>}Joshua 21:38; ^{<0380>}1 Chronicles 6:80). It was in this city that Ishbosheth, the son of Saul, reigned (^{<0108>}2 Samuel 2:8, 12) during David's reign at Hebron, and here he was assassinated (ch. 4). The choice of this place was probably because he found the influence of David's name less strong on the east than on the west of the Jordan; at least, it seems to show that Mahanaim was then an important and strong place (comp. ^{<0129>}2 Samuel 2:29; 19:32). Hence, many years after, David himself repaired to Mahanaim, where he was entertained by Barzillai, the aged sheik of that district, when he sought refuge beyond the Jordan from his son Absalom (^{<0174>}2 Samuel 17:24, 27; ^{<0108>}1 Kings 2:8). In this vicinity also appears to have been fought the decisive battle in the wood of Ephraim, between the royal troops and the rebels (2 Samuel 18). **SEE DAVID**. We only read of Mahanaim again as the station of one of the twelve officers who had charge, in monthly rotation, of raising the provisions for the royal establishment under Solomon (^{<0104>}1 Kings 4:14). Some find an allusion to the place in ^{<0174>}Song of Solomon 6:13 ("companies of two armies," lit. dance of Mahanaim), but this is doubtful. "On the monument of Sheshonk (Shishak) at Karnak, in the 22d cartouchone of those which are believed to contain the names of Israelitish cities conquered by that king — a name appears which is read as *Ma-ha-n-m -a*, that is, Mahanaim. The adjoining cartouches contain names which are read as Bethshean, Shunerm, Megiddo, Beth-boron, Gibeon, and other Israelitish names (Brugsch, *Geogr. der nachbarländer Aegyptens*, p. 61). If this interpretation may be relied on, it shows that the invasion of Shishak was more extensive than we should gather from the records of the Bible (2 Chronicles 13), which are occupied mainly with occurrences at the metropolis. Possibly the army entered by the plains of Philistia and Sharon, ravaged Esdraelon and some towns like Mahanaim just beyond Jordan, and then returned, either by the same route or by the Jordan valley, to Jerusalem, attacking it last. This would account for Rehoboam's non-resistance, and also for the fact, of which special mention is made, that

many of the chief men of the country had taken refuge in the city. It should, however, be remarked that the names occur in most promiscuous order, and that none has been found resembling Jerusalem.” In Dr. Eli Smith’s Arabic list of names of places in Jebel Ajlh.n (Robinson’s *Bib. Researches*, 3, Append. p. 166), we find a ruined site under the name of *Mahneh*, which is probably that of Mahanaim (comp. Schwarz, *Palest.* p. 231; Keil’s *Comment.* on ^{<0635>}Joshua 13:26). The same identification was pointed out by the Jewish traveler Hap-Parchi, according to whom it lies about half a day’s journey due east of Bethshan (Zunz, in Asher’s edit. of *Benj. of Tudela*, p. 40), the same direction as in Kiepert’s *Map*, but only half as far. Its distance from the Jabbok is a considerable but not fatal objection. Tristram visited the place which he defends at length as the site of Mahanaim, and describes it as well situated for a large town, with considerable remains and a fine pond (*Land of Israel*, p. 483).

Ma’haneh-dan

(Heb. *Machaneh’-Dan*, ^{<0635>}*ḏAhnj ni*, camp of Dan; Septuag. Παρεμβολή Δάν, Vulg. *Casitre Dan*), a name given to a spot west of Kirjath-jearim, in consequence of its having been the encampment of the party of Danites on their way to capture Laish (^{<0782>}Judges 18:12). Mr. Williams suggests a site called *Beit Mahanem*, on the north side of wady Ismail. and N.N.E. of Deir el Howa (*Holy City*, 1:12, note); but the name appears on no map, and occurs in no other traveler.

Maha-Pralya

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

Ma’harai

(Hebrew *Maharay’*, ^{<0635>}*yrhni* hasty; Sept. Μαχαράι and Μοοράι v. r. Μαράι and Μεηρά), a Netophathite, and one of David’s chief warriors (^{<1238>}2 Samuel 23:28; ^{<1313>}1 Chronicles 11:30); being a descendant of Zerach,

and the tenth captain of a contingent of 24,000 men (^{<13713>}1 Chronicles 27:13). B.C. 1014.

Maha-Rudra

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

Maha-sanghika

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

Ma'hath

(Heb. *fMam'chath*, תַּי מִי prob. for חַתַּי מִי *grasping*; Sept. Μαάθ), the name of two Levites.

1. A Kohathite, son of Amasai and father of Elkanah (^{<13165>}1 Chronicles 6:35); apparently the same elsewhere (^{<13165>}1 Chronicles 6:25) called AHIMOTH *SEE AHIMOTH* (q.v.). B.C. cir. 1375. *SEE SAMUEL*.
2. Another Kohathite, one of those who cleansed the Temple in the reformation instituted by Hezekiah (^{<14912>}2 Chronicles 29:12), and was appointed by that king one of the subordinate overseers of the sacred revenues (2 31:13). B.C. 726.

Maha-vansa

is the title of two celebrated works written in Pali, and relating to the early history of Ceylon (q.v.). The older work was probably composed by the monks of the convent Uttaravihâra at Anuradhapura, the capital of Ceylon. Its date is uncertain, but it apparently preceded the reign of Dhatusena (459-477), as that monarch ordered it to be read in public, a circumstance which seems to prove the celebrity it already enjoyed in his time. The later work of the same name is an improved edition and continuation of the former. Its author, *Mahânâma*, was the son of an aunt of the king

Dhatusena, and he brings down the history of Ceylon, like his predecessor, to the death of Mahasena. A first volume of the text of the latter Work, “in Roman characters, with a translation subjoined, and an introductory essay on Pali Buddhistic literature,” was published by the Hon. George Turnour (Ceylon, 1837). See also Lassen, *Indische Alterthumskunde*, 2:15 sq. (Bonn, 1852).

Maha-vira

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

The works above referred to state, with considerable detail, the conversions worked by Mahavira. Among the pupils were Indrabhuti (also called Gautama, and for this reason, but erroneously, considered as the same with the founder of the Buddhist religion), Agnibhuti, Vayubhuti — all three sons of Vasubhuti, a Braihmana of the Gotama tribe, and others. These converts to Jaina principles are mostly made in the same manner:

each comes to the saint prepared to overwhelm him with shame, when he salutes them mildly, and, as the Jainas hold, solves their metaphysical or religious doubts. Thus Indrabhuti doubts whether there be a living principle or not; Vayubhuti doubts if life be not body; Mandita has not made up his mind on the subjects of bondage and liberation; Aehalabhratri is skeptical as to the distinction between vice and virtue, and so on. Mahavira removes all their difficulties, and, by teaching them the Jaina truth, converts them to the doctrine of his sect. For a summary account of the life of this saint, see H. T. Colebroke's *Miscellaneous Essays*, 2:213 sq.; H. H. Wilson's *Works*, 1:291 sq.

Ma'havite

(Hebrew only in the plur. *Machavim*', מַחַוִּים, *reviving*; Sept. Μαωείν v. r. Μαωί, Vulg. *Mahumites*, Auth. Vers. "Mahavite;," probably by erroneous transcription for the sing. *מַחַוִּי*, apparently a patrial attribute of Eliel, one of David's body-guard (^{<1314>}1 Chronicles 11:46); but no place or person *Mahavah* or *Mahavai* is anywhere else alluded to from which the title could have been derived. There is doubtless some corruption in the text. "The Targum has אַחַוַי יְהִי מֵאֵל 'from Machavua.' Kennicott (*Dissert.* p.231) conjectures that originally the Hebrew may have stood מַחַוִּי חַמ, 'from the Hivites.' Others have proposed to insert an N and read 'the Mahanaimite' (Furst, *Handwb.* p. 721 a; Bertheau, *Chronik.* p. 136)."

Maha'ziath

(Heb. *Machazioth*', תַּאֲזִיָּא, *visions*; Sept. Μααζιώθ v. r. Μεαζώθ), the last named of the fourteen sons of Heman the Levite (^{<1320>}1 Chronicles 25:4), and leader under him of the twenty-third division of the Temple musicians as arranged by David (^{<1321>}1 Chronicles 25:30). B.C. 1014.

Ma'her-sha'lal-hash-baz

(Heb. *Maher'-Shalal'-Chash-Baz*, זְבִיבַי ; לֵלֵנָה; רַחֲמַי *speeding for booty he hastes to the spoil*; Sept. ὀξέως προνομῆν ποιῆσαι σκύλων and Ταχέως σκύλευσον, ὀξέως προνόμεισον, Vulg. *Velociter spolia detrahe, cito praemdare* and *Accelera spolia detrahere, festiia pracedsci*; for the grammatical construction, see Gesenius, *Comment.* ad loc.), words which the prophet Isaiah was first commanded to write in large characters upon a tablet, n and afterwards to give as a symbolical name to a son that

was to be born to him (^{<2381>}Isaiah 8:1, 3), as prognostic of the sudden attack of Damascus and Syria by the Assyrian army (see Henderson's *Comment.* ad loc.). The child in question was evidently the prophet's son by "the prophetess" whom he espoused in pursuance of the divine mandate, and appears to have been the same with the one whose birth under the more Messianic title of IMMANUEL was at once a token to Ahaz of the coming defeat of his enemies (^{<2374>}Isaiah 7:14-16), and an illustrious type of Gospel deliverance. B.C. 739.

Mahes(H)A And Meheswara

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

Mah'lah

(Heb. *Machlah'*, *hl j ḥj* another form for *hl j ḥj* *disease*, as in ^{<1253>}Exodus 15:26, etc.), the name of two persons.

1. (Sept. *Μοολά* v. r. *Μαελά*, Vulg. *Mohola*, Auth. Vers. "Mahalah.") Apparently a son (but perhaps a daughter) of Hamoleketh, a female descendant of Manasseh; the father's name is not given, but two brothers are mentioned (^{<1378>}1 Chronicles 7:18). B.C. prob. cir. 1658.
2. (Sept. *Μααλά*, Vulg. *Melcha*.) The first named of the five daughters and heiresses of Zelophehad, of the tribe of Manasseh west, who married among their kindred (^{<1023>}Numbers 26:33; 27:1; 36:11; ^{<1173>}Joshua 17:13). B.C. 1618.

Mah'li

(Heb. *Machli'*, *yl j ḥj* *sick*; Sept. *Μοολί*, Vulg. *Moholi*; but in ^{<1169>}Exodus 6:19, *Μοολεί*, Auth. Vers. "Mahali;" *SEE MAHLITE*), the name of two Levites.

1. A son of Merari, and grandson of Levi (^{<1169>}Exodus 6:19; ^{<1023>}Numbers 3:20; ^{<1369>}1 Chronicles 6:19; 23:21; 24:26, 28; ^{<1588>}Ezra 8:18). Among his sons was one named Libni (^{<1369>}1 Chronicles 6:29). His descendants were named after him (^{<1023>}Numbers 3:33; 26:58). B.C. post 1856.
2. A son of Mushi, and nephew of the preceding (^{<1323>}1 Chronicles 23:23; 24:30). He had a son named Shamer (^{<1367>}1 Chronicles 6:47). B.C. ante 1658.

Mah'lite

(Heb. only in the singular collectively, *Machli'*, *yl ꞑꞑꞑ* patronymic of the same form from MAHLI; Sept. *Μοολί*, Vulg. *Moholitae*; but in ^{<RB>}Numbers 26:58, Sept. omits, Vulg. *Moaholi*; A. Vers. constantly "Mahlites"), the descendants of Mahli, the son of Merari (^{<RB>}Numbers 3:33; 26:58).

Mah'lon

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

Mahmiud

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

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

Mahnenschmidt, John Peter

a pioneer of the (German Reformed Church in Ohio, was born probably in Somerset or in Westmoreland Co., Pa., in 1783; first taught school for a number of years, and was finally, in 1812, licensed to preach, and soon after removed to Ohio where he performed missionary labors in the counties of Columbiana and Trumbull. He laid the foundations of numerous congregations, which he lived to see grow and prosper. He died

in Canfield, Mahoning Co., Ohio, July 11, 1857. Mahnenschmidt was a modest, childlike, and earnest man. See Harbaugh, *Fathers of the German Ref. Ch.* (Lancaster, Pa., 1872, 12mo), 3:207 sq.

Ma'hol

(Heb. *Machol'*, *l /j m*; a sacred *dance*, as in ^{<3200>}Psalm 20:12, etc.; Sept. *Μαχὼλ*; Josephus' *Ἠμαῶν*, *Ant.* 8:2, 5), a person apparently named as the father of the famous wise men Ethan, Heman, Chalcol, and Darda (or at least of the last two), prior to the time of Solomon (^{<1061>}1 Kings 4:31); but if these be the same with those enumerated as sons of Zerah (^{<1306>}1 Chronicles 2:6), the word must be taken as elsewhere to denote simply their pursuit, as musical composers (see Keil's *Comment.* ad loc. Kings), an art with which dancing has ever been intimately connected. *SEE ETHAN.*

Mahomet

SEE MOHAMMED.

Mahrattas

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

History. — The Mahrattas are first mentioned in history about the middle of the 17th century. They then inhabited a narrow strip of territory on the west side of the peninsula, extending from 15° to 21° N. lat., and are spoken of as for three centuries the subjects of Mohammedanism. The founder of the Mahratta power was Sevaji (died in 1680), a freebooter or adventurer, whose father was an officer in the service of the last king of Bejapir. By

policy or by force, he eventually succeeded in compelling the several independent chiefs to acknowledge him as their leader, and, with a large army at his command, overran and subdued a vast portion of the emperor of Delhi's territory. He was crowned as king in 1674. his son and successor, Sambaji, after vigorously following out his father's policy, was taken prisoner by Aurungzebe in 1689, and put to death. The incapacity of the subsequent rulers who reigned under the title of *Ramrjah* ("great king"), tempted the two chief officers of state, the *Peishzwa*, or prime minister, and the paymaster-general, to divide, about 1749, the empire between them, the former fixing his residence at Pfuna, and retaining a nominal supremacy over the whole nation, while the latter made Nagpur his capital, and founded the empire of the Berar Mahrattas. Later, however, the Mahratta kingdom was divided into a great number of states, more or less powerful and independent, chief among which were, besides the two above mentioned, Gwalior, ruled by the Rao Scindiah; Indore, by the Rao Holkar; and Baroda, by the Guicowar. Intestine wars followed this subdivision, and ultimately the East India Company was compelled to interfere. After many long and bloody contests with the British and their allies, the Mahrattas were reduced to a state of dependence. The only exception was Scindiah, a powerful chief; who had raised a powerful army, officered by Frenchmen, and disciplined after the European method. He continued the contest until 1843. The dignity of peishwa was abolished in 1818, and his territories were occupied by the British. Nagpur and Sattara subsequently also came to the British, but the other chiefs still possess extensive dominions under British protection.

Missions. — The earliest missions of the Christian Church in India date with the settlement of the Portuguese in Goa, where the Roman Catholics established the first bishopric in 1534. The second important hold the Romish Church secured at the two Salsettes, the peninsula and island near Bombay. From these the work was gradually pressed through the Mahratta-land. At Goa there are claimed to be 312,000, and at Bombay 20,300 Roman Catholics. *SEE INDIA.* The first Protestant mission was commenced in the Mahratta-land by the American Board in 1811. For about twenty years it was confined to the territory this side of the Ghauts. Mahim, Tannah, and Chowul (Choule) were occupied for a time, but abandoned in 1826. In 1836, however, the work began to show signs of vigor and promise. At this time a mission was established on the high lands of Ahmednuggur, a city of 30,000 inhabitants, and by 1842 it became an

independent mission center. For the success of this work and its present status, see the article INDIA, vol. 4, p. 555, col. 2. The Anglican Church first began missionary labors in Bombay in 1820, and gradually gained a hold at Tannah, Bandora, and Bassein. In 1832, Nasik, the most celebrated center of Brahminism in all Deccan, was secured; in 1846 the work was extended to the station Junir, and in 1848 to Malligaum. The attempt made a few years ago, at Yeolat, to Christianize exclusively by the aid of native helpers failed completely. Neither did the effort among the Illanmgs, in the neighborhood of Aurangabad (stations Buldana, etc.), prove successful. In Bombay and vicinity the Church Missionary Society sustains many schools, and Christian influences are molding the character of the rising generation. A special missionary for the Mohammedans is sustained here. See

BOMBAY. The Scotch Mission commenced at Konkan in 1823; the first stations were Bankot and Suvarndrug, but these were abandoned when the laborers were needed at Bombay. Here both the "Established Church" and the "Free Church" sustain schools. The Scotch Mission at Poonah, which originated in 1839, belongs to the Free Church. Of late years the Free Church has established missions among the Waralies (aborigines) near Daman. The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel has labored in this field since 1840, but confined mainly to Bombay. Very lately the Medical Missionary Society has established an institute which will prove of valuable service to the mission work. See Sprengel, *Geschichte der Maratten* (Halle, 1786); Duth, *History of the Mahrattas* (London, 1826, 3 vols. 8vo); Grundemann, *Missionsatlas*, No. 12; Chambers, *Cyclopaedia*, s.v.

Mai, Angelo

a noted Roman Catholic prelate, and one of the most distinguished scholars of the 19th century, was born at Schilpario (province of Bergamo), Italy, March 7, 1782. As a youth he arrested the attention of his instructor, the ex-Jesuit father Lewis Mozzi de' Caspitani, by the unusual taste and capacity which he displayed for classical learning. The father, determined to lead Angelo's inclination towards the service of the Church, finally induced him to enter, in 1799, the novitiate of the Society of Jesus, which, although elsewhere suppressed, the Duke of Parma, with the sanction of Pius VI, was just re-establishing at Colorno, a small city of his duchy. In this community Mai resided till the provisional restoration of the society in Naples (1804), whither he was sent as Professor of Greek and Latin literature. About the end of 1805 he was transferred to Rome for the completion of his theological studies, and soon afterwards to Orvieto, and

was there admitted to priest's orders. It was at this place that he acquired great familiarity with the Hebrews language, his accurate knowledge of palaeography, and his skill in deciphering ancient manuscripts. He returned to Rome in 1808, just about the time when the contest of Pius VII with Napoleon was reaching the crisis; an order issued by the viceroy, commanding all subjects of the kingdom of Italy to return to their respective provinces, had compelled him to change his residence once again. Happily for the interests of literature, he settled at Milan. The Ambrosian Library of that city had long been known as rich in manuscripts of the highest interest — the remnant of the treasures of the old monastic libraries, especially those of Bobbio and Lucca, and of some of the suppressed Benedictine convents of the Protestant cantons of Switzerland. Many of its best treasures had been made public by Muratori, Mabillon, and the Benedictine editors; but there yet remained a department entirely unexplored, which Mai soon appropriated to himself, and which has since come to be regarded as exclusively his own—that of palimpsest or re-written manuscripts, in which the original writing has been effaced in order to make room for a later work written over it. Mai was admitted an associate, and eventually a doctor of this celebrated library, and labored in this novel editorial career with a zeal and success not unworthy of the traditional glories of his country. From the Society of Jesus, to which he had not yet avowed himself, he now withdrew, with the consent and approval of the authorities at Rome. His first essay as an author was a Latin translation (with a commentary) of Isocrates, *De Permutatione* (1813), the original of which had been published by a Greek named Andrew Mustoxidi in the previous year; but this was only the prelude of his far more remarkable successes in the decipherment and publication of palimpsest manuscripts. Up to this period, with the exception of Küster and Wetstein's readings of the Old and New Testament from the *Codex Ephremi*. Knittel's portions of the Gothic Bible of Ulphilas, Peter Bruns's fragment of the ninety-first book of Livy, and Barrett's palimpsest of the Gospels, palimpsest literature was entirely untried. Within a few years Mai deciphered and published from palimpsest sources writings of several classical authors, besides two works then supposed to be by Philo Judaeus, but afterwards recognized as the productions of Georgius Gemistus. In 1819 Mai was called to Rome as chief keeper of the Vatican Library, canon of the Church of St. Peter's, and domestic prelate of the pope, Pius VII. Here he continued the publication of palimpsest manuscripts, and in 1820 brought out the work by which he is best known out of Italy — a large and interesting portion of the long lost

De Republica of Cicero, the fragments of which he arranged with consummate skill in their respective order, and interwove with all the known extracts of the work which had been preserved in the collections of ancient authors. The whole text he illustrated by a critical commentary of exceeding interest, which at once established his reputation as one of the first scholars of the age.

From these comparatively desultory labors he turned to a project not unworthy of the palmiest days of Italian editorship. Selecting from the vast and till then imperfectly explored manuscript treasures of the Vatican, he prepared his *Scriptorum veterum Nova Collectio e Vaticanis Codicibus edita* (Rome, 1825, and later, 10 vols. 4to), on the plan of the various *Anecdota*, published under different titles by Mabillon, Pez, Montfaucon, Muratori, and others. It is a work of immense labor and research, and of a most miscellaneous character — Greek and Latin, sacred and profane, theological, historical, patristical, and philosophical. Next, he published *Classici Scriptores ex Codicibus Vaticanis editi* (completed in 1838, in 10 vols. 8vo), which included some of the author's earlier publications (especially the *De Republica*); although, with the exception of about two volumes, its contents were entirely new. Scarcely was this collection finished when he entered upon the preparation of the *Spicilegium Romanum* (1839-44, 10 vols. 8vo), equally interesting and various in its contents, and a fourth collection entitled *Nova Patrum Bibliotheca* (1845-53, 6 vols. 4to), thus completing a series unparalleled since the days of Muratori, and, indeed, far more extraordinary than the older collections, from the circumstance that it was compiled from the mere gleanings which had escaped the research of the earlier generations of editors and collectors. In addition to all these labors, and while they were still on his hands, he commenced an edition of the well-known *Codex Vaticanus* of the Old and New Testament, with various readings and prolegomena, which, however, he never entirely completed; or if he did, as some suppose, he destroyed a greater part of his manuscript on the Old Testament, lest it should ever see the light of day in an incomplete and imperfect state. The text of the New Testament was published in 1858, and in a thoroughly revised form in 1859, under the title *Nov. Test. ex vetustissimo codice Vat., secundis cursis editum studio Angeli MAii*; but even in a revised form the work does not deserve the name of Mai on its titlepage. Comp. Kitto, *Journ. Sac. Lit.* 1859 (Oct.), p. 166 sq.

While engaged in these vast literary enterprises Mai held the laborious and responsible post of secretary of the Propaganda, to which he had been appointed in 1833; and it was observed with wonder that his other engagements were never suffered to interfere with the duties of the secretaryship. In 1838 he was rewarded for his great services to the Church with the cardinal's hat, at the same time with his friend and successor in the Vatican Library, Mezzofanti; and soon afterwards was appointed to several important and confidential offices in the Roman court, chiefly of a literary character. He was named successively prefect of the Congregation for the Supervision of the Oriental Press; prefect of the Congregation of the Index; and prefect of the Congregation of the Council of Trent. In 1853 he was appointed to the still more congenial post of librarian of the Roman Church. He died September 9, 1854.

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

he derived his title as cardinal.” See Mutti, *Elogio di Angelo Mali* (1828); Rabbe, *Biog. Univ. des Contemporains*; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 32:857 sq.; *English Cyclop.* s.v.; Wetzter und Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, vol. 12, s.v.

Maia'neas

(Μαϊάννας, Vulg. omits), given (1 Esdras 9:48) in place of the MAASIAS (q.v.) of the Heb. text (^{408B} Nehemiah 8:7).

Maid

or MAIDEN (prop. ἡρ[ῆ] παιδίσκη, a *girl*. as corresponding to ῥ[ῆ] παῖς, a young man; also ἡl WtB] κορασίον, a *virgin*; for which the usual term is ἡm[] ἰ; but ἡma; and ἡj ῥῥαῖκε δούλη, are a *maid-servant*). *SEE HANDMAID; SEE VIRGIN.*

Maignan, Emanuel

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

Maigrot, Charles

a French Jesuit and missionary, was born at Paris in 1652; entered the order and prepared for missionary labors in foreign parts. In 1681 he was sent to Siam, and in 1683 he was placed in charge of the missions of China.

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

Mail

Picture for Mail

(**tcqçqj** *koaske'seth*, a “scale,” as of fish, ^{<BIB>}Leviticus 11:9, etc.), spoken of as a cuirass composed of plates of metal attached to a bodice like scales, so as to be impervious to the sword (^{<BIB>}1 Samuel 17:5). Another term, rendered “coat of mail,” is [^]**yrlyæshiryon'**, which signifies the corselet or garment thus encased (^{<BIB>}1 Samuel 17:38). At other times metallic rings were employed instead of scales (see Kitto, *Pict. Dict.* note at 1 Samuel 17). **SEE ARMOR.**

Mailduff

an Irish monk, who flourished about the middle of the 7th century, established a monastery in Wiltshire, England, A.D. 650, long called Mailduffburgh, now known as Malmesbury. It was richly endowed by Athelstan and other kings of England, and became the alma mater of some of the first educated Saxons in England in either Church or State. Among them was Aldhelm, bishop of Sherborne, who acknowledged “that

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

Maillard, Olivier

a celebrated French pulpit orator, was born in Bretagne in the 15th century. His early history is somewhat obscure. He became a doctor of the Sorbonne, professor of theology in the order of the “Minor Brethren,” and court preacher to Louis XI and to the duke of Burgundy. In 1501 he was entrusted by the papal legate with the reform of the Paris convents of the order of “Gray Friars,” and he discharged this task so energetically and independently that he incurred the displeasure of the “Gray Friars.” His reputation, however, rests mainly on the wonderful power of oratory and independence of thought he displayed in his pulpit utterances. In many

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

Maillat, Joseph Anne Marie De Moyrta De,

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

Maille De Breze, Simon De

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

Maim

SEE ABEL-MAIMI; SEE MISREPHIOTH-MAIM.

