

THE AGES DIGITAL LIBRARY
REFERENCE

CYCLOPEDIA of BIBLICAL,
THEOLOGICAL and
ECCLESIASTICAL
LITERATURE

Manahath - Marriage, Heathen

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

Man'ahath

(Heb. *Mana'chath*, תַּיִן *im*; *rest*), the name of a man and of a place.

1. (Sept. **Μαναχάθ**.) The second named of the five sons of Shobal, the son of Seir the Horite (^{<0323>}Genesis 36:23; ^{<0340>}1 Chronicles 1:40). B.C. cir. 1927.

2. (Sept. **Μαναχαθί** v. r. **Μαχαναθί**.) A town or region to which certain descendants of Ehud, of the tribe of Benjamin, appear to have been exiled from Geba by an act of his father Bela (^{<0386>}1 Chronicles 8:6). The context would seem to indicate some locality in the land of Moab. **SEE SHAHARAIM**. Some refer it to the MENCHAH of Judah (^{<0708>}Judges 9:43, A. Vers. "with ease;" comp. ^{<0322>}1 Chronicles 2:52, 54), but with little probability. **SEE MENCHITE**.

Man'ahethite

(^{<0322>}1 Chronicles 2:52). **SEE HATSI-HAMMENCHOTH**.

Manasse'as

(**Μανασσίας** v. r. **Μανασσίας**, *Vulg. Manasses*), given (1 Esdras 9:31) in place of the MANASSEH **SEE MANASSEH** (q.v.), 4, of the Hebrew list (^{<0500>}Ezra 10:30).

Manas'seh

(Heb. *Menahssheh'*, מְנַחֵשׁ *who makes to forget*; see ^{<0451>}Genesis 41:51; Sept., Josephus, and N.T. **Μανασσῆς**; "Manasses" in ^{<0110>}Matthew 1:10; ^{<0106>}Revelation 7:6), the name of four men and of a tribe descended from one of them; also of another man mentioned by Josephus.

1. The elder of the two sons of Joseph, born in Egypt (^{<0451>}Genesis 41:51; 46:20) of Asenath, the priest's daughter of Heliopolis. B.C. 1882. He was afterwards, together with his brother, adopted by Jacob as his own (^{<0481>}Genesis 48:1), by which act each became the head of a tribe in Israel. B.C. 1856. **SEE JACOB**. The act of adoption was, however, accompanied by a clear intimation from Jacob that the descendants of Manasseh, although the elder, would be far less numerous and powerful than those of the younger Ephraim. The result corresponded remarkably with this intimation. **SEE EPHRAIM**. He married a Syrian concubine, by whom he

had several children (^{<1374>}1 Chronicles 7:14). *SEE MACHIR*. The only thing subsequently recorded of him personally is that his grandchildren were “brought up on Joseph’s knees” (^{<0023>}Genesis 1:23). “The ancient Jewish traditions are, however, less reticent. According to them Manasseh was the steward of Joseph’s house, and the interpreter who intervened between Joseph and his brethren at their interview; and the extraordinary strength which he displayed in the struggle with and binding of Simeon first caused Judah to suspect that the apparent Egyptians were really his own flesh and blood (see Targums Jerusalem and Pseudojon. on ^{<0423>}Genesis 42:23; 43:15; also the quotations in Weil’s *Bibl. Legends*, p. 88, note).’

Manasseh, Tribe Of

— On the prophetic benediction of Jacob, above referred to, although Manasseh, as the representative of his future lineage, had, like his grand-uncle Esau, lost his birthright in favor of his younger brother, he received, as Esau had, a blessing only inferior to the birthright itself. Like his brother, he was to increase with the fertility of the fish which swarmed in the great Egyptian stream, to “become a people, and also to be great” — the “thousands of Manasseh,” no less than those of Ephraim, indeed more, were to become a proverb in the nation; his name, no less than that of Ephraim, was to be the symbol and the expression of the richest blessings for his kindred.

The position of the tribe of Manasseh during the march to Canaan was with Ephraim and Benjamin on the west side of the sacred tent. The standard of the three sons of Rachel was the figure of a boy, with the inscription “The cloud of Jehovah rested on them until they went forth out of the camp” (Targ. Pseudojon. on ^{<0428>}Numbers 2:18). The chief of the tribe at the time of the census at Sinai was Gamaliel ben-Pedahzur, and its numbers were then 32,200 (^{<0010>}Numbers 1:10, 35; 2:20, 21; 7:54-59). The numbers of Ephraim were at the same date 40,500. Forty years later, on the banks of the Jordan, these proportions were reversed. Manasseh had then increased to 52,700, while Ephraim had diminished to 32,500 (^{<0254>}Numbers 26:34, 37). On this occasion it is remarkable that Manasseh resumes his position in the catalogue as the eldest son of Joseph. Possibly this is due to the prowess which the tribe had shown in the conquest of Gilead, for Manasseh was certainly at this time the most distinguished of all the tribes. Of the three who had elected to remain on that side of the Jordan, Reuben and Gad had chosen their lot because the country was suitable to their

pastoral possessions and tendencies. But Machir, Jair, and Nobah, the sons of Manasseh, were no shepherds. They were pure warriors, who had taken the most prominent part in the conquest of those provinces which up to that time had been conquered, and whose deeds are constantly referred to (^{<RB29>}Numbers 32:39; ^{<RB13>}Deuteronomy 3:13, 14, 15) with credit and renown. “Jair, the son of Manasseh, took all the tract of Argob... sixty great cities” (^{<RB14>}Deuteronomy 3:14, 4). “Nobah took Kenath and the daughter-towns thereof. and called it after his own name” (^{<RB2>}Numbers 32:42). “Because Machir was a man of war, therefore he had Gilead and Bashan” (^{<RB7>}Joshua 17:1). The district which these ancient warriors conquered was among the most difficult, if not the most difficult, in the whole country. It embraced the hills of Gilead, with their inaccessible heights and impassable ravines, and the almost impregnable tract of Argob, which derives its modern name of Lejah from the secure “asylum” it affords to those who take refuge within its natural fortifications. Had they not remained in these wild and inaccessible districts, but gone forward and taken their lot with the rest, who shall say what changes might not have occurred in the history of the nation, through the presence of such energetic and warlike spirits? The few personages of eminence whom we can with certainty identify as Manassites, such as Gideon and Jephthah-for Elijah and others may with equal probability have belonged to the neighboring tribe of Gad — were among the most remarkable characters that Israel produced. Gideon was, in fact, “the greatest of the judges, and his children all but established hereditary monarchy in their own line” (Stanley, *S. and P.* p. 230). But, with the one exception of Gideon, the warlike tendencies of Manasseh seem to have been confined to the east of the Jordan. There they throve exceedingly, pushing their way northward over the rich plains of Jaulan and Jedur — the Gaulanitis and Ituraea of the Roman period — to the foot of Mount Hermon (^{<RB3>}1 Chronicles 5:23). At the time of the coronation of David at Hebron, while the western Manasseh sent 18,000, and Ephraim itself 20,800, the eastern Manasseh, with Gad and Reuben, mustered to the number of 120,000, thoroughly armed — a remarkable demonstration of strength, still more remarkable when we remember the fact that Saul’s house, with the great Abner at its head, was then residing at Mahanaim, on the border of Manasseh and Gad. But, though thus outwardly prosperous, a similar fate awaited them in the end to that which befell Gad and Reuben; they gradually assimilated themselves to the old inhabitants of the country — they “transgressed against the God of their fathers, and went a-whoring after the gods of the people of the land

whom God destroyed before them” (ver. 25). They relinquished, too, the settled mode of life and the definite limits which befitted the members of a federal nation, and gradually became Bedouins of the wilderness, spreading themselves over the vast deserts which lay between the allotted possessions of their tribe and the Euphrates, and which had from time immemorial been the hunting-grounds and pastures of the wild Hagarites, of Jetur, Nephish, and Nodab (^{<1359>}1 Chronicles 5:19, 22). On them first descended the punishment which was ordained to be the inevitable consequence of such misdoing. They, first of all Israel, were carried away by Pul and Tiglath-Pileser, and settled in the Assyrian territories (ver. 26). The connection, however, between east and west had been kept up to a certain degree. In Bethshean, the most easterly city of the cis-Jordanic Manasseh, the two portions all but joined. David had judges or officers there for all matters sacred and secular (^{<1362>}1 Chronicles 26:32); and Solomon’s commissariat officer, Ben-Geber, ruled over the towns of Jair and the whole district of Argob (^{<1043>}1 Kings 4:13), and transmitted their productions, doubtless not without their people, to the court of Jerusalem.

Picture for Manasseh 1

The genealogies of the tribe are preserved in ^{<0458>}Numbers 26:28-34; ^{<0670>}Joshua 17:1, etc.; and ^{<1374>}1 Chronicles 7:14-19. But it seems impossible to unravel these so as to ascertain, for instance, which of the families remained east of Jordan, and which advanced to the west. From the fact that Abi-ezer (the family of Gideon), Hephher (possibly Ophrah, the native place of the same hero), and Shechem (the well-known city of the Bene-Joseph) all occur among the names of the sons of Gilead, the son of Machir, it seems probable that Gilead, whose name is so intimately connected with the eastern, was also the immediate progenitor of the western half of the tribe.

Nor is it less difficult to fix the exact position of the territory allotted to the western half. In ^{<0574>}Joshua 17:14-18, a passage usually regarded by critics as an exceedingly ancient document, we find the two tribes of Joseph complaining that only one portion had been allotted to them, viz. Mount Ephraim (ver. 15), and that they could not extend into the plains of Jordan or Esdraelon, because those districts were still in the possession of the Canaanites, and scoured by their chariots. In reply Joshua advises them to go up into the forest (ver. 15, A.V. “wood”) into the mountain which is a forest (ver. 18). This mountain clothed with forest can surely be nothing

but the various spurs and off-shoots of Carmel, the “mountain” closely adjoining the portion of Ephraim whose richness of wood was so proverbial. It is in accordance with this view that the majority of the towns of Manasseh—which, as the weaker portion of the tribe, would naturally be pushed to seek its fortunes outside the limits originally bestowed—were actually on the slopes either of Carmel itself or of the contiguous ranges. Thus Taanach and Megiddo were on the northern spurs of Carmel; Ibleam appears to have been on the eastern continuation of the range, somewhere near the present Jenin. En-Dor was on the slopes of the so-called “Little Hermon.” The two remaining towns mentioned as belonging to Manasseh formed the extreme eastern and western limits of the tribe; the one, Bethshean (^{<0671>}Joshua 17:11), was in the hollow of the Ghôr, or Jordan Valley; the other, Dor (*ibid.*), was on the coast of the Mediterranean, sheltered behind the range of Carmel, and immediately opposite the bluff or shoulder which forms its highest point. The whole of these cities are specially mentioned as standing in the allotments of other tribes, though inhabited by Manasseh; and this, with the absence of any attempt to define a limit to the possessions of the tribe on the north, looks as if no boundary-line had existed on that side, but as if the territory faded off gradually into those of the two contiguous tribes from whom it had borrowed its fairest cities. On the south side the boundary between Manasseh and Ephraim is more definitely described, and may generally be traced with tolerable certainty. Their joint possessions were bounded by the territory of Asher on the north and Issachar on the north-east (^{<0671>}Joshua 17:10), but the division line between the two kindred tribes is defined by a place called Asher (*ver.* 7), now Yasir, twelve miles north-east of Nablis. Thence it ran to Michmethah, described as facing Shechem (Nablis); then went to the right, i.e. southward, to the spring of Tappuah, and so doubtless to the Jordan. In the opposite direction it fell in with the watercourses of the torrent Kanah—probably the Nahr Falaik — along which it ran to the Mediterranean. See **TRIBE**.

Picture for Manasseh 2

From the indications of the history, it would appear that Manasseh took very little part in public affairs. They either left all that to Ephraim, or were so far removed from the center of the nation as to have little interest in what was taking place. That they attended David’s coronation at Hebron has already been mentioned. When his rule was established over all Israel, each half had its distinct ruler — the western, Joel ben-Pedaiah; the

eastern, Iddo ben-Zechariah (^{<1370>}1 Chronicles 27:20, 21). From this time the eastern Manasseh fades entirely from our view, and the western is hardly kept before us by an occasional mention. Such scattered notices as we do find have almost all reference to the part taken by members of the tribe in the reforms of the good kings of Judah — the Jehovah-revival under Asa (^{<4450>}2 Chronicles 15:9)-the Passover of Hezekiah (^{<4400>}2 Chronicles 30:1, 10, 11, 18), and the subsequent enthusiasm against idolatry (^{<4300>}2 Chronicles 31:1) — the iconoclasm of Josiah (^{<4305>}2 Chronicles 34:6), and his restoration of the buildings of the Temple (ver. 9). It is gratifying to reflect that these notices, faint and scattered as they are, are all colored with goods and exhibit none of the repulsive traits of that most repulsive heathenism into which other tribes of Israel fell.

A positive connection between Manasseh and Benjamin is implied in the genealogies of 1 Chronicles 7, where Machir is said to have married into the family of Huppim and Shuppim, chief houses in the latter tribe (ver. 15). No record of any such relation appears anywhere else.

The following are all the Biblical localities in both sections of the tribe, with their preserved modern representatives:

Picture for Manasseh 3

II. According to the usual reading of the text in ^{<0783>}Judges 18:30, Manasseh was the father of Gershom who is named as the father of Jonathan that acted as priest to the Danites at Laish; but besides that this would not make him a Levite, and, in addition to the fact that Gershom is a Levitical name, the reading is marked as suspicious (**hCḥim**] Sept. **Μανασση**), and should doubtless be corrected to “Moses,” as in the Vulg. and many copies of the Sept. *SEE JONATHAN.*

III. The fourteenth separate king of Judah, son and successor of Hezekiah, who began to reign at the early age of twelve years, and reigned fifty-five years. B.C. 697-642. For the synchronisms with profane history especially, of Assyria, Babylon, and Egypt, *SEE CHRONOLOGY.* The reign of this monarch is the larger than that of any other of the house of David. There is none of which we know less. In part, it may be, this was the direct result of the character and policy of the man. In part, doubtless, it is to be traced to the abhorrence with which the following generation looked back upon it as the period of lowest degradation to which their

country had ever fallen. Chroniclers and prophets pass it over, gathering from its horrors and disasters the great, broad lessons in which they saw the foot-prints of a righteous retribution, the tokens of a divine compassion, and then they avert their eyes and will see and say no more. This is in itself significant. It gives a meaning and a value to every fact which has escaped the sentence of oblivion. The very reticence of the historians of the O.T. shows how free they were from the rhetorical exaggerations and inaccuracies of a later age. The struggle of opposing worships must have been as fierce under Manasseh as it was under Antiochus, or Decius, or Diocletian, or Mary. Men must have suffered and died in that struggle of whom the world was not worthy, and yet no contrast can be greater than that between the short notices in Kings and Chronicles, and the martyrologies which belong to those other periods of persecution.

1. The birth of Manasseh is fixed (B.C. 709) twelve years before the death of Hezekiah (^{<1200>}2 Kings 21:1). We must, therefore, infer either that there had been no heir to the throne up to that comparatively late period in his reign, or that any that had been born had died, or that, as sometimes happened in the succession of Jewish and other Eastern kings, the elder son was passed over for the younger. There are reasons which make the former the more probable alternative. The exceeding bitterness of Hezekiah's sorrow at the threatened approach of death (^{<1200>}2 Kings 20:2, 3; ^{<4924>}2 Chronicles 32:24; ^{<2300>}Isaiah 38:1-3), is more natural if we think of him as sinking under the thought that he was dying childless, leaving no heir to his work and to his kingdom. When, a little later, Isaiah warns him of the captivity and shame which will fall on his children, he speaks of those children as yet future (^{<1208>}2 Kings 20:18). This circumstance will explain one or two facts in the contemporary history. Hezekiah, it would seem, recovering from his sickness, anxious to avoid the danger that had threatened him, of leaving his kingdom without an heir, married, at or about this time, Hephzibah (^{<1200>}2 Kings 21:1), the daughter of one of the citizens or princes of Jerusalem (Joseph. *Ant.* 10:3, 1). The prophets, we may well imagine, would welcome the prospect of a successor named by a king who had been so true and faithful. Isaiah (in a passage clearly belonging to a later date than the early portions of the book, and apparently suggested by some conspicuous marriage), with his characteristic fondness for tracing auguries in names, finds in that of the new queen a prophecy of the ultimate restoration of Israel and the glories

of Jerusalem (~~2304~~Isaiah 62:4, 5; compare Blunt, *Scriptural Coincid.* part 3:5). The city, also, should be a Hephzibah, a delightful one. As the bridegroom rejoiceth over the bride, so would Jehovah rejoice over his people. **SEE HEPHZIBAH.** The child that is born from this union is called Manasseh. This name, too, is strangely significant. It appears nowhere else in the history of the kingdom of Judah. The only associations connected with it were that it belonged to the tribe which was all but the most powerful of the hostile kingdom of Israel. How are we to account for so singular and unlikely a choice? The answer is, that the name embodied what had been for years the cherished object of Hezekiah's policy and hope. To take advantage of the overthrow of the rival kingdom by Shalmaneser, and the anarchy in which its provinces had been left, to gather round him the remnant of the population, to bring them back to the worship and faith of their fathers, this had been the second step in his great national reformation (~~4406~~2 Chronicles 30:6). It was at least partially successful. "Divers of Asher, *Manasseh*, and Zebulun humbled themselves and came to Jerusalem." They were there at the great passover. The work of destroying idols went on in Ephraim and *Manasseh* as well as in Judah (~~4300~~2 Chronicles 31:1). What could be a more acceptable pledge of his desire to receive the fugitives as on the same footing with his own subjects than that he should give to the heir to his throne the name in which one of their tribes exulted? What could better show the desire to let all past discords and offenses be forgotten than the name which was itself an amnesty?