Maimbourg, Louis

a celebrated French ecclesiastic and defender of Gallican liberty, was born at Nancy in 1620; entered the "Society of Jesus" in 1636; was by them sent to Rome to study theology; was, on his return to France, for six years professor of rhetoric in the College of Rouen; then began preaching, and soon attained great eminence. Having, however, in his *Traite Historique de l'glise de Rome* (Paris, 1685; new ed., Nevers. 1831) come out boldly in favor of the liberty of the Gallican Church, he was expelled from the Order of the Jesuits. The king took sides with Maimbourg and indemnified him by a pension. He retired to the Abbey of St. Victor, in Paris, where he wrote the history of schism of England, and died Aug. 13, 1686. He had entirely disconnected himself from the Jesuits, and did not spare them much in his writings; yet in his *Histoire du Calvinisme* (Paris, 1682, 4to), dedicated to the king, one can readily distinguish the influence of his former associations when he called Calvinism "the most rabid and dangerous of all the enemies France ever had to contend against." Bossuet's interpretation of the doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church, SEE BOSSUET, Maimbourg pronounced against. (Compare Schrockh, *Kirchengesch. s. d Ref* 7:280 sq.; Smith's Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*, 2:200 [15].) As a historian Maimbourg is inaccurate and untrustworthy, receiving all the calumnies of the Jesuits against Protestantism as facts, and giving them as such. The ephemeral success of his works is to be attributed only to a pleasing and ornate style and to their romantic garb. His first collection of sermons is

uninteresting and insipid, and his controversial works have long been forgotten. His historical works, consisting of *Histoire de l'Arianisme* (1682, 2 vols. 4to); *Des Iconoclastes* (1674|1679, 4to); *Du Schisme des Grecs* (1677, 4to); *Des Croisades* (1675, 2 vols. 4to); *De la Decadence de l'Empire, depuis Charlemagne* (1679, 4to); *Du Grand Schisme de l'Occident* (1677, 4to); *Du Luthdianisme* (1680, 4to, and 2 vols. 8vo); *Du Calvinisme* (1682, 4to); *De la Ligne* (1683. 4to; 1684, 2 vols. 12mo); *Du Pontificat de St. Gregoire le Grand* (1686, 4to); *Du Pontificat de St. Leon* (1687, 4to)-the two latter of which are considered the best have been collected and published in 14 vols. 4to (Paris, 1686). See Herzog, *Real-Encykl.* s.v.; Dupin, *Biblioth. Eccles.* s.v.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 32:891 sq.; Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, 6:758 sq.; Bayle, *Hist. Dict.* s.v.

Maimbourg, Theodore

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

Maimon, Solomon

a Jewish rabbi and philosopher, one of the ablest expounders of the Kantian school, was born in Lithuania in 1753. He was of very humble parentage, and in his youth was confined in his educational advantages to the study of Hebrew. Yet his talent for speculation manifested itself at a very early age, when still confined to the expounding of Talmudic lore. In his very youth, Moses Maimonides's *Moreh Nebuchim* fell into his hands; but while to Moses Mendelssohn it became the guide to truth, it became to Maimon a guide to a labyrinth of speculation from which no open-sesame gave him an outlet until, in advanced life, he fell in with the writings of Kant, to become one of his most ardent students and ablest expounders. In the despair which the *Moreh Nebuchim* prepared for him, he turned to the Cabala for relief, determined to become a Jewish Faust. Plagued by the disadvantages of Russo-Jewish society, he finally quitted his native land and went to Germany to study medicine and thus gain a livelihood. He was 25 years old when he arrived at Konigsberg, in West Prussia. His

condition in this, the old capital of Prussia, the seat of a university at that time in the very zenith of her glory, was much like that of a man who, after having suffered starvation for days, is suddenly placed at a table filled with the daintiest food. Partaking too greedily of the food set before him, he became a great sufferer mentally — i.e. he was lost in wild speculation. In 1779 he went to Berlin, and became an intimate associate of the German Jewish savant, Moses Mendelssohn. It was not, however, until years had been passed in a roving life that he finally, in 1788, on his return to Berlin, gave himself to the study of Kantian philosophy, was recommended to Kant, and soon made a great name for himself. Both Schiller and Goethe, it is said, sought his society; the latter, we are told, desired Maimon to take up his residence near his side (*Aaimoniana*, p. 197; Varnhagen's *Nachlass, Briefwechsel zwischen Rahel u. David Veit*, 1:243 sq., 247 et al.; 2:23). In his last years Count Kalkreuth gave Maimon a home on one of his estates in Silesia. He died in 1800. From an admirer of Kant, Maimon finally changed to a decided opponent, and, to make good his claims, presented the world with a new system of philosophy, which was written in the interests of skepticism. According to Maimon, there is no knowledge strictly objective except pure mathematics, and all empirical knowledge is only an illusion. He traces all the forms of thought, categories, and judgments to a general and unique principle, that of determinability, of reality, of substance; but he contends that we have no right to suppose that our thought has for its object a thing without ourselves, existing independently of the thought, which determines it. "He admits, with Kant," says Wilson (*Hist. of German Philosophy*, 2:186), "that there are conceptions and principles *a priori*, a pure knowledge which applies itself to an object of thought in general, and to objects of knowledge *a priori*; but he denies that this very pure knowledge absolutely applies itself to experience. The philosophy of the *Kritik* admits this application as a fact of conscience. This fact, according to Maimon, is simply an illusion, and he declares that the categories are destined only to apply to objects of pure mathematics. Maimon's objections were not without influence on the ulterior development of general philosophy, and Fichte paid much regard to them; but the great objection, the one which bears upon the application of category to reality, Fichte destroyed in one word when he said that the right of this application cannot be deducted until it is absolute" (compare Ueberweg, *History of Philosophy*, vol. 2). Among his best works are, besides his numerous essays and treatises on various philosophical themes in the "Berliner Monatsschrift" and the "Magazin" from 1789 to 1800, in themselves a

small library, and besides ten books on all departments of philosophy, published between 1790 and 1797, the *Gilbath ha-Moreh*, a Hebrew commentary and a remarkable introduction to the three volumes of Maimonides's *Moreh Nebuchim* (Berlin, 1791), in which he proved himself master of the philosophical field; also *Versuch über die Transcendentalphilosophie* (Berlin, 1790, 8vo); *Versuch einer neuen Logik, oder Theorie des Denkens*, etc. (Berlin, 1794, 8vo); and *Kritische Untersuchungen iuber den menschlichen Geist* (1797), and a memoir of his own life entitled "*Lebensgeschichte*" (2 vols. 1792-93). See Wolf, "*Rhapsodien zur Charakteristik S. Maimons*" (1813); Gratz, *Gesch. d. Juden*. 11:142 sq. (Leipzig, 1870, 8vo); Tennemann, *Manual of Philosophy*, p. 411 sq.; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*. vol. 32, s.v.; Dr. Wise in the *Israelite* (Cincinnati, Ohio), Jan. 1871. (J. H. W.)

Maimonides

(i.e. *son of Maimon*), Moses, also called by the Jews *Rambam*, from the initial letters $\mu\text{ב } 8\text{מ} \text{ר} = \text{^}\mu\text{פּוּיִם } \text{^}\text{ב } \text{חֶמ } 8\text{ר}$, *R. Moses b. Maimun*, and by the Arabians *Abu Arnraman Musa b. — Maimun Obeid A hah*, one of the greatest of the Jews since the exile the great luminary, the glory of Israel, the second Moses, the reformer of Judaism, as he is called, was born at Cordova, March 30, 1135. As a youth, he received his instruction in the Heb. Scriptures, the Talmud, and Jewish literature from his father, R. Maimon, who held the dignity of judge of the Jews, as also his forefathers had held it for some centuries previous, and was himself renowned as a scholar and author of a commentary on *Esther*, a work on the laws of the Jewish prayers and festivals, a commentary on the Talmud, etc., etc. But for instruction in the Arabic, then the predominant language of Spain, as the country was in the hands of the Mohammedans, and mathematics, a and astronomy, Moses was handed over to the care of the renowned Arabian philosophers Averroes and Ibn-Thofeil (compare Jost, *Gesch. d. Israeliten*, 6:168). Spain, in which the Jews had found an early- home (some say as early as the days of Solomon; compare Rule, *Karaites*, p. 146 sq.; Lindo, *Hist. of the Jews of Spain and Portugal*, p. 1 sq.; Da Costa, *Israel and the Gentiles*, p. 211), is by Milman (*History of the Jews*, 3:155) spoken of as the country in which "the golden age of the Jews shone with the brightest and most enduring splendor." In the early days of Christianity we find the Jew alluded to by Church councils [see ELVIRA], and legislation enacted in his behalf; but, to the shame of Christiainity be it said,

the Jew enjoyed his greatest privileges in the Iberian peninsula under Mussulman rule, and from the conquest by the Moors till towards the end of the 10th century, when, while Christian Europe lay in darkness, Mohammedan Cordova might be considered the center of civilization of arts, and of letters,... the Jews, under the enjoyments of equal rights and privileges, rivaled their masters, or, rather, their compatriots, in their advancement to wealth, splendor, and cultivation” (Milman). In Spain alone, and only under Mussulman reign, the Jews in the Middle Ages enjoyed religious liberty and the privilege of their own jurisdiction, and it was in Spain alone that the Jews, since their Babylonian exile, developed a nobility which to this day is considered the aristocracy of the dispersed people of Israel (compare Da Costa, *Israel and the Gentiles*, p. 204). Need we wonder that under such very favorable conditions, which became endangered only now and then, the Spanish Jews developed a very active spiritual life, and a desire for culture and science which produced noteworthy fruits? “The Jews in the Arabic provinces,” says Da Costa (p. 223), in speaking of the Saracen rule in Spain, “were rarely bankers, but merchants, trading on a large scale to different parts of the East. They acted as treasurers to the califs, but more frequently as physicians, philosophers, poets, theologians — in a word, as *savans* and men of letters.” Especially worthy to be called the golden age of Spanish Judaism was the age that gave birth to Moses Maimonides. While the Jews, who at that time lived under less favorable circumstances in France and Germany, were disinclined to all scientific endeavors, and all their spiritual activity became absorbed in the study of the ‘Talmud, the Spanish Jews vied in all sciences—in philosophy, mathematics, astronomy, medicine, and in poetry, with the flower of the Arabian genius. Formerly the Jews of the Iberian peninsula had derived their learning of the Biblical writings and their commentators from the famous schools of Babylon and Persia, whither the young were sent for theological instruction; but when, by sheer accident, a noted Eastern rabbi of the 10th century found a home in these Western coasts (see Rabbi Moses, “clad in sackcloth:” compare Milman, 3:156, and other histories of the Jews), and “the light of learning, which, by the rapid progress of the iron age of Judaism in Babylonia, by the extinction of the authority of the prince of the captivity, the dispersion of the illustrious teachers, and the final closing of the great schools, seemed to have set forever, it suddenly rose again in the West in renewed and undismayed splendor.” From this time (A.D. 990) the schools of the Spanish Rabbanim (at Cordova, Toledo, Barcelona, and Granada) not only became the center

of Jewish civilization and learning, but the auxiliaries of the Arabian philosophers in their endeavor to keep alive the flame of learning during the deep darkness of the Middle Ages, and the Jews became the communicators of Arabian philosophy to the Christian world, or, as Tennemann (*Manual of Philosophy*. transl. by Morell, p. 231) has it, "the interpreters between the Saracens and the Western nations." It was at such a time — when the heaven of Spanish Judaism was resplendent with stars of its greatest magnitude — Solomon Ibn-Gebirol (1021-1070), Jehudah Halevi (1086-1142), Aben-Ezra (1092-1167), David Kimchi (1160-1240), a galaxy of great and learned men of which any nation might well be proud that Moses Maimonides lived, wrote, and flourished as the brightest ornament of them all.

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

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

Life and Labors. — During his boyhood, Moses Maimonides is said to have manifested anything but a promise of those great abilities which were unfolded in his manhood. He was indolent, and so disinclined to study that his father sent him, at a very early ages from his paternal roof. During his absence from home, however, an earnest desire for knowledge was manifested by him, and, by study and intercourse with learned co-religionists and Arabians, he acquired a great treasure of knowledge in the different provinces of science, which his clear, penetrating, and methodical mind mastered with a marvelous power. An elegant oration, delivered by him at fourteen, reconciled father and son. Acquainted with all the writings of ancient philosophers, he became the most eminent of his age. He was an able mathematician and metaphysician. When only 23 years old (1158), he proved the possession of extraordinary powers of comprehension and elucidation in a treatise on the Jewish calendar, based on astronomical principles (ר״ב [j] װב״ח), which he composed for a friend. In the same year also, whilst wandering about from place to place, and deprived of the aid of a library, he yet began his stupendous *Commentary on the Mishna* (ת״נ״מ ח ך״ר״פ). At this time also (about 1160) he composed the *Letter on Religious Persecution* (דמ״ח תר״ג), or *A Treatise on Glorifying God* (מ״ח ך״ד״ק רמ״מ) — i.e. by suffering martyrdom — a most ingenious

plea for those who have not the courage to lay down life for their religion, and who, having outwardly renounced their faith, continue secretly to practice it — which was provoked by the attack of a zealous co-religionist against Moses's public profession of Mohammedanism and private devotion to Judaism. (It was published by Geiger, *Moses ben-Maimon*, part 1 [Bresl. 1850].) The sudden loss of his brother David and of their possessions threw upon Moses the responsibility of providing alone for his own, his father's, and his brother's family. Without means to continue in mercantile life, he now entered the medical profession; at the same time he also delivered lectures on philosophy. But his mind was mainly upon the work in which he had engaged years ago. Neither misfortune, nor bodily infirmities, nor even misinterpretation, could turn Moses Maimonides from the goal he was striving to reach. He had assigned to himself the task of harmonizing religion with science, Judaism with philosophy; to exhibit Judaism in such a light that it might become not only endeared to its thinking adherents, but that it might claim the respect also of other religionists. and even of philosophers; and though the wants of so many dependent upon him obliged him to labor assiduously as a physician, he yet found time for the completion of his commentary on the Mishna, and, in 1168, finally brought it before the public under the title *The Book of Light* (Arabic **garsl a batk**, Hebrew **rps rwamh**). This remarkable production, which he wrote in Arabic (for editions, see below), is designed to simplify the study of the exposition of the Law or Pentateuch, handed down by tradition, rendered exceedingly difficult by the super-commentaries and discussions which had accumulated thereon since the close of the Mishna to the days of Maimonides. It is preceded by a general elaborate introduction, in which he discourses on the true nature of prophecy, shows its relationship to the law given on Sinai, treats of the figurative language occurring in the Pentateuch and the Prophets, etc. In the special introduction to the *Tract Sanhedrim* he, for the first time, defined and formally laid down the Jewish creed (see our article JUDAISM, in vol. 4, p. 1057). In consequence of this work — which has now for more than 500 years been deemed so essential a part of the Talmud itself that no edition of the latter is considered complete without it — Maimonides gradually became the great oracle in all matters of religion. He was appealed to (in 1175) by the Jews from different parts of the world for his opinion on difficulties connected with the law, and in 1177 was called to the rabbishop of Raheia.

Though constantly beset by crowds who came to consult him on all questions, philosophical, medical, and religious, yet, by intruding on the night for his profounder studies, he was able, after ten years' further labor (1170-80), to complete (Nov. 7, 1180) another work, of even greater magnitude than the foregoing, which he called *Deuteronomy, Second Law* (hrwt hnçm), or *Jad Hachezaka = The Mighty Hand* (hqzj h dy, in allusion to ⁽⁶³⁴²⁾Deuteronomy 34:12, and because the work consists of fourteen books, dy =14), which created a new epoch in Judaism. The fourteen books, subdivided into eighty-two Tractates (twkl h), of which the work consists, form a cyclopaedia comprising every department of Biblical and Judaistic literature. When it is added that Maimonides has given in every article a lucid abstract of the ancient traditional expositions of those who were regarded as the oracles in their respective departments, the immense importance of this remarkable production to the Biblical student can hardly be overrated. It is written in very clear and easy Hebrew, as Maimonides was anxious that it should be accessible to the Jewish people generally. Within a few years after its appearance the work was copied and circulated most extensively in Arabia, Palestine, Africa, Southern France, and Italy, and throughout the world wherever Jews resided. It soon became the text-book of the Jewish religion, and was regarded as a new Bible or Talmud. A detailed account of its contents is given by Wolf, *Bibliotheca Heb.* 1:840 sq. Most of the young Israelites of his days were spending their best time in acquiring a mediocre knowledge of the sixty books of the Talmud, to the neglect and exclusion of all secular science and philosophy. To obviate this, Maimonides wrote these systematical works, comprising the main contents of the whole Talmud. "If the Talmud," says Gritz (6:339)," may be likened to a Dsedalic structure, in which one can scarcely find his way even with the aid of an Ariadne thread, Maimonides has transformed it into a well-regulated edifice, with side-wings, halls, apartments, chambers, and closets, in which the stranger, led by the fitting superscriptions and numbers, may make his way without a guide, and gain a view of all the contents of the Talmud... One might almost say that Maimonides created a new Talmud. It is true these are the old elements; we know their origin, their rise, their original connection; but in his hands it looks like another work; the mist is removed; the disfiguring addenda done away with; it appears remolded, smoother, fresher, and newer. The Mishna, the foundation-structure of the Talmud, opens by propounding the question on the law: 'At what time of the night is the

chapter Shema to be read?’ and closes with the discussion, when this or that thing becomes levitically unclean. Maimonides, on the other hand, thus opens his Talmoudical codex: ‘The foundation of foundations, and the pillar of wisdom, is to know that there exists a first Being which called all other beings into existence, and that all things existing in heaven or on earth, and whatever is between them, exist only through the medium of this first Being,’ and closes with the words, ‘The earth will one day be covered with knowledge as the ocean’s ground is by water.’ The whole work is permeated by a peculiar savor; it breathes the spirit of complete wisdom, cool reflection, and deep morality. Maimonides, so to speak, has Talmudized philosophy and metaphysicized the Talmud. He has admitted philosophy within the precincts of the religious codex, and there conceded her a citizenship of equality beside the Halacha. Though philosophy had, previous to his day, been cultivated by Jewish thinkers (here comp. Sachs, *Religiose Poesie der Juden in Spanien*, p. 185 sq.), and applied to Judaism from Philo down to Abraham Ibn-David, *SEE CHAYUG*, she had always been regarded as something outside of the Jewish camp as a something which had nothing in common with practical Judaism as exercised daily and hourly. Maimonides, however, introduced her into the very holiest of Judaism, and, so to speak, gave Aristotle a place by the side of the sages of the Talmud.” “The master-mind of Maimonides only,” says Dr. Wise (*Israelite*, Dec. 1, 1871), “could accomplish such a gigantic task, and codify that immense mass of laws and customs as systematically and linguistically exact as he did. Nobody before or even after him has been able to do it so well and completely as he has done it. He alone has brought the rabbinical law within a compass, to be mastered in a few years, and under a system to find particular laws or customs without roaming over a mass of rabbinical sources. thereby affording students an opportunity to master the rabbinical laws, and to save time for other studies.” His fame now became world-wide. Not only, however, as a law-giver in Judah did he advance to the first place among the great and learned; as a physician also he excelled his colleagues, and for his attainments in this field of labor his name was carried to many foreign lands. Richard Coeur de Lion, learning of his medical skill, anxiously sought to secure the services of this noted Jew as his court physician. Maimonides, however, preferred to remain in the land of his adoption, and declined the proffered honor (compare Weil, *Chalifen*, 3:423 sq.). It was about this time that the vizier of Saladin, the Kadhi al-Fadhel, who had taken Maimonides under his protection, appointed Moses chief (*Reis*, *dygn*) of all the congregations in

Egypt (about 1187): The numerous and onerous duties now put upon him as the spiritual head of Judaism, and the constant demand for his great medical skill, were, however, alike unable to overcome the powers of his intellect, which he had consecrated to the elucidation of the Bible and the traditional law, and to the harmonizing of revelation with philosophy, and in the midst of all his engagements Maimonides entered upon the preparation of a third religio-philosophical work, which became, of all his productions, the most valued and important. Its object was to reclaim one of his disciples, Ibn-Aknin (q.v.), from the prevailing skepticism about a future world, the destiny of man, sin, retribution, revelation, etc. The design of the work is explained by Maimonides himself in the following terms: "I have composed this work, not for the common people, neither for beginners, nor for those who occupy themselves only with the law as it is handed down without contemplating its principle. The design of my work is rather to promote the true understanding of the real spirit of the law, to guide those religious persons who, adhering to the truth of the Torah have studied philosophy, and are embarrassed by the contradictions between the teachings of philosophy and the liberal sense of the Torah." The work, consisting of three parts in 204 sections, and entitled in Arabic **ṭī al d̄ ḡyryaj l̄ a**, in Heb. **מְיָרְיָא לְא**, *Moreh Nebuchim* (*The Guide of the Perplexed*), in allusion to ⁽¹²⁴⁸⁾Exodus 14:3, and, according to Gratz (6:363), "constituting the summit of the Maimonical mind and the justification of his inmost convictions," created a new epoch in the philosophy of the Middle Ages. "Ce livre," says Frank (*Etudes Orientales*, p. 360), "inspire également le respect par les puissantes facultés de l'auteur, la prodigieuse souplesse de son esprit, la variété de ses connaissances, l'élevation de son spiritualisme enfin par la lumière qu'il repand sur quelques-uns des points les plus obscurs de l'histoire de l'esprit humain." Not only did Mohammedans write commentaries upon it, but the Christian schoolmen learned from it how to harmonize the conflicts between religion and philosophy (compare Joel, *Eiifluss d. .uid. Philos. auf die christl. Scholastik*, in Frankel's *Monatsschrift* [Bresl. 1860, p. 210 sq.]; Munk, *Melanges*, p. 486). The contents of this great and noble work, which has become for Jewish thinkers, as it were, a "touchstone of philosophy," are, in the three parts into which it is divided, as follows: The first part is especially devoted to the explanation of all sensual expressions which are made use of in the Bible in regard to God; this is really but a mere detailed explication of what Maimonides had already laid down in the first book of his aforementioned code, namely, that such expressions must

be taken only in a spiritual and figurative sense; this part contains also the rational arguments by which philosophy proves the existence, the unity, and spirituality of God. The second part treats, first, of natural religion and its deficiencies; secondly, of the creation of the world and the different gradations of the world's system; and, thirdly, of revelation, prophecy, and of the excellence and perfectness of the divine law. The third part, after giving an explanation of the first vision of the prophet Ezekiel, treats of the opposition of good and evil in the world, of God's providence and omniscience, and their relation to the free will of man; a number of chapters of this last part are taken up in explaining the general design of the Mosaic law, and the reason for each separate law.

But while, on the one hand, the *Moreh Nebuchim* contributed more than any other work to the progress of rational development in Judaism, it, on the other hand, also provoked a long and bitter strife between orthodoxy and science — carrying out, as it did, to its last consequences the broad principle that “the Bible must be explained metaphorically by established fundamental truths in accordance with rational conclusions.” So bitter, indeed, was the contest which broke out between the subsequent spiritualistic Maimonidian and the “literal Talmudistic” schools, that the fierce invectives were speedily followed by anathemas and counter-anathemas issued by both camps; and, finally, about the middle of the 13th century, the decision was transferred into the hands of the Christian authorities, who commenced by burning Maimonides's books, continued by bringing to the stake all Hebrew books on which they could lay their hands, and followed this decision up by a wholesale slaughter of thousands upon thousands of Jews, men, women, and children — irrespective of their philosophical views. Under these circumstances, the antagonistic parties, chiefly through the influence of David Kimchi and others, came to their senses, and gladly enough withdrew their mutual anathemas; they even went so far as to send a deputation (in 1232) to Maimonides's grave at Saphet “to ask pardon of his ashes” (Lindo, p. 65); and, as time wore on, the name of Moses Maimonides became the pride and glory of the nation. Moses, himself, however, never witnessed the end of the conflict into which he had the mortification to see his nation plunged, caused by his own labors, which had been intended solely for their good. In the midst of the conflict (the opposition begun by Samuel ben-All, the gaon of Bagdad, was particularly strong in Southern France and Spain, see Gritz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, vol. 7, chap. 2), “the Great Luminary” of the Jewish nation was

extinguished Dec. 13, 1204. Both Jews and Mohammedans of Fostat had public mourning for three days. At Jerusalem the Jews proclaimed a day of extraordinary humiliation, reading publicly the threatenings of the law (Deuteronomy 28) and the history of the capture of the ark by the Philistines (1 Samuel 4, etc.), for they regarded Maimonides as the ark containing the law. His remains, in accordance with a personal request before his decease, were conveyed to Tiberias; and the reverence which the Jewish nation still cherish for his memory is expressed by the well-known saying, *hçm d[w hçmm hçmk µq al*, “From Moses, the lawgiver, to Moses (Maimonides), no one hath arisen like Moses,” in allusion to ⁽⁶³⁴⁰⁾Deuteronomy 34:10. “No man since Ezra had exercised so deep, universal, and lasting an influence on Jews and Judaism as Moses Maimonides. His theologico-philosophical works gained an authority among the progressive thinkers equal to his Mishna-Torah among rabbinical students. All Jewish thinkers up to date Baruch Spinoza, Moses Mendelssohn, and the writers of the 19th century included—are more or less the disciples of Maimonides; so that no Jewish theologico-philosophical book, from and after A.D. 1200, can be picked up in which the ideas of Maimonides form not a prominent part” (Dr. Wise).

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

contributed by his enunciation of definite articles of faith to a narrow determination of Jewish dogmas, although his own investigations bear throughout a rationalizing character. Maimonides is no friend to astrological mysticisms. We are only to believe that which is either attested by the senses, or strictly demonstrated by the understanding, or transmitted to us by prophets and godly men. In the province of *Science* he regards Aristotle as the most trustworthy leader, and only differs from him when the dogma requires it, as, especially, in the doctrine of the creation and providential guidance of the world. Maimonides holds firmly to the belief (without which, in his opinion, the doctrines of inspiration and of miracles, as suspensions of natural laws, could not be maintained) that God called into existence out of nothing not only the form but also the matter of the world, the philosophical proofs to the contrary not appearing to him conclusive. If these proofs possessed mathematical certainty, it would be necessary to interpret those passages in the Bible which appear to oppose them allegorically, which is now not admissible. Accordingly Maimonides condemns the hypothesis of the eternity of the world in the Aristotelian sense, or the doctrine that matter is eternal *ab in zítio*, and has always been the substratum of an order or form arising from the tendency of all things to become like the eternal and divine Spirit; “the Bible,” he says, “teaches the temporal origin of the world.” Less discordant with the teachings of the Bible, according to Maimonides, is the Platonic theory, which he interprets with the exactest strictness according to the literal sense of the dialogue *Timæus*. He understands the theory as assuming that matter is eternal, but that the divinely-caused order, by the addition of which to matter the world was formed, had a beginning in time. Yet he does not himself accept this theory, but adheres to the belief that matter was created by God. In *Ethics*, Maimonides, holding reason in man — if properly developed and tutored by divine revelation — to be the great touchstone for the right or wrong of individual deeds, fully allows the freedom of will, and, while he urges the necessity, nay, the merit of listening, to a certain degree, to the promptings of nature, rigorously condemns a life of idle asceticism, and dreamy, albeit pious contemplation. No less is it, according to him, right and praiseworthy to pay the utmost attention to the healthy and vigorous development of the body, and the care of its preservation by the closest application to hygienic rules. Providence, he argues, reigns in a certain — broad — manner over humanity, and holds the sway over the destinies of nations; but he utterly denies its working in the single event that may befall the individual, who, subject above all to the great physical

laws, must learn to understand and obey them, and to shape his mode of life and action in accordance with existing conditions and circumstances — the study of natural science and medicine being therefore a thing almost of necessity to everybody. The soul, and the soul only, is immortal, and the reward of virtue consists in its — strictly unbodily — bliss in a world to come; while the punishment of vice is the “loss of the soul.” “Do not,” says Maimonides, “allow thyself to be persuaded by fools that God predetermines who shall be righteous and who wicked. He who sins has only himself to blame for it, and he can do nothing better than speedily to change his course. God’s omnipotence has bestowed freedom on man, and his omniscience foreknows man’s choice without guiding it. We should not choose the good, like children and ignorant people, from motives of reward or punishment, but we should do good for its own sake, and from love to God; still retribution does await the immortal soul in the future world.” The *resurrection of the body* is treated by Maimonides as being simply an article of faith, which is not to be opposed, but which cannot be explained.

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

expectation of a Messiah.” Not only is this statement refuted by the fact that Maimonides inserted these dogmas in the thirteen articles of his *Creed* [see JUDAISM], but when, in his later productions, he has occasion to treat of them, he does so with great consideration of his relation to the synagogue, as we have seen above.

Editions and Translations of the principal Works of Maimonides —

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

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

(3) *The Mishna Torah* or *Jad Hachazaka*. The first edition of the text appeared in Italy, in the printing-office of Solomon b. — Jehuda and Obadja b. — Moses, about 1480, two vols. folio; then in Soncino, 1499; the text, with different commentaries, Constantinople, 1509; Venice, 1524, 1550-51, 1574-75; with an alphabetical index and many plates, 4 vols. folio, Amsterdam, 1702. It is to this edition that the references in this Cyclopaedia are made. Translations of portions of this work in Latin have

been published, and also two in English; one by H. H. Bernard, *Main Principles of the Creed and Ethics of the Jews exhibited in Selections from the Yad-Hachazakah of Maimonides* (Cambr. 1832, 8vo).

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

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

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

(translated by Prof. Morris), 1:97; Dr. Milziener, in the *Jewish Times* (N.Y. 1872), p. 765 sq.; Kitto, *Bibl. Cyclopaedia*, s.v.; Chambers, *Cyclopaedia*, s.v.

Main-sail

is the rendering in the Auth. Version of the nautical term ἄρτέμων (from *caprew*, to *suspend* or “hoist”), which occurs only in this sense in ~~424~~Acts 27:40. It is explained by some critics, *the largest sail of the poop*, answering to our “mizzen-sail,” and even yet called by the Venetians *artinmone*. Some regard it as the “top-sail,” Lat. *supparum*. Others understand by it a small sail or “jib” near the prow, called by the Romans the *dolon*. The term may thus be understood to signify properly the *fore-sail*, which, in the opinion of those qualified to judge, would be most useful in bringing a ship to head to the wind under the circumstances narrated by Luke (see Hackett’s *Comment.* ad loc.). The vessels of that time had one, two, or three masts; the largest was in the stern (Smith’s *Dict. of Ant.* s.v. *Malus*). Hence, if Paul’s ship had but one, the sail in question would have been that now called *thejib*, being fastened to a “boom” or spar projecting from the bowsprit; but if, as is more probable from its size, it had at least two masts, this sail would be the one attached to the front mast, that is, the “fore-sail.” “A sailor will at once see that the fore-sail was the best possible *sail* that could be set under the circumstances” (Smith, *Shipwreck of St. Paul*, 3d edit. p. 139, note). **SEE SHIP.**

Maine De Biran, Marie Francois Pierre Gouthier

one of the most eminent French philosophers of our age, “the modern Malebranche,” as he has been aptly termed, was born near Bergerac Nov. 29, 1766. Upon the completion of his collegiate studies he entered the army, and was engaged in the stormy days of the first French Revolution. Later he devoted himself to politics, and in 1795 became a member of the department of Dordogne, from which, in 1797, he was deputed to the Council of the Five Hundred. From 1809 to 1814 he was a member of the legislative body; after the Restoration of 1816 he became a moderate royalist, and represented the people as such. All this time he was deeply engaged also in philosophical studies. In 1800 the National Institute offered a prize for the best essay “On the Influence of Habit upon the Faculty of Thinking;” he wrote for it, and secured the prize. In 1803 he bore off another prize for an essay “On the Decomposition of the Faculty

of Thinking;” and in 1807 he was awarded a third prize, this time from the Berlin Academy of Science, for a memoir on the question “Whether there is in man an inordinate internal intuition. and in what it differs from the perception of the senses.” Further honors he gained shortly after from Copenhagen, for an exposition of “The Mutual Relation of Man’s Moral and Physical Constitution.” In these different contributions to philosophical literature, Maine de Biran had gradually brought a new philosophy to maturity. To give his system to the public in a more completed form, he published a short work entitled *L’Examen de la Philosophie de Laromiguiere*; and finally crowned his philosophical labors by his magnificent article on *Leibnitz*, in the *Biographie Universelle*; and died, “too soon for the interest of philosophy,” in 1824, leaving behind, however, many traces of extraordinary philosophical genius, not only in France, but in various parts of Europe besides.

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

1. The consciousness of a voluntary effort;
2. The consciousness of a movement produced; and,
3. A fixed relation between the effort, on the one hand, and the movement, on the other.

Now the source or cause of the whole movement is the *will* and this term *will* we now use as virtually synonymous with self. Whether we say, I moved my arm, or my will moved it, the sentiment is exactly identical. Hence the notions of *cause*, of *will*, of *self* we find to be fundamentally the same; and several truths are by this means brought to light of great importance in metaphysical science (Preface to the *Nouvelles Considerations* [a posthumous work of Maine de Biran], p. 10). First, it becomes evident that we possess a natural activity, the seat of which is in

the will, so that whether we regard man as a thinking or an acting being, yet it is the will which alike presides over and regulates the flow of our thoughts or the course of our actions. Secondly, we infer that the will is the foundation of personality; that my will is virtually myself. And, thirdly, we infer that to will is to *cause*, and that from the inward consciousness of volition, viewed in connection with the effect produced, we gain our first notion of causality. These three points, as Cousin has shown us, embrace in a small compass the whole philosophy of Maine de Biran. He first seizes, with admirable sagacity, the principle of all human activity as resident in the power of the will, exemplifying it even in the case of those muscular movements which may appear to the unreflecting to be simply the result of nervous excitement. Having established the principle of activity, as residing in the will, he proceeds to identify the will with our very personality itself, showing that the soul is in its nature a force, the very essence of which is not to be acted upon, but to act. Finally, he proves that we gain our first notion of causality from the consciousness of our own personal effort, and that having once observed the conjunction of power exerted and effect produced in this particular case, we transfer the notion of cause thus originated into the objective world, and conclude by analogy the necessity of a sufficient power existing for every given effect" (*Hist. of Mod. Philippians* p. 639, 640; compare the memoir *De la Decomposition de la Pensee*; preferable even, *Nouvelles Considerations*, part i, sec. 1, and part 2, sec. 1 and 3; also the *Examen des Leçons de Philosophie*, sec. 8 and 9). "In the whole of the process by which our author had gradually advanced from the ideology of Cabanis to the absolute dynamical spiritualism of Leibnitz, he had relied simply upon his own power of reflection. Disciple of none, he had philosophized simply within the region of his own consciousness; so that whatever merit some may deny him, there are none, assuredly, who can reject the claim to that of complete originality" (Morell, p. 638-9). "Of all the masters of France," says Cousin, "Maine de Biran, if not the greatest, is unquestionably the most original. M. Laromiguiere only continued the philosophy of Condillac, modifying it in a few important points. M. Royer-Collard came from the Scottish philosophy, which, with the vigor and natural power of his reason, he would have infallibly surpassed, had he completely followed out the labors which form only the least solid part of his glory. As for *myself*, I come at the same time from the Scottish and German school. M. Maine de Biran alone comes from himself, and from his own meditations" (Preface to the *Fragmens Philosophiques*). See, besides the authorities already quoted, Ernest

Naville, *Alaine de Biran, sa vie et ses Pensees* (1857); Damiron, *Essai sur l'histoire de la Philosophie en France au dix-neuvieme Siecle*; *Brit. Qu. Rev.* 1866 (Oct.); Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. GCnerale*, vol. 32, s.v.; *The Academy* (Lond.), Sept. 15, 1872 (. (H. W.)

Maintaenon

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

Mair Hugh, D.D.

a Presbyterian minister, was born at New Mylus, Ayrshire, Scotland, July 16, 1797; graduated at the college in Glasgow in 1817; studied theology in Edinburgh; was licensed in 1822; was employed for some time as a missionary in the Orkneys, and other parts of Scotland; came to America in

1828, and was ordained and installed pastor of the churches at Fort Miller and Northumberland, N. Y.; in 1830 became pastor of the Church at Johnstown; resigned in 1843, and went to Brockport, where he officiated, as a stated supply, for several months; subsequently supplied at Warsaw for a year, and in 1847 went to Upper Canada, and became pastor at Fergus, in connection with the Church of Scotland, and there continued till the close of life, Nov. 1, 1854. Mair published *Four Miscellaneous Sermons. A Memoir*, with a selection from his MS. sermons, was published in 1856 by A. Dingwall Fordyce. Sprague, *Annals*, 4:744.

Mairs, George

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

Maistre de Sacy

SEE SACY.

Maistre, Joseph

(*count*) de, an eminent French Roman Catholic writer, the greatest advocate of Ultramontanism in the 19th century, was born at Chambéry April 1, 1753. His father was president of the senate of Savoy, and he became himself a member of that body in 1787. When the French armies invaded Savoy in 1792 he retired to Piedmont, where he wrote his *Considerations sur la France* (1796, 8vo; three editions in one year). Charles Emanuel IV called De Maistre to Turin, where he remained until the downfall of that prince, Nov. 19, 1798; he then retired to Venice, and lived there one year in great poverty. In 1799 he was created grand chancellor of Sardinia, and in September, 1802, was sent by that country as ambassador to Russia. While there he published (in 1810) his *Essai sur le*

principe regnateur des constitutions politiques, a full exposition of his political views, advocating the principle of divine right, and declaring the rights of the people derived from the sovereign — withal a sort of theocratic form of government more adapted to the Middle Ages than to the 19th century. “M. de Maistre,” in this work, “represents men as connected with God by a chain which binds them to his throne, and holds them without enslaving them. To the full extent of this chain we are at liberty to move; we are slaves indeed, but we are freely slaves (*librement esclaves*); we must necessarily work out the purposes of the Supreme Being, and yet the actions by which we work out these purposes are always free. So far so good; but here come the peculiarities of our author’s system. He does not consider men as individually responsible before God; he takes them as nations. and the nation, for M. de Maistre, is made up of the king and the aristocracy. Even considering each order separately, he asserts that all the members of the same order are indissolubly bound together, each bearing a share of the mutual and joint responsibility which weighs on the whole order. Now let us suppose the case of a revolution. In those terrible events which follow the disregard of all the laws of right and wrong, although the persons who fall victims to the fury of the multitude may sometimes be those whose very crimes have called down the divine vengeance, yet very often, nay, in most cases, the individually innocent suffer most. But, then, although individually innocent, they must come in for the share of the solidarity which belongs to the whole order. This results from the fact that the doctrine of atonement is the principle on which rests the constitution of society; the sins of the guilty are visited on the innocent, and the blood of the innocent, in its turn, atones for the guilty. Here is to be found the key-stone of count De Maistre’s theory; the Savoyard publicist develops it with all the resources of logic and erudition.” It has been well remarked that a system such as this is fatalism of the very worst description. Not only does it take away the free agency of men considered as individuals, but it effectually proclaims the validity of the maxim *that might is right*. “Wishing to transform all *earthly* governments into one homogeneous *theocracy*, he proposed, as a control over absolutism, an absolutism of a much more dangerous character. M. de Maistre’s leading idea is a good one: he swishes to appeal from the passions and depraved will of man to the Deity itself as to the eternal source of right and good; but not being, of course, able to receive immediately from God the counsel and the laws he wishes to reduce into practice for the good of society, he traces them to the pope, as the

vicegerent of Heaven! — an error common to all reactionary movements from the fear of allowing anything like vagueness to exist in the minds of men respecting their connection with the Almighty. He is not satisfied with anything short of what is really tangible, visible, perceptible to the senses, thus forgetting the character of the true Mediator. Failing to understand that both divinity and humanity have met together only in the man Christ Jesus, he would fain make us believe that the pope is ‘God made manifest in the flesh.’ With such views, he could not but condemn severely the charter of 1814, which introduced new institutions into France, and he turned his face towards Russia with a view of making it his home. By a ukase of December, 1815, Russia expelled the Jesuits. To them De Maistre and his family were much attached, and being on this account himself suspected of proselytism, he quitted the country and returned to Savoy in 1817, and became minister of state. He died Feb. 26, 1821.

Among the principal works of De Maistre, our special consideration is claimed also by his *Du Pape* (Lyons, 1819, 2 vols. 8vo; second and improved edition, 1821, 2 vols. 8vo), in which he treats of the papacy, 1, in its relation to the Romish Church; 2, to the temporal powers; 3, to civilization; and, 4, to the dissenting churches. It is a daring apology of the spiritual and temporal power of the pope. He starts from the principle that modern nations need a guarantee against the abuses of sovereign power. Such guarantee, he claims, is not to be found either in written charters, which are always useless, nor in assemblies, which are powerless when they are not anarchic. He can find it only in a sovereignty superior to all others, at once independent and disinterested, and interfering to promote the cause of justice, which has been entrusted to it by God himself. The Savoyard publicist’s *beau ideal* of government is the constitution of the Middle Ages. He describes it in exulting language, and crowds his margins with quotations from Bellarmine, Baronius, and the Tridentine fathers, never suspecting that, after all, he has only been painting a *tableau de fantaisie*, a piece of historical inaccuracy which will match the dreamy theories of Boulainvilliers and Dubos. We are invited, seriously, to return to those happy times when royalty, while it retained its full volition, and was endowed with an independent patrimony, was restrained in the exercise of legislative power by the clergy, the nobility, and the commons, each resting on its own foundation, and acting within its allotted sphere, while above was the papacy, which, by its sublime umpirage, maintained, in cases of collision, the harmonious cooperation of the members of all the

body politic. We are told to admire the noble, temperate monarchy which had grown up under the shelter of the Christian Church, and which, though never brought to perfection (this is, at least, a candid acknowledgment), had yet secured to the mediaeval nations so long a career of happiness and freedom, prosperity and glory. It would be a task both useless and unprofitable to point out all the misstatements which occur in the description just given. The futility of his scheme was demonstrated by the conduct of De Maistre himself. In 1804 pope Pius VII crowned Napoleon emperor. This, according to the theory of the work *Du Pape*, was one of those judgments by which the papal infallibility settled political difficulties. Yet De Maistre speaks of this decision in the following disrespectful terms: "The pope's journey and the coronation are for the present the great subject of conversation... All in the French Revolution is wonderfully bad, but this is the *ne plus ultra*. The crimes of an Alexander VI are less frightful than this hideous apostasy of his weak-minded successor... I wish with all my heart that the unfortunate pontiff would go to St. Domingo to crown Dessalines. When once a man of his rank and character so far forgets both, all that is to be hoped for is that he may completely degrade himself until he becomes but an insignificant puppet" (*Corresp. diplom.* p. 138, 139). It was thus the great ultramontane writer respected papal infallibility when not in accordance with his own views or his passions. *De l'Eglise Gallicane dans ses rapports avec le souverainpontife* (Paris, 1821, 8vo; Lyons, 1822) is a sort of continuation of the preceding work. It attacks the privileges of semi-independence claimed by the Church of France. This book, in which Bossuet and Fleury are somewhat roughly handled, was not well received at first by the French clergy. Abbe Baston published an answer to it under the title *Reclamations pour l'Eglise de France, et pour la verite, contre M. de Maistre* (1821, 1824, 2 vols. 8vo); still, in the course of time, it was greatly instrumental in causing the triumph of the ultramontane doctrine. *Les soires de St. Petersbourg, ou Entretiens*, etc. (Paris, 1821, 2 vols. 8vo), "the best known and certainly the most readable work of the author," treats of retribution, both here and hereafter. We cannot give here the details of De Maistre's theory, but its most important features may be summed up thus: the thorough badness of human nature, the necessity of atonement, the reversion of the merits of the innocent paying for the guilty, and salvation through blood. These views, in which excellent Christians have found a daring perversion of the most holy Christian principles, led De Maistre to justify the Inquisition. His apology, entitled *Lettres a uns gentilhomme Russe sur l'Inquisition Espagnole*

(Paris, 1822, 8vo), is, however, but a very lame defense of that atrocious institution. His violent attack against Bacon, *Examen de la Philosophie de Bacon* (Paris, 1836, 2 vols. 8vo) is not much better. His works are very original, but more in the form than in the ideas. Carrying often a true principle to its fullest extent, he arrives at a paradox which he then proclaims as evident. "As a pamphlet writer," says Dr. M'Clintock (in the *Meth. Quart. Rev.* 1856, p. 218), "De Maistre may be compared, in some respects, to Paul Louis Courier; he had the same point, the same *finesse*, the same elegance of style, and an apparent simplicity, which only set off with greater effect the home-truths he addressed to his readers; but finished as these minor works decidedly were, true both as to sentiment and language, they were merely suggested by the events of the times, and, as such, were likely to lose most of their point as the course of things moved in a new direction. The *Considerations*, on the contrary, will ever retain their interest, for they discuss principles; they belong to the philosophy of history. Whatever view we may take of the conclusions adopted by De Maistre, we cannot but admire both the extent of his learning and the depth of his thoughts; the work fully deserves to be placed by the student on the same shelf as Bossuet's *Discourse on Universal History*."

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

Philosophes Français du dix^e siècle; *Edinburgh Review*, Oct. 1852; Albert Blanc, *Introduction à la Correspondance diplomatique de Joseph de Maistre*; Migne, *Nouv. Encyclopedie Theologique*, 2:1326; *Edinb. Review*, April, 1849; *Lond. Quart. Rev.* 1857, art. 7; and especially the article by Dr. M'Clintock in the *Meth. Quart. Rev.* April, 1856, art. 3:(J. H. W.)

Maitland, Samuel Roffey

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

Maitland, William

a noted Scotch politician of the Reformation period, better known as "Secretary Lethington," was born about 1525, and was educated both at St. Andrews and on the Continent. He had great influence as a political

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

na warrant that ever he shall be well," alluding to Maitland's state in the hereafter. See Froude, *Hist. of England*, vol. 10. ch. 19 and 23; Robertson, *Hist. of Scotland* (see Index).

Maitreya

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

Majolists

SEE SOMASKER.

Majolus

SEE CLUGNY.

Major, Georg

a German theologian, was born at Nuremberg. April 25, 1502. He studied theology under Luther and Melancthon, and was successively rector at Magdeburg (1529), superintendent at Eisleben (1536), and professor of theology and court-preacher at Wittenberg (1539). In 1544 he was made doctor of divinity, and two years later he was one of the representatives (with Bucer and Brenz) of the Protestants at the colloquy at Regensburg. On the breaking out of the Smalcald war, Major left Wittenberg, and received (1547) the appointment of superintendent and court-preacher at Merseburg; but, on the close of the war, next year, he returned to Wittenberg. After rejecting the offer of prominent positions, made by the king of Denmark and the duke of Holstein, he became, in 1552, superintendent of the Mansfeld churches. In the mean time he had been

active in supporting the Leipzig Interim, which asserted that good works are necessary to salvation, and had thus excited the suspicion of the strict Lutherans, who denied that proposition. Towards the close of 1551 Amsdorf assailed Major on these grounds, and the clergy of the district soon joined him in opposing the new superintendent, as having corrupted the doctrine of justification by faith. Major replied to the charge of Amsdorf in 1552, denying its truth, and asserting his acceptance of the doctrine of the Church; but, as he still insisted on the necessity of good works, the controversy continued to rage, and, as the count of Mansfeld held with the orthodox party, Major finally removed to Wittenberg. He then sought to give an unobjectionable form to his views by teaching that while faith alone is essential to salvation, good works are necessary as a consequent on saving faith. But, despite every effort at reconciliation, his opponents persisted, and even went to the length of asserting that good works are *detrimental* to salvation. The doctrines advocated by Major were finally branded as heretical in the *Corpus doctrinae Prutenicum*, and were rejected by the compilers of the *Formula Concordiae*. Towards the close of his life he became involved in the *Crypto-calvinistic controversy* (q.v.), and, together with the Wittenberg and Leipzig theologians, was compelled to subscribe to the *Torgau articles* (q.v.). He died at Wittenberg, Nov. 28, 1574, before the Majoristic controversy was concluded. A portion of his works, comprising homilies and commentaries on the Gospels and on the Pauline epistles was published at Wittenberg in 1569, in three folio volumes. See Schröckh, *Kirchengeschichte seit der Reformation*, 4:547 sq.; Planck, *Gesch. des Prot. Lehrbegriffs*, 4:468 sq.; Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, vol. 4, s.v.; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, vol. 6; Krauth, *Conservative Ref.* p. 147 et passim; Kurtz, *Manual Ch. Hist.* 2:135; Smith's Gieseler, *Eccles. History*, vol. 4, § 37; Thomasius, *Confess. der Evang. Luth. Kirche* (Nuremb. 1848), p. 100 sq. (G. M.)

Major, Johann

a humanistic poet at Wittenberg during the latter half of the 16th century, deserves a place here as the greatest satirist among the *Philippists*, as the followers of Melancthon were called. He was born in 1533 at Joachimsthal, where Johann Mathesius (q.v.) became his tutor and friend. At the age of sixteen he went to Wittenberg, and formed a most intimate connection with Melancthon. To the influence of this association may doubtless be attributed his future course. After attaining to the degree of M.A. he

removed to Wtitzburg, with a view to succor the university at that place. Towards the close of 1557 the degree of D.D. was conferred on him, and in the following year he was honored with the title of crown poet. Returning to Wittenberg, he was, in 1560, admitted to the philosophical faculty of that university, and, besides lecturing on poetry and the interpretation of Latin poets, he wrote occasional poems. In 1574 the Philippist party was overthrown in Electoral Saxony, and its heads imprisoned. It is certain that Major suffered in this reverse, and he is said to have been three times imprisoned — at one time (from 1579 to 1581) was under sentence of death, although his opponents charge this, not to his connection with the Philippists, but to his conviction for criminal offenses.

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

Major, John

a Scottish historian and theologian, was born at Gleghorn, East Lothian, Scotland, in 1469.; was educated at Oxford, Cambridge, and Paris. After teaching a number of years in Paris, as professor of scholastic philosophy, he became professor of divinity, and subsequently provost at St. Andrews,

in Scotland. He died in 1547. He published *Commentaries on the Scriptures*, besides works of a secular character. — Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.; Thomas, *Dict. of Biog. and Mythol.* s.v.

Majores

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

Majorinus

SEE DONATISTS.

Majoristic Controversy

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

Majorists

SEE MAJOR, GEORG.

Majoritas

(*Precedence*) is the form in ecclesiastical law to denote the preference of the clergy over the laity, as well as the rank of the Church officers. In the Roman Catholic Church the distinction between the clergy and the laity is greater than in the Protestant churches. In the former there is also greater distinction in the ranks of the clergy itself. Thus an older ordination has precedence over a more recent ordination, and a higher over a lower order (c. 1:15, X, *De maj. et obed.* 1:33), excepting only an ordination conferred by the pope himself, as his act takes precedence in any case (c. vii, X, eod). In ordinations equal in rank the secular clergy precede the regulars; and again, among the secular clergy, the canons of the chapter-house those of the collegiate; among the orders, the regular canons the monks, and all other orders the mendicants; and among the latter the Dominicans precede all others (compare Benedict XIV, *De Syn. disc.* lib. iii, c. x). This term expresses also the official authority, the legal power of the Church office. Persons who are invested with such offices are denominated in the

Protestant churches *officials* (q.v.). In the Roman Catholic Church they are called Church superiors (*superiores ecclesiastici*), and as a body they make up the hierarchical rank (*status hierarchicus*). The Romish Church authority requires obedience not only of its subjects, i.e. non-officials, but also of its officials, who, on entering upon their office, vow submission and obedience to their superiors by a formal oath. Hence arose the dispute whether the pope should be accepted as the highest authority, or whether even he was subject to a council. *SEE INFALLIBILITY; SEE PAPACY.*

Makarij

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

Ma’kaz

(Heb. *Ma’kats*, /q̄m; *boundary*; Septuag. Μακέζ v. r. Μαχυᾶς), a place first named among those designating the district of Ben-Dekar, one of Solomon’s purveyors (^{<100>}1 Kings 4:9). The associated names, Shaalvim, Beth-shemesh, and Elon-beth-hanan, would seem to indicate a locality in the tribe of Dan, perhaps in the plain east of Ekron.

Ma’ked

(Μακέδ v. r. Μακέβ; Syr. *Mokor*; Vulg. *Mageth*), one of the “strong and great cities” of Gilead Josephus says Galilee, but this must be an error-into which the Jews were driven by the Ammonites under Timotheus, and from which they were delivered by Judas Maccabaeus (1 Maccabees 5:26, 36; in

the latter passage the name is given in the A. V. as MAGED). By Josephus (*Ant.* 12:8, 3) it is not mentioned. Some of the other cities named in this narrative have been identified, but no name corresponding to Maked has yet been discovered, and the conjecture of Schwarz (p. 230), that it is a corruption of MINNITHS (**tgm** for **tNm**), though ingenious, can hardly be accepted without further proof.

Makemie, Francis

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

Makhe'loth

(Heb. *Makheloth'*, **tl beq̄h** — *assemblies*, as in ⁽¹⁹⁸⁷⁾Psalm 68:27; Sept. **Μακηλώθ**), the twenty-sixth station of the Israelites in the desert. between Haradah and Tahath (⁽¹⁹²⁵⁾Numbers 33:25, 26); probably situated on the summit north-west of Jebel el-Mukrah. *SEE EXODE*.