The last twelve years of Hezekiah's reign were not, however, it will be remembered, those which were likely to influence for good the character of his successor. His policy had succeeded. He had thrown off the yoke of the king of Assyria, which Ahaz had accepted, had defied his armies, had been delivered from extremest danger, and had made himself the head of an independent kingdom, receiving tribute from neighboring princes instead of paying it to the great king, the king of Assyria. But he goes a step further. Not content with independence, he enters on a policy of aggression. He contracts an alliance with the rebellious viceroy of Babylon against their common enemy (~~4202~~2 Kings 20:12; ~~2390~~Isaiah 39). He displays the treasures of his kingdom to the ambassadors, in the belief that this will show them how powerful an ally he can prove himself. Isaiah protested against this step, but the ambition of being a great potentate continued, and it was to

the results of this ambition that the boy Manasseh succeeded at the age of twelve.

2. The accession of the youthful king appears to have been the signal for an entire change, if not in the foreign policy, at any rate in the religious administration of the kingdom. At so early an age he can scarcely have been the spontaneous author of so great an alteration, and we may infer accordingly that it was the work of the idolatrous, or Ahaz party, which had been repressed during the reign of Hezekiah, but had all along, like the Rorish clergy under Edward VI in England, looked on the reform with a sullen acquiescence, and thwarted it when they dared. The change which the king's measures brought about was, after all, superficial. The idolatry which was publicly discountenanced was practiced privately (²³¹²⁹Isaiah 1:29; 2:20; 65:3). The priests and the prophets, in spite of their outward orthodoxy, were too often little better than licentious drunkards (²³⁸¹⁷Isaiah 28:7). The nobles of Judah kept the new moons and sabbaths much in the same way as those of France kept their Lents when Louis XIV had made devotion a court ceremonial (²³¹¹³Isaiah 1:13,14). There are signs that even among the king's highest officers of state there was one, Shebna the scribe (²³⁵¹⁰Isaiah 37:2), the treasurer (²²²¹⁵Isaiah 22:15) "over the house," whose policy was simply that of a selfish ambition, himself possibly a foreigner (comp. Blunt's *Script. Coinc.* 3:4), and whom Isaiah saw through and distrusted. It was, moreover, the traditional policy of "the princes of Judah" (compare one remarkable instance in the reign of Joash, ¹⁴²¹⁷2 Chronicles 24:17) to favor foreign alliances and the toleration of foreign worship, as it was that of the true priests and prophets to protest against it. It would seem, accordingly, as if they urged upon the young king that scheme of a close alliance with Babylon which Isaiah had condemned, and, as the natural consequence of this, the adoption, as far as possible, of its worship, and that of other nations whom it was desirable to conciliate. The morbid desire for widening the range of their knowledge and penetrating into the mysteries of other systems of belief may possibly have contributed now, as it had done in the days of Solomon, to increase the evil (²⁴¹²⁰Jeremiah 2:10-25; Ewald, *Gesch. Isr.* 3. 666). The result was a debasement which had not been equaled even in the reign of Ahaz, uniting in one center the abominations which elsewhere existed separately. Not content with sanctioning their presence in the Holy City, as Solomon and Rehoboam had done, Manasseh defiled with it the sanctuary itself (¹⁴³⁰⁴2 Chronicles 33:4). The worship thus introduced was, as has been said,

predominantly Babylonian in its character. “He observed times, and used enchantments, and used witchcraft, and dealt with a familiar spirit, and with wizards” (ver. 6). The worship of “the host of heaven,” which each man celebrated for himself on the roof of his own house, took the place of that of the Lord God of Sabaoth (^{<123D>}2 Kings 23:12; ^{<268B>}Isaiah 65:3, 11; ^{<300F>}Zephaniah 1:5; ^{<248D>}Jeremiah 8:2; 19:13; 22:29). With this, however, there was associated the old Molech worship of the Ammonites. The fires were rekindled in the valley of Ben-Hinnom. Tophet was (for the first time, apparently) built into a stately fabric (^{<124B>}2 Kings 16:3; ^{<238B>}Isaiah 30:33, as compared with ^{<247B>}Jeremiah 7:31; 19:5; Ewald, *Gesch. Isr.* 3:667). Even the king’s sons, instead of being presented to Jehovah, received a horrible fire-baptism dedicating them to Molech (^{<143B>}2 Chronicles 33:6), while others were actually slaughtered (^{<323B>}Ezekiel 23:37, 39). The Baal and Ashtaroth ritual, which had been imported under Solomon from the Phoenicians, was revived with fresh splendor, and, in the worship of the “queen of heaven,” fixed its roots deep into the habits of the people (^{<247B>}Jeremiah 7:18). Worse and more horrible than all, the Asherah, the image of Astarte, or the obscene symbol of a phallic worship (*SEE ASHEKAH*, and, in addition to the authorities there cited, Mayer, *De Reforme. Josiae*, etc., in the *Thes. Theo. philol.* Amstel. 1701) was seen in the house of which Jehovah had said that he would there put his name forever (^{<120F>}2 Kings 21:7). All this was accompanied by the extremest moral degradation. The worship of those old Eastern religions has been well described as a kind of “sensuous intoxication,” simply sensuous, and therefore associated inevitably with a fiendish cruelty, leading to the utter annihilation of the spiritual life of men (Hegel, *Philos. of History*, 1:3). So it was in Jerusalem in the days of Manasseh. Rival priests (the Chemarim of ^{<300F>}Zephaniah 1:4) were consecrated for this hideous worship. Women dedicating themselves to a *cultus* like that of the Babylonian Mylitta wove hangings for the Asherah as they sat there (Mayer, cap. 2, § 4). The Kadeshim, in closest neighborhood with them, gave themselves up to yet darker abominations (^{<122F>}2 Kings 23:7). The awful words in ^{<201D>}Isaiah 1:10 had a terrible truth in them. Those to whom he spoke were literally “rulers of Sodom and princes of Gomorrah.” Every faith was tolerated but the old faith of Israel. This was abandoned and proscribed. The altar of Jehovah was displaced (^{<143B>}2 Chronicles 33:16). The very ark of the covenant was removed from the sanctuary (^{<143B>}2 Chronicles 35:3). The sacred books of the people were so systematically destroyed that fifty years later men listened to the Book of the Law of Jehovah as a newly-discovered treasure

(^{<1218>}2 Kings 22:8). It may well be, according to a Jewish tradition, that this fanaticism of idolatry led Manasseh to order the name Jehovah to be erased from all documents and inscriptions (Patrick, ad loc.). All this involved also a systematic violation of the weekly sabbatic rest and the consequent loss of one witness against a merely animal life (^{<2361>}Isaiah 56:2; 58:13). The tide of corruption carried away some even of those who, as priests and prophets, should have been steadfast in resisting it (^{<3104>}Zephaniah 3:4; ^{<3426>}Jeremiah 2:26; 5:13; 6:13).

It is easy to imagine the bitter grief and burning indignation of those who continued faithful. The fiercest zeal of Huguenots in France, of Covenanters in Scotland, against the badges and symbols of the Latin Church, is perhaps but a faint shadow of that which grew to a white heat in the hearts of the worshippers of Jehovah. They spoke out in words of corresponding strength. Evil was coming on Jerusalem which should make the ears of men to tingle (^{<1212>}2 Kings 21:12). The line of Samaria and the plummet of the house of Ahab should be the doom of the Holy City. Like a vessel that had once been full of precious ointment (comp. the Sept. [ἄλαβάστρον](#)), but had afterwards become foul, Jerusalem should be emptied and wiped out, and exposed to the winds of Heaven till it was cleansed. Foremost, we may well believe, among those who thus bore their witness was the old prophet, now bent with the weight of fourscore years, who had in his earlier days protested with equal courage against the crimes of the king's grandfather. On him, too, according to the old Jewish tradition, came the first shock of the persecution. Enraged at the rebukes which the aged prophet doubtless administered, the king is said to have caused him to be sawn asunder with a wooden saw; this fate seems to be alluded to in ^{<5815>}Hebrews 11:37. *SEE ISAIAH*. Habakkuk may have shared his martyrdom (Keil on 2 Kings 21; but *SEE HABAKKUK*). But the persecution did not stop there. It attacked the whole order of the true prophets, and those who followed them. Every day witnessed an execution (Josephus, *Ant.* 10:3, 1). The slaughter was like that under Alva or Charles IX (^{<1216>}2 Kings 21:16). The martyrs who were faithful unto death had to endure not torture only, but the mocks and taunts of a godless generation (^{<2571>}Isaiah 57:1-4). Long afterwards the remembrance of that reign of terror lingered in the minds of men as a guilt for which nothing could atone (^{<1244>}2 Kings 24:4). The persecution, like most other persecutions carried on with entire singleness of purpose, was for a time successful (^{<3423>}Jeremiah 2:30). The prophets appear no more in the long history of

Manasseh's reign. The heart and the intellect of the nation were crushed out, and there would seem to have been no chroniclers left to record this portion of its history.

3. Retribution came soon in the natural sequence of events. There are indications that the neighboring nations — Philistines, Moabites, Ammonites — who had been tributary under Hezekiah, revolted at some period in the reign of Manasseh, and asserted their independence (~~301B~~Zephaniah 2:4-19; Jeremiah 47, 48, 49). The Babylonian alliance bore the fruits which had been predicted. Hezekiah had been too hasty in attaching himself to the cause of the rebel prince against Assyria. The rebellion of Merodach-Baladan was crushed, and then the wrath of the Assyrian king fell on those who had supported him. *SEE ESAR-HADDON*. According to others, during the constant war between Assyria and Egypt, Manasseh adhered to the policy of his father in making common cause with the latter power. One or the other of these causes, although not stated by the sacred historian, brought into Judaea an Assyrian army, under the general of Esar-haddon, and this time the invasion was more successful than that of Sennacherib. The city apparently was taken. The miserable king attempted flight, but was discovered in a thorn-brake in which he had hidden himself, was laden with chains, and sent away as a captive to Babylon, which was then subject to the Assyrians, where he was cast into prison. His name has been discovered on the Assyrian monuments (*Journ. of Sac. Lit.* April, 1859, p. 75). *SEE NINEVEH*. Here, at last, Manasseh had ample opportunity and leisure for cool reflection; and the hard lessons of adversity were not lost upon him. He saw and deplored the evils of his reign — he became as a new man — he humbly besought pardon from God, and implored that he might be enabled to evince the sincerity of his contrition by being restored to a position for undoing all that it had been the business of his life to effect. His prayer was heard. His captivity is supposed to have lasted a year, and he was then restored to his kingdom under certain obligations of tribute and allegiance to the king of Assyria, which, although not expressed in the account of this transaction, are alluded to in the history of his successors (~~431B~~2 Chronicles 33:11-13; comp. Maurice, *Prophets and Kings*, p. 362). *SEE MANASSEH, PRAYER OF*.

Two questions meet us at this point. (a) Have we satisfactory grounds for believing that this statement is historically true? (b) If we accept it, to what

period in the reign of Manasseh is it to be assigned? It has been urged in regard to

(a) that the silence of the writer of the books of Kings is conclusive against the trustworthiness of the narrative of 2 Chronicles. In the former there is no mention made of captivity or repentance or return. The latter, it has been said, yields to the temptation of pointing a moral, of making history appear more in harmony with his own notions of the divine government than it actually is. His anxiety to deal leniently with the successors of David leads him to invent at once a reformation and the captivity which is represented as its cause (Rosenmüller, *Bibl. Alterth.* 1:2, p. 131; Hitzig, *Begr. d. Kritik*, p. 130). It will be necessary in dealing with this objection to meet the skeptical critic on his own ground. To say that his reasoning contradicts our belief in the inspiration of the historical books of Scripture, and is destructive of all reverence for them, would involve a *petitio principii*, and, however strongly it may influence our feelings, we are bound to find another answer. It is believed that the answer is not far to seek.

(1) The silence of a writer who sums up the history of a reign of fifty-five years in nineteen verses as to one alleged event in it is surely a weak ground for refusing to accept that event on the authority of another historian.

(2) The omission is in part explained by the character of the narrative of 2 Kings 21. The writer deliberately turns away from the history of the days of shame, and not less from the personal biography of the king. He looks on the reign only as it contributed to the corruption and final overthrow of the kingdom, and no after repentance was able to undo the mischief that had been done at first.

(3) Still keeping on the level of human probabilities, the character of the writer of 2 Chronicles, obviously a Levite, and looking at the facts of the history from the Levitical point of view, would lead him to attach greater importance to a partial reinstatement of the old ritual and to the cessation of persecution, and so to give them in proportion a greater prominence.

(4) There is one peculiarity in the history which is, in some measure, of the nature of an undesigned coincidence, and so confirms it. The captains of the host of Assyria take Manasseh to Babylon. Would not a later writer, inventing the story, have made the Assyrian, and not the Babylonian,

capital the scene of the captivity; or, if the latter were chosen for the sake of harmony with the prophecy of (233901>Isaiah 39, have made the king of Babylon rather than of Assyria the captor? As it is, the narrative fits in, with the utmost accuracy, to the facts of Oriental history. The first attempt of Babylon to assert its independence of Nineveh failed. It was crushed by Esar-haddon (the first or second of that name; *SEE ESAR-HADDON*, and Ewald, *Gesch. Isr.* 3:675), and for a time the Assyrian king held his court at Babylon, so as to effect more completely the reduction of the rebellious province. There is

(5) the fact of agreement with the intervention of the Assyrian king in <1273>2 Kings 17:24, just at the same time. The king is not named there, but <1342>Ezra 4:2, 10, gives Asnapper, and this is probably only another form of Asardanapar, and this = Esar-haddon (compare Ewald, *Gesch.* 3:676; Tob. 1:21 gives Sarchedonus). The importation of tribes from Eastern Asia thus becomes part of the same policy as the attack on Judah. On the whole, then, the objection may well be dismissed as frivolous and vexatious. Like many other difficulties urged by the same school, it has in it something at once captious and puerile. Those who lay undue stress on them act in the spirit of a clever boy asking puzzling questions, or a sharp advocate getting up a case against the evidence on the other side, rather than in that of critics who have learned how to construct a history and to value its materials rightly (comp. Keil, *Comment.* on <1210>2 Kings 21). Ewald, a critic of a nobler stamp, whose fault is rather that of fantastic reconstruction than needless skepticism (*Gesch. Isr.* 3:678), admits the groundwork of truth. Would the prophecy of Isaiah, it may be asked, have been recorded and preserved if it had not been fulfilled? Might not Manasseh's release have been, as Ewald suggests, the direct consequence of the death of Esar-haddon? Indeed, all the soberer German critics accept it as truth, and place Manasseh's captivity under Esar-haddon (Bertheau, *ad loc.*). Bertheau suggests that some support to the account may perhaps be found in <1217>2 Kings 20:17 sq. For other discussions of the alleged improbabilities of the Biblical narrative, see Dahlers, *Defide Chronic. hist.* p. 139, Gramberg, *Chron.* p. 199, 210; *Religionsid.* 2:234; Rosenmüller, *Alterth.* I, 2:131; Keil, *Apoloq. der Chronik.* p. 425; Havernick, *Einleit.* II, 1:221; *Stud. u Krit.* 1860, vol. 3.

(b.) The circumstance just noticed enables us to return an approximate answer to the other question. The duration of Esar-haddon's Babylonian reign is calculated as being in B.C. 680-667; and Manasseh's captivity must

therefore have fallen within those limits. A Jewish tradition (*Seder Olam Rabba*, c. 24) fixes the twenty-second year of his reign as the exact date.

4. The period that followed is dwelt upon by the writer of 2 Chronicles as one of a great change for the better. The discipline of exile made the king feel that the gods whom he had chosen were powerless to deliver, and he turned in his heart to Jehovah, the God of his fathers. The compassion or death of Esar-haddon led to his release, and he returned after some uncertain interval of time to Jerusalem. It is not improbable that his absence from that city had given a breathing time to the oppressed adherents of the ancient creed, and possibly had brought into prominence, as the provisional ruler and defender of the city, one of the chief members of the party. If the prophecy of ^{<2215>}Isaiah 22:15 received, as it probably did, its fulfillment in Shebna's sharing the captivity of his master, there is nothing extravagant in the belief that we may refer to the same period the noble words which speak of Eliakim, the son of Hilkiah, as taking the place which Shebna should leave vacant, and rising up to be "a father unto the inhabitants of Jerusalem and to the house of Judah," having "the key of the house of David on his shoulder."

The return of Manasseh was at any rate followed by a new policy. The old faith of Israel was no longer persecuted. Foreign idolatries were no longer thrust, in all their foulness, into the sanctuary itself. The altar of the Lord was again restored, and peace-offerings and thank-offerings sacrificed to Jehovah (^{<4315>}2 Chronicles 33:15, 16). But beyond this the reformation did not go. The ark was not restored to its place. The book of the law of Jehovah remained in its concealment. Satisfied with the feeling that they were no longer worshipping the gods of other nations by name, they went on with a mode of worship essentially idolatrous. "The people did sacrifice still in the high places, but to Jehovah their God only" (ibid. ver. 17).

5. The other facts known of Manasseh's reign connect themselves with the state of the world round him. The Assyrian monarchy was tottering to its fall, and the king of Judah seems to have thought that it was still possible for him to rule as the head of a strong and independent kingdom. If he had to content himself with a smaller territory, he might yet guard its capital against attack by a new wall defending what had been before its weak side (comp. ^{<3110>}Zephaniah 1:10), "to the entering in of the fish-gate," and completing the tower of Ophel, which had been begun with a like purpose by Jotham (^{<4273>}2 Chronicles 27:3). Nor were the preparations for defense

limited to Jerusalem. “He put captains of war into all the fenced cities of Judah.” There was, it must be remembered, a special reason for this attitude, over and above that afforded by the condition of Assyria. Egypt had emerged from the chaos of the Dodecarchy and the Ethiopian intruders, and again become strong and aggressive under Psammitichus. Pushing his arms northwards, he attacked the Philistines, and the twenty-nine years’ siege of Azotus must have fallen wholly or in part within the reign of Manasseh. So far his progress would not be unacceptable. It would be pleasant to see the old hereditary enemies of Israel, who had lately grown insolent and defiant, meet with their masters. About this time, accordingly, we find the thought of an Egyptian alliance again beginning to gain favor. The prophets, and those who were guided by them, dreaded this more than anything, and entered their protest against it. Not the less, however, from this time forth, did it continue to be the favorite idea which took possession of the minds of the lay-party of the princes of Judah. The very name of Manasseh’s son, Amon, barely admitting a possible Hebrew explanation, but identical in form and sound with that of the great sungod of Egypt (so Ewald, *Gesch.* 3:665), is probably an indication of the gladness with which the alliance of Psammitichus was welcomed. As one of its consequences, it probably involved the supply of troops from Judah to serve in the armies of the Egyptian king. Without adopting Ewald’s hypothesis that this is referred to in ^{<1528>}Deuteronomy 28:68, it is yet likely enough in itself, and ^{<2424>}Jeremiah 2:14-16 seems to allude to some such state of things. In return for this, Manasseh, we may believe, received the help of the chariots and horses for which Egypt was always famous (^{<2300>}Isaiah 31:1). (Comp. Aristeas, *Epist. ad Philocr.* in Havercamp’s *Josephus*, 2:104). If this was the close of Manasseh’s reign, we can well understand how to the writer of the books of Kings it would seem hardly better than the beginning, leaving the root-evil uncured, preparing the way for worse evils than itself. We can understand how it was that on his death he was buried as Ahaz had been, not with the burial of a king, in the sepulchers of the house of David, but in the garden of Uzza (^{<1226>}2 Kings 21:26), and that, long afterwards, in spite of his repentance, the Jews held his name in abhorrence, as one of the three kings (the other two are Jeroboam and Ahab) who had no part in eternal life (*Sanhedr.* 11:1, quoted by Patrick on ^{<4693>}2 Chronicles 33:13).

Indeed, the evil was irreparable. The habits of a sensuous and debased worship had eaten into the life of the people; and though they might be

repressed for a time by force, as in the reformation of Josiah, they burst out again, when the pressure was removed, with fresh violence, and rendered even the zeal of the best of the Jewish kings fruitful chiefly in hypocrisy and unreality. The intellectual life of the people suffered in the same degree. The persecution cut off all who, trained in the schools of the prophets, were the thinkers and teachers of the people. The reign of Manasseh witnessed the close of the work of Isaiah and Habakkuk at its beginning, and the youth of Jeremiah and Zephaniah at its conclusion, but no prophetic writings illumine that dreary half-century of debasement. The most fearful symptom of all, when a prophet's voice was again heard during the minority of Josiah, was the atheism which, then as in other ages, followed on the confused adoption of a confluent polytheism (^{<3012>}Zephaniah 1:12). It is surely a strained, almost a fantastic hypothesis, to assign (as Ewald does) to such a period two such noble works as Deuteronomy and the book of Job. Nor was this dying out of a true faith the only evil. The systematic persecution of the worshippers of Jehovah accustomed the people to the horrors of a religious war; and when they in their turn gained the ascendancy, they used the opportunity with a fiercer sternness than had been known before. Jehoshaphat and Hezekiah in their reforms had been content with restoring the true worship and destroying the instruments of the false. In that of Josiah, the destruction extends to the priests of the high places, whom he sacrifices on their own altars (^{<1231>}2 Kings 23:20).

6. But little is added by later tradition to the O.T. narrative of Manasseh's reign. The prayer that bears his name among the apocryphal books can hardly, in the absence of any Hebrew original, be considered as identical with that referred to in ^{<4531>}2 Chronicles 33, and is probably rather the result of an attempt to work out the hint there supplied than the reproduction of an older document. There are reasons, however, for believing that there existed at some time or other a fuller history, more or less legendary, of Manasseh and his conversion, from which the prayer may possibly have been an *except*, preserved for devotional purposes (it appears for the first time in the Apostolical Constitutions) when the rest was rejected as worthless. Scattered here and there, we find the *disjecta membra* of such a work. Among the offenses of Manasseh, the most prominent is that he places in the sanctuary an ἄγαλμα τετραπρόσωπον of Zeus (Suidas, s.v. Μανασσῆς; Georg. Syncellus, *Chonograph.* 1:404). The charge on which he condemns Isaiah to death is that of blasphemy, the words "I saw the

Lord” (^{<2301>}Isaiah 6:1) being treated as a presumptuous boast at variance with ^{<2330>}Exodus 33:20 (Nic. de Lyra, from a Jewish treatise: *Jebamoth*, quoted by Amama, in *Crit. Sacri* on 2 Kings 21). Isaiah is miraculously rescued. A cedar opens to receive him. Then comes the order that the cedar should be sawn through (*ibid.*). That which made this sin the greater was that the king’s mother, Hephzibah, was the daughter of Isaiah. When Manasseh was taken captive by Merodach and taken to Babylon (Suidas), he was thrown into prison and fed daily with a scanty allowance of bran-bread and water mixed with vinegar. Then came his condemnation. He was encased in a brazen image (the description suggests a punishment like that of the bull of Perillus), but he repented and prayed, and the image clave asunder, and he escaped (Suidas and Georg. Syncellus). “And the Lord heard the voice of Manasses and pitied him,” the legend continues, “and there came around him a flame of fire, and all the irons about him (τὰ περιῖ αὐτὸν σιδηρᾶ) were melted, and the Lord delivered him out of his affliction” (*Const. Apost.* 2:22; compare Jul. Afric. ap. Routh, *Rel. Sac.* 2:288). Then he returned to Jerusalem and lived righteously and justly.

IV. An Israelite of the descendants (or residents) of Pahath-moab, who repudiated his foreign wife after the exile (^{<1500>}Ezra 10:30). B.C. 459.

V. Another Israelite of Hashun who did the same (^{<1503>}Ezra 10:33). B.C. 459.

Manasseh, Ben-Joseph Ben-Israel

one of the most distinguished Jewish theologians of the 17th century, was born at Lisbon, Portugal, in 1604, at a time when the Iberian peninsula was a place of torture for all non-Roman Catholic believers, but more particularly the Jews. Joseph, his father, a rich merchant, feared the power of the inquisitors, and, like many religiously persecuted, turned towards hospitable Holland for an asylum for himself and his family. The household found a safe home in Amsterdam, and when yet a youth ben-Joseph was placed under the instruction of the celebrated Isaac Uzziel, then rabbi at the Dutch capital. So rapid was his progress and so unbounded the confidence of the Jews of Amsterdam in Manasseh ben-Israel, as he is commonly called, that on the death of Uzziel, when only eighteen years old (1622), he was deemed a worthy successor of the departed rabbi. In 1626, in need of means to meet the expenses of his father’s family, largely dependent upon him for support, he established the celebrated “Amsterdam Hebrew

printing-office.” Two years later he printed his own maiden production, and in 1632 finally came before the public with the first volume of his great and justly celebrated *Conciliator, or Harmony of the Pentateuch* (see below), in which upwards of two hundred and ten Hebrew works, and fifty-four Greek, Latin, Spanish, and Portuguese authors, both sacred and profane, are quoted. His fame was now established in all Europe, and his authority accepted not only by the Jews, but even Christian scholars acknowledged his scholarship, and wrote to him from far and wide, requesting explanations of difficulties which they encountered in the Hebrew Scriptures and Jewish history. The celebrated Vossius, Dionysius, Hugo Grotius, Huet, Episcopus, Sobierie, Frankenberg, Thomas Fuller, Nathaniel Homesius, etc., were among his correspondents. He solicited their influence in behalf of his suffering brethren, and was thereby enabled to petition the Long Parliament (1650) to readmit the Jews into England, whence they had been expelled ever since 1290. Shortly after, he dedicated *The Hope of Israel* to the English Parliament, which was gratefully acknowledged in a letter written by lord Middlesex, addressed *To my dear brother M. B. I., the Hebrew philosopher*. Encouraged thereby, Manasseh came over to England in 1655; presented “A Humble Address” in behalf of his religionists to Cromwell; published in London, 1656, his *Vindication of Jews*, in answer to those Christians who opposed the readmission of Jews into that country; and though Cromwell, with all his power, could not carry through the measure permitting Jews to settle in England (see JEWS), he granted to Manasseh ben-Israel a pension of £100 per annum, payable quarterly, and commencing Feb. 20, 1656 (comp. Carlyle, 2:163). Manasseh, however, did not long enjoy this generous gift, for he died in Middleburg in 1657, on his way back to Amsterdam. Grätz (*Gesch. d. Juden*, 10, 184-86) rather belittles Manasseh’s literary ability. He regards him as “a man of much information, but of little thought,” and yet his acquaintance with Manasseh is founded mainly on Kayserling’s biography. An encyclopadical knowledge was displayed by Manasseh in his writings; this should certainly not stand against him. His most important works are

(1.) *hbr ynp*, in Hebrew, being an index to all the passages of the Hebrew Scriptures in the *Midrash Rabboth* on the Pentateuch and the Five Megilloth (Amsterdam, 1628);

(2.) *Conciliator, sive de convenientia locorum S. Scripturae, quae pugnare inter se videntur*, etc. (in Spanish, Amst. 1632-1651, 4 vols.; vol.

1 was translated into Latin by Vossius, Amst. 1633, and the whole into English by Lindo, London, 1842);

(3.) *De Creatione Problemata* (in Spanish, Amsterd. 1635);

(4.) *De Resurrectione Mortuorum, Libri tres* (in Spanish, Amsterd. 1636);

(5.) **μϋϋϵ h rwr x**, *De Termino Vitae* (in Latin, Amsterd. 1639; translated into English by Thomas Poccocke, Lond. 1699);

(6.) **μϋϋϵ tmϕn**: four books on the immortality of the soul (written in Hebrew, Amst. 1651; new ed. Leips. 1862. These are valuable contributions to Biblical literature, inasmuch as Manasseh gives in them all the passages from the Hebrew Scriptures which, according to the explanations of the ancient rabbins, teach the immortality of the soul and the resurrection);

(7.) **hrqy ^ba**, *Piedra Gloriosa o de la Estatua de Nebuchadnesar* (Amst. 1655), an exposition of Daniel's dream, written in Spanish, which the immortal Rembrandt did not think it below his dignity to adorn with four engravings. He also carried through his own press several beautiful and correctly printed editions of the Hebrew Scriptures; wrote a Hebrew grammar, entitled **hrwrb hpϕ**, *Grammatica Hebraea, dividida en quatuor libros*, which has not as yet been published; and left us over four hundred well-written sermons in Portuguese. See Fürst, *Biblioth. Jud.* 2:354-358; Steinschneider, *Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Bibliotheca Bodleiana*, col. 1645-1652; and especially the valuable biographies by Kayserling, *Jahrbuch für die Geschichte der Juden* (Leipz. 1861), 2:85 sq.; and by Carmoly, in the *Revue Orientale* (Bruxelles, 1842), p. 299348; C. D. Ginsburg, in *Kitto*, 3, s.v.; Hofer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 33:145 sq.

Manas'ses

(**Μανασσηϕ**), the Greek form of the name *Manasseh*, and, as such, applied not only to those mentioned in the O.T., but to another in the Apocrypha.

1. The son of Joseph by that name (^{<600>}Revelation 7:6).

2. The king of Judah (^{<400>}Matthew 1:10; and so in "the Prayer" thus entitled).

3. One of the sons of Hashum (1 Esdras 9:33; comp. ^{<500>}Ezra 10:33).

4. A wealthy inhabitant of Bethuha, and husband of Judith, according to the legend. He was smitten with a sunstroke while superintending the laborers in his fields, leaving Judith a widow with great possessions (^{<408D>}Judges 8:2,7; 10:3; 16:22-24), and was buried between Dothan and Baal-hamon. *SEE JUDITH.*

Manasses, The Prayer Of,

one of the shorter apocryphal pieces appended to the O.T. (In the following account we mainly follow the articles on the subject in Kitto and Smith's *Dictionaries.*) Though wanting in the early printed editions of the Sept., it must have been included in the ancient MSS. of the Sept., as is evident from the fact that there exists an Ante-Hieronymian Latin version of it. It is found in the Codex Alexandrinus, and the Greek text was first published in Robert Stephens' edition of the *Biblia Latina* (Paris. 1540), and in the edition of the same printed in 1546. It was also printed in the *Apostolical Constitutions* in 1563; it was then published by Dauderstadt in 1628; inserted in the fourth volume of the London Polyglot, with the various readings of the Codex Alexandrinus, in the *Apostolical Fathers* of Cotelierus in 1672; in the *Libri apocr. V. T.* (Francof. ad M. 1694, Halle, 1749); in the editions of the Apocrypha by Reineccius (1730). Michaelis (1741); and after the text of the Cod. Alexandrinus in the editions of the Sept. by Grabe and Breitinger.

I. Title and Position. — This apocryphal production is called *the prayer of Manasses* (προσευχή Μανασσή), or *hymn of prayer* (προσευχή τῆς ὀδῆς), because it purports to be the supplications which this monarch offered to God when captive in Babylon, mentioned in ^{<443I2>}2 Chronicles 33:12,13. Its position varies in the MSS., printed editions of the text, and in the versions. It is more generally appended to the Psalter with the collection of hymns and prayers, as in the Codex Alexandrinus, the Zurich MS. of the Psalms mentioned by Fritzsche, and in the Ethiopic Psalter, published by Ludolf (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1701); in the three Latin MSS. used by Sabatier it is placed at the end of 2 Chronicles (Sabat. *Bibl. Lat.* 3:1038); in the editions of the Vulgate formed after the Trident. Canon of the Bible it is usually put at the end of the N.T., succeeded by the third and fourth books of Esdras. Luther placed it as the last of the Apocrypha, at the end of the O.T., while Matthew's Bible, which first inserted it among the Apocrypha, and which is followed by the Bishop's Bible and the A. V., puts it before the Maccabees.

II. *Contents, Author, Date, Original Language, etc.* — It opens with an appeal to the God of the faithful patriarchs and their righteous seed, describes his greatness as Creator of all things, before whose power every one trembles, and whose wrath no sinner can endure, and speaks of his proffered pardon to the penitent (ver. 1-8). Thereupon the repentant king confesses his sins, humbles himself on account of them, prays for pardon, and promises to lead a life of gratitude and praise (ver. 9-15).