Mak'kedah

(Heb. *Alakkedah'*, **hdQm** *herdsman's place*; Sept. **Μακηδά**, Josephus **Μακχιδά**, *Ant.* 5:1, 17), a royal city of the ancient Canaanites (⁽¹⁹¹⁶⁾Joshua

12:16), in the neighborhood of which was the cave where the five kings who confederated against Israel took refuge after their defeat (^{<6300>}Joshua 10:10-29). It afterwards belonged to Judah (^{<6154>}Joshua 15:41). Makkedah is placed by Eusebius and Jerome eight Roman miles to the east of Eleutheropolis (*Onomast.* s.v. Maceda), which would bring it among the mountains, as Keil observes, who therefore locates it to the *west* (*Comment.* on ^{<6300>}Joshua 10:10), since it was situated in the plain of Judah (^{<6154>}Joshua 15:41), north of Libnah (^{<6309>}Joshua 10:29, 31) and west of Azekah (^{<6300>}Joshua 10:10). De Saulcy (*Narrat.* 1:438) is disposed to fix its site at a place which he names *el-Merked*; on the way from Hebron to the Dead Sea, a little east of Jenbeh; but this is at least twenty-five miles from Eleutheropolis, and the spot itself was not heard of by Dr. Robinson, who passed along the same route. Porter suggests a ruin bearing the slightly similar name *el-Klediah*, on the northern slope of wady el-Surnib, about eight miles north-east of Eleutheropolis, with large caves adjacent (*Handbook*, p. 224, 251); but Van de Velde's selection (*Memoir*, p. 332) of *Sumeil*, a village on a hillock in the plain, about two and a half hours north-west of Beit-Jibrin (Robinson, *Researches*, 2:368), seems more probable, as it has ancient remains, especially a cavern (Van de Velde, *Nartrat.* 2:173), although somewhat remote from Beth-horon, where Joshua's battle was fought. **SEE JOSHUA.** The suggestion of captain Warren (*Quarterly Statement* of the "Palestine Exploration Fund," April, 1871, p. 91), that Makkedah is the present "village of *El-Mughar* (the cave)" (meaning, doubtless, the *Moyharah* of Van de Velde's *Map*, though Robinson writes it *Mughar*, in *Researches*, 3:22, note), is quite too far north for the narrative in Joshua, as well as for the associated names, his proposed identification of which would place some, at least, of them (e.g. Beth-dagon, at Beit-Dejan) clearly within the tribe of Dan.

Makkoth

SEE TALMUD.

Makowski

SEE MACCOVIUS.

Makrina

The Roman Catholic Church recognizes two saints by this name.

1. A Cappadocian lady, grandmother of Gregory of Nyssa, who suffered persecution under the reign of Maximian, and wandered for a long time through the woods, together with her husband. She is commemorated on the 14th of January.
2. The sister of St. Basil and of St. Gregory of Nyssa; after the death of her father she withdrew into solitude, and afterwards induced her mother to establish a convent in Pontus, into which she retired. She died in 379, after performing a great number of miracles, etc. Her life was written by her brother, St. Gregory. She is commemorated on the 19th of July. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 8:746; Pierer, *Universal-Lexikon*, 10:764; Migne, *Nouv. Encyclopedie Theologique*, 2:1298.

Mak'tesh

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

Malabar

a tract of country extending along the western coast of India, from Cape Comorin to the River Chandragri, in N. lat. 12° 30'. Frequently the name Malabar, however, is erroneously applied to the whole country from Bombay to the southern extremity. British Malabar is situated between the 10th and 13th degrees of N. lat., belongs to the presidency of Madras, and has a population of 2,261,250. By far the most extensive portion of Malabar lies in the vicinity of the Ghaut Mountains, and consists of low hills, separated by narrow but fertile valleys. The upland is barren, and the

cultivation much neglected; and it is in the valleys, and extensive ravines, and upon the banks of the rivers that the inhabitants chiefly reside. Until a recent period slavery existed in Malabar, but in 1843 a legislative enactment was passed by the British government, by the provisions of which slavery has been abolished throughout the whole extent of the British possessions in the East. The country is distinguished by the neatness of its villages, which are superior to any in India, being built of mud, neatly smoothed, and either whitewashed or painted; their picturesque effect is heightened by the beauty and elegant dresses of the Brahmin girls. The villages, as well as the bazaars, are the work of foreigners, the aboriginal natives of Malabar living in detached houses surrounded with gardens. The higher ranks use little clothing, but are remarkably clean in their persons, and all ranks are free from cutaneous distempers excepting the very lowest castes.

History. — It is supposed that Malabar was, at a very early period, conquered by a king from above the Ghauts. The Nairs may have been established at the same time by the conqueror, or called in by the Brahmins, as a military body to support the government. In process of time they obtained settlements in the land, and the chiefs, taking every opportunity to aggrandize themselves, became rajahs, and from a remote period continued to govern Malabar like independent princes. In 1760 the Mohammedans first effected an entry here under Hyder All, who subdued the country in 1761, and expelled all the rajahs except such as conciliated him by immediate submission. Disturbances were occasioned by these proceedings, but he succeeded in establishing his authority, and in 1782 appointed a deputy, who made still further progress in subduing and settling the country. In 1788 Tippoo Sahib, his son, attempted forcibly to supersede Hinduism by his own faith, Mohammedanism. This produced a serious rebellion, which, however, was soon quelled by his vigorous administration, but in the mean time the country was laid waste by his tyrannical proceedings. On the breaking out of the war between Tippoo and the British in 1790, the refractory rajahs and Nairs joined the British, and Tippoo was driven from the country; Malabar he came a portion of the British possessions of India, and, with slight disturbances, has since remained in the hands of the English. Under the management of the British the country is said to be advancing in prosperity.

Religion. — The original manners and peculiar customs of the Hindus have been preserved in Malabar in much greater purity than in other parts of

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

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

Travancore. There are also some 30,000 Jews in Malabar. See *Cyclop. Britannica*, s.v. *SEE MADRAS*.

Malacca

an extensive region, situate in Southern India, consisting of a large peninsula connected by the isthmus of Kraw, extends from the 1st to the 12th degrees of N. lat., and from the 98th to the 104th degrees of E. long., and is 775 miles in length by 125 in average breadth. The country is a long, narrow strip of land, traversed by a chain of lofty mountains, and covered with extensive forests and marshes, so that it is very difficult to penetrate into the interior. A range of extremely bleak mountains, running through it from one extremity to the other, gives rise to innumerable streams, the courses of which, from the proximity of the mountains to the sea, are short, and are so obstructed at the mouths by bars and sand-banks that they can not be ascended by vessels of any size. At the southern extremity of the continent are the islands of Bintang, Batang, and Singapore, with many others, so thickly clustered together that they are only separated from the continent by narrow straits, and seem to be a prolongation of the land. On the west coast also there are numerous islands.

History. — The political state of Malacca has been subject to many revolutions, having been occasionally dependent on Siam when that monarchy was in the height of its power, and when its supremacy was owned by the whole peninsula. But, since the Siamese have yielded to the increasing power of the Burmans, all the southern portion of the peninsula has shaken off the yoke, and the northern states pay only a moderate tribute. The whole of the sea-coast from that latitude to Port Romania is still possessed by the Malays, who are mixed in some places with the burgesses from Celebes, and who have a small settlement at Salengore. The northern and inland parts of the peninsula are inhabited by the Patany people, who appear to be a mixture of the Siamese and Malays, and who occupy independent villages. The negro race is found in the interior among the aboriginal natives. The great majority of the inhabitants are, however, of the Malay race, who are well known and widely diffused among all the eastern islands. The origin of this remarkable race is not distinctly known; they are understood, however, not to be natives of this country, but to have come originally from the district of Palembang, in the interior of Sumatra, situate on the banks of the River Malaya. Having crossed over about the end of the 12th century to the opposite continent, they, in 1252,

founded the city of Malacca. Sultan Mohammed Shah, who ascended the throne in the 13th century, was the first Mussulman prince who extended his rule over Malacca. During part of the 15th century Malacca was under Siamese sovereigns. In 1509 sultan Mahmud repelled the aggression of the king of Siam, but in 1511 he was conquered by the Portuguese under Albuquerque. In 1642 it became the possession of the Dutch, and in 1824 it was finally transferred to the British among the cessions made by the king of Netherlands in exchange for the British possessions on the island of Sumatra, E. long. 1000, N. lat. 5° (comp. *Cyclop. Brit.* s.v.).

Religion. — Until the inroads of the Mohammedans in the 13th century, the inhabitants of Malacca were pagans or followed some corrupt form of Hindu idolatry. With the Mussulman reign the religion of the Crescent became the predominating belief. Christianity was introduced in the 16th century by the Portuguese. One of the earliest laborers here was the renowned Spanish Jesuit, Francis Xavier (q.v.). Unfortunately, however, for the success of the Gospel truth, the conduct of the Romish priesthood and of the Portuguese authorities was very unkind toward the natives. Not much better was the influence of the Dutch. Though Protestantism, with their entrance, superseded Romanism in a measure, the government hesitated to encourage the Christian missions, and gave great liberty to Mohammedans, lest the latter should be tempted to insurrection, and Holland be deprived of these valuable possessions. To this day the Mussulmen continue to make converts in Malacca. The Romanists maintain a suffragan bishop at the capital (of like name as the country). For further details on the success of Christianity in Malacca at present, see the articles *SEE INDIA*; *SEE MALAYS*. See also Grundemann, *Missionsatas*, No. 7, 21, and 24; Cameron, *Our Trop. Possess. in Malayan India* (Lond. 1865).

Mal'achi

(Heb. *Malaki'*, *ykæl mī* nmessenger; Sept. in the title *Μαλαχίας*, but in ch. 1, it renders *ἄγγελος αὐτοῦ*, Vulg. *Malachias*), the last of the minor prophets, and the latest writer in the canon of the O.T. (comp. ^{300b}Malachi 4:4, 5, 6). What is known of him is so intimately connected with his prophecies that it will be most convenient to consider the whole subject together. In doing so we will, at the same time, treat any doubtful questions involved.

I. Personal Account. — The name Malachi is rendered by some *my angel*, but it is usually regarded as contracted from Malachijah, “messenger of Jehovah,” like Abi (^{128P}2 Kings 18:2) from Abijah (^{140E}2 Chronicles 29:1). The traditionists regard the name as having been given to the prophet on account of the beauty of his person and his unblemished life. The name means an *angel*, angels being, in fact, the messengers of God; and, as the prophets are often styled angels or messengers of Jehovah, it is supposed by some that “Malachi” is merely a general title descriptive of this character, and not a proper name. So Hengstenberg, *Christol.* 3:372 sq. Of his personal history nothing is known (see Dr. Davidson in *Horne’s Introd.* new ed. 2:894 sq.). A tradition preserved in Pseudo-Epiphanius (*De Vitis Proph.*) relates that Malachi was of the tribe of Zebulun, and born after the captivity at Sopha (Σοφᾶ,? Saphir) in the territory of that tribe. According to the same apocryphal story he died young, and was buried with his fathers in his own country. Jerome, in the preface to his *Commentary on Malachi*, mentions a belief which was current among the Jews, that Malachi was identical with Ezra the priest, because the circumstances recorded in the narrative of the latter are also mentioned by the prophet. The Targum of Jonathan ben-Uzziel, on the words “by the hand of Malachi” (1:1), gives the gloss “whose name is called Ezra the scribe.” With equal probability Malachi has been identified with Mordecai, Nehemiah, and Zerubbabel. The Sept., as above noted renders “by Malachi” (^{300E}Malachi 1:1), “by the hand of his angel;” and this translation appears to have given rise to the idea that Malachi, as well as Haggai and John the Baptist, was an angel in human shape (comp. ^{300E}Malachi 3:1; 2 Esdras 1:40; Jerome, *Comm. in Mag.* 1:13). Cyril alludes to this belief only to express his disapprobation, and characterizes those who hold it as romancers (ο μᾶτην ἐρῶραψοδήκασιν, κ. τ. λ.). The current opinion of the Jews is that of the Talmud, in which this question is mooted, and which decides, it seems to us rightly, that this prophet is not the same with Mordecai, or Ezra, or Zerubbabel, or Nehemiah, whose claims had all been advocated by different parties, but a distinct person named Malachi (*Bab. Megillah*, 15:1). Another Hebrew tradition associates Malachi with Haggai and Zechariah as the companions of Daniel when he saw the vision recorded in ^{270P}Daniel 10:7 (Smith’s *Select Discourses*, p. 214; A.D. 1660), and as among the first members of the Great Synagogue, which consisted of 120 elders (Isidore, *De Vita et Morte Sanct.* ch. li). For a notice of prophecy of the succession of the Roman pontiffs attributed to him, see the *Studien u. Kritiken*, 1857, p. 555 sq.). **SEE MALACHY, ST.**

II. Date of his Prophecies. — Although there has been a faint disposition to regard Zechariah as the last of the prophets (Lactant. *De Velra Sapent.* 4:5), the received opinion decides for Malachi. Accordingly Aben-Ezra calls him ““ the end of the prophets;” Kimchi, “the last of them;” and not seldom he is distinguished by the rabbins as “the seal of the prophets.” Cyril makes him contemporary with Haggai and Zechariah, or a little later. Syncellus (p. 240 B) places these three prophets under Joshua the son of Josedec. That Malachi was contemporary with Nehemiah is rendered probable by a comparison of ^{<3008>}Malachi 2:8 with ^{<4635>}Nehemiah 13:15; 2:10-16 with ^{<4623>}Nehemiah 13:23, etc.; and ^{<3008>}Malachi 3:7-12 with ^{<4630>}Nehemiah 13:10, etc. That he prophesied after the times of Haggai and Zechariah is inferred from his omitting to mention the restoration of the Temple, and from no allusion being made to him by Ezra. The captivity was already a thing of the long past, and is not referred to. The existence of the Temple-service is presupposed in 1:10; 3:1, 10. The Jewish nation had still a political chief (^{<3008>}Malachi 1:8), distinguished by the same title as that borne by Nehemiah (^{<4626>}Nehemiah 12:26), to which Gesenius assigns a Persian origin. Hence Vitranga concludes that Malachi delivered his prophecies after the second return of Nehemiah from Persia (^{<4636>}Nehemiah 13:6), and subsequently to the thirty-second year of Artaxerxes Longimanus (B.C. cir. 420), which is the date adopted by Kennicott and Hales, and approved by Davidson (*Introd.* p. 985). The date B.C. 410 cannot be far from correct. It may be mentioned that in the Seder Olam Rabba (p. 55, ed. Meyer) the date of Malachi’s prophecy is assigned, with that of Haggai and Zechariah, to the second year of Darius; and his death in the Seder Olam Zuta (p. 105) is placed, with that of the same two prophets, in the fifty-second year of the Medes and Persians. The principal reasons adduced by Vitranga, and which appear conclusively to fix the time of Malachi’s prophecy as contemporary with Nehemiah, are the following: The offenses denounced by Malachi as prevailing among the people, and especially the corruption of the priests by marrying foreign wives, correspond with the actual abuses with which Nehemiah had to contend in his efforts to bring about a reformation (comp. ^{<3008>}Malachi 2:8 with ^{<4629>}Nehemiah 13:29). The alliance of the high-priest’s family with Tobiah the Ammonite (^{<4634>}Nehemiah 13:4, 28) and Sanballat the Horonite had introduced neglect of the customary Temple-service, and the offerings and tithes due to the Levites and priests, in consequence of which the Temple was forsaken (^{<4634>}Nehemiah 13:4-13) and the Sabbath openly profaned (ver. 15-21). The short interval of Nehemiah’s absence from Jerusalem had

been sufficient for the growth of these corruptions, and on his return he found it necessary to put them down with a strong hand, and to do over again the work that Ezra had done a few years before. From the striking parallelism between the state of things indicated in Malachi's prophecies and that actually existing on Nehemiah's return from the court of Artaxerxes, it is on all accounts highly probable that the efforts of the secular governor were on this occasion seconded by the preaching of "Jehovah's messenger," and that Malachi occupied the same position with regard to the reformation under Nehemiah as Isaiah held in the time of Hezekiah, and Jeremiah in that of Josiah. The last chapter of canonical Jewish history is the key to the last chapter of its prophecy. See Noel Alexander, *De Malachia Propheta*, in his *Hist. Eccles.* 3:642 sq.; Vitringa, *idem*, in his *Observationes Sociae*, vol. 2; Hebenstreit, *Disp. in Malachi* (Lips. 1731 sq.).

III. Contents of the Book. — The prophecies of Malachi are comprised in four chapters in our version, as in the Sept., Vulgate, and Peshito-Syriac. In the Hebrew the 3d and 4th form but one chapter. The whole prophecy naturally divides itself into three sections, in the first of which Jehovah is represented as the loving father and ruler of his people (^{<3000>}Malachi 1:2-2:9); in the second, as the supreme God and father of all (^{<3020>}Malachi 2:10-16); and in the third, as their righteous and final judge (^{<3027>}Malachi 2:17-end). These may be again subdivided into smaller sections, each of which follows a certain order: first, a short sentence; then the skeptical questions which might be raised by the people; and, finally, their full and triumphant refutation. The formal and almost scholastic manner of the prophecy seemed to Ewald to indicate that it was rather delivered in writing than spoken publicly. But though this may be true of the prophecy in its present shape, which probably presents the substance of oral discourses, there is no reason for supposing that it was not also pronounced orally in public, like the warnings and denunciations of the older prophets, however it may differ from them in vigor of conception and high poetic diction.

1. The first section of the prophet's message consists of two parts; the first (^{<3000>}Malachi 1:1-8) addressed to the people generally, in which Jehovah, by his messenger, asserts his love for them, and proves it, in answer to their reply, "Wherein hast thou loved us?" by referring to the punishment of Edom as an example. The second part (^{<3006>}Malachi 1:6-2:9) is addressed especially to the priests, who had despised the name of Jehovah, and had been the chief movers of the defection from his worship and covenant.

They are rebuked for the worthlessness of their sacrifices and offerings, and their profanation of the Temple thereby (^{<3007>}Malachi 1:7-14). The denunciation of their offense is followed by the threat of punishment for future neglect (^{<3001>}Malachi 2:1-3), and the character of the true priest is drawn as the companion picture to their own (^{<3005>}Malachi 2:5-9).

2. In the second section (^{<3010>}Malachi 2:10-16) the prophet reproves the people for their intermarriages with the idolatrous heathen, and the divorces by which they separated themselves from their legitimate wives, who wept at the altar of Jehovah, in violation of the great law of marriage which God the father of all, established at the beginning.

3. The judgment, which the people lightly regard, is announced with all solemnity, ushered in by the advent of the Messiah. The Lord, preceded by his messenger shall come to his Temple suddenly, to purify the land from its iniquity, and to execute swift judgment upon those who violate their duty to God and their neighbor. The first part (^{<3017>}Malachi 2:17-3:5) of the section terminates with the threatened punishment; in the second (^{<3016>}Malachi 3:6-12) the faithfulness of God to his promises is vindicated, and the people are exhorted to repentance, with its attendant blessings; in the third (^{<3013>}Malachi 3:13-4:6) they are reproved for their want of confidence in God, and for confusing good and evil. The final severance between the righteous and the wicked is then set forth, and the great day of judgment is depicted, to be announced by the coming of Elijah, or John the Baptist, the forerunner of Christ (^{<4014>}Matthew 11:14; 17:10-13).

IV. Style. — The diction of Malachi offers few, if any, distinguishing characteristics. His language is suitable to the manner of his prophecy. Smooth and easy to a remarkable degree, it is the style of the reasoner rather than of the poet. The rhythm and imagery of his writings are substantially those of the old prophets, but they possess no remarkable vigor or beauty. We miss the fiery prophetic eloquence of Isaiah, and have in its stead the calm and almost artificial discourse of the practiced orator, carefully modeled upon those of the ancient prophets. His phraseology is accounted for by his living during that decline of Hebrew poetry which we trace more or less in all the sacred writings posterior to the captivity. In general the language is concise, clear, and polished, and the manner of introducing a new line of argument or a new range of thought is most striking. Here the peculiarity is to be noticed, that there is no longer the ancient dramatic manner displayed, but a kind of dialogue has taken its

place, which is carried on between God and the people or the priests, whose half-mocking questions are enlarged upon and finally answered with scorn by the mouth of the messenger. He seems fully aware of being the last of the sacred bards (^{301E}Malachi 3:1 and 22), and the epoch of transition from the glowing energetic fullness of the inspired seer, who speaks to the people as the highest power suddenly and forcibly moves him, to the carefully studied and methodically constructed written discourse, becomes strangely apparent in him. We find both the ancient prophetic improvised original exhortation, with its repetitions and apparent incongruities, and the artificially composed address, with its borrowed ideas well arranged and its euphonious words well selected. This circumstance has probably also given rise to the notion that we have only in his book a summary of his orations: a work containing, as it were, the substance only of his addresses, written out by himself from his recollections an opinion which we do not share. Of peculiarities of phraseology we may notice the occurrence of passages like *wyl a µkta aḳnw* (^{301B}Malachi 2:3), *wḳwbl Al [smj hsk* (^{301G}Malachi 2:16), etc.

V. *Canonicity and Integrity.* — The claim of the book of Malachi to its place in the canon of the Old Testament has never been disputed, and its authority is established by the references to it in the New Testament (⁴⁰¹⁰Matthew 11:10; 17:12; ⁴⁰⁰²Mark 1:2; 9:11,12; ⁴⁰¹⁷Luke 1:17; ⁴⁰¹³Romans 9:13). Philo, Josephus, Melito, Jerome, and other ancient authorities, mention it, and quote from it as in accordance with our present copies. Nor is there anything, either in its language or the circumstances of its time, the manners and customs touched upon, or its topographical and geographical allusions, that could give rise to the slightest critical suspicion.

Its text is one of the purest and best preserved, and no glosses to it are to be found in the Codd., such as had to be added to correct the corruptions of other books. The differences in the various ancient versions arise only from the differences of the vowels assumed or found by the translators in their copies. The few variants which occur in the different texts are so unimportant that they do not call for any detailed remark.

VI. *Commentaries.* — Special exegetical helps on the whole book are as follows, a few of the most important of which we designate by an asterisk prefixed: Ephraem Syrus, *Explanation* (in Syriac, in his *Opp.* v. 312); Rupertus Tuitiensis, *In Malachi* (in his *Opp.* 1:520); D. Kimchi and S.

Jarchi's commentaries, tr. into Latin by De Muis (Paris, 1618, 4to); Aben-Ezra's and other Jewish commentaries, tr. into Latin by Hebenstreet (Lips. 1746, 4to); D. Kimchi's and Aben-Ezra's commentaries, in Latin by Bohle (Rost. 1637, 4to); Kimchi's alone, by Carpzov (Lips. 1679, 8vo), by Miinster (Basil. 1530, 8vo); Aben-Ezra's alone, by Mitnster (ib. 1530, 8vo), by Borgwall (Upsal. 1707, 8vo); Abrabanel's, by Meyer (Hammon. 1685, 4to); Luther, *Commentarius* (in *Opp.*, Wittenb. edit., 4:520; in German, by Agricola, 1555); Melancthon, *Explicationes* (Vitemb. 1553; also in *Opp.* 2:541); Draconis, *Explanaciones* (Lips. 1564, folio); Chytrens, *Explicatio* (Rost. 1568, 8vo; also in *Opp.* 2:455); Moller, *Expositio* (Vitemb. 1569, 8vo); Brocardus, *interpretatio* [including Cant., Hag., and Zech.] (L. B. 1580, 8vo); Gryneus, *Hlypomnemata* (Genesis 1582, 8vo; Basil. 1583, 1612, 4to); Polanus, *Analysis* (Basil- 1597, 1606, 8vo); Baldwin, *Commentarius* [includ. Hag. and Zech.] (Vitemb. 1610, 8vo); De Quiros, *Commentarii* [includ. Nah.] (Hispal. 1622; Lugd. 1623, fol.); Tarnow, *Commentarius* (iost. 1624, 4to); Stock and Torshell, *Commentary* (Lond. 1641, fol.); Acosta, *Commentarius* [including Ruth, etc.] (Lugd. 1641, fol.); Sclater, *Commentary* (Lon.don, 1650, 4to); Ursinus, *Commentarius* (Francof. 1652, 8vo); Martinus, *Observationes* (Groning. 1647, 4to; 1658, 8vo); Varenius, *Trifolium* [including Hag. and Zech.] (Rost. 1662, 4to); Pocock, *Commentary* (Oxf. 1677, fol.; also in *Works*, 119); Van Til, *Commentarius* (L.B. 1701, 4to); Kippen, *Observationes* (Gryph. 1708, 4to); Wessel. *Enucleatio* (Lub. 1729, 4to); *Venema, *Commentsarius* (Leon. 1759, 4to); Fischer, *Prolusio* (Lips. 1759, etc.); Bahrat, *Commmentatrius* (Lips. 1768, 8vo); *Faber, *Comment(atio)* (Onold. 1779, 4to); Rosenmüller, *Scholia* (Lips. 1828, 8vo); *Reinke, *Commentar* (Giessen, 1856, 8vo); *Moore, *Com, mentary* [including Hag. and Zech.] (N. Y. 1856, 8vo); Kohler, *Er'kl run'g* (Erlang. 1865, 8vo). **SEE PROPHETS, MINOR.**

Mal'achy

(Vulg. *Malsachias*), a familiar form (2 Esdras 1:40) of the name of the prophet MALACHI.