Many writers have seen nothing in this prayer to militate against its being the penitential dirge of the penitent Manasseh; on the contrary, they think that the simplicity and appropriateness of its style, the earnest and touching manner in which it is expressed, go far to show that if it is not literally “his prayer unto his God” rendered into Greek, that prayer formed the basis of the Greek. It is, indeed, certain that the prayer was still extant when the Chronicles were compiled, that the chronicler *saw* it “in the book of the Kings of Israel” (^{443B}2 Chronicles 33:18), and that later writers, as well as tradition, constantly refer to it (compare *Sanhedrin*, 101, b; 103, a; *Jerusalem Sanhedrin* 17; *Midrash Rabboth* on Lev., Parsha 30, p. 150; on Deut., Parsha 2, or ch. 4:25, p. 216, ed. Sulzbach; *Chaldee Paraphrase* of ^{443B}2 Chronicles 33:11, etc.; *Const. Apost.* 2:22). We may more reasonably conclude, however, that it is but the embodiment of these traditions. *SEE MANASSEH*, 3.

The Greek text is undoubtedly original, and not a mere translation from the Hebrew, for even within the small space of fifteen verses some peculiarities are found (ἄστεκτος, κλίνειν γόνυ καρδίας, παροργίζειν τὸν θυμόν, τίθεσθαι μετάνοιάν τινι). The writer was well acquainted with the Sept. (τὰ κατώτατα τῆς γῆς, τὸ πλῆθος τῆς χρηστότητός σου, πᾶσα ἡ δύναμις τῶν οὐρανῶν), but beyond this there is nothing to determine the date at which he lived. The allusion to the patriarchs (ver. 8, δίκαιοι; ver. 1, τὸ σπέρμα αὐτῶν τὸ δίκαιον) appears to fix the authorship on a Jew, but the clear teaching on repentance points to a time certainly not long before the Christian era. There is no indication of the place at which the prayer was written. All that we know is that reference is made to it in a fragment of Julius Africanus (circa A.D. 221), that it is given at length in the *Apostolical Constitutions* (2:22), a work attributed to Clemens Romanus, but generally believed to be of the 3d or 4th century, and that the whole complexion of it shows it to be an ante-Christian production, compiled most probably in the first century B.C. The Latin translation which occurs in Vulgate MSS. is not by the hand of Jerome,

and has some remarkable phrases (*insustentabilis, importabilis* [ἀνυπόστατος], *omnis virtus clelorum*), but there is no sufficient internal evidence to show whether it is later or earlier than his time. It does not, however, seem to have been used by any Latin writer of the first four centuries, and was not known to Victor Tunonensis in the sixth (Ambrosius, 4:989, ed. Migne).

III. Canonicity. — This prayer was considered by many of the ancients as genuine, and used as such for ecclesiastical purposes. It is quoted as such by the author of the *Sermons on the Pharisee and Publican*; in the sixth volume of Chrysostom's works; by Anthony the monk (2:94); Theodore Studita (*Sesrm. Catachet.* 93); Theophanes Ceramaeus (*Homnil.* 2 and 56); by Freulfus, George Syncellus, and George the sinner, in their *Chronicles*; by Suidas (*Lex.* s.v. **Μανασσῆς**); and by Anastasius Sinaita (in *Psalm* 6); and is still placed by the modern Greeks in their Psalter along with the other hymns (Leo Allatius, *De lib. Ecclesiast. Graecorum*, p. 62). But the fact of its non-occurrence in the Heb. text, and its uniform rejection by the Jewish Church, clearly stamp it as apocryphal. It was never recognized in the Roman Church as canonical, and has, therefore, been omitted in the ancient editions of the Sept. For this reason it is also omitted from the Zurich Version, and Coverdale's Bible, which follows it, as well as from the Geneva Version; but is retained among the Apocrypha in Luther's translation, Matthew's Bible, and in the Bishop's Bible, and thence passed over into the A.V.

IV. Versions and Exegetical Helps. — Greek and Latin metrical versions of this prayer have been reprinted by Fabricius, in his edition of *the books of Sirach, Wisdom, Judith, and Tobit* (Leipz. 1691). A Hebrew version of it is mentioned by Wolf, *Bibliotheca Hebraea*, 1:778; a very beautiful Hebrew version, with valuable notes, is printed in the *Hebrew Annual*, entitled *likure Ha-Itim* (Vienna, 1824), v. 12 sq.; important literary notices are given by Fabricius, *Codex Pseudepigraphs V. T.* 1:1100 sq.; *Bibliotheca Graeca* (ed. Harles), 3:732 sq.; Müller, *Erklärung des Gebet Manasse* (Salzwedel, 1733); and especially Fritzsche, *Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch z. d. Apokryphen d. A. T.* 1:157 sq. (Leips. 1851).
SEE APOCRYPHA.

Manas' site

(yCnm] *Menassi'*, patronymic from MANASSEH, used collectively; Sept. Μανασσή), Auth. Vers. "Manassites," "of Manasseh"), a descendant of Manasseh, or a member of that tribe (^{<B4B>}Deuteronomy 4:43; 29:8; ^{<D4B>}2 Kings 10:33; ^{<B6>}1 Chronicles 26:32).

Manby, Peter

an Irish theologian, was educated at Trinity College, Dublin, became chaplain to Dr. Michael Boyle, afterwards archbishop of Dublin, and at length dean of Perry. In the reign of James II he embraced the popish religion, in vindication of which he wrote several books; then removed to France, thence to England, and died at London in 1697. Manby published several controversial tracts in favor of the Roman Catholic religion. — Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* 7:214, s.v.

Manchet

is a name given in the 16th century to the *wafer* used in the mass. — Walcott, *Sac. Archaeol.* s.v.

Manchuria

SEE MANTCHURIA.

Mancius, George Wilhelmus

one of the prominent ministers of the Reformed Church in America, and a sturdy opposer of the movements for securing its independence of the Church in Holland. He was settled in Bergen County, N. J., at Schraalenbergh and Paramus (1730-32), and at Kingston, N. Y. (1732-56 or '59). He possessed much ability and learning, but it was alleged that "consciences slumbered" under his orthodox preaching. His friends, however, claim that his manuscript sermons show him to have been "a faithful, learned, industrious, and zealous preacher of the Gospel, one who did not fear to declare the whole counsel of God; and that it was, on the other hand, his opposition to an illiterate ministry and to heresy, his independence in reproving vice, and his general zeal and fidelity which induced certain of his enemies to misrepresent him." He left 420 members in full communion of his Church. He died Sept. 6, 1762. See Corwin's *Manual of the Reformed Church*, p. 150. (W. J. R. T.)

Mandaeans

SEE MENDAEANS.

Mandata de Providendo

SEE EXPECTANTIA.

Mandeville, Bernard de

a skeptical writer in the English tongue, was born of French extraction about 1670 at Dort, Holland, and went to England near the opening of the 18th century. He practiced medicine in London, but does not appear to have had much success as a physician, and depended mainly on his literary activity for the means of support. He died in 1733. In the article **DEISM** *SEE DEISM* (q.v.) the name of Mandeville has not been inserted "because his speculations" (see works below), as Farrar says (*Crit. Hist. of Free Thought*, p. 135, note 65), "did not bear directly on religion." Upon morality, however, Mandeville exerted so great an influence that we cannot pass him unnoticed. His attacks on Christian morals already reveal him to have been a champion of Deism. The doctrines laid down in several of his works is nothing more nor less than a further elucidation of the assertion of Bayle (in *Pensees diverses*), that Atheism does not necessarily make man vicious, nor a state unhappy, because dogmas have no influence on the acts of men. Superficial observation of society led Mandeville to the belief that many institutions of public weal derive their strength and support from prevailing immorality. This view he developed in a poem entitled *The Grumbling Hive, or Knaves turned Honest* (1714), to which he afterwards added long explanatory notes, and then published the whole under the new title of *The Fable of the Bees*. However erroneous may be its views of morals and of society, it bears all the marks of an honest and sincere inquiry on an important subject. It exposed Mandeville, however, to much obloquy, and, besides meeting with many answers and attacks, was denounced as injurious to morality. It would appear that some of the hostility against this work, and against Mandeville generally, is to be traced to another publication, recommending the public licensing of stews, the matter and manner of which are certainly exceptionable, though it must at the same time be stated that Mandeville earnestly and with seeming sincerity recommends his plan as a means of diminishing immorality, and that he endeavored, so far as lay in his power, by affixing a high price and in other ways, to prevent the work from having a general circulation.

Mandeville subsequently published a second part of *The Fable of the Bees*, and several other works, among which are two entitled ‘*Free Thoughts on Religion, the Church, and National Happiness*, and *An Inquiry into the Origin of Honor and the Usefulness of Christianity in War.*’ *The Fable of the Bees, or Private Vices Public Benefits*, may be viewed in two ways, as a satire on men and as a theory of society and national prosperity. So far as it is a satire, it is sufficiently just and pleasant; but viewed in its more ambitious character of a theory of society, it is altogether worthless. It is Mandeville’s object to show that national greatness depends on the prevalence of fraud and luxury; and for this purpose he supposes a ‘vast hive of bees,’ possessing in all respects institutions similar to those of men; he details the various frauds, similar to those among men, practiced by bees one upon another in various professions; he shows how the wealth accumulated by means of these frauds is turned, through luxurious habits, to the good of others, who again practice their frauds upon the wealthy; and, having already assumed that wealth cannot be gotten without fraud and cannot exist without luxury, he assumes further that wealth is the only cause and criterion of national greatness. His hive of bees having thus become wealthy and great, he afterwards supposes a mutual jealousy of frauds to arise, and fraud to be by common consent dismissed; and he again assumes that wealth and luxury immediately disappear, and that the greatness of the society is gone. It is needless to point out inconsistencies and errors, such, for instance, as the absence of all distinction between luxury and vice, when the whole theory rests upon obviously false assumptions; and the long dissertations appended to the fable, however amusing and full of valuable remarks, contain no attempts to establish by proof the fundamental points of the theory. In an ‘*Inquiry into the Origin of Moral Distinctions*,’ contained in *The Fable of the Bees*, Mandeville contends that virtue and vice, and the feelings of moral approbation and disapprobation, have been created in men by their several governments, for the purpose of maintaining society and preserving their own power. Incredible as it seems that such a proposition as this should be seriously put forth, it is yet more so that it should come from one whose professed object was, however strange the way in which he set about it, to promote good morals; for there is nothing in Mandeville’s writings to warrant the belief that he sought to encourage vice” (*English Cyclop.* s.v.). This book was translated into French, as well as the other writings of Mandeville, and contributed in no small degree to the corruption of French society, and helped forward the sad days of the Revolution. Schlosser (*Hist. of the 18th*

and 19th Cent.) is quite severe on Mandeville. He says that “Mandeville was a man wholly destitute of morality, and without any insight into the nature of man or the connection between bodily and mental soundness and well-being.” See *Life* by Dr. Birch; *Blackwood’s Magazine*, 2:268, 442; 27:712; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.; Schröckh, *Kirchengeschichte s. d. Ref.* 6:204 sq.; Henke, *Gesch. d. christl. Kirche*, 6:85 sq. (J. H. W.)

Mandeville, Henry

D.D., a (Dutch) Reformed minister, was born at Kinderhook, N. Y., March 6, 1804; graduated at Union College in 1826, and at New Brunswick Theological Seminary in 1829, and was licensed by the Classis of Albany in 1829. His ministry was chiefly spent in the Reformed Church in the State of New York, viz., at Shawangunk, 1829-31; Geneva, 1831-34; Utica, 1834-41. From 1841 to 1849 he was professor of moral philosophy and belles-lettres in Hamilton College, N. Y. While in this position he published several valuable text-books on elocution and English literature, which evince his thorough scholarship and “aptness to teach.” From Hamilton College he was called to the Government Street Presbyterian Church, Mobile, Ala., where he died of yellow fever in 1858. Dr. Mandeville was a man of large frame, imposing presence, and cultivated manners. He was a brilliant pulpit orator, a powerful reasoner, a successful preacher and professor, and a faithful pastor. He gloried in the cross of Christ, and devoted all of his fine powers to his work. His published address on the *Reflex Influence of Foreign Missions*, which was delivered before the Society of Inquiry of the Theological Seminary at New Brunswick, N. J., in 1847, is a masterpiece of reasoning and eloquence, and a worthy memorial of the author’s genius, piety, and zeal. — *Personal Recollections*; Corwin’s *Manual*, s.v. (W. J. R. T.)

Mandingo

is the name of an African people, the nation of the *Wangarawa*-according to Barth, comprising some 6,000,000 or more. Strictly speaking, however, Mandingoes should be termed only the inhabitants of the most south-westerly territories belonging to the great West African race of the Wangarawa (sing. *Wangara*), and inhabiting a district extending in lat. from 8 to 12° N., and between the west coasts and the head waters of the Senegal and Niger. Their original seat is said to be Manding, a small

mountain country on the eastern sources of the Senegal, whence, partly by conquest and partly by emigration, they have spread themselves over a most extensive tract of country, and now consist of a variety of tribes. They are black in color, tall and well shaped, with regular features, and are, generally speaking, a fine race, capable of a high degree of civilization and organization, great travelers, fond of trading, and remarkable for their industry and energy. The language of the Mandingo prevails from the Senegal coast up to Sago on the Niger. A grammar of the language was compiled by R. Maxwell Macbrair (Lond. 1837).

Religious Belief, etc. — Of the neighboring nations, the Mandingoes were the first who embraced Islamism. The greater portion of them are now Moslems, and are zealous propagators of their religion. Those of the Mandlingoes adhering to their primitive religion have a very peculiar idea of marriage. With them it is merely a form of regulated slavery, and there is no marriage ceremony observed to evince union (Caille, *Travels*, 1:350). Most generally the female partner is carried from her home by force (Gray, *Travels in W. Africa*, p. 56). They have also, according to Park *Travels*, 1:267), a very peculiar idea of the Deity, whom they regard as “so remote, and of so exalted a nature, that it is idle to imagine the feeble supplications of wretched mortals can reverse the decrees and change the purposes of unerring wisdom.” Neither do they have any confidence in any belief in the hereafter, of which they assert that “no man knows anything about it.”

Mandra

(*sheepfold*), a name given to a *monastery* in the Greek Church. **SEE ARCHIMANDRITE.**

Mandrake

Picture for Mandrake

(only in the plur. **𐤎𐤃𐤁𐤍**, *dudaim*’, from **𐤃𐤁𐤍**, to *be hot*, from their amatory properties; whence the sing. **𐤃𐤁𐤍**, a *pot* or boiling vessel, hence a *basket*, **𐤃𐤁𐤍** Jeremiah 24:1) occurs in **𐤃𐤁𐤍** Genesis 30:14-16: “Reuben went out in the days of wheat harvest, and found *mandrakes* in the field, and brought them home to his mother Leah. Then Rachel said to Leah, Give me of thy son’s *mandrakes*;” “And Jacob came out of the field in the evening, and Leah went out to meet him, and said, Thou must come in unto me, for surely I have hired thee with my son’s *mandrakes*; and he lay

with her that night.” The only other passage is ²¹⁷³Song of Solomon 7:13: “The *mandrakes* give a smell, and at our gates are all manner of pleasant plants.” From the above passages it is evident that the *dudaim* were collected in the fields, that they were fit for gathering in the wheat harvest in Mesopotamia, where the first occurrence took place; that they were found in Palestine; that they or the plants which yielded them diffused a peculiar and agreeable odor; and that they were supposed to be possessed of aphrodisiac powers, or of assisting in producing conception. It is possible that there is a connection between this plant and the love-charms (μυδάδ) which seem to have been worn by Oriental brides (²¹⁰²Song of Solomon 1:2, 4; 4:10; 7:12; comp. 1:12), like smelling-bottles (²³⁹¹Isaiah 3:20, “tablets”); perhaps these contained an odoriferous mandrake philter. From this it is manifest that there is little to guide us in determining what plant is alluded to at such early periods, especially as no similar name has been recognized in any of the cognate languages. Hence interpreters have wasted much time and pains in endeavoring to ascertain what is intended by the Hebrew word *dudaim*. Some translate it by “violet,” others “lilies,” “jasmins,” “truffles or mushrooms;” and some think that the word means “flowers,” or “fine flowers.” Bochart, Calmet, and Sir Thomas Browne suppose the *citron* intended; Celsius (*Hierobot.* 1:20; but see, on the contrary, Oedmann, p. 99) is persuaded that it is *the fruit of the lote-tree*; Hiller that *cherries* are spoken of; and Ludolf (*Hist. Aeth.* 1:9, etc.) maintains that it is the fruit which the Syrians call *matuz* (that is, the plantain), resembling in figure and taste the Indian fig; but the generality of interpreters and commentators understand *mandrakes* (not the melon so called “melo dudaim,” but the *mandragora*) by *dudaim*. The ground upon which the *mandragora* has been preferred is that the most ancient Greek translator interprets the Hebrew name in ¹⁰¹⁴Genesis 30:14 by mandrake apples (μῆλα μανδραγορῶν); and in the Song of Solomon by mandrakes, οἱ μανδραγόραι. Saadias, Onkelos, and the Syriac Version agree with the Greek translators. The first of these puts *laffach*; the two latter *yabruchin*, which names denote the same plant (Rosenmüller, *Bib. Bot.* p. 130, and note; Castelli. *Lexicon*, p. 1591). The earliest notice of *μανδραγόρας* is by Hippocrates, and the next by Theophrastus (*Hist. Plant.* 6:2). Both of these, C. Sprengel (*Hist. Rei. Herb.* 1:38. 82) supposes, intend *Atropa mandragora*. Dioscorides (4:76) notices three kinds:

(1.) the female, which is supposed to be the *Mandragora asutumnalis* of Berloton;

(2.) the male, *Mandragorca vesralis* of the same botanist (these two are, however, usually accounted varieties of *Atropa mandragora*);

(3.) a kind called *morion*. It has been inferred that this may be the same as the mandragora of Theophrastus, which, by some authors, has been supposed to be *Atropa belladonna*. To all of these Dioscorides ascribes narcotic properties, and says of the first that it is also called *Circoea*, because it appears to be a root which promotes venery. Pythagoras named the mandragora *anthropomorphon*, and Theophrastus, among other qualities, mentions its soporific powers, and also its tendency to excite to love. Its fruit was called love-apple, and Venus herself Mandragorites. But it is not easy to decide whether the above all refer to the same plant or plants. (See Lucian, *Tim.* p. 2; Pliny, 25:94; Apulsi, *A sin.* 10:233, Bip.; Schol. at Plat. *Rep.* 6:411, tom. v, Lips.; Philo, *Opp.* 2:478.) Persian authors on *materia medica* give *madragoras* as a synonyme for *yebruk*, or *yabruz*, which is said to be the root of a plant of which the fruit is called *lufach*. This, there is little doubt, must be the above *Atropa mandragora*, as the Arabs usually refer only to the plants of Dioscorides, and on this occasion they quote him as well as Galen, and ascribe narcotic properties to both the root and the fruit. D'Herbelot (*bibl. Orient.* 1:72) details some of the superstitious opinions respecting this plant, which originated in the East, but which continued for a long time to be retailed by authors in Europe. (See Schubert, 3:116; Schulz, *Leit.* v. 197; Burckhardt, 1:441.) By the Arabs it is said to be called *tilfah al-sheifan*, or devil's apple, on account of its power to excite voluptuousness. If we look to the works of more modern authors, we find a continuance of the same statements. Thus Mariti, in his *Travels* (2:195), says that the Arabs called the mandrake plant, *yabrochak*, which is, no doubt, the same name as given above. "At the village of St. John, in the mountains, about six miles south-west from Jerusalem. this plant is found at present, as well as in Tuscany. It grows low, like lettuce, to which its leaves have a strong resemblance, except that they have a dark-green color. The flowers are purple, and the root is for the most part forked. The fruit, when ripe, in the beginning of May, is of the size and color of a small apple, exceedingly ruddy, and of a most agreeable odor; our guide. thought us fools for suspecting it to be unwholesome. He ate it freely himself, and it is generally valued by the inhabitants as exhilarating to their spirits and a provocative to venery."

Maundrell (*Trav.* p. 83) was informed by the chief priest of the Samaritans that it was still noted for its genial virtues. Hasselquist also seems inclined to consider it the *dudacim*, for, when at Nazareth, he says (*Trav.* p. 183), “What I found most remarkable in their villages was the great quantity of mandrakes that grew in a vale below it. The fruit was now (May 16) ripe. From the season in which this mandrake blossoms and ripens its fruit, one might form a conjecture that it is Rachel’s *dudaim*. These were brought her in the wheat harvest, which in Galilee is in the month of Mala about this time, and the mandrake was now in fruit.” Dr. Thomson (*Land and Book*, 2:380) found mandrakes ripe on the lower ranges of Lebanon and Hermon towards the end of April. On the 15th of May, Schulz also found mandrakes on Mount Tabor, which, as he says, “have a delightful scent. and whose taste is equally agreeable, although not to every body. They are almost globular, and yellow like oranges, and about two and a quarter inches in diameter. This fruit grows on a shrub resembling the mallow; and the fruit lies about the stem, as it were about the root, after such a manner that a single shrub may have six to ten fruits, of which the color is so beautiful that no orange equals its brilliancy.” This fruit, which a recent traveler describes as of an “insipid, sickish taste,” is by the Arabs of other regions alleged to possess strengthening virtues, when used in small quantities, but they call it *tufuh el-maujanim*, or “apples of the possessed,” owing to the temporary insanity which an over-dose produces. “At first,” says a traveler, “I felt inclined to doubt the assertion, but during my residence in the country I had the opportunity of witnessing its effect on an English traveler, a Mr. L., who had the temerity to test the property of the mandrake. A few hours after partaking of the root he began to show unequivocal symptoms of insanity; and such was its effect on the nervous system that he had to be relieved by cupping and other remedies before he could be restored to consciousness” (Dupuis, *Holy Places* [1856], 1:272). The name “love-apple” Gesenius’s translation of *dudaim* — was formerly in this country given to a kindred plant, the tomato (*Lycopersicon esculentum*), a native of South America, but now largely cultivated everywhere for its agreeable acidulous fruit. “From a certain rude resemblance of old roots of the mandrake to the human form, whence Pythagoras is said to have called the mandrake *ἄνθρωπόμορφον*, and Columella (10, 19) *semihonzo*, some strange superstitious notions have arisen concerning it. Josephus (*War*, 7:6, 3) evidently alludes to one of these superstitions, though he calls the plant *baaras*. In a Vienna MS. of Dioscorides is a curious drawing which represents Euresis, the goddess of

discovery, handing to Dioscorides a root of the mandrake; the dog employed for the purpose is depicted in the agonies of death (Daubeny's *Roman Husbandry*, p. 275). The mandrake is found abundantly in the Grecian islands, and in some parts of the south of Europe. The root is spindle-shaped, and often divided into two or three forks. The leaves, which are long, sharp-pointed, and hairy, rise immediately from the ground. The flowers are dingy white, stained with veins of purple. The fruit is of a pale orange color, and about the size of a nutmeg; but it would appear that the plant varies considerably in appearance according to the localities where it grows. The man drake (*A tropa mandragora*) is closely allied to the well-known deadly nightshade (*A. belladonna*), and belongs to the order *Solanaceae*." See Liebetantz, *De Rachelis Dudaim* (Vitemb. 1702); Simon, *De μῦαδ' R*, etc. (Halle, 1735); Ant. Bertolini, *Comment. de Mandragoris* (Bol. 1836); Dougltaei *Analect.* 1:35; Velthuysen, *Comment. ub. d. loheliad*, p. 502; Eichhorn. *Repert.* 11:158; Michaelis, *Suppl.* p. 410; Oken, *Lehrb. d. Natursgesch.* II, 2:333; W. Bickerton, *Dissertation on the Mandrake of the Ancients* (Lond. 1737); Tristram, *Nat. Hist. of Bible*, p. 466 sq.

Mandyas

(μᾶνδύας), a vestment of the Greek priests, not unlike the cope of the Romanists, but with bells at the lower edges, in supposed imitation of the Jewish high-priest.

Ma'neh

(חמ; *maneh*', ^{<3612>}Ezekiel 45:12, a *portion* as divided by weight; hence the Greek μῦα, a *mina*; rendered "pound" in ^{<1107>}1 Kings 10:17; ^{<1589>}Ezra 2:69; ^{<4172>}Nehemiah 7:21, 22), a weight of a *hundred shekels*, as we gather from ^{<1107>}1 Kings 10:17 (compare ^{<44916>}2 Chronicles 9:16). Another and somewhat obscure specification is given in ^{<3612>}Ezekiel 45:12, "twenty shekels, five and twenty shekels, fifteen shekels, shall be your maneh;" spoken either of a triple maneh of *twenty, twenty-five, and fifty shekels*; or of a single maneh of *sixty shekels*, distributed into three parts of fifteen, twenty, and twenty-five. There are other explanations offered (as by the Chaldee paraphrast, by Jarchi, J. D. Michaelis, and others), but the latter is generally supposed to be the best. *SEE WEIGHTS*.

Manetho

(**Μανεθών** or **Μανεθώς**), OF SEBENNYTUS, a distinguished Egyptian historian, a native of Diospolis, according to some, or of Mende or Heliopolis, according to others, is said to have lived in the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus, and to have been a man of great learning and wisdom (Elian, *De Animal.* 10:16). He belonged to the priestly caste, and was himself a priest, and interpreter or recorder of religious usages, and of the religious and probably also historical writings. His name has been interpreted “beloved of Thoth;” in the *song* of Lagos and Ptolemy Philadelphus, *Mai en tet*, or *Ma Net*, “beloved of Neith;” but both interpretations are doubtful. Scarcely anything is known of the history of Manetho himself, and he is more renowned for his Egyptian history than on any other account. On the occasion of Ptolemy I dreaming of the god Serapis at Sinope, Manetho was consulted by the monarch, and, in conjunction with Timotheus of Athens, the interpreter of the Eleusinian mysteries, declared the statue of Serapis, brought by orders of the king from Sinope, to be that of the god Serapis or Pluto, and the god had a temple and his worship inaugurated at Alexandria. It appears probable, however, that there were more than one individual of this name, and it is therefore doubtful whether all the works which were attributed by ancient writers to Manetho were in reality written by the Manetho who lived in the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus. (See below.)

Writings. — The only work of Manetho which has come down to us complete is a poem of six books, in hexameter verse, on the influence of the stars (**ἀποτελεσματικά**), which was first published by Gronovius (Leyden, 1698), and has also been edited by Axtius and Rigler (Cologne, 1832). It is probable, however, for many reasons, as Heyne has shown in his *Opuscula Academica* (1:95), that parts, at least, of this poem could not have been written till a much later date. We also possess considerable fragments of a work of Manetho on the history of the ancient kings of Egypt. (See below.) It was in three books or parts, and comprised the period from the earliest times to the death of the last Persian Darius. Some of these fragments are preserved in the treatise of Josephus against Apion; and still greater portions in the “Chronicles” of George Syncellus, a monk of the 9th century. The “Chronicles” of Syncellus were principally compiled from the “Chronicles” of Julius Africanus and Eusebius, bishop of Caesarea, both of whom made great use of Manetho’s “History.” The work of Africanus is lost, and we only possess a Latin version of that of

Eusebius, which was translated out of the Armenian version of the Greek text preserved at Constantinople. Manetho is said to have derived his history of the kings of Egypt, whom he divides into thirty classes, called dynasties, from the sacred records in the temple at Heliopolis. In addition to these works, Manetho is also said to have written,

1, Ἱερὰ Βίβλος, on the Egyptian religion;

2, Περὶ ἀρχαϊσμοῦ καὶ εὐσεβείας, on the ancient rites and ceremonies of the Egyptians;

3, Φυσικῶν ἐπιτομή (Laertius, *Proem.* s. 10), probably the same work as that called by Suidas **φυσιολογικά**;

4, Βίβλος τῆς Σώθewος, both the subject and genuineness of which are very doubtful. See Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog.* s.v.; *English Cyclopaedia*, s.v. His name is introduced here on account of the importance of his work on Egyptian history in determining the list of ancient Egyptian kings. **SEE EGYPT**. In this regard his authority has been overestimated by one class of writers, and almost wholly set aside by others, according to their own preconceived theories. **SEE PHARAOH**.

Authenticity of Manetho's History. — Manetho was a learned priest at the court of the first Ptolemy, according to Plutarch (*de Isaiâ et Os.* c. 28), who cites a religious work of his in Greek, which is quoted also under various names by Elian, Diogenes Laertius, Porphyry, and other late writers (Fruin, *Manethonis Sebennytæ Reliquiae*, p. 133 sq.; Parthey, *Plutarch über Isis u. Osiris*, p. 180 sq.). Josephus (*Apion*, 1:14-16, 26, 27) gives two long extracts, with a list of seventeen reigns, from the **Αἴγυπτιακά**, “a work composed in Greek by Manetho the Sebennyte, from materials which he professes to have rendered from the sacred records:” of which history all else that is extant is a catalogue of Egyptian dynasties, preserved in two widely different recensions by Georgius Syncellus, A.D. 800; the one from the lost *Chronographia* of Julius Africanus, A.D. 220; the other from the *Chronicon* of Eusebius, A.D. 325 (of which we have now the Armenian version); both texts are given by Fruin, and by Bunsen in the appendix to *Egypt's Place*, vol. 1. The statement that “Manetho the Sebennyte, of Heliopolis, high-priest and scribe of the sacred adyta, composed this work from the sacred records by command of Ptolemy Philadelphus,” rests only on the dedication (ap. Syncell.) prefixed to the *Sothis*, an undoubted forgery of Christian times.

All that can be inferred from it is that the forger had grounds, good or bad, for placing Manetho in the time of the second Ptolemy. In fact, the incident with which Plutarch (*ut sup.*) connects his name (the bringing in of Serapis) is related by other writers (*without mention of Manetho*), and is assigned by Tacitus also (*Hist.* 4:183 sq.) to the time of the first Ptolemy; but by Clem. Alex. (*Protrept.* 4:48) and Cyrill. Al. (*c. Julian.* p. 13) to Ptolemy Philadelphus, with the date 01. 124-B.C. 284-1. If he did live, and was a man of note, under the early Ptolemies, certain it is that "this most distinguished writer, the sage and scholar of Egypt" (as Bunsen calls him, *Aeg. St.* 1:88), was speedily and long forgotten; for more than three centuries after the time at which he is said to have flourished not a trace of him or his writings is anywhere discoverable. Nothing of the kind occurs in the remains of the Alexandrine scholars, the early Greek Jews, Polyhistor's collections, or the chronological writings of Castor. That the *Catalogue of Thirty-eight Theban Kings* (ap. Syncell.) is the work of *Eratosthenes* there is nothing to show; at any rate, it contains no reference to Manetho. If it was from Manetho that Dicsearchas, cir. A.D. 290 (ap. Schol. in *Apollon. Rhod.*), got his two Egyptian names and dates, it was in quite another form of the work; to the scholiast, Manetho is an unknown name. The Egyptian list in the *Excespta Latino-barbara* of Scaliger, bearing the name of Castor, is a mere abstract from Africanus. Diodorus Sic. and Strabo visited and wrote about Egypt, yet neither of them names or alludes to Manetho; and the former gives (1:44 sq., from the priests, he says) an account of the kingly succession altogether different from his. If, as Fruin suggests (p. 63), it was through measures taken by Domitian to repair the losses sustained by the public libraries (Sueton. *Dom.* 29) that Manetho's works were brought to Rome from the Alexandrine library where they had long slumbered unregarded, still it is strange that the *AEgyptiaca* should have caught the attention of Josephus alone (among extant writers), and that neither those who, as Plutarch, do mention the other work, nor others who have occasion to speak of the ancient times of Egypt, as Tacitus and the elder Pliny (esp. *H. N.* 36:8-13), ever name this history, or show any acquaintance with its list of kings. Lepsius (*Chron. der Aeg.* 1:583 sq.) better meets the difficulty by supposing that the original work, never widely known, was so early lost that even in the 1st century all that survived of it was a bare abstract of its names and numbers, and (distinct from this) the two passages relating to the "*Hyksos*" and the "*lepers*," with the accompanying list of seventeen reigns, which some Jewish reader had extracted on account of their Biblical interest, and beyond which

Josephus knew nothing of Manetho. Whatever be the explanation, the fact is that it is only through Jewish and Christian writers that we ever hear of Manetho as a historian. Of these, Theophilus Ant. (*ad Autolyca*. 3:20, cir. A.D. 181) does but copy Josephus. Clemens Alex. nowhere names Manetho. A history of “*the Acts of the Kings of Egypt*, in three books” — not, however, by Manetho, but by “Ptolemy the Mendesian” — is, indeed, quoted by him (*Strong*. 1:26, 101), but at second-hand from Tatian; who again (*ad Gentes*, p. 129), as perhaps Justin Martyr before him (*ad Gr.* 8), quotes Ptolemy, not directly, but from Apion. In short, it is plain, on comparing these passages and Euseb. (*Pr. Ev.* 10:11, 12), that Apion is the sole source of all that is known of this Ptolemy of Mendes; and Apion, as far as we know, makes no mention of Manetho. In what relation the work of Ptolemy may have stood to Manetho’s, as there is no evidence to show, it is idle to speculate; and, indeed, the question with which we are concerned would remain very much where it is, even were it proved that “Manetho” is a borrowed name, and the *AEgyptiaca* a product of Roman times. For the important point is, not who wrote the book, and when, but what is its value? It may not be genuine, nor so old as it pretends to be, and yet may contain good materials, honestly rendered from earlier writings or original records, probably as available in the time of Domitian as they were under the Ptolemies; and, in fact, existing monuments do furnish so considerable a number of names unquestionably identical with those in the list, that to reject this altogether, and deny it all historical value, would betoken either egregious ignorance or a reckless scepticism that can shut its eyes to manifest facts.

Chronological Value of Manetho’s History. — The attestation which the list obtains from contemporary monuments cannot be held to warrant the assumption that it is to be depended upon where these fail. For the monuments which attest, also correct its statements. Monuments prove some reigns, and even dynasties, contemporaneous, which in the list are successive; but we have no means of ascertaining what was truly consecutive and what parallel, where monuments are wanting. Their dates are always in years of the current reign, not of an era. From Cambyses upward to Psammetichus, and his immediate predecessor, Taracus = Tirhaka, the chronology is now settled [*SEE CHRONOLOGY*, sec. 3]. Thence up to Petubastes (dyn. 23) the materials are too scanty to yield any determination. For dyn. 22, headed by Sesonchis = Shishak, the records are copious: dates on apsis-stelae, of which Mariette reports seven in this

dynasty, prove that it lasted much more than the 120 years of Africanus. But even these reigns cannot be formed into a canon, and the epoch of Sesonchis can only be approximately given from the Biblical synchronism, "In 5 Rehoboam Shishak invaded Judaea" — in what year of his reign the monument which records the conquest does not say; although the epoch of Rehoboam is, as to B.C., a fixed point, or nearly so, for all chronologists. The inscription is dated 21 Shishak, but does not indicate the order or time of the several conquests recorded. The attempt has been made to prove from Biblical data that the invasion was in the 20th year. Thus: It was while Solomon was building Millo (^{<210>}2 Kings 11:27) that Jeroboam fled to "Shishak, king of Egypt" (ver. 40). This work began *not earlier* than 24 Solomon (^{<118>}2 Kings 6:37-7:1). *If* it began in that or the next year; if Jeroboam was immediately appointed overseer of the forced labor of his tribesmen; if he presently conceived the purpose of insurrection, encouraged by Ahijah; if his purpose became known to Solomon almost as soon as formed if, in short, his flight into Egypt was not later than 26 Solomon; lastly, if Shishak became king in that year, then 5 Rehoboam (= 45 Solomon) will be 20 Shishak. This is a specimen of much that passes for chronology, where the Bible is concerned. Some light is thrown on the dynastic connection of dyn. 12 and 23 by a stele recently discovered by Mariette in Ethiopia, which proves the fact of numerous contemporary reigns throughout Egypt at that time (Brugsch's *Zeitschrift*, July, 1863; De Rouge, *Inscr. du roi Pianchi Meri Arun*, 1864). But it helps the chronology little or nothing. In dyns. 20, 21, is another gap, at present not to be bridged over. The seven-named Tanites of 21 (Afr. 130, Eus. 121 years) seem to have been military priest-kings; and that they were partly contemporaneous with 20 and 21 may appear from the absence of apistelae, of which 20 has nine, 22 seven. Dyn. 20, for which the list gives no names, consisted of some ten or more kings, all bearing the name Rameses, beginning with R. III, and five of them his sons, probably joint-kings. The apis-inscriptions furnish no connected dates, nor can any inference be drawn from their number, since Mariette reports no less than five in the first reign. For dyn. 19 (Sethos), 18 (Amosis), the materials, written and monumental, are most copious; yet even here the means of an exact determination are wanting: indeed, if further proof were needed that the Manethonic lists are not to be implicitly trusted, it is furnished by the monumental evidence here of contemporary reigns which in the lists are successive. It is certain, and will at last be owned by all competent inquirers, that in the part of the succession for which the evidence is

clearest and most ample, it is impossible to assign the year at which any king, from Amosis to Tirhaka, began to reign. No ingenuity of calculation and conjecture can make amends for the capital defects — the want of an sera, the inadequacy of the materials. The brilliant light shed on this point or that, does but make the surrounding darkness more palpable. Analysis of the lists may enable the inquirer, at most, to divine the intentions of their authors, which is but a small step gained towards the truth of facts.

But it has been supposed that certain fixed points may be got by means of astronomical conjunctures assigned to certain dates of the vague year on the monuments Thus,

(I) A fragmentary inscription of Takelut II, 6th king of dyn. 22, purports that “on the 25th Messori of the 15th year of his father” (Sesonk II, according to Lepsius, *Age of XXII Dyn.*, but Osorkon II, according to Brugsch, Dr. Hincks, and v. Gumpach), “the heavens were invisible, the moon struggling... Hence Mr. Cooper (*Athenaeum*, 11 May, 1861) gathers, that on the (lay named, in the given year of Sesonk II, there was a lunar eclipse, which he considers must be that of 16th March, B.C. 851. Dr. Hincks. who at first also made the eclipse lunar, and its date 4th April, B.C. 945, now contends that it was solar, and the only possible date 1st April, B.C. 927 (*Journnl of Sac. Lit.* Jan. 1863, p. 333-376; compare *ib.* Jan. 1861, p. 459 sq.). In making it solar, he follows M. v. (Gumpach (*Hist. Antiq. of the People of Egypt*, 1863, p. 29), who finds its date 11th March, B.C. 841. Unfortunately the 25th Messori of that year was 10th March. This is the only monumental notice supposed to refer to an eclipse: not worth much at the best; the record, even if its meaning were certain, is not contemporary.

(II) In several inscriptions certain dates are given to the “manifestation of Sothis,” assumed to mean the heliacal rising of Sirius, which, for 2000 years before our aera, for the latitude of Heliopolis, fell on the 20th of July. (Biot, indeed, *Recherches des quelques dates absolues*, etc., 1853, contends that the calculation must be made for the place at which the inscription is dated each day of difference, of course, making a difference of four years in the date B.C.) The dates of these “manifestations” are —

(1) “1 Tybi of 11 Takelut II” (Brugsch): the quaternion of years in which 1 Tybi would coincide with 20th July is B.C. 845-42.

(2) “15 Thoth in a year, not named, of Rameses VI, at Thebes” (Biot, *ut sup.*; De Rouge, *Memoire sur queques phenomenes celestes*, etc., in *Rdvue Archeol.* 9:686). The date implied is 20th July, B.C. 1265-62 (Biot, 14th July, B.C. 1241-38).

(3) “1 Thoth in some year of Rameses III at Thebes” (Biot and De Rouge, *ut sup.*, from a festival-calendar). The date implied is, of course, B.C. 1325-22 (Biot, 14th July, B.C. 1301-1298).

(4) “28 Epiphi in some year of Thothmes III” (Biot, etc., from a festival-calendar at Elephantine). This implies B.C. 1477-74 (Biot, 12th July, B.C. 1445-42). The antiquity of this calendar is called in question by De Rouge (*Athen. Francais*, 1855), and by Dr. Brugsch, who says the style indicates the 19th dynasty. Mariette assigns it to Thothmes III (*Journal Asiatique*, tom. 12, Aug., Sept., 1858). Lepsius, who in 1854 doubted (*Monatsbericht* of Berlin R. Acad.), now contends for its antiquity (*Konigsbuch der Aeg.* p. 164), having contrived to make it fit his chronology by assuming an error in the numeral of the month.

(5) “12 Messori in 33 Thothmes III” (Mr. S. Poole in *Trans. R. S. Lit.* v. 340). This implies B.C. 1421-18. These dates would make the interval from Rameses III to Takelut II 480 years, greatly in excess even of Manetho’s numbers, and more so of Lepsius’s arrangement, in which, from the 1st of Rameses III to the 11th of Takelut II are little more than 400 years. Again, the interval of only 152 years, implied in (3) and (4), is unquestionably too little: from the last year of Thothmes III to the first of Rameses III, Lepsius reckons 296, Bunsen 225 years. Lastly, in (4) and (5) the dates imply an interval of 56 years, which is plainly absurd. The fact must be that these inscriptions are not rightly understood. We need to be informed what the Egyptians meant by the “manifestation of this;” what method. they followed in assigning it to a particular day; especially when, as in Biot’s three instances, the date occurs in a calendar, and is marked as a “festival,” we ask, were these calendars calculated only for four years? when a new one was set up, were the astronomical notices duly corrected, or were they merely copied from the preceding calendar?

(III) “At Semneh in 2 Thothmes III, one of the three feasts of the Commencement of the Seasons is noted on 21 Pharmuthi.” Biot (*ut sup.*) supposes the vernal equinox to be meant, and assigns this to 6th April in the quaternion B.C. 1445-42 (as above), in which 6th April was 21 Pharmuthi. But the vernal equinox is *not* the commencement of one of the

three seasons of the Egyptian year; these start either from the rising of Sirius, 20th July, or, more probably, from the summer solstice: as this, in the 14th century, usually fell on 6th July, the two other tetramenies or seasons would commence cir. 5th Nov. and 6th March. Now 6th March did coincide with 21 Pharmuthi in B.C. 1321-18, at which time it also occupied precisely the place which Mr. Stuart Poole assigns to “the great Rukh” (Leps., “the greater Heat”), just one zodiacal month before the little Rukh, or vernal equinox (*Hore Agypt.* p. 15 sq.).

(IV). “On 1 Athur of II Amenophis III the king ordered an immense basin to be dug, and on the 16th s. m. celebrated a great panegyry of the waters” (Dr. Hincks, *On the Age of Dynasty X VIII*, *Trans. R. Irish Acad.* vol. 21, pt. 1; comp. Mr. S. Poole, *Trans. R. S. Lit.* v. 340). If the waters were let in when the Nile had reached its highest point — which, as it is from 90 to 100 days after the summer solstice, in the 14th century would be at 4-14 Oct. — the month-date indicates one of the years B.C. 1369-26. But if (which is certainly more likely) the time chosen was some weeks earlier, the year indicated would be after B.C. 1300. So this and the preceding indication may agree, and so far there is some evidence for the supposition that the sothic epochal year B.C. 1322 lies in the reign of Thothmes III. (See Dr. Hincks, *ut sup.*, and in the *Dublin Univ. Magazine*, 1846, p. 187.)

(V.) An astronomical representation on the ceiling of the Hameseum (the work of Rameses II) has been supposed to yield the year B.C. 1322 as its date (bishop Tomlinson, *Trans. R. S. Lit.* 1839; Sir G. Wilkinson, *Manners and Customs*, etc., 2d ser. p. 377); while Mr. Cullimore, from the same, gets B.C. 1138. The truth is, these astronomical configurations, in the present state of our knowledge, are an unsolved riddle. Lepsius’s inferences (*Chron. der Aeg.*) from the same representations in the reigns of Rameses IV and VI are little more than guesses, too vague and precarious to satisfy any man who knows what evidence means.

It appears, then, that the supposed astronomical notes of time hitherto discovered lend but little aid, and bring nothing like certainty into the inquiry. We cannot accept the lists as they stand. How are they to be rectified? Until we have the means of rectifying them, every attempt to put forth a definite scheme of Egyptian chronology is simply futile. The appeal to authority avails nothing here. Lepsius, Bunsen, Brugsch, and many more, all claim to have settled the matter. Their very discrepancies — on the scale of which half a century is a mere trifle — sufficiently prove that to

them, as to us, the evidence is defective. The profoundest scholarship, the keenest insight, cannot get more out of it than is in it; “that which is crooked cannot be made straight, and that which is wanting cannot be numbered.” Yet, from the easy confidence with which people assign dates — their own, or taken on trust — to the Pharaohs after Amosis, and even of much earlier times, it might be thought that from Manetho and the monuments together a connected chronology has been elicited as certain as that of the Roman emperors. In particular, there appears to be a growing belief — even finding its way into popular Bible histories and commentaries — that *the Pharaoh of the Exodus* can be identified in Manetho, and so the time of that event determined.

Early Christian writers usually assumed, with Josephus, that the *Hyksos* or “shepherd-kings,” whose story he gives from Manetho (*Apion*, 1:14-16), were the Israelites, and their expulsion by Amosis or Tethmosisone or both, for the accounts are confused — the Egyptian version of the story of the exode. This view has still its advocates (quite recently Mr. Nash, *The Pharaoh of the Exodus*, 1863), but not among those who have been long conversant with the subject. Indeed, there is a monument of Thothmes III which, if it has been truly interpreted, is conclusive for a much earlier date of the exode than this reign, or perhaps any of the dynasty. A long inscription of his twenty-third year gives a list of the confederates defeated by him at Megiddo, in which De Rouge reads the names *Jacob* and *Joseph*, and Mr. Stuart Poole thinks he finds the names of some of the tribes, *Reuben*, *Simeon*, *Issachar*, *Gad* (Report of R. S. H. in *Athenaeum*, March 21, 1863).

But the story of the Jews put forth by “Manetho” himself (Josephus, *Apion*, 1:26, 27). with the confession, however, that he obtained it not from ancient records, but from popular tradition (**ἀδεσπότως μυθογούμενα**), represents them as a race of lepers, who, oppressed by the reigning king, called to their aid the Hyksos from Palestine (where these, on their expulsion some centuries earlier by Tethmosis, had settled and built Jerusalem), and with these allies overran all Egypt for thirteen years, at the end of which Amenophis, who had taken refuge in Ethiopia, returning thence with his son Sethos, drove out the invaders. These, headed by Osarsiph (= Moses). a priest of Heliopolis, retired into Palestine, and there became the nation of the Jews. Josephus protests against this story as a mere figment, prompted by Egyptian malignity, and labors to prove it inconsistent with Manetho’s own list: unsuccessfully enough, for,

in fact, Amenophis (Ammenephtes, Afr.) does appear there just where the story places him, i.e. next to Sethos and Rameses II, with a reign of nineteen years and six months. The monuments give the name Menephtah, and his son and successor Seti Sethos II, just as in the story. The *names* are not fictitious, whatever may be the value of the story as regards the Israelites. This Menephtah, then, son and successor of Rameses the Great, is the Pharaoh of the Exode, according to Lepsius and Bunsen, and of late accepted as such by many writers, learned and unlearned. Those to whom the name of Manetho is not voucher enough, will demand independent evidence. In fact, it is alleged that the monuments of the time of Menephtah attest a period of depression: no great works of that king are known to exist; of his reign of twenty years the highest date hitherto found is the fourth; and two rival kings, Amenmessu (the Ammenemeses of the lists) and Siphthah, are reigning at the same time with him, i.e. holding precarious sovereignty in Thebes during the time of alien occupation and the flight of Menephtah (Bunsen, *Aeg. Stelle*, 4:208 sq.). That these two kings reigned in the time of Menephtah, and not with or after Sethos II, is assumed without proof; that the reign of Rameses II was followed by a period of decadence proves nothing as to its cause; and the entire silence of the monuments as to an event so memorable as the final expulsion of the hated "Shepherds" (*Shas-u*), who so often figure in the monumental recitals of earlier kings (e.g. of Sethos I, who calls them *shas-u p'kananakar*, "shepherds of the land of Canaan"), tells as strongly against the story as any merely negative evidence can do it. More important is the argument derived from the mention (Exodus 1:11) of the "treasure-cities Pithom and Raamses," built for the persecuting Pharaoh by the forced labor of the Hebrews; the Pharaoh (says Rosellini, *Mon. Storici*, 1:294 sq.) was Rameses [II, son of Sethos I], who gave one of the cities his own name. (Comp. Ewald, *Gesch.* 2:66, note.) Lepsius, art. Aegypten, in Herzog's *Encyclop.*, calls this "the weightiest confirmation," and in *Chronol. der Aeg.* 1:337-357, enlarges upon this argument. Raamses, he says, was at the eastern, as Pithom (Πάτουμος) was certainly at the western end of the great canal known to be the work of Rameses II, and the site of the city bearing his name is further identified with him by the granite group disinterred at Abu Keisheib, in which the deified king sits enthroned between the gods Ra and Tum. Certainly a king Rameses appears first in the 19th dynasty, but the place may have taken its name, if from a man at all, from some earlier person.

That the exode cannot be placed *before* the 19th dynasty, Bunsen (*ut sup.* p. 234) holds to be conclusively shown by the fact that on the monuments which record the conquests of Rameses the Great in Palestine, no mention occurs of the Israelites among the *Kheti* (Hittites) and other conquered nations; while, on the other hand, there is no hint in the book of Judges of an Egyptian invasion and servitude. On similar negative grounds he urges that the settlement in Palestine must have been subsequent to the conquests made in that country by Rameses III, first king of the 20th dynasty. To this it may be replied,

(1.) that we have no clear information as to the route of the invaders; if it was either along the coast or to the east of Jordan, the tribes, perhaps, were not directly affected by it.

(2.) The expeditions so pompously described on the monuments (as in the Statistical Table of Karnak, Thothmes III, and similar recitals of the conquests of Ramses II and III; see Mr. Birch, in *Trans. Of R. S. Lit.* 2:317 sq.; and 7:50 sq.) certainly did not result in the permanent subjugation of the countries invaded. This is sufficiently shown by the fact that the conquests repeat themselves under different kings, and even in the same reign. Year by year the king with his army sets out on a gigantic *razzia*, to return with spoil of cattle, slaves, and produce of the countries overrun.