Malachy, St.,

archbishop of Armagh, one of the most noted characters in Irish Church History, was born of a noble family at Armagh about 1195. While yet a youth he retired from the world to subject himself to a most rigid

asceticism under the abbot Imar of Armagh. His humility and fervor soon gained him a great reputation for sanctity, and, quite contrary to the canonical rule, he was ordained priest when only twenty-five years old, by Celsus, then archbishop of Armagh, who took a special interest in Malachy, and favored him in many ways. He also employed Malachy as assistant in the discharge of the archiepiscopal office, Celsus intending thus gradually to introduce Malachy to the archiepiscopal duties, with a view of securing him as successor. Of these opportunities Malachy availed himself for the furtherance of a plan he had long cherished, that of bringing the Irish Church, which since the conquest of the south-western provinces by the Normans had remained independent of Rome, into subjectivity to the papal chair. Malachy gradually introduced the Roman method of reciting the hours, and also established the rites of confession, confirmation, ecclesiastical marriage, etc., in the several convents. Then, in order to become better acquainted with the details of the Roman Catholic ritual, he resided for some years with bishop Malchus of Lismore, also a native of Ireland, but who had been a monk of Winchester, England, and had there become thoroughly acquainted with the practices of Rome. Upon his return to his native land, Malachy was engaged by his friends for the restoration of the Bangor monastery, which had remained in ruins since its destruction by the Danes, and which was now the possession of Malachy's uncle. Assisted by ten monastic associates, he erected an oratory and a small house for their accommodation, and, as their superior, remained there until about 1225, when he was called away to preside over the see of Connereth (Connor), where, by unwearied exertions, he built up the cause of Christianity. About 1129 he was further promoted by a call to the archbishopric of Armagh, the place for which Celsus had long intended him. Malachy accepted the position, however, only upon condition that he should be permitted to resign it "as soon as it was rescued from its present unbecoming situation." Hitherto, by custom, the archiepiscopacy had been hereditary, and in consequence, though Celsus had himself nominated Malachy, the latter had not undisputed possession of the primatial see until about 1135, when he at once applied himself most earnestly and zealously to perfecting the reforms he had inaugurated while yet with Celsus. Previous to Malachy's accession to the arch-see there never had been a hierarchy or a legalized support for religion in the Irish Church. The ministry had been sustained by voluntary offerings, and in some instances by the donation of Tremon, or free lands, the rents of which were to be appropriated annually to the bishop and the poor. These lands, however,

were neither large nor numerous. During the commotions of the 10th and 11th centuries those which had been given to Armagh were again claimed by the lineal descendants of the original donors as their rightful inheritance. At this time they had been thus held for eight successive generations. Malachy's great endeavor was to do away with this abuse. *SEE IMPROPRIATION*. But he failed to accomplish this object, and in consequence resigned the primatial office and retired to the bishopric of Down, hitherto a part of his former see of Connor.

Malachy untiringly devoted himself to the one great object likely to be successfully accomplished — the Romanizing of the Irish Church. To accomplish this object — the greatest task which could have been undertaken by any person in his day, and which in consequence has made the name of Malachy one of the most prominent connected with the ecclesiastical annals of Ireland — he first traveled extensively in his own country, and then all the way to the Imperial City, where he was affectionately received by the pope (Innocent II), bishops, and cardinals, all vying with each other in their attentions to him. The pallium, or pontifical investure, however, for which he had come, the pope refused to grant until a request for union with Rome should come from one of the Irish synods. Malachy received, however, a sure proof of the pleasure of his holiness with the proposed scheme in his appointment to the legateship for all Ireland, and returned to his native land expectant of the immediate realization of his life-long dream. On his way homeward he became intimately acquainted with Bernard of St. Clairvaux, whom he had already visited on his way towards the Eternal City, and so charmed was he with the order and rule of the Cistercian monastery that he determined to establish the order also in his country, and in 1142 opened the first Cistercian monastery in Ireland. In the mean time, however, Malachy busily employed himself, his legative power also, in behalf of union, and in 1148 at last succeeded in moving a synod to make the request which Rome demanded previous to the bestowal of the pallium on the Irish clergy. It is, however, not a little remarkable that the synod from which this very important request emanated was not one convened in any province or principal city. It was held in Inis Padrig (Patrick's Island), a small, inconsiderable island near the Sherries, in the northern channel of Ireland (Haverty's *History of Ireland* [New York, 1866], p. 161). Could no more conspicuous place be found? From this and other internal evidences there is abundant reason to infer that the Irish clergy were not then in favor of

union with Rome. The request, however, was issued, and St. Malachy set off immediately with it, expecting to meet the pope (now Eugene III) at Clairvaux; but, having been long delayed in England by the jealousy of king Stephen, Malachy, to his sore disappointment, did not reach there till the pope had left. Shortly afterwards he was taken ill, and died (1148) in the arms of his friend and future biographer, St. Bernard. Although Malachy did not personally obtain the cherished wish of his heart, he yet inaugurated and put in train the measures which brought the pallium a few years later.

St. Malachy was by far the most prominent and powerful native ecclesiastic of Ireland in her early days. "His personal influence," says Todd (*Irish Ch.* p. 116), "was so great that he was able to direct the minds of his countrymen as he saw fit;" and for this he was admirably fitted by his descent, his learning, his eloquence, and his fascinating address. In A.D. 1152 St. Bernard wrote his *Life* in elegant mediaeval Latin. Previous to an acquaintance with the Irish saint, Bernard had written many hard things against the Irish, calling them "a stiff-necked, intractable, and ungovernable race;" but, in reference to Malachy, he declared that he could not find words to express his admiration of the saint.

A curious *Prophecy concerning the Future Roman Pontiff* is extant under the name of Malachy. It designates, by a few brief phrases, the leading characteristics of each successive reign, and in some instances these descriptive characteristics have proved so curiously appropriate as to lead to some discussion. The characteristic of Pio Nine, *Crux de Cruce* (cross after cross), was the subject of much speculation. That the prophecy really dates from the time of St. Malachy no scholar now supposes; it was unknown not only to his biographer, St. Bernard (*Liber de vita S. JMI.*), but neither does any other author allude to this work until the beginning of the 17th century. It may be a sufficient indication of its worth to state that neither Baronius nor any of his continuators deemed it deserving of attention. It is now supposed to have been prepared in the conclave of 1590 by the friends of cardinal Simoncelli, who is clearly described in the work (comp. Dollinger, *Fables respecting the Popes of the Middle Ages*, edited by Prof. H. B. Smith [Dodd and Mead, N.Y., 1872, 12mo], p. 150 sq.). See Menestrier, *Traite sur les propheties attribuees at saint Malachie*; John Germano, *Vita gesti e predizioni del padre san Malachia* (Naples, 1670, 2 vols. 4to); Brenan, *Eccles. Hist. of Ireland*, p. 267 sq.; Todd, *Hist. Anc. Ch. in Ireland*, p. 106-117; Inett, *Origines Anglicanae* (see Index); *Jahrb. deutsch. Theol.* 1871, p. 564. (J. H. W.)

Malagrida, Gabriele

an Italian theologian and preacher, who flourished in Portugal in the first half of the 18th century, was born in the Milanese in 1689. He entered the Order of the Jesuits, removed to Portugal, and became popular as a pulpit orator and a theological writer. In 1758, when an attempt at assassination was made on Joseph I, the then reigning monarch of Portugal, the Jesuits were charged with the crime (they were shortly after expelled from the kingdom); Malagrida was suspected of complicity, and arrested forthwith. Freed from this charge, he was accused of spreading heretic doctrines, and suffered death at the stake in 1761. A list of his writings is given in Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, vol. 32, s.v. See Platel, *Relazione della Condemna ed Esecuzione del Gesuita G. Malagrida* (1761).

Malakans

or MILK-EATERS (Russian *Molocani*. i.e. those who, contrary to the rule of the Eastern Church, take milk on fast-days), is the name of a religious sect in the Russo-Greek Church. The name Malakans is a term of contempt applied to these religionists, and originated. as the word Shaker, Methodist, etc., among those who did not approve of the movement. They themselves like to be called *Gospel-Men*. They were first brought into notice by the zeal of a Prussian prisoner of war, about the middle of. last century. He settled in a village of southern Russia, and spent his life in explaining the Scriptures to the villagers, and in visiting from house to house. After his death they acknowledged him as the founder of their new religious belief. The Malakans acknowledge the Bible as the Word of God, and the Trinity of the Godhead. They admit the fall of Adam, and the resurrection of Christ. They teach that Adam's soul only, and not his body, was made after God's image. The Ten Commandments are received among them. Idolatry and the worship of images are forbidden. It is considered sinful to take an oath, and the observance of the Sabbath is strictly enjoined; so much so that, like many of the Oriental sects, they devote Saturday evening to preparation for the Sabbath. They are firm believers in the Millennium, and are improperly described as followers of the fanatic Terenti Beloreff, who was, in fact, a member of their body. He announced in 1833 the coming of the Lord within two years and a half. Many Malakans, in consequence, abandoned their callings, and waited the event in prayer and fasting. Beloreff persuaded himself that, like Elijah, he should ascend to heaven on a certain day in a chariot of fire. Thousands of the

Milk-eaters came from all parts of Russia to witness this miracle. Beloreff appeared, majestically seated in a chariot, ordered the multitude to prostrate themselves, and then, opening his arms like an eagle spreading his wings, he leapt into the air, but, dropping down on the heads of the gaping multitude, was instantly seized and dragged off to prison as an imposter. He died soon after, no doubt in a state of insanity, declaring himself to be the prophet of God. But many of the Malakans still believe in his divine mission. A considerable number of his followers afterwards emigrated to Georgia, and settled in sight of Mount Ararat, expecting the Millennium. They spend whole days and nights in prayer, and have all their goods in common. *SEE MILLENARIANS in Russia.* These milk-people deny the sanctity and use of fasts, holding that men who have to work require good food, to be eaten in moderation all the year round-no day stinted, no day in excess. They prefer to live by the laws of nature, asking and giving a reason for everything they do. They set their faces against monks and popes. In Russia they suffered sore persecution under the late emperor Nicholas. Sixteen thousand men and women were seized by the police, arranged in gangs, and driven with rods and thongs across the dreary steppes and yet more dreary mountain crests into the Caucasus. In that fearful day a great many of the Milkeaters fled across the Pruth into Turkey, where the Sultan gave them a village called Tulcha for their residence. The Methodist mission at that place, under the leadership of Mr. Flocken, labored among them for some time; at present, however (1872), the mission is discontinued. See Dixon, *Free Russia*, p. 138 sq.; Marsden, *History of Christian Churches and Sects*, 2:234; Le Raskol, *Essai historique et critique sur les sectes riselqiuses de la Russe* (Paris, 1854, 8vo). *SEE RUSSIA.* (J. H. W.)

Malan, Abraham Henri Caesar, D.D.,

one of the most noted of Swiss Protestant divines of our day, was born at Geneva July 7, 1787. When but an infant of three years Malan exhibited great powers of intellectual superiority, and the hopes which he awakened while yet an inmate of the cradle by securing a prize for reading at the Geneva Academy were more than realized in his manhood and hoary age. The poverty of his parents induced him to turn aside from an intellectual career to which he so much inclined, and to enter the mercantile profession at eighteen, but he soon returned again to his former mode of life, and decided upon the ministry. In 1810 he was consecrated for this sacred work by the *Venerable Compagnie*, or Presbytery of Geneva, and he at

once made a name for himself as a pulpit orator of unusual eloquence. He was appointed preacher at the Geneva cathedral, and from the pulpit whence formerly the immortal Calvin had thundered forth the unalterable decrees of the Holy One. Malan now taught the Word of God in a most brilliant oratory. Unfortunately, however, the spiritual life built up by Calvin and his successors in the hearts of their forefathers had been suffered to die out, and in the hearts of the hearers of Malan, as well as in the heart of the preacher himself, there was a luke-warmness, aye a coldness, to all religion — rationalism sat enthroned in the pulpit and the pew of Geneva, the forms of the Church founded by Calvin remained, but the spiritual life had departed. The young preacher endeavored to infuse the vitality of his own fervid spirit into the lifeless forms and the latitudinarian creed of the “Venerable Compagnie,” but in vain; both the preacher and the auditor lacked that most essential element of a Christian life, the possession of the truly orthodox belief and trust in a *divine* Savior. In the midst of his despair Malan was brought under the influence of those noble-hearted Scotchmen, the Haldane brothers, and by them and our late Dr. John M. Mason (q.v.), and Matthias Bruen, was led to see the error of a faith built on a human Savior, and brought to acknowledge the divinity of Jesus the Christ. From this time forward Malan became a champion of the orthodox faith. The first opportunity to display his ability as a polemic he found against the Venerable Compagnie itself. This body had issued for circulation among the masses an edition of the N.T. in which all passages bearing on the divinity of Christ were so altered as to favor the Socinian belief; this translation Malan denounced with the most vehement eloquence, and from his pulpit expounded these self-same passages in the spirit of their intended declaration to the multitudes who crowded around him. (For a review of the Church at Geneva, see Hurst, *Rationalism*, chap. 18.) By 1818 the rupture between him and the Church authorities of Geneva had become so great that reconciliation was an impossibility, and Malan was consequently dismissed from the Established Church. Besides his relation to the cathedral, Malan had been regent of the academy; in this post also he was now superseded by a divine of Socinian tendency. Not in the least daunted, he now followed the example of the Haldane brothers, and preached the truth wherever an opportunity would offer to address the multitudes and press forward the interests of Christ his master. No church accessible to him, he preached in his own house, for preach he would. The most eminent of Geneva’s inhabitants gathered regularly, and by 1820 he was enabled to rear a church upon his own ground. He named it “The

Testimonial Chapel" ("*La Chapelle du Timoignage*"). But not only was his tongue active in building up Christ's kingdom among men, to his pen also he gave no rest; now busy in the defense of Christ's divinity or the sovereignty of divine grace, tomorrow exposing and attacking Romish error, and next rushing forth in print to reach the masses by religious tracts, clear, simple, and practical. With these manifold duties upon him, he was yet far from content. He organized a school of theology, and himself became one of the instructors; founded a tract society, and a Magdalen asylum or penitentiary. He has also the honor to have been the first to introduce the Sabbath-school into Switzerland. Not even all this toil could prevent him in the least from fostering also a joy in the development of aesthetical talents which he possessed. As a sacred poet he will live as long as the language in which he wrote shall be known. He has been pronounced the French Dr. Watts. As a composer he likewise displayed unusual endowments, and as a painter and saulptor masters of art delighted to enjoy his friendship and counsel. Thorwaldsen was his intimate friend, and more than once entrusted him with the completion of his choicest groups. Surely a master mind was that of Malan's. With untiring industry maintaining his position in the pulpit almost to the last, he died at his native place, May 8, 1864. No better comment on such a life can be given than that by E. de Pressense: "Caesar Malan a ete un homme d'indomptable conviction; il a toujours suivi les impulsions de sa conscience sans hesitation" (*Revue Chretienne*, Aug. 5, 1869, p. 502). His appearance at the age of fifty is thus described by an American divine who had the pleasure of being his guest: "His *personnel* was noble and imposing; a little above the medium height, stout built, and, having something of a military bearing, he was still natural and easy in his manners. His broad shoulders supported a superb head; his open and lofty brow gave one an idea of his mental power; his eyes were full of intellect and fire, and at the same time his loving look won your heart; his fine mouth indicated an iron will, combined with great tenderness; a profusion of white hair fell upon his shoulders" (*The Observer* [N. Y.], April 22, 1869). The degree of D.D. was conferred on Malan by the University of Edinburgh. Of his works, many of which have appeared also in an English dress both in England and in the United States, the following deserve special mention, *The Ch. of Rome* (N.Y. 1844): — *Les Momiers sontils invisibles?* (1828); his followers were called *Memoirs*: — *Les Chants de Sion* (1826, 12mo, and often), a collection of his *hymns*: — *Le Temoiqnage de Dieu* (1833, 8vo). See, besides the excellent article in the *New Amer. Cyclop.* 1864, p. 495,

and Bost, *Memoires du Reveil rel. des eglises protest. de la Suisse et de la France* (see Index); the *Life, Labors, and Writings of Caesar Malan*, by one of his sons (1869, post 8vo). (J. H.W.)

Malay Archipelago

also called the INDIAN or EASTERN ARCHIPELAGO and MALAISIA, by far the largest, if not the most important island group, or rather system of island groups in the world, of which the principal are the Sunda Islands (embracing Sumatra, Java, etc.), the Philippines, and the Moluccas, or Spice Islands. They are treated severally under the respective names of the different islands. *SEE JAVA; SEE MACASSAR; SEE MALACCA; SEE MOLUCCAS; SEE PHILIPPINES; SEE SUMATRA*, etc. "The whole of these islands together, comprising an area of 170,000 square miles, contain about 20,000,000 of human beings of all grades of color and stature. The most ancient appear to be the Papoos, who are the only inhabitants of the Andaman Islands, but who are found farther eastward as a people driven into the forests, mountains, and defiles, and are not found again as a leading population till we reach New Guinea. They are among the most degenerate of the human race. They were supplanted more immediately by the Malays, who, having many centuries ago emigrated from India beyond the Ganges, have become a mysteriously heterogeneous people by mixture with Papoos, Hindus, Arabs, Chinese, Siamese, and even with Europeans. The shores have of late years been more and more covered with Chinese emigrants, who threaten the same fate to the Malays which they have-inflicted upon the Papoos. The religions are as various as the nations, and tribes, and languages. Here we may still meet with aboriginal sorcery, together with the divine worship paid to mountains, rocks, woods, storms, volcanoes; then with Brahminism and Buddhism, the Chinese worship of ancestors exalted into demigods, the Mohammedan delusions, and the saint worship of the Romish communion. The worship of God in spirit and in truth has hitherto been to those wretched natives a thing unknown, and what has been attempted for these forty or fifty years past by about seventy or eighty missionaries is as yet but little more than a beginning of what remains to be done." See Newcomb, *Cyclop. of Missions*, p. 479; Grundemann, *Missions atlas*, No. 17. *SEE MALAYS*.

Malays

(properly *Malayus*, a Malay word, the derivation of which has not yet been satisfactorily ascertained) is the name given to a great branch of the human family dwelling in the Malay peninsula, in the islands, large and small, of the Indian Archipelago, in Madagascar, and in the numerous islands of the Pacific. In the fivefold division of mankind laid down by Blumenbach, the Malays are treated as a distinct race, while in the threefold division of Latham they are regarded as a branch of the Mongolidae. Prichard, however, subdivides the various representatives of the Malay family into three branches, viz:

(1.) the Indo-Malayan, comprehending the Malays proper of Malacca, and the inhabitants of Sumatra, Java, Celebes, the Moluccas, and the Philippines, with whom, perhaps, may be associated the natives of the Caroline Islands and the Ladrões;

(2.) the Polynesians; and

(3.) the Madecasses, or people of Madagascar. Following Latham, we shall here confine ourselves to the Malays proper, the natives of Madagascar having been already noticed under that heading, and reserving the Polynesians generally and the Maori in particular for distinct articles. In physical appearance the Malays are a brown-complexioned race, rather darker than the Chinese, but not so swarthy as the Hindus; they have long, black, shining, but coarse hair; little or no beard; a large mouth; eyes large and dark; nose generally short and flat; lips rather thicker than those of Europeans; and cheek-bones high. In stature, the Indo-Malays are for the most part below the middle height, while the Polynesians generally exceed it; the Indo-Malays have also slight, well-formed limbs, and are particularly small about the wrists and ankles. "The profile," according to Dr. Pickering, "is usually more vertical than in the white race, but this may be owing in part to the mode of carriage, for the skull does not show a superior facial angle." This people must, however, be classified, as there is a great distinction among them from a civilized stand-point. There is a class of Malays who have a *written* language (the spoken language is essentially the same with all the Malays), and who have made some progress in the arts of life; then there are the sea-people, *orang-laut*, literally "men of the sea," a kind of sea-gipsies or robbers; and there are also the *orang banua*

or *orang utan*, “wild men” or “savages,” dwelling in the woods or forests, and supposed to be the aborigines of the peninsula and islands.

Origin and Language. — The name of *Malaya* seems to have been first used about the middle of the 12th century. The first settlement is by themselves stated to have been Menangkabo, in the island of Sumatra, rather than the peninsula itself. Even the Malays of Borneo claim to have come from Menangkabo. Palembang, however, also in Sumatra, has been mentioned as the original seat of Malay civilization; while others, again, point to Java as the source from which both Menangkabo and Palembang received their first settlers. “The Javanese,” says Crawford, “would seem to have been even the founders of Malacca. Monuments have been discovered which prove the presence of this people in the country of the Malays. Thus Sir Stamford Raffles, when he visited Menangkabo, found there inscriptions on stone in the ancient character of Java, such as are frequent in that island; and he was supported in his conclusion by the learned natives of Java who accompanied him in his journey. The settlement of the Javanese in several parts of Sumatra is, indeed, sufficiently attested. In Palembang they have been immemorially the ruling people; and, although the Malay language is the popular one, the Javanese, in its peculiar written character, is still that of the court.” According to Wallace the Malays are found in Malacca, Sumatra, Borneo, Tidore, Temata, Macian, and Obi. The northern peninsula of Gilolo and the island Ceram are inhabited by Alfuri; Timor and the neighboring isles as far to the west as Flores and Sandalwood, and as far to the east as Timorlant, are inhabited by a people more akin to the Papoos than to the Malays, the Timorese being strictly distinguished from both; the inhabitants of the island Buru are partly Malays, partly Alfuri; while the Papoos inhabit New Guinea, the Kay and Aru isles, Meisol, Salwatty, and Weigim, and all the country eastward as far as the Fiji Isles. (Comp. F. Muller, *Lingus-istische Ethnographie*, in Behm, *Geograph. Jahrbuch* [Gotha], 1868, vol. ii.) The Malay language is simple and easy in its construction, harmonious in its pronunciation, and easily acquired by Europeans. It is the *lingua Franca* of the Eastern Archipelago. Of its numerous dialects, the Javanese is the most refined, a superiority which it owes to the influence upon it of Sanscrit literature. From the Arabians (who gave the Malays Mohammedanism) their characters are borrowed, and many Arabic words have also been incorporated with the Malay language, by means of which the Javanese are able to supply the deficiency of scientific terms in their own tongue.

Religion. — The civilized Malays are generally Mohammedans in religious belief; they embraced the faith of the Crescent in the 13th or 14th century. The tribes in the interior and the “men of the sea” have either no religion at all, or only the most debased superstition. In the years 1805-38 a sect of wild fanatics, the Padris-Priests, also called Orang-Patih, white men (after their dress), sought to re-establish their superstitious creed by fire and sword. They did much mischief until the Hollanders found that their own safety as rulers was threatened, and, after a short war, subdued the Padris and broke their power most substantially. The moral character of the Indo-Malays generally is not high; they are passionate, treacherous, and revengeful. But it must be said that the cruelty and persecution which the Malays suffered at the hands of the Portuguese, who became their conquerors in the 16th century, and afterwards under the sway of the Hollanders, greatly molded the present character of this people. Little is done, even in our day, to ameliorate the forlorn condition of this unfortunate people. Polygamy is practiced only among the affluent and in the large towns. Marriage can be effected in three ways: either by purchase of the woman, who, upon the decease of her husband becomes the property of his nearest blood-relation; by entering upon a life of servitude with the proposed father-in-law, a custom reminding us of the patriarchal days of the Bible; by an equal tax borne by both contracting parties. They practice the rite of circumcision upon the male child between the ages of 6 and 10. The N. Testament was translated into the Malay language as early as the middle of the 17th century (1668), by Brower; the O.T. only three fourths of a century later (1735); the whole Bible was published at Batavia in 1758 in 5 vols., and often since, e.g. by Willmet (1824, 3 vols. 8vo). Comp. Dulaurier, *Memoires, lettres et rapports relatifs du cours de langues Malae et Javanaise* (Par. 1843); Grey and Bleek, *Handbook of African, Australian, and Polynesian Theology* (Cape City, 1858 sq., 3 vols. 8vo). See Waitz, *Anthropologie der Natusrvlker* (Leipsic, 1869, 5 vols.); Wallace, *Studies of Man and Nature* (London, 1869, 2 vols. 8vo); Chambers, *Cyclop. s.v.* **SEE MALAY ARCHIPELAGO.**

Mal'cham

(Heb. *Malkam'*, מלכִי הִי *their king*, as often [and as it should be rendered in ^{<3005>}Zephaniah 1:5, instead of the Auth.Vers. “Malcham,” i.e. MOROCH]; Septuag. Μελχάμ v. r. Μελχάς, Vullg. *Molchom*), the fourth-named of the

seven sons of Shaharaim by his wife Hodesh (^{<1389>}1 Chronicles 8:9). B.C. prob. 1612. *SEE MILCOM*.

Malchi'ah

(Heb. *Malkiyah'*. מלכיהי and [^{<2806>}Jeremiah 38:6] *Malkiya'hu*, מלכיהי *king of Jehovah*; Sept. Μελχία or Μελχίας, but in Nehemiah v. r. Μελχεία or Μελχείας; Auth. Version “Malchijah,” in ^{<1392>}1 Chronicles 9:12; 24:9; ^{<1681>}Nehemiah 3:11; 10:3; 12:42; ^{<1505>}Ezra 10:25, last occurrence; “Melchiah” in ^{<2901>}Jeremiah 21:1), the name of at least ten persons near the time of the Babylonian exile.

- 1.** The son of Ethni, and father of Baaseiah. Levites of the family of Gershom (^{<1360>}1 Chronicles 6:40). B.C. much ante 1014.
- 2.** The head of the fifth division of the sacerdotal order in the distribution appointed by David (^{<1349>}1 Chronicles 24:9). B.C. 1014.
- 3.** A priest, the father of Pashur (^{<1392>}1 Chronicles 9:12; ^{<1612>}Nehemiah 11:12), which latter was one of those who proposed to execute the prophet Jeremiah on a charge of treason (^{<2801>}Jeremiah 38:1), although he had but unfavorably answered his inquiry respecting the fate of the city (^{<2901>}Jeremiah 21:1). B.C. ante 589. He is very possibly the same with the son of Hammelech (lit. *the king's son*), and owner or constructor of the private dungeon into which Jeremiah was cruelly thrown (^{<2806>}Jeremiah 38:6). *SEE JEREMIAH*. “The title *ben-ham-Melek* is applied to Jerahmel (^{<2805>}Jeremiah 36:26), who was among those commissioned by the king to take prisoners Jeremiah and Baruch; to Joash, who appears to have held an office inferior to that of the governor of the city, and to whose custody Micaiah was committed by Ahab (^{<1026>}1 Kings 22:26); and to Maaseiah, who was slain by Zichri, the Ephraimite, in the invasion of Judah by Pekah, in the reign of Ahaz (^{<1487>}2 Chronicles 28:7). It would seem from these passages that the title ‘king’s son’ was official, like that of ‘king’s mother,’ and applied to one of the royal family, who exercised functions somewhat similar to those of Potiphar in the court of Pharaohs”
- 4.** One of the Israelites, former residents (or descendants) of Parosh, who divorced his Gentile wife after the exile (^{<1505>}Ezra 10:25). B.C. 459.
- 5.** Another Israelite of the same place (or parentage) who did likewise (^{<1505>}Ezra 10:25). B.C. 459. In the Sept. (ad loc. and 1 Esd. 9:26) his name appears as Ασυβίας.