(3.) If the lands of the tribes were thus overrun, it may have been during one of the periods of servitude, in which case they suffered only as the vassals of their Canaanitish, Moabitish, or other oppressors. That this may possibly have been the case is sufficient to deprive of all its force the argument derived from the silence of the monuments, and of the book of Judges.

There remains to be noticed one piece of documentary evidence which has quite recently been brought to light. Dr. Brugsch (*Zeitschrift*, Sept. 1863) reports that "one set of the Leyden hieratic papyri, now publishing by Dr. Leemans, consists of letters and official reports. In several of these, examined by M. Chabas, repeated mention is made of certain foreigners, called *Apuruju*, i.e. Hebrews, compelled by Rameses II to drag stones for the building of the city Raamses." In his *Melanges Egyptol.* 1862, 4th dissertation, M. Chabas calls them *Aperiu*. It is certainly striking, as Mr. Birch remarks (in *Revue Archeol.* April, 1862, p. 291), that "in the three documents which speak of these foreigners, they appear engaged on works

of the same kind as those to which the Hebrews were subjected by the Egyptians; it is also important that the papyri were found at Memphis. But the more inviting the proposed identification, the more cautious one needs to be.” As the sounds R and L are not discriminated in Egyptian writing, it may be that the name is *Apeliu*; and as B and P have distinct characters, one does not see why the *b* of $\mu\gamma\rho b$ should be rendered byp. (The case of *Epep* = *bybæ* is different; see below.) It seems, also, that the same name occurs as late as the time of Rameses IV, where it can hardly mean the Hebrews. Besides, the monument of Thothmes III above mentioned leads to quite a different conclusion. Where the evidence is so conflicting, the inquirer who seeks only truth, not the confirmation of a foregone conclusion, has no choice but to reserve his judgment.

The *time* of this Menephtha, so unhesitatingly proclaimed to be the Pharaoh of the Exode, is placed beyond all controversy — so Bunsen and Lepsius maintain — by an invaluable piece of evidence furnished by Theon, the Alexandrine mathematician of the 4th century. In a passage of his unpublished commentary on the *Almagest*, first given to the world by *Larcher* (*Hierodot.* 2:553), and since by *Biot* (*Sur la periode Sothiaque*, p. 18, 129 sq.), it is stated that the Sothiac Cycle of Astronomy which, as it ended in A.D. 139, commenced in B.C. 1322 (20th July), was known in his time as “the sera of Menophres” (ἔτη ἀπὸ Μενόφρεως.). There is no king of this name: read *Μενόφθεως* — so we have Menephtha of the 19th dynasty, the king of the leper-story, the Exodus Pharaoh. Lepsius, making the reign begin in B.C. 1328, places the exode at B.C. 1314-15 Menephtha, in accordance with the alleged thirteen years’ retirement into Ethiopia and the return in the fourteenth or fifteenth year. Certainly the precise name *Menophres* does not appear in the lists; but in later times that name may have been used for the purpose of distinguishing some particular king from others of the same name; and there is reason to think this was actually the case.

(1.) The king Tethmosis or Thothmes III repeatedly appears on monuments with the addition to his royal legend *Mai-Re*, “Beloved of Re,” with the article *Mai-ph-Re*, and with the preposition *Mai-n’-ph-Re*, which last is precisely Theon’s *Μενόφρης*.

(2.) The acknowledged confusion of names in that part of the 18th dynasty where this king occurs — *Misaphris*, *Misphres*, *Memphres* (Armen.), then *Misphragmuthosis* (the $\Lambda\Lambda\text{I}\Sigma\Phi\text{P}$. of Josephus is evidently an error of

copying for ΜΙΣΦΡ: in the list *ibid.* the 5th and 6th names are Μήφρης, Μερραμούθωσις) — is perhaps best explained by supposing that the king was entered in the lists by his distinctive as well as his family name.

(3.) In Pliny's notice of the obelisks (*H. N.* 36:64), that known to be of Thothmes III is said to belong to *Mesphres*, which, says Bunsen (4:130), "would be the popular distinctive name given to this Thothmes." Just so! And in the statement of Theon the king is presented by "his popular distinctive name," *Menophres*.

(4.) "There was (says Dr. Hincks, *Trans. R. Irish. Acad.* vol. 21, pt. 1) a tradition, if it does not deserve another name, current among the Egyptians in the time of Antoninus, to the effect that the Sothic Cycle, then ending (A.D. 139), commenced in the reign of Thothmes III. The existence of such a tradition is evidenced by a number of scarabaei, evidently of Roman workmanship, referring to the Sothic Cycle, and in which the royal legend of this monarch appears." These are sufficient grounds for believing that the Menophres of Theon is no other than Thothmes III, and that his reign was *supposed* (rightly or wrongly) to include the year B.C. 1322. It may be, also, that when Herodotus was told that *Moeris* lived about 900 years before the time of his visit to Egypt — a date not very wide of B.C. 1322 Thothmes was named to him by his popular distinctive appellation, *Mai-Re*. only confused with *Mares* = Ameneinha III, the Pharaoh of the Labyrinth and its Lake. (Other explanations of the name Menophres may be seen in Bockh, *Manetho*, p. 691 sq.; Biot, *Recherches*, interprets it as the name of Memphis, *Mennofru*, importing that the normal date, 20th July, for the heliacal rising of Sirius and epoch of the cycle, is true only for the latitude of Memphis.) What has been said is sufficient to show that there is no necessity for altering a letter of the name; consequently that the time of Menephtha is not defined by the authority of Theon. De Rouge emphatically rejects Lepsius's notion of Menophres (*Revue Archeol.* 9:664; *Journal Asiatique*, Aug. 1858, p. 268). He thinks the year 1322 lies in the reign of Rameses III.

In support of his date, B.C. 1314, for the exode, Lepsius (*Chronol.* p. 359 sq.) has an argument deduced from the modern Jewish chronology (Hillel's *Mundane Era*), in which he says that it is the precise year assigned to that event. Hillel, he is confident, was led to it by Manetho's Egyptian tradition, which gave him the name of the Pharaoh, and this being obtained would easily give him the time. Bunsen, though finally settling on the year B.C.

1320, had previously declared with Lepsius for B.C. 1314,” decided by the circumstance that *a tradition not compatible with the usual chronological systems of the Jews, but which cannot be accidental*, places the exode at that year. This fact seems, from Lepsius’s account of the *Seder Olam Rabba*, to admit of no doubt” (4:336). It admits of more than doubt — of absolute refutation. Hillel’s whole procedure, from first to last, was simply Biblical. Daniel’s prophecy of the seventy weeks gave him B.C. 422 for 11 Zedekiah; thence up to 6 Hezekiah he found the sum — 133 years; for the kings of Israel the actual numbers were 243, of which he made 240 years; then 37 years of Solomon; 480 years of ^{<1000>}1 Kings 6:1, added to these, made the total 890 years, whence the date for the exode was B.C. 422 + 890 = 1312; for that this, not 1314, was Hillel’s year of the exode is demonstrable (Review of *Lepsius om Bible Chronology*, by H. Browne, in Arnold’s *Theolog. Critic*, 1:52-59, 1851). Yet, though the process by which Hillel got his date is so transparent, it is spoken of as “an important tradition” by those who take ready-made conclusions at second-hand, without inquiry into their grounds. So Duncker, *Gesch. des Alterthums*, 1:196, note; Dr. Williams, in *Essays and Reviews*, p. 58.

It is alleged that an indication confirmatory of the low date assigned by these writers is furnished by the *month-date* of the Exodus passover, 14 Abib, a name which occurs only in connection with that history (^{<017>}Exodus 12:2; 13, 4; 23:15; 34:18; ^{<018>}Deuteronomy 16:1). This argument proceeds on the presumption that Abib is the Hebraized form of the Egyptian *Epep*, Coptic *Epiphi*, of which the Arabic rendering is also *Abib*. The Egyptian month takes its name from the goddess *Apap*: the change of *p* to *b* is intended to make the word pure Hebrew, denoting the time of year, **bybāh; vdlj** ☞ the month when the barley is in the ear (*abib*) (^{<019>}Exodus 9:31). “At the time assigned, the vague month Epep would pretty nearly coincide with the Hebrew Abib” (Lepsius, *Chron.* p. 141). Hardly so, for in the year named 1 Epiphi would fall on 14th May, and it is scarcely conceivable that the passover month (whose full moon is that next to the vernal equinox, which in that century fell cir. 5th April) should begin so late as the middle of May. Not till a hundred years later would the vague month Epiphi and the Hebrew passover month coincide. The argument proves too much, unless we are prepared to lower the exode to cir. B.C. 1200. (To some it may imply that the narrative of the exode was written about that time — Mr. Sharpe, *History of Egypt*, 1:63 — but one can hardly suppose that the Hebrews retained the vague Egyptian months as

well as their names so long after their settlement in Palestine.) If in any year from B.C. 1300 upwards, the full moon next the vernal equinox fell in the month Epiphi, it would follow that the Coptic month-names (which, it is well understood, never occur on the monuments) belonged then to a different form of the year.

For the first seventeen dynasties, numbering in Afr. more than 4000 years, a bare statement of their contents and of the monumental evidence would greatly exceed the limits of this article. Perhaps the time is not far distant when the attempt to educe a connected chronology from Manetho (whether for or against the Mosaic numbers) will be abandoned by all sensible men. Full and unprejudiced inquiry can have but one result: *for times anterior to B.C. 700 Eg.(?) has no fixed chronology*. De Rouge has in two words set the whole matter in its true light: “Les textes de Manethon sont profondement *alteres*, et la serie des dates monumentales est tres *incomplete*.” The incompleteness of the record is palpable: the alteration of the texts is the result of their having passed through numerous hands, and been refashioned according to various intentions, by which the whole inquiry has been complicated to a degree that baffles all attempts to determine what was their original form. These intentions were mainly *cyclical*. A very brief statement of facts, not resting on critical conjecture and questionable combinations, as in the elaborate treatise of Bickh, but lying on the surface, will place the character and relations of the several texts in a clear light. Menes stands,

- 1.** In Africanus (according to Syncellus’s running summation of the numbers in book 1) just *three complete sothiac cycles*, 3 x 1460 Julian years, before B.C. 1322;
- 2.** In Eusebius, according to the epigraphal sum of book 1, *three cycles* before the epoch of Sethosis, dyn. 19;
- 3.** In Eusebius, according to the actual sum of book 1, *three cycles* before the year B.C. 978-77, meant as the goal of the Diospolitan monarchy or epoch of Shishak;
- 4.** In Syncellus’s period of 3555 years (accepted by Lepsius and Bunsen as the true Manethonic measure from Menes to Nectanebus), *two cycles* before the same goal;

5. In the Old Chronicle, according to its *scthiac* form, *one cycle* before the same goal;

6. In the Sothis, *one cycle* before B.C. 1322; but here it is contrived that *Osiropis*, or the commencement of Diospolitan monarchy, stands *one cycle* before *Susak-eim* = *Shishlak*. ‘The inquirer may easily verify these facts for himself. In the series of papers, “Cycles of Egyptian Chronology,” published in Arnold’s *Theol. Critic*, 1851-52, he will find them fully stated, with many other like facts, which prove that these chronographies, one and all, are intensely cyclical. But if Manetho, as we have him, is cyclical, then, Lepsius himself confesses (K. B. p. 6, 7), “*the historical character of his work falls to the ground; for the very fact of Menes heading a sothiac circle could only be the result of after-contrivance;*” and Bunsen (*Aeg. St.* 4:13) sees that in place of “the genuine historical work of Manetho, the venerable priest and conscientious inquirer,” we get “*a made-up thing, systematically carved to shape, and therefore really fabulous.*” Whether or not the original “Manetho,” whatever its authorship and date, was contrived upon a cyclical plan, we have but the lists as they come to us finally from the hands of Annianus and Pandorus through Syncellus. It may be observed, however, that the cardinal dates given by *Dicesarchus*, which we have from an independent source, imply that the cyclical treatment of Egyptian chronology is at least as old as the alleged time of Manetho (“*Cycles,*” etc., *u. s.*, sec, 4, 16, 34, 36).

For literature additional to the above, *SEE EGYPT*; also Fruin, *Dissertatio Historica de Manethone* (Leyd. 1847, 8vo); Böckh, *Manetho* (Berlin, 1845, 8vo); A. H. von Sagens, *Mtanechos, die Originen unserer Gesch.* (Gotha, 1865, 8vo); *Ain. Presb. Rev.* Jan. 1866, p. 180.

Manger

is the rendering found in ~~4000~~ Luke 2:7,12, 16, of the term , φάτην used to designate the place in which the infant Redeemer was cradled; which seems to denote a *crib* or “stall” for feeding cattle, as it is rendered in ~~2135~~ Luke 13:15 (see Horrei *Miscell. Crit.* Leon. 1738, bk. 2, ch. 16). It is employed in the Sept. in a similar sense for the Heb. סִבְאֵ ~~880~~ Job 39:9; ~~2003~~ Isaiah 1:3; also by Josephus, *Ant.* 8:2, 4; comp. Lucan, *Tim.* p. 14; Xenophon, — Eg. 4:1. Gersdorff (*Beitreege zur Sprachchakteristik des N.T.* p. 220) is in favor of translating the word *crib* everywhere, and quotes Elian (apud Suid. s.v.), Philo (*De sommdiiis*, p. 872, b. ed. Colon. 1613), and Sybile.

Eryth. (ap. Lactantius, 7:24, 12) to that effect. Schleusner (*Lex. s.v.*) says it is any enclosure, but especially the vestibule to the house, where the cattle were enclosed, not with walls, but wooden hurdles; but in common Greek the word undoubtedly often refers to a trough hollowed out to receive the food for horses, etc. (see Homer, *II. v.* 271; 10:568; 24:280). The Peshito Version evidently so understands it. On the other hand, it is doubtful if such a contrivance as a proper manger was known in the East, especially in the khans or “inns” of the description alluded to in the text. **SEE CARAVANSERAI.** “Stables and mangers, in the sense in which we understand them, are of comparatively late introduction into the East (see the quotations from Chardin and others in Harmer’s *Observations*, 2:205), and, although they have furnished material to modern painters and poets, did not enter into the circumstances attending the birth of Christ, and are hardly less inaccurate than the ‘cradle’ and the ‘stable’ which are named in some descriptions of that event.” We are therefore doubtless here to regard the term as designating the ledge or projection in the end of the room used as a stable, on which they have or other food of the animals of travelers was placed. (See Strong’s *Harmonyos and Expos. of the Gospels*, p. 14.) Several of the Christian fathers maintain at that the stable itself was in a cave, and the identical manger in which the infant Jesus is traditionally stated to have lain is still shown by the superstitious monks, being no other than a marble sarcophagus; but the whole story is at variance with the narrative in the Gospels. (See Meldon, *De praesepe Christi*, Jen. 1662.) **SEE BETHLEHEM.** “avernier, speaking of Aleppo, states that” in the caravanserais, on each side of the hall, for persons of the best quality, there are lodgings for every man by himself. These lodgings are raised a along the court, two or three steps high, just behind which are the stables, where many times it is as good lying as in the chambers. Right against the head of every horse there is a niche with a window into the lodging-chamber, out of which every man may see that his horse is looked after. These niches are usually so large that three men may lie in them, and here the servants dress their victuals.” In modern Oriental farm-houses, however, something corresponding to a Western “manager” may be found.” It is common to find two sides of the one room where the native farmer resides with his cattle fitted up with these mangers, and the remainder elevated about two feet higher for the accommodation of the family. The mangers are built of small stones and mortar, in the shape of a box, or, rather, of a kneading-trough, and when cleaned up and whitewashed, as they often are in

summer, they do very well to lay little babes in” (Thomson, *Land and Book*, 2:98). *SEE STABLE*.

Mangey, Thomas, D.D.,

an English theologian, was born at Leeds in 1684; was educated at St. John’s College, Cambridge; held successively the livings of St. Mildred, Bread Street, London; St. Nicholas, Guilford, and Ealing, in Middlesex; was chaplain to Dr. Robinson, bishop of London; in 1721 was presented to the fifth stall in the cathedral of Durham, and was advanced to the first stall in 1722; became D.D. in 1725, and died in 1755. Dr. Mangey published a number of *Sermons*: and controversial tracts, and a most valuable edition of the works of Philo Judaeus: *Philonis Judaei Opera omnia quae reperiripotuerunt* (Lond. 1742, 2 vols. fol.). — Allibone, *Dict. Brit. and Amer. Auth. s.v.*; Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* 7:222.