- 6.** One of the former residents (or descendants) of Harim, who assisted in reconstructing the wall of Jerusalem after the return from Babylon (^{<1681B>}Nehemiah 3:11). B.C. 446. He was one of the Israelites who had previously divorced his (Gentile wife (^{<1516B>}Ezra 10:31). B.C. 459.
- 7.** Son of Rechab, and ruler of part of Beth-haccerem, who repaired the dung-gate of Jerusalem after the captivity (^{<1681A>}Nehemiah 3:14). B.C. 446.
- 8.** The son of a “goldsmith,” and the repairer of part of the wall of Jerusalem opposite Ophel (^{<1681B>}Nehemiah 3:31). B.C. 446.
- 9.** One of the priests appointed as musicians, apparently vocal, to celebrate the completion of the walls of Jerusalem after the exile (^{<1624D>}Nehemiah 12:42). B.C. 446.
- 10.** One of those who supported Ezra on the left hand while reading the law to the people assembled at Jerusalem (^{<1681B>}Nehemiah 8:4); probably the same with one of the priests who subscribed the sacred covenant entered into on the same occasion (^{<1601B>}Nehemiah 10:3). B.C. cir. 410.

Mal'chiel

(Heb. *Malkiel*, מלך אלהים *king of God*; Sept. Μελχιήλ), the second of the two sons of Beriah, son of Asher (^{<04617>}Genesis 46:17); he became the “father” (? founder) of Birzavith (^{<1373>}1 Chronicles 7:31), and his descendants bore his name (^{<0465>}Numbers 26:45). B.C. 1856. “Josephus (*Ant.* 2:7, 4) reckons him with Heber among the six sons of Asher, thus making up the number of Jacob’s children and grandchildren to seventy, without reckoning great-grandchildren.”

Mal'chielite

(Heb. *Malkieli*, מלך אלהים *patronymic from Malchiel*, used collectively; Sept. Μαλχιηλί, Auth. Vers. “Malchielites”), a descendant of MALCHIEL (^{<0465>}Numbers 26:45).

Malchi'jah

(in several passages, for different men). *SEE MALCHIAH.*

Mal'chiram

(Heb. *Jalkiram'*, **μρυκάρι**, *king of height*; Sept. **Μελχιράμ**), the second son of king Jehoiachin, born to him (according to Jewish tradition, by Susannah) during his captivity (^{<1388>}1 Chronicles 3:18), and apparently himself without issue (see Strong's *Harmony and Expos. of the Gosp.* p. 17). B.C. post 598.

Malchi-shu'a

(Heb. *Malki-Shlu'a*, [**WvAyKḫni**] *king of help*, twice as one word, [**WvyKḫni**] ^{<1944>}1 Samuel 14:49; 31:2; where the Auth. Vers. Anglicizes "Melchi-shua;" Septuag. and Vulg. everywhere **Μαλχισουέ**, *Melchisua*), the second or third named of the four sons of king Saul (^{<1383>}1 Chronicles 8:33; 9:39), apparently by Ahinoam (^{<1944>}1 Samuel 14:49); he perished in the battle at Gilboa with his father (^{<1382>}1 Samuel 31:2; ^{<1302>}1 Chronicles 10:2). B.C. 1053. "In the fact that the name of Saul's eldest son was Jehovistic in form (*Jehovah hath given*), whereas no such peculiarity is found in the names of the other sons, some writers (e.g. Mr. F. Newman) have seen a trace of Saul's gradual apostasy. Josephus only mentions Malchishuah once, *after* his brothers (**Μελχισός**, *Ant.* 6:14, 7)."

Mal'chus

(**Μάλχος**, from the Heb. **Ēl m**, *king*, or **ĒWLMi** *counsellor*), a slave of the high-priest Caiaphas, and the individual among the party sent to arrest Jesus whose right ear was cut off by Peter in the garden of Gethsemane (^{<1380>}John 18:10), but which was cured by a touch from Christ (^{<1225>}Luke 22:51). He had a kinsman another slave of the same master (^{<1380>}John 18:26). A.D. 29. The name of Malchus was not unfrequent among the Greeks (see Wetstein, *ad loc.*; Gesenius, *Monzum. Phoen.* p. 409), but it was usually applied to persons of Oriental countries, as to an Arab chieftain (Josephus, *Ast.* 13:5 1; 14:14,1; 15:6, 2). This Malchus "was the personal servant (**δοῦλος**) of the high-priest, and not one of the bailiffs or apparitors (**ὑπηρέτης**) of the Sanhedrim. The high-priest intended is Caiaphas, no doubt (though Annas is called **ἀρχιερεύς**, in the same connection), for John, who was personally known to the former (^{<1385>}John 18:15), is the only one of the evangelists who gives the name of Malchus. This servant was probably stepping forward at the moment, with others, to handcuff or pinion Jesus, when the zealous Peter struck at him with his

sword. The blow was undoubtedly meant to be more effective, but reached only the ear. It may be, as Stier remarks (*Reden Jesu*, 6:268), that the man, seeing the danger, threw his head or body to the left, so as to expose the right ear more than the other. The allegation that the writers are inconsistent with each other, because Matthew, Mark, and John say either ὠτίον or ὠτάριον (as if that meant the lappet or tip of the ear), while Luke says ος, is groundless. The Greek of the New Testament age, like the modern Romaic, often made no distinction between the primitive and diminutive. In fact, Luke himself exchanges the one term for the other in this very narrative. The Savior, as his pursuers were about to seize him, asked to be left free for a moment longer (ἔατε ἕως τούτου), and that moment he used in restoring the wounded man to soundness. The ἀψάμενος τοῦ ὠτίου may indicate (which is not forbidden by ἀφείλεν, ἀπεκοψεν) that the ear still adhered slightly to its place. It is noticeable that Luke, the physician, is the only one of the writers who mentions the act of healing” (Smith). “Some think Peter’s name was omitted by the synoptists, lest the publication of it in his lifetime should expose him to the revenge of the unbelieving Jews, but, as the gospels were *not published*, this seems improbable.”

Maldive Islands

a chain of low coral islands in the Indian Ocean, about 400 miles west-south-west of Ceylon, some 500 miles in length by 45 in average breadth, consist of 17 groups or atolls, each atoll surrounded by a coral reef. The entire number, including the islets, is estimated at about 50,000. Mali, the largest of the chain, seven miles in circumference, with a population of 2000, is the residence of the native prince, “the sultan of the Twelve Thousand Islands,” who is a tributary prince to the governor of Ceylon. The population of all the islands is estimated at 150,000. The larger and inhabited islands are clad with palm, fig, citron, and bread-fruit trees. Grain is also abundantly produced. Wild-fowl breed in prodigious numbers; fish, rice (imported from Hindustan), and cocoa-nuts, constitute the food of the inhabitants. These people are strict Mohammedans in their religion.

Maldonatus, Joannes

(1), a celebrated Spanish Jesuit, was born at Las Casas-de-la-Reina, in Estremadura, in 1534; studied at the University of Salamanca, and afterwards taught Greek, philosophy, and theology with great success; the

lecture-rooms of the college were often too small to accommodate his numerous pupils. He subsequently removed to Poitiers. France, from whence the cardinal of Lorraine brought him to the University of Pont-a-Mousson. Later he came to Paris, and there created an unprecedented enthusiasm. His exegetical lectures were attended not only by Romanists, but even by Protestants, and the renown of his teaching reminds one of the history of Abelard. His brilliant course was checkered by accusations against him of having induced the president, Montbrun, to will away all his fortune to the Order of the Jesuits, and of teaching false doctrines touching the dogma of the Immaculate Conception. He was acquitted, however, on both charges, but left Paris, and retired to Bourges, where he devoted himself to exegetical studies, and prepared several of the works (see list below) which have made his name celebrated. He was called to Rome by pope Gregory XIII, to take a part in the publication of the Greek Septuagint. He (died in that city in 1583. His principal works are *Commentarii in praecipuos Sacrae Scripturae Veteris Testamenti* (Paris, 1643, fol.): — *Commentarii in quatuor Evangelistas*, etc. (Lugd. 1615; Mayence, 1841-45, 5 vols. 8vo). ““ Though condemned by some, and procuring for its author the title of ‘virulentissimus et maledicentissimus,’ this work has received from Catholic and Protestant writers a just meed of praise (see Bayle, Richard Simon, Schlichtingius, M. Poole, and Jackson). In this work Maldonatus collates the opinions of the fathers with great ability, and does not hesitate to differ even from Augustine, when sound exegesis demands it. He shows acquaintance with the Vatican MS. of the N.T., and with the Sept. version of the O.T., and with the original Hebrew.” The critical Simon (*Hist. crit. des princip. commentateurs du N.T.* p. 618 sq.) says he succeeded better than any one else in explaining the literal sense of the sacred writers. He also wrote *Traite des Sacrements* (Lyon. 1614, 4to): — *Traite de la grace*, etc. (Paris, 1677, fol.): — *Traite des anyes et des demons* (Paris, 1617): — *Tractatus de cceremoniis* (*Bibliotheca ritualis*, Rome, 1781, 4to). *Summula casuum conscientiae* has been, we believe, unjustly accredited to Maldonatus. It is a work of doubtful morality, and very unlike the productions of Maldonatus. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 8, s.v.; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* vi, s.v.; Kitto, *Cyclop. Bibl. Lit.* s.v.; Prat, *Maldonat et l’Universite de Paris* (1857); *Theol. Quarterly*, 1860 (4), p. 682.

Maldonatus, Joannes

(2), a Spanish Jesuit, who, according to Aubertus Miraeus, was a priest of Burgos, and is stated by Zeller to have ordered the lessons of the Roman Breviary, flourished about the middle of the 16th century. In 1549 he published a treatise, *De Senectute Christiana*, and an elegant abridgment of the lives of the saints. — Kitto, *Cyclop. Bibl. Lit.* vol. 3, s.v.

Male

(Heb. **rkz**; *zakar*', ^{<0002>}Genesis 1:27; 6:19; 34:25), applied to the male of either man or beasts. The superior estimation in which male children were held among the Hebrews is testified by numerous passages of Scripture, and we find the same feeling, expressed almost in the same words, still existing in Eastern countries (see ^{<1818>}Job 3:3; and comp. Roberts, *Observ.* ad loc.). *SEE CHILD*.

Malebranche, Nicholas,

a French Jesuit, distinguished for his peculiar philosophical views, and for the brilliancy and fascination of the style in which they were expounded. He was one of the most illustrious of the Cartesians, aiming by his speculations to correct the dangerous tendencies of Des Cartes's philosophy, *SEE SPINOZA*, and occupies an eminent, though not a controlling, position in the history of the higher philosophy. Some knowledge of his system is required for the just estimation of the doctrines both of Locke and of Leibnitz, and for the illustration of the views of Berkeley.

Life. — Malebranche was born of respectable parents in Paris, Aug. 6, 1638. Feeble and sickly from his birth, and deformed by a curvature of the spine, he was reared with the tenderest care, and was educated mainly at home. His ill health and his deformity confirmed the natural shyness of his disposition. He avoided the companionship of robust, sanguine, and active playmates, and spent most of his time in solitary meditation. He found his world within himself. Eager for seclusion from the turmoil of life, he sought a refuge in the Society of Jesuits, and joined the Congregation of the Oratory in the twenty-second year of his age. His studies were at first ecclesiastical history and antiquities, but these he soon abandoned in consequence of the weakness of his memory. He was next induced by the learned Richard Simon to prosecute sacred criticism and the Oriental

languages. They had few attractions for him. In this wavering mood he picked up the then recently published treatise of Des Cartes *On Man*. To this newly-acquired treasure he devoted himself assiduously, and sought the mastery of the Cartesian doctrines and of philosophical problems. Thus he busied himself for the next ten years of his life, and became one of the most earnest and eminent of the Cartesians. His perspicacity discerned the weak point of the Cartesian system; and he was too honest and too independent to be “*addictus jurare in verba magistri.*” He meditated intently closing the windows of his room that he might not be distracted by the light and noise of the outer world; and he revolved in silence and solitude the arduous questions which presented themselves for solution. He read little, thinking the knowledge of man, of mind, and of God the all-sufficient realm of speculation; and considering that such knowledge was to be attained only by diligence, introspection, and abstract reasoning. Fortified and enriched by such silent and solitary labors, Malebranche proposed his modifications of Cartesianism in a work entitled *Reche-che de la Verite*, the first volume of which appeared at Paris in 1673; the second and third were published in the course of the ensuing year. An improved and enlarged edition was brought out, towards the close of his life, in 1712. This is his principal work; it is that which determines his position in the history of philosophic opinion. Besides other interesting topics discussed, it, in a manner less open to objection, propounded his celebrated doctrine of *Seeing all things in God*. The treatise itself was an examination of the nature and characteristics of knowledge, of the origin of ideas, of the mode of avoiding error and arriving at truth, of the precautions required to guard against delusions of various kinds, and especially the fallacies which arise from the senses and from prejudice. Malebranche has been accused of unacknowledged obligations to Bacon. In this he only imitated the example of his illustrious master Des Cartes. Nor did he deviate from his exemplar in the attention bestowed upon the literary execution of the book. The style was so exquisite that it exercised an irresistible fascination over all its readers. Many who rejected his principles and deductions were charmed by their exposition; and many were beguiled into the acceptance of his reveries by the plausibility of their presentation, and by the beauty of their expression. His ornate style disguised his dogmas even to himself. His language wanted philosophical precision, and offered many salient points for attack. His system was assailed by Foucher, by Antoine Arnauld, and by Locke. The Jesuit Du Tertre, at the instigation of his order, reluctantly impugned it. Hardouin, in his *Atheists Unmasked*, accused it of atheistic

characteristics. Leibnitz, in defending it against such charges, admitted that the looseness of the brilliant presentation rendered it liable to misapprehension and misrepresentation, but maintained that the real opinions of the author were very different from those attributed to him by his opponents (*Lettre a M. Remond*, Nov. 4, 1715). The whole system of Malebranche, so far as it is a departure from Cartesianism, is centered in the doctrine of his "Vision in God," and this doctrine led by a logical development to those views of free will and grace which resulted in the controversy with Arnauld (1680). His inquiries were, however, actuated throughout by an earnest religious desire for the purification and elevation of his fellow-men, and were not confined to metaphysical speculation, but were extended to practical topics. With this design he composed his *Consolations Chretiennes* (1676), and his *Traite de la Morale* (1684). The latter is one of the landmarks in ethical philosophy, and has merited the high commendation of Sir James Mackintosh. Besides these noted treatises, Malebranche was the author of several essays, on various scientific topics, published in the Journal of the Academy of Sciences. Whatever opposition was excited by the peculiarity, or the extravagance, or the apparent peril of his metaphysical speculations, he was always held in the highest esteem for his amiability, his intelligence, his simple goodness, and his unaffected piety.

The life of a valetudinarian so retired, and bound by the restraints of a rigid religious order, offers few incidents for curious investigation. The calm and equable tenor of Malebranche's frail existence was prolonged till he had entered his seventy-eighth year, when, in another form of existence, he may be believed to have entered upon that "vision of all things in God" which, with pious enthusiasm, he had endeavored to anticipate on earth. He died in Paris Oct. 13, 1715, a year and a month before his great contemporary Leibnitz.

Philosophy. — The cardinal tenet of the philosophy of Malebranche, which contradistinguishes it from that of Des Cartes, of Spinoza, of Leibnitz, etc., of the reforming and of the acquiescing acolytes of the Cartesian school, is the doctrine of *seeing all things in God*, to which such frequent reference has already been made. The motive, the meaning, the genesis of this doctrine, and its relation to antecedent, contemporary, and subsequent speculation, are unintelligible, unless it is contemplated in connection with the dogmas of Des Cartes and their development. Des Cartes (q.v.)

recognized only two essences in the universe, thought and extension, which with him were the equivalents of mind and matter.

The mystery, the enigma, which presents itself in such endless forms, and which inevitably returns with all the Protean changes of metaphysical speculation which cannot be evaded in the study of that strange microcosm, *Man*, in which body and soul are so intimately, and, apparently, so everlastingly united — which cannot be overlooked in ascertaining the interaction of the *mens sana* or *insane*, and the *corpus sanum* or *insanum*, or in determining the grounds of moral obligation — the wondrous riddle is, how can mind act upon matter, or matter act upon mind, and the one regulate or affect the other. The diversity of the unsatisfactory solutions will be seen by comparing the explanations propounded by Des Cartes, Leibnitz, Spinoza, and Herbert Spencer. Des Cartes, recognizing the impossibility of any solution in the relations of the transitory creation, as he had arbitrarily conceived it, and with the absolute divorce of the two existences postulated by him, introduced a *Deus ex machina*, and imagined a divine interposition to effect concurrent action on every occasion where the joint operation of intellectual and physical nature was manifested. To this hypothesis has been given the name of the doctrine of *Assistancy*. This scheme is assuredly obnoxious to the sharp censure of Aristotle on some of his precursors, and renders the active intelligence of the human race a mere collection of intrusive episodes, like a miserable tragedy (*Metaph.* 11, 10-13, 3). The explanation was soon discovered to be not merely a presumption, but utterly inefficacious, and of most pernicious tendency. Obviously, it made the creating and sustaining God the direct agent in man's actions in all cases where inward contemplation proceeded to outward act, and it made the universe a complicated piece of puppetry, whose motions were communicated by a hidden personage constantly jerking at the strings. The logical inconsistency of maintaining an entire separation between the grand constituents of human nature, and of requiring divine intervention for all effective manifestation of human thought, offended the acute perspicacity of Spinoza. He sought to restore harmony and congruity to the philosophical interpretation of the intelligible world, by considering thought and action, mind and matter, as only effluences, phenomenal coruscations, from the one, sole, independent, self-sustaining, eternal, all-embracing Existence, which did not so much support and regulate, as constitute and contain alike the whole creation and the Creator. This, of course, pushed Cartesianism to the absurdity of its logical

extreme, but annihilated all moral responsibility, all distinctions of nature, annulled all individual existence, establishing, in short, a pure Pantheism. But Pantheism, whether Stoic, Platonic, Spinozistic, or Schellingistic, is the negation of a personal God, of all separable existence, and of all the duties, the hopes, and the fears that spring from human obligations to a heavenly Father, and to a divine Creator and beneficent Governor of the universe.

About the same time that Spinoza was secretly engaged in transmuting Cartesianism into Pantheism, and probably independently of any impulse from his investigations, Malebranche endeavored to uphold and enforce the obligations which were nullified by the Spinozistic system, to preserve all the dogmas of revealed religion, to fortify the sense of religious duty, to escape the hazards and aberrations of the Cartesian theory, are yet to uphold the Cartesian doctrine in its essential characteristics, by correcting its excesses, and by indicating the means of conciliation between the two widely separated constituents of his creation. The Cartesian fantasy of assistancy he supplanted by his own celebrated hypothesis of *Occasional Causes*. Instead of supposing all material motion, in accordance with the movements of the apparently moving mind, to be due to a mechanical impulse of the Divinity, disconnected from human intelligence, he imagined that all such phenomena were provoked by images of change reflected from the divine mind, and that human knowledge and action proceeded exclusively from *seeing all things in God*.

A half-truth is the most dangerous, because it is the most seductive form of delusion. The moiety of truth which is present usually precludes the suspicion of deception. Such a half-truth was Malebranche's devout imagination of the vision of the universe in the divine mind. It was, however unwittingly to himself, the Pantheism of Spinoza, contemplated from a different point of view, and disguised by a brilliant but very translucent veil. It is an indubitable, because it is a revealed truth, that "in God we live, and move, and have our being;" that "there is a spirit in man, and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth them understanding;" that "the Lord giveth wisdom, out of his mouth cometh knowledge and understanding;" but how this quickening and illuminating power of the Almighty is so exercised as not to infringe upon the independent action of the human mind, and the free agency of the human will, is one of the most bewildering problems of transcendental speculation. Our finite capacities can attain a definite solution only by a violent severance of the Gordian knot, and mutilation of the truth. We may throw aside one half, and accept

the other half as complete and exclusive, thus welcoming Fatalism on the one side, and Pantheism, in all the various shades of idealistic subtlety, on the other. That every moment of our continuous existence must be ascribed to the unintermittent support of the original creating power; that all our thoughts and actions, and our capacity for thought and action, require the same upholding agency; that this is the divine action of grace on our will and conscience; the divine guidance and providence in shaping our ends and the issues of our conduct; the divine impulse and irradiation in our best decisions, and in our intuitive apprehensions of recondite truths—these are positions earnestly entertained and asserted by the clearest and strongest thinkers, of all schools and vocations, in every age. A cloud of witnesses to these conclusions might be summoned, more numerous than those convoked by Sir William Hamilton in support of the doctrine of common-sense, and rendering much less questionable testimony. “Omnis sapientia a Domino Deo est;” “a Deo projecta et sapientia” (Ecclesiasticus. 1:1; 15:10). “Mihi autem Deus dedit dicere ex sententia, et præsumere digna horum quæ mihi dantur: quoniam ipse sapientiæ dux est et sapientiam emendatur. In manu enim illius et nos et sermones nostri, et omnis sapientia, et operum scientia, et disciplina. Ipse enim dedit mihi horum quæ sunt scientiam veram” (Wisdom of Solomon 7:15-17). “Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights.” “Nemo vir magnus sine aliquo afflatu divino umquam fuit” (Cicero, *De Nat. Deor.* 2, 66, § 167). This tenet may have been borrowed by Cicero from Plato, or even from Homer, but it has been recently approved by Whewell, Blackie, and Dallas. “Sacer intra nos spiritus sedet; malorum bonorumque nostrorum observator et custos. His, prout a nobis tractatus est, ita nos ipse tractat. Bonus vero vir sine deo nemo est; an potuit aliquis supra fortunam nisi ab illo adjustus exsurgere? Ille dat consilia magnifica et erecta. In unoquoque virorum bonorum, quis deus incertum est, habitat deus” (Seneca, *Epist. Mol.* 4, 12 [42], § 2). Similar declarations are to be found in Thales, Democritus, Plato, Proclus, Plotinus, and a very remarkable one in Clemens Alexandrinus (*Stromat.* v. 14). S. Augustin says, “Initium ergo ejus figmentum est Dei: non enim est ulla natura etiam in extremis infimisque vestigiis, quam non ille constituit, a quo est omnis modus, omnis species, omnis ordo; sine quibus nihil rerum inveniri vel cogitari potest” (*De Civ. Dei*, 11, 15). The thesis has been amply commented upon, elucidated and expanded, by S. Thomas Aquinas, Henry of Ghent, Roger Bacon, Duns Scotus, and the better half of the schoolmen. It is confirmed by lord Bacon, John Millis, bishop Berkeley, and many of

the most distinguished moderns, out of Germany as well as in that land of golden mists. "In this, at once most comprehensive and most appropriate acceptation of the word, reason is pre-eminently spiritual, and a spirit, even our spirit, through an effluence of the same grace by which we are privileged to say, *Our Father*" (Coleridge, *Aids to Reflection*); and the same author cites with approval *sa* still stronger utterance to the like effect from that easily distinguishable personage. John Smith, 1660.

Leibnitz might well say that Malebranche's doctrine was no novelty. It was, indeed, both very old and very generally accredited, but in a form and with an application widely different from what was contemplated by him in its new presentation. The long citation of the evidences of its general acceptance — and not the tenth part accessible has been given — may be pardoned as being necessary to exhibit its familiarity to the greatest intellects, and its inclusion of actual and important truth. The doctrine is true, but it is most perilous. It must be received with habitual caution, and with most circumspect limitations. It runs along a sharp crest, with precipices on either hand stretching sheer down into unfathomable abysses. On this narrow path, at this giddy elevation, Malebranche was unable to preserve his balance, however pure and lofty was his design. His speculation topples over into the yawning gulf of Pantheism, and is distinguished from Spinozism rather by its motive and spirit than by its tendency or result. "The vision of all things in God" becomes a new because a changed doctrine in the hands of the philosophical Jesuit. He is carried away from all safe landmarks by his own noble but misleading enthusiasm, and justifies the censure of Brucker, "non multum ab entusiasmo, vel etiam a Quackerorum illuminatione immediata abesse videtur."

In the theory of Malebranche, body and spirit, being totally disjoined from each other, and incapable of intercommunication, can be brought into harmonious — and, indeed, into possible — co-operation only by the intervention of a higher nature. As knowledge, according to the postulate of Des Cartes, is the substance and the evidence of intelligible existence, supreme knowledge or omniscience must be the attribute and exclusive property of the only Absolute Existence. All things, therefore, primarily exist in the Divine Mind and in the Divine Contemplation; and their genuine, as well as their original, reality is as the archetypal idea of the Divine Intelligence. Temporal existences, with their alterations and combinations, proceed from the divine aspiration. All their forms, modes,

habits, changes separately, and in the intricate dance of spiritual and material mutations and complications — are presented and revealed to the gaze of other intelligences only in the mirror of God’s mind. This is not very remote from the Pre-established Harmony of Leibnitz, but it is much nearer to the infinite effluxes of the Godhead in Spinoza. It is only in their divine types that we contemplate the marvels of sublunary change, receive impressions from without, and regulate our actions accordingly. We see all things in God-and all material motions concurrent with our will are produced, as on the Cartesian system, by divine intervention. All our perceptions and sensations, apparently excited by extrinsic stimulations, are due to divine action. The extrinsic object is perceived, not in itself, nor even in its sensible image; but the sensible image is only the reflection of the idea abiding in the mind of God. Thus man, and man’s sensibilities, are not the cause, the immediate cause at least, of his perceptions or of his actions; but they are only the *occasion* of God’s revealing that perception through the idea subsisting in himself, or of his impelling to the action which may ensue from the conception, but without actual dependence upon it. “Non sentement les hommes ne sont point les veritables causes des mouvements qu’ils produisent dans leurs corps; il semble meme qu’il y ait contradiction qu’ils puissent l’etre. . . Il n’y a que Dieu qui soit veritable cause, et qui est veritablement la puissance de mouvoir les corps” (*Traite de Morale*, 54, 6, p^{ie} 2, ch. 3).

The cardinal doctrine of Malebranche is all that preserves enduring interest, and that needs concern us here. It gained only a very limited and temporary acceptance. Its invalidity was almost immediately and intuitively recognised, and it was soon supplanted by other schemes of like character and of like frailty, or was hustled out of consideration by wholly contradictory doctrines. It may again return unexpectedly in other forms, but in its own Cartesian garb it has passed away forever. Its applications and developments, ingenious as they are, and animated as they are with a spirit of pure and deep devotion, have few special claims to attention. Many valuable counsels, many stimulating and comforting exhortations, many precious exhortations for the guidance of our investigations, our feelings, and our conduct, are presented in the graceful and perspicuous expositions of the serene-tempered and heavenly-minded philosopher, whose heart saw all things in God, if his metaphysics failed to prove that vision of the divinity to be the sole possible mode of finite thought and action. His moral system was directly founded on his cardinal tenet, and fell

with it. He referred all virtue to the recognition and love of the universal order as it exists eternally in the Divine Reason, where every created reason contemplates it. There is some analogy between this view and the ennobling reflections of Donoso Cortes; but it is open to the objections made by Sir James Mackintosh, and to others which he has not made. Malebranche, however, merits the praise of the same just and discriminating critic, that "he is perhaps the first philosopher who has precisely laid down and rigidly adhered to the principle that virtue 'consists in pure intentions and dispositions of mind, without which actions, however conformable to rules, are not truly moral' "-a thesis developed, and perhaps degraded, by Paley.

The further criticism of Malebranche's writings is unnecessary, though they merited a formal refutation by Locke, a rectification and a partial acceptance by Leibnitz. "Quod ad controversiam attinet, utrum omnia videamus in Deo (quae utique vetus est sententia, et, si sano sensu intelligatur, non omnino spernenda), an vero proprias ideas habeamus, sciendum est, et si omnia in Deo videamus, necesse tamen est ut habemus et ideas proprias"...(Meditationes, 1684; *Operac Ed. Dutens.* tom. ii, ps i, p. 12; comp. *Lettre a M. Montmort*, Nov. 4, 1715; *ibid.* p. 217).

Thus Malebranche is admitted into honorable and lasting conjunction with the illustrious names of Spinoza, Locke, and Leibnitz; and, sharing in the light in which they lived, he participated in molding the influences which formed the succeeding generation of bold and curious metaphysical inquirers, and left behind the memory and the example of an earnest, sincere, and irreproachable existence. The other productions of Malebranche were partly controversial and partly religious. Of the latter we may mention the *Entretiens d'un Philosophe Chretien et d'un Philosophe Chinois sur la Nature de Dieu* (Paris, 1708): — *De la Nature et de la Grace* (Amsterdam, 1680): — *Entretiens sur elt Metaphysique et sur la Religion* (Rotterd. 1688; of a mystical character, blending religion with metaphysics). A complete edition of his works was published at Paris, 1712, in 11 vols. 12mo; new edition by Genoude and Lourdoucix. 1837, 2 vols. 8vo.

Literature. — The works of Malebranche are probably sufficient of themselves to supply all that is necessary to be known of the peculiarities of his system, and to be indicated in regard to its tendencies. Besides

Brucker and the other historians of philosophy, the following may be consulted with advantage: Arnauld, *Des Idees Vraies et Fausses*; Bayle, *Dict. Hist. et Critique*; Norris, *Essay towards the Theory of the Ideal or Intellectual World* (Lond. 1701, 2 vols. 8vo); Leibnitz, *Examen des Sentiments de Malebranche*, in Raspe, (*Euvres Philosophiques de M. Leibnitz* (Amst. 1765); Leibnitz, *Theodicee and Epistola ad Remonlldum*; Locke, *Examination of Malebranche's Opinion*; Fontenelle, *Hist. du Renouvellement de l'Academie Royale des Sciences*; Dug. Stewart, *Philosophy of the iluman Mind*, and *Dissertation I, Supplement to the Encyclopedia Britannica*; Mackintosh, *Dissertation, Supplem. Encycl. Britann.*; Sir William Hamilton, *Lectures on Metaphysics* (Boston, 1859); Blakey, *History of the Philosophy of Mind* (London, 1850), vol. 2; Saisset, *Pantheisme*, 1:66 sq.; and the same in *Revue des Deux Mondes*, April 1, 1862; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, vol. 20, s.v.; Erdmann, *Malebranche, Spinoza, die Skeptiker und Mystiker des Siebzehnten Jahrhunderts* (1836); Relstab, *Dissertatio de Malebrancho Philosopho* (1846); Hallam, *Introd. to the Lit. of Europe* (Harpers' edition), 2:91 sq.; Blampignon, *Etude sur Malebranche* (Paris, 1862, 8vo). (G. F. H.)

Malec

(king). So the Mohammedans call the principal angel in care of hell. In the Koran it is said (speaking of the infidels), "And they shall call aloud, saying, O Malec, intercede for us, that the Lord would end us by annihilation. And he shall answer, Verily, ye shall remain here forever. We brought you the truth heretofore, and ye abhorred the truth." Some of the Mohammedan doctors say this answer will be given a thousand years after the final dissolution of this world. — Broughton, *Biblioth. Hist. Sac.* vol. 2, s.v.; Sale, *Koran*, p. 401.

Malekites

the second of the four orthodox Mohammedan sects. The founder of the Malekites was Malek Ibn-Ansa, born at Medina about the year of the Hegira 95. He was remarkable for strenuously insisting on the literal acceptance of the prohibitory precepts. Tradition will have it that when visited in his last illness by a friend, who found him in tears, and asked him the cause of his affliction, he replied, "Who has more reason to weep than I? Would God that for every question decided by me according to my own opinion I had received so many stripes, then would my account be easier.

Would to God I had never given any decision of my own." The Malekites are chiefly found in Barbary and other parts of Africa. — Sale's *Koran*, Prel. Disc. § 8; Taylor, *Hist. of Mohammedanism*, p. 288; Broughton, *Biblioth. Hist. Sac.* vol. 2, S. V. *SEE MOHAMMEDANISM.*

Mal'eleel

(~~4137~~ Luke 3:37). *SEE MAHALALEEL.*

Malevolenc

is that disposition of mind which inclines us to wish ill to any person. It discovers itself in frowns and a lowering countenance, in uncharitableness, in evil sentiments, hard speeches to or of its object, in cursing and reviling, and doing mischief either with open violence or secret spite, as far as there is power. *SEE MALICE.*

Maley, George W.

an American Methodist minister, was born in western Pennsylvania in 1799; was educated at an academy in Butler, Pennsylvania; was converted in 1819; was licensed to preach and recommended to the Ohio Conference in 1821, and was appollsted to the Mad River Circuit; in 1822, to London; in 1823, to Piqua; in 1824, to White Oak; in 1825, to Piqua; in 1826-7, to Union; in 1828-9, to Wilmilngton; in 1830-1, to Hillsboro; in 1832-3, to White Oak; in 1834, to Madison; in 1835, to New Richmond; in 18367, to Milford; in 1838, to Franklin; in 1839-40, to Germantown; in 1841, agent for Springfield and Germantown Academy; in 1842, to Franklin; in 1843, to Eaton; in 1844-5, to Cincinnati City Mission. In 1846 he joined the Kentucky Conference, M. E. Church South; in 1846-7, was presiding elder of Covington District; in 1848 was appointed to Soule Chapel, Cincinnati, Ohio; the next ten years was supernumerary, and the remainder of his life superannuated. He died in Urbana, Champaign Co., Ohio, Dec. 14, 1866. In his last illness, though suffering, he was uncomplaining and happy, and sent his love and greetings to his ministerial associates: "Tell my brethren of the Kentucky Conference that I die in the *faith*, and in full fellowship with the whole Church, East, West, North, and South." — *Minutes of Conferences*, 1867.

Malice

is a settled or deliberate determination to revenge or do hurt to another. It more frequently denotes the disposition of inferior minds to execute every purpose of mischief within the more limited circle of their abilities. It is a most hateful temper in the sight of God, strictly forbidden in his holy Word (⁵¹⁸⁸Colossians 3:812), disgraceful to rational creatures, and every way inimical to the spirit of Christianity (⁴¹⁵⁴Matthew 5:44). *SEE MALEVOLENCE.*

Malignity

a disposition obstinately, bad or malicious. Malignancy and malignity are words nearly synonymous. In some connections, malignity seems rather more pertinently applied to a radical depravity of nature, and malignancy to indications of this depravity in temper and conduct in particular instances. *SEE MALEVOLENCE.*

Mallery, Charles Dutton, D.D.

an American Baptist minister, was born at Poultney, Vermont, Jan. 23, 1801. He graduated at Middlebury College in 1821, and in 1822 removed to Columbia, South Carolina; was ordained, and preached six years. He afterwards resided in Georgia, and was a principal founder of Mercer University. In the division of the denomination in 1835, on the missionary question, he advocated that system. He died July 31, 1864. Dr. Mallery published a *Life of Mercer, and Soul Prosperity*. — Drake, *Dict. of Amer. Biog.* p. 593.

Malleolus

SEE HEMMERLIN.

Mal'los

a town of Asia Minor, whose inhabitants (*Μαλλώται*, *Vulg. lallotce*, A. V. "they of Mallos"), with the people of Tarsus, revolted from Antiochus Epiphanes because he had bestowed them on one of his concubines (2 Maccabees 4:30). The absence of the king from Antioch to put down the insurrection gave the infamous Menelaus, the high-priest, an opportunity of purloining some of the sacred vessels from the Temple of Jerusalem (ver. 32, 39), an act which finally led to the murder of the good Onias (ver. 34,

35). Mallos was an important city of Cilicia, lying at the mouth of the Pyramus (Seihun), on the shore of the Mediterranean, northeast of Cyprus, and about twenty miles from Tarsus (Tersûs). (See Smith, *Dict. of Class. Geography.*)

Mal'lothi

(Hebrew *Mallo'thi*, **ytæmj** perhaps for **ytæbmj** *my fullness*; Septuag. **Μαλλιθί** v. r. **Μεαλωθί, Μελληθί, Μελλωθί**; Vulg. *Mellothi*), one of the fourteen sons of Heman the Levite (^{<1370>}1 Chronicles 25:4), and head of the nineteenth division of Temple musicians as arranged by David (^{<1376>}1 Chronicles 25:26). B.C. 1014.

Mallows

Picture for Mallows 1

(— j /Lmj *mallu'ach*, *salted*; Sept. **ἄλιμον**, Vulg. *herba*) occurs only in the passage where Job complains that he is subjected to the contumely of the meanest people, those “who cut up *mallows* by the bushes for their meat” (^{<1800>}Job 30:4). The proper meaning of the word *malluach* has been a subject of considerable discussion among authors, in consequence, apparently, of its resemblance to the Greek **μαλάχη**, signifying “mallow,” and also to *nmaluch*, which is said to be the Syriac name of a species of *Orache*, or *Atriplex*. It is difficult, if not impossible, to say which is the more correct interpretation, as both appear to have some foundation in truth, and seem equally adapted to the sense of the above-quoted passage. (See Gesenius, *Thesaur. Heb.* p. 791). The *malache* of the Greeks is distinguished by Dioscorides into two kinds, of which he states that the cultivated is more fit for food than the wild kind. Arabic authors apply the description of Dioscorides to *khub-bazi*, a name which in India is applied both to species of *Malva rotundifolia* and of *M. sylvestris*, which extend from Europe to the north of India, and which are still used as food in the latter country, as they formerly were in Europe, and probably in Syria. That some kind of mallow has been so used in Syria we have evidence in the quotation made by Mr. Harmer from Biddulph, who says, “We saw many poor people collecting *mallows* and three-leaved grass, and asked them what they did with it; and they answered, that it was all their food, and that they boiled it, and did eat it.” Dr. Shaw, in his *Travels*, on the contrary, observes that “*Mellou-keah*, or *mulookiah*, **ayj wl m**, as in the Arabic, is

the same with the *melochia* or *corchorus*, being a podded species of mallows, whose pods are rough, of a glutinous substance, and used in most of their dishes. *Mellou-keah* appears to be little different in name from **hwl m** (~~חבל~~ Job 30:4), which we render ‘mallows,’ though some other plant, of a more saltish taste, and less nourishing quality, may be rather intended.” The plant alluded to is *Corchorus olitorius*, which has been adopted and figured in her *Scripture Herbal* (p. 255) by lady Calcott, who observes that this plant, called Jews’ Mallow, appears to be certainly that mentioned by the patriarch. Avicenna calls it *olus Judaicum*; and Rauwolf saw the Jews about Aleppo use the leaves as potherbs; “and this same mallow continues to be eaten in Egypt and Arabia, as well as Palestine.” But there are so many plants of a mild mucilaginous nature which are used as articles of diet in the East, that it is hardly possible to select one in preference to another, unless we find a similarity in the name. Thus species of *Amaranthus*, of *Chenopodium*, of *Portulacca*, as well as the above *Corchorus*, and the *mallow*, are all used as food, and might be adduced as suitable to the above passages, since most of them are found growing wild in many parts of the countries of the East.

Picture for Mallows 2

The learned Bochart, however, contends (*Hieroz.* part 1, t. 3, c. 16) that the word *malluach* denotes a saltish plant called **ἄλιμος** by the Greeks, and which with good reason is supposed to be the *Atriplex halimus* of botanists, or tall shrubby *Orache*. The Sept., indeed, first gave **ἄλιμα** as the interpretation of *malluach*. Celsius adopts it (*Hierobot.* 2:96 sq.), and many others consider it as the most correct. A good abstract of Bochart’s arguments is given by Dr. Harris. In the first place the most ancient Greek translator interprets *malluach* by *halimos*. That the Jews were in the habit of eating a plant called by the former name is evident from the quotation given by Bochart from the Talmudical tract *Kiddusin* (c. 3:65). By Ibn-Buetar, *malukh* is given as the synonym of *al-kutuf al-buhuri*. i.e. the sea-side *Kutuf* or *Orache*, which is usually considered to be the *Atriplex marinum*, now *A. halimus*. Bochart, indeed, remarks that Dioscorides describes the *halimus* as a shrub with branches, destitute of thorns, with a leaf like the olive, but broader, and growing on the sea-shore. This notice evidently refers to the **ἄλιμος** (Dioscor. 1:121), which, as above stated, is supposed to be the *Atriplex halimnus* of botanists, and the *Kutuf buhuri* of the Arabs, while the **ἀτράφαξις** of the same author (2:145) is their *kutuf*

and *A triplex hortensis*, Linnaeus. Bochart quotes Galen as describing the tops of the former as being used for food when young. Dioscorides also says that its leaves are employed for the same purpose. (Comp. Theophrast. *Plant.* 4:17; Athen. *Deipn.* 4:161; Horace, *Ep.* 1:12, 7; Pliny, 21:55; Tournefort, *Trav.* 1:41.) What the Arab writers state as to the tops of the plants being eaten corresponds to the description of Job, who states that those to whom he refers *cropped upon the shrub* — which by some is supposed to indicate that the *malluach* grew near hedges. These, however, do not exist in the desert. There is no doubt that species of *Orache* were used as articles of diet in ancient times, and probably still are so in the countries where they are indigenous; but there are many other plants, similar in nature, that is, soft and succulent, and usually very saline, such as the *Salsolas*, *Salicornias*, etc., which, like the species of *Atriplex*, belong to the same natural family of *Chenopodece*, and which, from their saline nature, have received their respective names. Many of these are well known for yielding soda by incineration. In conformity with this, Mr. Good thinks that “the real plant is a species of *Salsola*, or ‘salt-wort;’ and that the term ἄλιμα, employed in the Greek versions, gives additional countenance to this conjecture.” Some of these are shrubby, but most of them are herbaceous, and extremely common in all the dry, desert, and saline soils which extend from the south of Europe to the north of India. Most of them are saline and bitter, but some are milder in taste and mucilaginous, and are therefore employed as articles of diet, as spinach is in Europe. *Salsola Indica*, for instance, which is common on the coasts of the Peninsula of India, Dr. Roxburgh states, saved the lives of many thousands of the poor natives of India during the famine of 1791-2-3; for, while the plant lasted, most of the poorer classes who lived near the sea had little else to eat; and, indeed, its green leaves ordinarily form an essential article of the food of those natives who inhabit the maritime districts. For other interpretations, see Rosenmüller (ad loc. Job.). Mr. Tristram (*Nat. Hist. of the Bible*, p. 466) decides in favor of the above species of sea-purslane (*A triplex halimnus*), which he says “grows abundantly on the shores of the Mediterranean, in salt marshes, and also on the shores of the Dead Sea still more luxuriantly. We found thickets of it of considerable extent on the west side of the sea, and it exclusively supplied us with fuel for many days. It grows there to the height of ten feet-more than double its size on the Mediterranean. It forms a dense mass of thin twigs without thorns, has a very minute purple flower close to the stem, and small, thick, sour-tasting leaves, which could be eaten, as is the

Atriplex hortensis, or Garden Orache, but it would be very miserable food.”

Malluach

SEE MALLOWS.

Mal'luch

(Heb. *Mailluk'*, *ĒWLMj* *reigned* over, or from the Syr. a *counsellor*), the name of several men.

1. (Sept. *Μαλώχ*, Vulg. *Maloch*.) A Levite of the family of Merari, son of Hashabiah and father of Abdi (^{<1364>}1 Chronicles 6:44). B.C. much ante 1014.
2. (Sept. *Μαλούχ*, Vulg. *Melluch*.) An Israelite of the descendants (or residents) of Bani who renounced his Gentile wife after the exile (^{<1502>}Ezra 10:29). B.C. 459.
3. (Sept. *Μαλούχ* v. r. *Βαλούχ*, Vulg. *Maloch*.) Another Israelite of the descendants (or residents) of Harim, who did the same (^{<1502>}Ezra 10:32). B.C. 459.
4. (Sept. *Μαλούχ*, Vulg. *Abelluch*.) One of the priests who returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (^{<1324>}Nehemiah 12:4). B.C. 536. The associated names would appear to indicate that he was the same with one of those who signed the sacred covenant with Nehemiah (^{<1604>}Nehemiah 10:4); although that would imply a very advanced age. B.C. cir. 410. He is probably the same with the son of Jonathan, elsewhere called MELICU (^{<1324>}Nehemiah 12:14, *γκζε πε*) Sept. *Μαλούχ*, Vulg. *Milicho*).
5. (Sept. *Μαλούχ*, Vulg. *Alelluch*.) One of the chief Israelites who subscribed the same covenant (^{<1602>}Nehemiah 10:27). B.C. cir. 410.

Malmesbury, William Of,

an English monastic and historian of the early period of his country's history, was born near the close of the 11th century, probably in Somersetshire, was educated at Oxford, and afterwards entered the Benedictine monastery whence he derived his name, and of which he became librarian. He died some time after 1142, but the exact date is not known. He wrote (in Latin) *De Gestis Regnum*, a history of the kings of

England from the Saxon invasion to the twenty-sixth year of Henry I (translated into English by the Rev. John Sharpe [Lond. 1815]; also in Bohn's Library, edited by Dr. Giles [1847]): — *Historiae Novellae*, extending from the twenty-sixth year of Henry I to the escape of the empress Maud from Oxford; and *De Gestis Pontifficum*, containing an account of the bishops and principal monasteries of England from the conversion of Ethelbert of Kent by St. Augustine to 1123: — *Antiquities of Glastonbury*, and *Life of St. Wulstan* (printed in Wharton's *Anglia Sacra*). Malmesbury gives proof in his writings of great diligence, good sense, modesty, and a genuine love of truth. His style is much above that of his contemporaries. See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth.* (s.v. William of Malmesbury); *Lond. Quart. Rev.* 1856 (Jan.), p. 295 sq.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.; Chambers, *Cyclopaedia*, s.v.

Malou, Jean Baptiste,

a Roman Catholic theologian, was born at Ypern; studied theology at the University of Louvain, where in 1835 he became a professor; in 1848 was made bishop of Bruges, and died March 23, 1864. He wrote *La lecture de la Ste. Bible en langue vulgaire* (Louv. 1846, 2 vols. 8vo). His brother JULE is the author of *Recherches sur le veritable auteur du livre de l'Imitation de Jesus-Christ* (Louv. 1848).

Malta

SEE MELITA.

Malta, Knights of

SEE KNIGHTHOOD; SEE TEMPLARS.

Maltbie, Ebenezer Davenport,

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Stamford, Conn., Jan. 20, 1799; graduated at Hamilton College, New York, in 1824, and studied theology in the Theological Seminary at Andover, Mass., which he left in 1826 to become tutor in Hamilton College. He was licensed to preach in 1832, and ordained pastor of the Congregational Church in Hamilton, N.Y. In 1841 he took charge of the Hudson River Academy, and in 1843 became principal of a literary institution in Lansingburg, N. Y., which position he resigned eight years after on account of failing health. He died at Syracuse, N. Y., in 1859. Mr. Maltbie was an excellent teacher, beloved and honored

as a pastor, and energetic and unwearied in his labors of charity and piety. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1860, p. 74.

Maltby, Edward

D.D., an English prelate, was born at Norwich, England, in 1770; was educated at Pembroke College, Oxford; in 1831 was made bishop of Chichester, and in 1836 was transferred to Durham. He died July 3, 1859. Dr. Maltby published several volumes of *Sermons* (1819, 1822, 1831): — *Occasional Sermons: — Illustration of the Truth of the Christian Religion* (Lond. 1802, 8vo; 2d ed. 1803, 8vo): — *Psalms and Hymns* (32 mo). — Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, vol. 2; Thomas, *Dictionary of Biography*, s.v.

Maltby, Henry

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Paris, N. Y., October 5, 1806, and graduated at Hamilton College, N. Y., in 1836. For some years he devoted himself to teaching in his native state, and subsequently built up a flourishing school in Flemingsburg, Ky. He studied theology privately, was licensed in 1847, and ordained pastor of the Third Presbyterian Church, Oxford, Ohio, in 1848. He was also a professor in Oxford Female College. He died May 22, 1860. Mr. Maltby was very successful as a teacher, and greatly beloved as a pastor; his sermons were characterized by systematic arrangement and fullness of thought, and his intercourse with the people was courteous and refined. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1861, p. 97.

Malthus, Thomas Robert

an English clergyman, was born at Rookery, Surrey County, England, in 1766; was educated at Jesus College, Cambridge, where he obtained a fellowship, graduating B.A. in 1788 and M.A. in 1791; soon after took holy orders, and obtained a curacy in Surrey, and identified himself with the "High-Church" party. In 1805 he was appointed professor of modern history and political economy at the East India College at Haileybury, in Hertfordshire, which position he held until his death, Dec. 29, 1834. Mr. Malthus devoted himself more particularly to the study of political economy and secular history, and received his professorship on this account. (For a résumé of the "Malthusian theory," concerning the relation of population to the means of sustenance, see Chambers. *Cyclop.* s.v.) He preached frequently, however, while in this position, and was an earnest

laborer for the upbuilding of Christ's kingdom among men. His works are exclusively of a secular character: a complete list of them may be found in Allibone, *Dict. of Auth.*, and *English Cyclopaedia*, s.v.

Malvenda, Thomas,

a learned Spanish exegete, was born at Xativa in 1566, and entered the Dominican convent of Lombay in 1582. A good Latin, Greek, and Hebrew scholar, he now applied his philological talents to the study of the divers texts of the Bible, at the same time devoting much attention also to dogmatics and to ecclesiastical history. In 1585 he wrote a treatise to prove that St. Anna was only once married, and that St. Joseph always held fast to the rule of abstinence. From 1585 to 1600 he taught first philosophy, and afterwards theology. In 1600 he addressed to cardinal Baronius a memoir on some parts of the *Annales ecclesiastici*, and of the *Martyrologium Romanum*, which he deemed incorrect. Baronius, struck by the knowledge exhibited in this memoir, called Malvenda to Rome, where the general of his order entrusted him with the correcting of the breviary, the missal, and the martyrology of the Dominicans. This work was completed in 1603. The congregation of the Index then submitted to him for revision the *Bibliotheca Patrum* of La Vigne (Par. 1575, 1589, 9 vols. fol.). His critical annotations on this work appeared at Rome in 1607, and were afterwards published together with the *Biblioth. Patr.* (Parns, 1609, 1624). About the same time he commenced *Annales ordinis fratrum predicatorum*, which he never completed; the existing fragment, extending over a period of thirty years, was subsequently published by Gravina (Naples, 1627, 2 vols. fol.). In 1610 Malvenda was recalled to Spain, where the grand inquisitor appointed him a member of the Spanish congregation of the *Index librorum praehibitorum*. He died at Valencia in 1628. His principal work, to which the later years of his life were devoted, was a literal translation of the Bible, with commentaries; he was unable to finish it, and left it at the 16th chapter of Ezekiel (published in this incomplete state by the general of the Dominicans, under title *Commentaria in sacram Scripturam una cum nova de verbo ad verbum ex Hebraeco translatione, variisque lectionibus* [Lyon, 1650, 5 vols. fol.]). The translation is so literal as to be very inelegant and sometimes unintelligible. The notes are mostly grammatical, and though perhaps valuable at the time, are now considered unimportant. Among his other works, which are very numerous, we notice *Libri novena de Antichristo* (Rome, 1604, often reprinted): *Commentarius de Paradiso voluptatis*

(Rome, 1605, 4to): — *Vida de san Pedro Martir* (Saragossa, 1613, 8vo). A complete list of his works is given in Quetif and Echard, *Scriptores ordinis praedicatorum*, 2:454 sq. See Antonio, *Bibl. Hispana nova*, vol. 2. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 8:771; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 33:122; Pierer, *Universal-Lexikon*, 10:806. (J. N. P.)

Mamachi, Thomas Maria,

a distinguished Dominican, was born on the island of Chio Dec. 3, 1713; was brought to Italy when yet a youth, and joined the Dominicans. He became professor of theology at Florence, and in 1740 was called to Rome as a member of the college of the Propaganda. Benedict XIV made him a doctor of divinity, and appointed him member of the congregation of the Index, of which he became secretary in 1779. Under Pius VI he was appointed *Magisterpalatii*. He died in 1792, at Corneto, near Montefiascone. His principal works are *Ad Joh. D. Mansium de ratione temporum Athanasiorum deque aliquot Synodis iv saeculo celebrats Epistole iv* (Flor. 1748), against Mansi, who, in his *De epochis conciliorum Sardicensis et Sirmiensi, ceterumque in causa Arianorum, hac occasione simul rerum potissimarum S. A. thanasii Chronologiam restituit* (Lucre, 1746), asserted, contrary to general opinion, that the Council of Sardica was held in 344, and that the return of Athanasius to Alexandria took place in 346. His *Oriqinum et antiquitatum Christianarum Libb. xx* (Rom. 1749-55), of which only five books, however, were completed, is a very important work, holding the same position among the Roman Catholics as Bingham's *Origines ecclesiasticae* among the Protestants; it is written in view of the later work, which it often attempts to refute. *De Costumi deprimitivi Christiani libri tres* (Rome, 1753; Venice, 1757) is an interesting work on the early ages of Christianity, and contains some valuable and curious information. *Epistolarum ad Justinum Febronium, de ratione regende Christianae reipublice, deque legitima Romani Pontificis potestate, Liber primus* (Romans 1776), in answer to Justinus Febronius's (J. N. von Hontheim, q.v.) *De statu Ecclesiae et legitima potestate Romani Pontificis liber singularis*, etc. (Bullioni. 1763), is but a weak production compared to that which it attacked. See *Neue theol. Bibliothek*, 55. 392 sq.; *Acta historico-ecclesiastica nostri temporis*, 39:888; *Göttinger gel. Anzeigen*, 1757, p. 1189 sq.; 1759, p. 595; Richard et Giratud, *Biblioth. sacree*. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*. 33. 123; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, 8:772; Pierer, *Universal-Lexikon*, 10:806.

Mamai'as

(Σαμααί, Vulg. *Samea*), given (1 Esdras 8:14) in place of the SHEMAIAH *SEE SHEMAIAH* (q.v.) of the Heb. text (^{<1816>}Ezra 8:16).

Mamas

a saint of the Romish Church, a native of Paphlagonia, flourished in the 3d century. He was born in prison, his mother, Russina, having been arrested on account of her adherence to Christianity. He was brought up by a Christian widow named Ammia, and while a boy was already persecuted for his faith, but wonderfully escaped death. He subsequently preached the Gospel in Caesarea. and died a martyr in 274. He is commemorated on the 17th of August. Mamas was highly honored in the ancient Church. Basil, Gregory of Nazianzen, and Walafrid Strabo make mention of him. See C. Baronii *Martyrologium Romanum* (Moguntiae, 1631), p. 507; Th. Ruinart, *Acta primorum Martyrum* (Amst. 1713), p. 264 sq. — Herzog, *Real-Encyclopädie*, 8:774. (J. N. P.)

Mamertus

ST., archbishop of Vienna, was a brother of Glaudianus Ecdicius Mamertus, *SEE CLAUDIANUS*, author of the celebrated work *De statu animon*. St. Mamertus is especially known for having, on the occasion of a great fire, and other accidents which befell the city of Vienna, instituted the *Rogations*, i.e. penitential prayers for the three days preceding the ascension. Baronius, in his *Martyrologium Romanum* (Moguntise, 1631), p. 255 sq. and 296, denies that Mamertus was the first to organize these rogations, claiming that they were an old institution which had fallen into disuse, and which he merely revived. Bingham in his *Orgini. eccles.* (3:80 sq.; 5:29), subsequently took the same view. However, it is certain that the example of Mamertus induced the Council of Orleans, in 511, to introduce the rogations throughout France. They were subsequently adopted by the whole Western Church, by order of Gregory the Great, in 591. Mamertus is generally believed to have died in 475. He is commersorated on the 11th of May. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 8:774; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog.* ^{<1832>}*Genesis* 33:129.

Mamertus, Claudianus

SEE CLAUDIANUS.

Mammaea, Julia.

SEE SEVERUS, ALEXANDER.

Mammillarians

the name of a branch of the Anabaptists which arose in Haarlem, Holland. Its origin is as follows. A young man having taken undue liberties with a young woman whom he intended to marry, was accused of it before the Church; the Church authorities, however, did not agree on the subject, some desiring to expel the offender from their society, and others opposing so severe a measure. This caused a separation, and those who were on the young man's side were visited by their opponents with the reproachful name of Mammillarians (from the French word *Mammelle*, a woman's breast). See Bayle, *Dict. Historique*, s.v.; Microelius, *Syntag. Hist. Eccl.* (ed. 1679) p. 1012. — Herzog, *Real-Encyclopidie*, 8:774.

Mam'mon

(μαμμωνᾶς or μαμωνᾶς, from the Chald. ^{ܡܡܘܢܐ} or ^{ܐܢܗܡܘܢܐ}; that in which one trusts; see Buxtorf, *Lex. Chald.* col. 1217 sq.), a term pre-eminently, by a technical and invidious usage (see Suidas in his *Lex.* s.v.), “signifying wealth or riches, and bearing that sense in ^{ⲙⲙⲟⲛ}Luke 16:9, 11; but also used by our Savior (^{ⲙⲙⲟⲛ}Matthew 6:24; ^{ⲙⲙⲟⲛ}Luke 16:13) as a personification of the god of riches: ‘Ye cannot serve God and Mammon.’ Gill, on ^{ⲙⲙⲟⲛ}Matthew 6:24, brings a very apt quotation from the Talmud Hieros. (*Yoma*, fol. 38), in confirmation of the character which Christ in these passages gives of the Jews in his day: ‘We know that they believed in the law, and took care of the commandments, and of the tithes, and that their whole conversation was good only that they loved the Mammon, and hated one another without cause.’ “The word often occurs in the Chaldee Targums of Onkelos, and later writers, and in the Syriac Version, in the sense of ‘riches.’ This meaning of the word is given by Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.* 4:33, and by Augustine and Jerome commenting on Matthew. Augustine adds that it was in use as a ‘Punic, and Jerome adds that it was a Syriac word. There is no reason to suppose that any idol received divine honors in the East under this name. It is used in Matthew as a personification of riches. The derivation of the word is discussed by A. Pfeiffer, *Opera*, p. 474.” The phrase “mammon of unrighteousness” as used in ^{ⲙⲙⲟⲛ}Luke 16:9, probably refers to gain which is too often unjustly

acquired (as by the publicans), but which may be sanctified by charity and piety so as to become a passport, in some sense, to final blessedness. See Grunenberg, *De mammona iniquitatis* (Jen. 1700); Wakins, *De μαμ. ἁδικίας* (Jen. 1701). In Rabbinical language the word is used to denote *confidence*.

Mamnitanai' mus

(Μαμνιτάναιμος v. r. Μαμτανόαιμος, Vulg. *Mathaneus*), given (1 Esdras 9:34) by corruption for the two names "Mattaniah, Mattenai," of the Heb. list (^{<151037>}Ezra 10:37).

Mam(O)Un, Al, Abbas-Abdallah,

a celebrated Mussulman ruler, was born at Bagdad in A.D. 786; was the son of Haroun-al-Raschid; and ascended the throne as the seventh Abasside caliph in 813. By his determination to enforce the heretical doctrine *that the Koran was created and not eternal*, he became very unpopular among the Moslem doctors and gave strength to the house of Ali. *SEE MOHAMMEDANISM; SEE MOHAMMEDAN SECTS*. Mamoun was a patron of science and literature, and is praised by Eastern writers for his talents and liberality. His capital, Bagdad, was in his day the great center of the world of learning and science. — He died in 833. See Weil, *Gesch. d. Chalifen*, II, chap. 7; Hammer-Purgstall, *Literaturgesch. d. Araber*.

Mam're

Picture for Mamre

(Heb. *Mamre'*, *אַרְמֹנִי* *fat*; Sept. Μαμβρη; Josephus Μαμβρης, *Ant.* 1:10, 2; Vulg. Mambre), the name of an Amorithish chief who, with his brothers Aner and Eschol, was in alliance with Abraham (^{<011413>}Genesis 14:13, 24). B.C. cir. 2080. In the Jewish traditions he appears as encouraging Abraham to undergo the pain of circumcision, from which his brothers would have dissuaded him, by a reference to the deliverance he had already experienced from far greater trials—the furnace of Nimrod and the sword of Chedorlaomer (Beer, *Leben Abrahams*, p.36). Hence (*אַרְמֹנִינִי* *אֶ*Sept. ἡ δρυς ἡ Μαμβρη), in the Auth. Vers., "the oaks of Mamre," "plain of Mamre" (^{<011318>}Genesis 13:18; 18:1), or simply "Mamre" (^{<012317>}Genesis 23:17,19; 35:27), a grove in the neighborhood of Hebron. It was here that

Abraham first dwelt after separating from Lot (⁻⁰¹³⁸Genesis 13:18); here the divine angel visited him with the warning of Sodom's fate (⁻⁰¹⁸⁰Genesis 18:1); it was in the cave in the corner of the field opposite this place that he deposited the remains of Sarah (⁻⁰²³⁷Genesis 23:17,19); where he was himself buried (⁻⁰²⁵⁹Genesis 25:9), as was likewise Jacob (⁻⁰⁴⁴³Genesis 49:30; 1, 13). In later times the spot is said to have lain six stadia from Hebron, still marked by a reputedly sacred terebinth (Joseph. *War*, 4:9, 7; Eusebius, *Praep. Evang.* v. 9; Sozomen, *Hist. Ev.* 1:18; Eusebius, *Onomast.* s.v. Ἀρχώ, Arboch); and later travelers likewise (Sanutus, *Secret. fidel.* 3:14, 3, in the *Gesta Dei per Franc.* 2:248; Troilo, *Trav.* p. 418) speak of a very venerable tree of this kind near the ruins of a church at Hebron (see Reland, *Palaest.* p. 712 sq.). Dr. Robinson found here, at a place called *Ramet el-Khulil*, one hour distant from Hebron, some ancient remains, which he regards (in accordance with the local tradition) as probably marking the site of Abraham's sepulcher (*Researches*, 1:318). He saw the venerable oak near Hebron which still passes with the Mohammedans for the tree under which Abraham pitched his tent (*Researches*, 2:429), but which he states is not a terebinth (*ib.* 443). **SEE OAK.** According to Schwarz, "North of Hebron, and sideward from Halhul, is a plain about two and one half miles in length, which the Arabs call *Elon*, no doubt the ancient dwelling-place of Abraham" (*Palestine*, p. 109). **SEE HEBRON.** "Manre is stated to have been at Hebron, for we read that 'Jacob came unto Isaac his father, to Mamre, to Kirjath-Arbah, which is Hebron, where Abraham and Isaac sojourned' (⁻⁰¹⁵⁷Genesis 35:27). The relative positions of Machpelah and Mamre are also described with great exactness. Five times Moses states that Machpelah lay 'before Mamre' (ἔμπροσθεν [; Sept. ὀπίθεναντι; Vulg. *quae respiciebat*); which may mean either that it was to the east of Mamre, or that it lay facing it. The latter seems to be the true meaning. Machpelah is situated on the shelving bank of a little valley, and probably the oakgrove of Mamre stood on the other side of the valley, facing the cave, while the town of Hebron lay a little farther up to the north-west (⁻⁰²³⁷Genesis 23:17,19; 25:9; 49:30; 1, 13). The identity of Machpelah with the modern *Haarna* being established, **SEE MACHPELAH**, there can be little difficulty in fixing the position of Mamre; it must have been within sight of or 'facing' Machpelah, and so near the town of Hebron that it could be described as *at* it. The *Jerusalem Itinerary* places it *two miles* from Hebron (p. 599), and Sozomen (*H. E.* 2:4) says it lay on the north towards Jerusalem. It is evident that all these notices refer to the above ruin, *Ramet el-Khulil*. The Jews of Hebron call it 'the house of

Abraham,' and regard it as the site of Mamre (Porter, *Handbook*, 1:72; Stanley, *S. and P.* p. 141). The position, however, does not accord with the notices in Genesis, and cannot, therefore, be the true site of Mamre. The sacred grove and the place of the patriarch's tent were doubtless on the face of the hill facing the great Haram, which covers the cave of Machpelah (Stanley, *Sermons in the East*, p. 166 sq.; Ritter, *Pal. und Syr.* 3:222 sq.). The tradition which identified Mamre with Ramet el-Khulil may have originated in the existence of a grove of venerable oaks on that spot, just as now the great oak a mile or more west of the town is called 'Abraham's Oak' (Porter, *Handbk.* 1:70)." **SEE ABRAHAM.**

Mamu' chus

(Μαμουῦχος, Vulg. *Maluchus*), given (1 Esdras 9:20) by corruption for MALLUCH **SEE MALLUCH** (q.v.) of the Heb. list (^{<15129>}Ezra 10:29).

Man

is the rendering mostly of four Hebrew and two Greek words in the English Version. They are used with as much precision as the terms of like import in other languages. Nor is the subject merely critical; it will be found connected with accurate interpretation. In our treatment of the subject we thus supplement what we have stated under the article ADAM **SEE ADAM** .

1. **μδα**; *adam'*, is used in several senses.

(a.) It is the proper name of the first man, though Gesenius thinks that when so applied it has the force rather of an appellative, and that, accordingly, in a translation, it would be better to render it *the man*. It seems, however, to be used by Luke as a proper name in the genealogy (^{<4138>}Luke 3:38), by Paul (^{<41614>}Romans 5:14; ^{<54213>}1 Timothy 2:13, 14), and by Jude (ver. 14). Paul's use of it in ^{<46155>}1 Corinthians 15:45 is remarkably clear: "the first man Adam." It is so employed throughout the Apocrypha without exception (2 Esdras 3:5, 10, 21, 26; 4:30; 6:54; 7:11, 46, 48; Tobit 8:6; Ecclesiasticus 33:10; 40:1; 49:16), and by Josephus (*ut infra*). Gesenius argues that, as applied to the first man, it has the article almost without exception. It is doubtless often thus used as an appellative, but the exceptions are decisive: ^{<00017>}Genesis 3:17, "to Adam he said," and see Sept., ^{<65108>}Deuteronomy 32:8, "the descendants of Adam;" "if I covered my transgressions as Adam" (^{<38133>}Job 31:33); "and unto Adam he said," etc.

(~~1838~~ Job 28:28), which, when examined by the context, seems to refer to a primeval revelation not recorded in Genesis (see also ~~3807~~ Hosea 6:7, Heb. or margin). Gesenius further argues that the woman has an appropriate name, but that the man has none. But the name Eve was given to her by Adam, and, as it would seem, under a change of circumstances; and though the *divine* origin of the word Adam, as a proper name of the first man, is not recorded in the history of the creation, as is that of the day, night, heaven, earth, seas, etc. (~~0005~~ Genesis 1:5, 8, 10), yet its divine origin as an appellative is recorded (comp. Hebrews, ~~0025~~ Genesis 1:26; 5:1); from which state it soon became a proper name, Dr. Lee thinks from its frequent occurrence, but we would suggest, from its peculiar appropriateness to “the man,” who is the more immediate *image* and glory of God (~~6107~~ 1 Corinthians 11:7). Other derivations of the word have been offered, as *ḡdā*; “to be red” or “redhaired;” and hence some of the rabbins have inferred that the first man was so. The derivation is as old as Josephus, who says that “the first man was called Adam because he was formed from the red earth,” and adds, “for the true virgin earth is of this color” (*Ant.* 1:1, 2). The following is a simple translation of the more detailed (Jehovistic) account given by Moses (~~0004~~ Genesis 2:47, 18-25) of the creation of the first human pair, omitting the paragraph concerning the garden of Eden. *SEE COSMOGONY.*

This [is the] genealogy of the heavens and the earth, when they were created, in the day [that] Jehovah God made earth and heavens. Now no shrub of the field had yet been [grown] on the earth, and no plant of the field had yet sprung up — for Jehovah God had not [as yet] caused [it] to rain upon the earth, nor [was there any] man to till the ground; but mist ascended from the earth, and watered all the face of the ground. Then Jehovah God formed the man, dust from the ground, and blew into his nostrils the breath of life; so the man became a living creature.

But Jehovah God said, “[It is] not good [that] the man be alone; I will make for him a help as his counterpart.” Now Jehovah God had formed from the ground every living [thing] of the field, and every bird of the heavens; and he brought [each] towards the man to see what he would call it: so whatever the man called it [as] a living creature, that [was] its name; thus the man called names to every beast, and to the bird of the heavens, and to every living [thing] of the field: yet for man [there] was not found a help as his counterpart. Then Jehovah God caused a lethargy to fall upon the man, so he slept; and he took one of his ribs, but closed flesh instead of

it: and Jehovah God built the rib which he took from the man for a woman, and brought her towards the man. Thereupon the man said, “This now [is] bone from my bones, and flesh from my flesh; this [being] shall be called Woman [*ishah*, *vira*], because from man [*ish*, *vir*] this [person] was taken: therefore will a man leave his father and his mother, and cling to his wife; and they shall become one flesh.” Now they were both of them naked, the man and his wife: yet they were not mutually ashamed [of their condition].

(b.) it is the generic name of the human race as originally created, and afterwards, like the English word man, person, whether man or woman, equivalent to the Latin *homo* and Greek ἄνθρωπος (^{<0026>}Genesis 1:26, 27; 5:2; 8:21; ^{<0026>}Deuteronomy 8:3; ^{<0026>}Matthew 5:13, 16; ^{<0026>}1 Corinthians 7:26), and even without regard to age (^{<0026>}John 16:21). It is applied to women only, “the *human* persons or women” (^{<0026>}Numbers 31:35), Sept. Ψυχαὶ ἀνθρώπων ἀπὸ τῶν γυναικῶν. Thus ἡ ἄνθρωπος means a woman (Herod. 1:60), and especially among the orators — (comp. Maccabees 2:28).

(c.) It denotes man in opposition to woman (^{<0026>}Genesis 3:12; ^{<0026>}Matthew 19:10), though more properly, the husband in opposition to the wife (compare ^{<0026>}1 Corinthians 7:1).

(d.) It is used, though very rarely, for those who maintain the dignity of human nature, a *man*, as we say, meaning one that deserves the name, like the Latin *vir* and Greek ἀνὴρ: “One man in a thousand have I found, but a woman,” etc. (^{<0026>}Ecclesiastes 7:28). Perhaps the word here glances at the original uprightness of man.

(e.) It is frequently used to denote the more degenerate and wicked portion of mankind: an instance of which occurs very early, “The sons (or worshippers) of God married the daughters of men (or the irreligious)” (^{<0026>}Genesis 6:2). We request a careful examination of the following passages with their respective contexts: ^{<0026>}Psalms 11:4; 12:1, 2, 8; 14:2, etc. The latter passage is often adduced to prove the *total* depravity of the *whole human race*, whereas it applies only to the more abandoned Jews, or possibly to the more wicked Gentile adversaries of Israel. It is a description of “the fool,” or wicked man (ver. 1), and of persons of the same class (ver. 1,2), “the workers of iniquity, who eat up God’s people like breads and called not upon the name of the Lord” (ver. 4). For the true view of Paul’s quotations from this psalm (^{<0026>}Romans 3:10), see M’Knight, *adiloc.*; and observe the use of the word “man” in ^{<0026>}Luke 5:20;

Matthew 10:17. It is applied to the Gentiles (Matthew 27:22; comp. Mark 10:33, and Mark 9:31; Luke 18:32; see Mountenev, *ad Demosth.* *Philippians* 1:221). (*J.*) The word is used to denote other men, in opposition to those already named, as “both upon Israel and other men” (Jeremiah 32:20), i.e. the Egyptians. “Like other men” (Psalm 73:5), i.e. common men, in opposition to better men (Psalm 82:7); men of inferior rank, as opposed to *vyaan* men of higher rank (see Hebrew, Isaiah 2:9; 5:15; Psalm 49:3; 62:10; Proverbs 8:4). The phrase “son of man,” in the Old Testament, denotes man as frail and unworthy (Numbers 23:19; Job 25:6; Ezekiel 2:1, 3); as applied to the prophet, so often, it has the force of “mortal!”

2. *vyaash*, is a man in the distinguished sense, like the Latin *vir* and Greek *ἀνὴρ*. It is used in all the several senses of the Latin *vir*, and denotes a man as distinguished from a woman (1 Samuel 17:33; Matthew 14:21); as a husband (Genesis 3:16; Hosea 2:16); and in reference to excellent mental qualities. A beautiful instance of the latter class occurs in Jeremiah 5:1: “Run ye to and fro through the streets of Jerusalem, and see now, and know, and seek in the broad places thereof, if ye can find a man, if there be any that executeth judgment, that seeketh the truth; and I will pardon it.” This reminds the reader of the philosopher who went through the streets of Athens with a lighted lamp in his hand, and being asked what he sought, said, “I am seeking to find a man” (see Herodot. 2:120; Homer, *II.* 5. 529). It is also used to designate the superior classes (Proverbs 8:4; Psalm 141:4, etc.), a courtier (Jeremiah 38:7), the male of animals (Genesis 7:2). Sometimes it means men in general (Exodus 16:29; Mark 6:44).

3. *vʷnē*, *enosh*’, mortals, *βροτοί*, as transient, perishable, liable to sickness, etc.: “Let not man [margin, ‘mortal man’] prevail against thee” (2 Chronicles 14:11). “Write with the pen of the common man” (Isaiah 8:1), i.e. in a common, legible character (Job 15:14; Psalm 8:5; 9:19, 20; Isaiah 51:7; Psalm 103:15). It is applied to women (Joshua 8:25).

4. *rbš*, *ge’ber*, *vir*, man, in regard to strength, etc. All etymologists concur in deriving the English word “man” from the superior powers and faculties with which *rman* is endowed above all earthly creatures; so the Latin *vir*, from *vis*, *vires*; and such is the idea conveyed by the present Hebrew word.

It is applied to man as distinguished from woman: “A man shall not put on a woman’s garment” (^{<4621B>}Deuteronomy 22:5), like **ἄνθρωπος** in ^{<408D>}Matthew 8:9; ^{<4006>}John 1:6; to men as distinguished from children (^{<0127>}Exodus 12:37); to a male child, in opposition to a female (^{<183B>}Job 3:3; Sept. **ἄρσεν**). It is much used in poetry: “Happy is the man” (^{<184D>}Psalms 34:9; 40:5; 52:9; 94:12). Sometimes it denotes the species at large (^{<18047>}Job 4:17; 14:10, 14). For a complete exemplification of these words, see the lexicons of Gesenius and Schleusner, etc.

5. μυτῶ *methim*, “men,” always masculine. The singular is to be traced in the antediluvian proper names Methusael and Methuselah. Perhaps it may be derived from the root *mith*, “he died,” in which case its use would be very appropriate in ^{<23414>}Isaiah 41:14, “Fear not, thou worm Jacob, ye men of Israel.” If this conjecture be admitted, this word would correspond to **βροτός**, and might be rendered “mortal.”

Other Heb. words occasionally rendered man in the A. V. are **אב** [*Bēbdal*, a master (husband), **נפש**, *nephesh*, an animate being, etc. The Greek words properly thus rendered are **ἄνθρωπος**, *homo*, a human being, and **ἀνὴρ**, *vir*, a man as distinguished from a woman.

Some peculiar uses of the word in the New Testament remain to be noticed. “The Son of Man,” applied to our Lord only by himself and St. Stephen (^{<4076>}Acts 7:56), is the Messiah in human form. Schleusner thinks that the word in this expression always means woman, and denotes that he was the promised Messiah, born of a virgin, who had taken upon him our nature to fulfill the great decree of Goci, that mankind should be saved by one in their own form. **ὁ παλαιός**, “the old man,” and **ὁ καινός**, “the new man”—the former denoting unsanctified disposition of heart, the latter the new disposition created and cherished by the Gospel; **ὁ ἔσω ἄνθρωπος** “the inner man;” **ὁ κρυπτός τῆς καρδίας ἄνθρωπος**, “the hidden man of the heart,” as opposed to the **ὁ ἔξω ἄνθρωπος**, “the external, visible man.” “A man of God,” first applied to Moses (^{<1830>}Deuteronomy 33:1), and always afterwards to a person acting under a divine commission (^{<1130>}1 Kings 13:1; ^{<508E>}1 Timothy 6:2, etc.). Finally, angels are styled men (^{<4010>}Acts 1:10). “To speak after the manner of men,” i.e. in accordance with human views, to illustrate by human examples or institutions, to use a popular mode of speaking (^{<5815>}Romans 3:5; ^{<4018>}1 Corinthians 9:8; ^{<8015>}Galatians 3:15). “The number of a man,” i.e. an ordinary number, such as is in general use among men (^{<6318>}Revelation

13:18); so also “the measure of a man,” all ordinary measure, in common use (^{<6217>}Revelation 21:17).

Man Of Sin

(ὁ ἄνθρωπος τῆς ἀμαρτίας), an impersonation of the sinful principle spoken of by the apostle Paul in an emphatic manner (^{<5113>}2 Thessalonians 2:3). The context (ver. 3, 4) gives the following attributes or synonymous titles:

- (1.) *apostasy* (ἡ ἀποστασία, “a [rather *the*] falling away”), which precedes (πρῶτον) the appearance (ἀπακαλυφθῆ);
- (2.) *son of perdition* (ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀπωλείας, i.e. one sprung from the fall (compare “that wicked”), and doomed to its penalty (comp. ver. 8);
- (3.) a *persecutor* (ὁ ἀντικείμενος), especially of God’s cause and government;
- (4.) a *blasphemer* (ὑπεραιρόμενος, etc.), i.e. one arrogating divine honors, and claiming to work miracles (verse 9,10). This is evidently an assemblage of the most striking characteristics of former Antichrists in Scripture, especially the “little horn” of Daniel. As that prophecy referred particularly to Antiochus Epiphanes, this passage must be understood as employing the conventional Scriptural language symbolically to indicate a then (and perhaps still) future effort on the part of some hostile power to overthrow Christianity, and induce its professors to renounce it. Such a peril is clearly intimated in several other passages of the N.T. (e.g. ^{<4112>}Mark 13:22; ^{<5111>}2 Timothy 3:1, 13; ^{<6113>}Revelation 20:8). But we are not to confine the prophecy to any one type of Antichrist; “in whomsoever these distinctive features are found — whoever wields temporal or spiritual power in any degree similar to that in which the Man of Sin is here described as wielding it—he, be he pope or potentate, is beyond all doubt a distinct type of Antichrist” (Ellicott, note, ad loc.). For a history of opinion on this passage, see Alford, *Gr. Test.* 3, proleg. p. 55 sq. **SEE ANTICHRIST.**

Man, Preadamite.

SEE PREADAMITES.

Man

SEE MANNA.

Man'ain

(**Μαννάην**, prob. i.q. MENAHEM; comp. **Μαννάημος**, Josephus, *Ant.* 9:11,1), a Christian teacher at Antioch, who had been educated with Herod Antipas (^{<4430>}Acts 13:1; see Kuinöl, ad loc.). A.D. 44. He was evidently a Jew, but nothing else is known of him beyond this passage, in which the epithet **σύντροφος** may mean either *playmate* (Herod was brought up, however, at Rome, Josephus, *Ant.* 17:1, 3) or *foster-brother*, as having the same nurse (see Walch, *Dissert. ad Act.* p. 234). Some identify him with the person above named by Josephus, others with a Menahem mentioned in the Talmud (see Lightfoot, *Harm. of N. Test.* ad loc.), but in either case on very slender grounds.

Managers

a committee of members appointed annually in many Presbyterian churches, entrusted with all merely secular affairs as to property and finance.