Manhartists Or Haagleitnerians

the name of a party in the Romish Church, especially in the archbishopric of Salzburg, from 1814 to 1826, whose founder and chief was a young priest named Caspar Haagleitner, of Hopfgarten; and its most distinguished and active member was Sebastian Manzl, of Westendorf (known also by the name of Manhart, from one of his estates). In 1809 Napoleon I had appointed the prince-bishop of Chiem-see and the coadjutor of Salzburg as ecclesiastical authorities in the diocese. The clergy submitted with the exception of Haagleitner, who refused to recognize them, and showed symptoms of heresy. He left Hopfgarten and went to Tyrol, where he created some religions and political troubles, and gained a number of followers. At the peace of Schonbrunn the Tyrol fell again into the hands of the French, and Haagleitner was taken a prisoner to Kusstein and Salzburg. He finally succeeded in making good his escape; and when, in 1814, Austria recovered the Bavarian Tyrol, he was appointed vicar at Worgel. Here he continued his intrigue, and succeeded so well that the people came to consider him as the only true priest in the country, the others having failed to do their duty by submitting to the dictates of Napoleon. Manhart assisted Haagleitner greatly in propagating his doctrines in Westendorf, Hopfgarten, and Kirchbichel, and their effect was felt even long after Haagleitner had been removed from Worgel. Manhart held meetings in his own house, preaching himself, or allowing his wife to preach, as well as another woman from Hopfgarten. The administrator of

the diocese of Salzburg, and afterwards the archbishop Augustin Gruber, sought in vain to reconcile them with the Church; they asked to be instructed by the pope himself in case they were in the wrong, and for this purpose went to Rome in 1825. The difficulty ended soon after. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, 8:781.

Ma'ni

(**Μα'νί**, *Vulg. Banni*), given (1 Esdras 9:30) by error for BANI (q.v.) of the Heb. list (^{<5029>}Ezra 10:29).

Mani, Manes, Or Manichæus

(entitled *Zendik*, Sadducee), the founder of the heretical sect of the Manichæans, is said to have flourished in the second half of the 3d century. Little is known with regard to his early history, and the accounts transmitted through two distinct sources — the Western or Greek, and the Eastern — are legendary and contradictory on almost every important point. According to the most probable supposition, he was a native of Persia, and was born about 214. His real name appears to have been *Curbicus*, and he was the slave of a rich woman of Ctesiphon, who bought him when he was but seven years of age, had him carefully educated, and at her decease left him all her wealth. Among the books she left him he is said to have found the writings of Scythianus, which had been given to her by one of the latter's disciples named Terebinthus, or *Budda*. The East was at this time in great ferment. The progress of Christianity had awakened the opposition of all the heathen religions from the Indus to the Euphrates. Parsism was the most powerful among them. Mani, with the aid of the treasure left him in the writings of Scythianus, believed it possible to accomplish the amalgamation of Parsism and Christianity, and for this purpose he emigrated to Persia, changed his name so as to obliterate all traces of his origin and former state, and, to carry out his plans more successfully, he proclaimed himself the Paraclete promised by Christ. It is said that the attempt was looked upon with favor by king Sapor and by Hormisdas, but this appears doubtful. Followers soon gathered, and three of the new sect — Thomas, Buddas or Addas, and Hermas — propagated the doctrines, the first in Egypt and the second in India. Hermas only remained with Mani to assist him. While they were away the son of Sapor fell ill, and Mani, who had been highly spoken of as a physician, was called to attend him; but, not succeeding, he was thrown into prison. Mani bribed

his keepers, and succeeded in escaping, but was pursued and captured, and publicly executed.

There are other accounts, however, which make Mani the scion of a noble magian family, and a man of extraordinary mental powers and artistic and scientific abilities — an eminent painter, mathematician, etc. According to them Mani embraced Christianity in early manhood, and became presbyter at a church in Ehvaz or Ahvaj, in the Persian province of Hazitis. He purposed to purge Christianity of its alleged Jewish corruptions, to demonstrate its unity with Parsism, and thereby to present the perfect universal religion. He gave himself out to be the Paraclete, and styled himself in ecclesiastical documents “Mani, called to be an apostle of Jesus Christ through the election of God the Father. These are the words of salvation from the eternal and living Source.” Persecuted by king Sapor I, he sought refuge in foreign countries, went to India, China, and Turkistan, and there lived in a cave for twelve months, during which he claimed to have been in heaven. He reappeared with a wonderful book of drawings and pictures, called Erdshenk or Ertenki-Mani. No doubt during his residence in these countries he had become acquainted with Buddhism, and had decided to incorporate some of its best points in his syncretistic religion (comp. Hardwick, *Christ and other Masters*, 1:288 sq.). After the death of Sapor (A.D. 272) he returned to Persia, where Hormas, the new king, who was well inclined towards him, received him with great honors, and, in order to protect him more effectually against the persecutions of the magi, gave him the stronghold of Deshereh, in Susiana, as a residence. After the death of this king, however, Bahram, his successor, entrapped Mani into a public disputation with the magi, for which purpose he had to leave his castle; and he was seized and flayed alive, A.D. 277. His skin was stuffed and hung up for a terror at the gates of the city Jondishapur.

Among the works of Mani may be reckoned four books, sometimes ascribed to Terebinthus and sometimes to Scythianus, entitled the *Mysteries*, the *Chapters or Leads*, the *Gospel*, and the *Treasure*. In the *Mysteries* Man endeavored to demonstrate the doctrine of two principles from the mixture of good and evil which is found in the world. He grounded his reasons on the argument that if there were one sole cause, simple, perfect, and good in the highest degree, the whole, corresponding with the nature and will of that cause, would show simplicity, perfection, and goodness, and everything would be immortal, holy, and happy like himself. The *Chapters* contained a summary of the chief articles of the

Manichæan scheme. Of the *Gospels* nothing certain can be asserted. Beausobre, apparently without sufficient grounds, considers it as a collection of the meditations and pretended revelations of Mani. The *Treasure*, or *Treasure of Life*, may, perhaps, have derived its name from the words of Christ, wherein he compares his doctrine to a treasure hid in a field. Mani also wrote other works and letters, and among them the *Epistle of the Foundation*, of which we have fragments still extant in St. Augustine, who undertook to refute it. His works appear to have been originally written, some in Syriac, some in Persic. For his doctrine, etc., *SEE MANICHÆISM*. (J. H. W.)

Manichæism

As we have seen in the life of MANI *SEE MANI* (q.v.), the origin of Manichæism, as well as the history of its founder and propagator, is matter of obscure and confused tradition. Although it utterly disclaimed being denominated Christian, it was reckoned among the heretical doctrines of the Church. It was intended, as we have already indicated in the sketch of Mani, to blend the chief doctrines of Parsism, or rather Magism, as reformed by Zoroaster, with a certain number of Buddhistic views, under the outward garb of Biblical, more especially New-Testament history, which, explained allegorically and symbolically, was made to represent an entirely new religious system, and one wholly at variance with Christianity and its fundamental teachings (comp. Hardwick, *Christ and other Masters*, 2:389 sq.; and see the references there for Lassen and others).

Doctrines. — Like Magism, Manichæism holds that there are two eternal principles from which all things proceed, the two everlasting kingdoms, bordering on each other—the kingdom of light under the dominion of God, and the kingdom of darkness under the demon or *hyle* (ϝλη). The Light, the Good, or God, and the Darkness, the Bad, Matter, or Archon, each inhabited a region akin to their natures, and excluding each other to such a degree that the region of Darkness and its leader never knew of the existence of that of the Light. Twelve aeons — corresponding to the twelve signs of the zodiac and the twelve stages of the world — had sprung (emanated) from the Primeval Light; while “Darkness,” filled with the eternal fire, which burned but shone not, was peopled by “daemons,” who were constantly fighting among themselves. In one of these contests, pressing towards the outer edge, as it were, of their region, they became aware of the neighboring region, and forthwith united, attacked it, and

succeeded in taking captive the Ray of Light that was sent against them at the head of the hosts of Light, and which was the embodiment of the Ideal or Primeval Man (Christ). A stronger aeon (the Holy Ghost) then hastened to the rescue, and redeemed the greater and better part of the captive Light (Jesus Impatibilis). The smaller and fainter portion, however (Jesus Passibilis), remained in the hands of the powers of Darkness, and out of this they formed, after the ideal of *The Man of Light*, mortal man. But even the small fraction of light left in him (broken in two souls) would have prevailed against them had they not found means to further divide and subdivide it by the propagation of this man (Eve-Sin). Not yet satisfied, they still more dimmed it by burying it under dark “forms of belief and faith, such as Paganism and Judaism.” Once more, however, the Original Light came to save the light buried in man — to deliver the captive souls of men from their corporeal prison. On this account there were created two sublime beings, Christ and the Holy Ghost. Christ was sent into the world clothed with the shadowy form of a human body, and not with the real substance, to teach mortals how to deliver the rational soul from the corrupt body, and to overcome the power of malignant matter. But again the daemons succeeded in defeating the schemes of the power of light. Obscuring men’s minds, even those of the apostles, so that they could not fully understand Christ’s object, his career of salvation was cut short by the daemons seducing man to crucify him. His sufferings and death were, naturally, only fictitious, since he could not in reality die; he only allowed himself to become an example of endurance and passive pain for his own, the souls of light. But to carry out the intended salvation of men Christ, shortly before his crucifixion, gave the promise recorded by John (16:7-15), that he would send to his disciples the Comforter, “who would lead them into all truth.” This promise, the Manichaeans maintain, was fulfilled in the person of Mani, who was sent by the God of light to declare to all men the doctrine of salvation, without concealing any of its truths under the veil of metaphor, or under any other covering.

Mani, like Christ, surrounded himself with twelve apostles, and sent them into the world to teach and to preach his doctrine of salvation. To carry out his work more successfully, and to make converts also of the Christians, he rejected the authority of the Old Testament, which, he said, was the work of the God of darkness, whom the Jews had worshipped in the place of light, and also a good part of the New Testament, upon the ground that many of the books had been grossly interpolated, and were not

the productions of the persons whose names they bear. As strictly canonical, he admitted only his own writings, and such parts of the New Testament as answered his purpose. “Whatever,” says Baur (*Manich. Religions system* p. 375), “in the writings of the New Testament seemed to concur with the dualism set forth by Mani was accounted among the most genuine ingredients in the doctrines of Christianity, and Mani and his adherents were very glad to cite for the confirmation of their own doctrines and principles passages like ~~4078~~ Matthew 7:18; 13:24; ~~4008~~ John 1:5; 8:44; 14:30; ~~4006~~ 2 Corinthians 4:4 (comp. Epiph. *Haer.* 66:67-69); and especially those in which the apostle Paul speaks of the opposition between flesh and spirit. As they found, however, so much in the New Testament which not only did not confirm the Manichaeian doctrines, but stood in opposition to them, they were obliged, in accordance with the hypothesis that the original doctrines of Christianity did not differ from those of Manicheism, to regard all passages of this kind as a distortion and falsification of Christianity. Accordingly, they laid down the rule that the written records of Christianity ought not to be received unconditionally, but must be subjected to a previous scrutiny, with a view to ascertain how far they exhibited the genuine substance of Christianity; and this was limited to those portions which bore the character of Manichaeism, so that, following this criterion, whatever did not harmonize with their own doctrines was rejected without hesitation, because original Christianity could not contradict itself.”

Mani also taught that those souls which obeyed the laws delivered by Christ, as explained by himself the Comforter, and struggled against the lusts and appetites of a corrupt nature, would, on their death, be delivered from their sinful bodies, and, after being purified by the sun and moon — “the two light-ships for conducting the imprisoned light into the eternal kingdom of light” — would ascend to the regions of light; but that those souls which neglected to struggle against their corrupt. natures would pass after death into the bodies of animals or other beings, until they had expiated their guilt. Belief in the evil of matter led to a denial of the doctrine of the resurrection. “These ideas,” says Donaldson, (*Christian Orthodoxy*, p. 143), “they [the Manicheans] worked out in a manner peculiar to themselves, and with results decidedly unfavorable to the integrity and authenticity of the New Testament. They could accept neither the doctrine nor the facts of revelation, unless they could regard them as a reflex of their own dualism. Without wishing to reject

Christianity, they made their own system the standard of measurement, and lopped off or stretched the religion of the Cross, wherever it did not fit the religion of light and darkness. The identification of Christ with Mithras led, of course, to a profession of Docetism, namely, to the assertion that our Lord's sufferings on the cross were not real, but apparent only. Christ had no real human body, no double nature, but only a fantastic semblance of corporeity, in which his essence, as the Son of Everlasting Light, was presented to the eyes of men... Accordingly, Christ had no human birth, and his apparent sufferings were really inflicted on him by his enemy, the Prince of Darkness; and in thus resolving the life of Jesus into a series of illusory appearances, the Manichaeans take from Christianity all its historical foundation, and leave us nothing but the realistic applications of a few Christian metaphors." "Christianity," says Dr. Schaff (*Ch. History*, 1:249) "is here resolved into a fantastic, dualistic-pantheistic philosophy of nature; moral regeneration is identified with a process of physical refinement; and the whole mystery of redemption is found in light, which was always worshipped in the East as the symbol of deity. Unquestionably there pervades the Manichaean system a kind of groaning of the creature for redemption, and a deep sympathy with nature, that hieroglyphic of spirit; but all is distorted and confused. The suffering Jesus on the cross, Jesus patibilis, is here a mere illusion, a symbol of the world-soul still enchained in matter, and is seen in every plant which works upwards from the clark bosom of the earth towards the light; towards bloom and fruit, yearning after freedom. Hence the class of the 'perfect' would not kill nor wound a beast, pluck a flower, nor break a blade of grass. The system, instead of being, as it pretends, a liberation of light from darkness, is really a turning of light into darkness."

Organization. — "Manichaeism," says Dr. Schaff (1:250), "differed from the Gnostic schools in having a fixed, and that a strictly hierarchal organization. At the head of the sect stood twelve apostles or magistri, among whom Mani and his successors, like Peter and the pope, held the chief place. Under them were seventy-two bishops, answering to the seventy-two (strictly, seventy) of the disciples of Jesus; and under these came presbyters, deacons, and itinerant evangelists. In the congregations there were two distinct classes, designed to correspond to the catechumens and the faithful in the Catholic Church — the 'hearers' (*Auditores*) and the 'perfect' (*Electi*), the esoteric, the priestly caste, which represents the last stage in the process of the liberation of the spirit and its separation from

the world, the transition from the kingdom of matter into the kingdom of light, or, in the Buddhistic terms, from the world of Sansara into Nirvana.” The Elect are required to adhere to the *Signaculum Oris*, *Muanes*, and *Sinus*, that is, they have to take the oath of abstinence from evil and profane speech (including “religious terms such as Christians use respecting the Godhead and religion”), further, from flesh, eggs, milk, fish, wine, and all intoxicating drinks (comp. Manu, *Instit.* vs. 51, 52, 53: “He who makes the flesh of an animal his food... not a mortal exists more sinful... he who... desires to enlarge his own flesh with the flesh of another creature,” etc.); further, from the possession of riches, or, indeed, any property whatsoever; from hurting any being, animal or vegetable; from heeding their own family, or showing any pity to him who is not of the Manichæan creed; and finally, from breaking their chastity by marriage or otherwise. The Auditors were comparatively free to partake of the good things of this world, but they had to provide for the subsistence of the Elect, and their highest aim, also, was the attainment of the state of their superior brethren.

Cultus. — In Manichæan worship, the visible representatives of the light (sun and moon) were revered, but only as representatives of the Ideal, of the good or supreme God. Neither altar nor sacrifice was to be found in their places of religious assemblies, nor did they erect sumptuous temples. Fasts, prayers, occasional readings in the supposed writings of Mani, chiefly a certain *Fundamental Epistle*, were all their outer worship. Sunday, as the day on which the visible universe was to be consumed, the day consecrated to the sun, was kept as a great festival; Church festivals they rejected, and, instead, made the most solemn day in their year the anniversary of the death of Mani. Baptism they repudiated, considering it useless; the Lord’s Supper was celebrated, but only by the Elect. Of the mode of celebration, however, we know next to nothing; even Augustine, who, for about nine years, belonged to the sect, and who is our chief authority on this subject, confesses his ignorance of it. Dr. Schaff (*Ch. Hist.* 1:250) says that they partook of it without wine (because Christ had no blood), “and regarded it perhaps according to their pantheistic symbolism, as the commemoration of the light-soul crucified in all nature.”

Character. — As to the general morality of the Manichæans, we are equally left to conjecture; but their doctrine certainly appears to have had a tendency, chiefly in the case of the uneducated, to lead to a sensual fanaticism hurtful to a pure mode of life. Bower, in the second volume of

his *History of the Popes*, has attempted to prove that the Manichaeans were addicted to immoral practices, but this (pinion has been ably controverted by Beausobre and Lardner. "The morality of the Manichaeans," says Dr. Schaff, "was severely ascetic, based on the fundamental error of the intrinsic evil of matter and the body; the extreme opposite of the Pelagian view of the essential moral purity of human nature. The great moral aim is to become entirely unworldly, in the Buddhistic sense; to renounce and destroy corporeity; to set the good soul free from the fetters of matter. This is accomplished by the most rigid and gloomy abstinence, which, however, is required only of the elect, not of the catechumens."

Extent. — Mani, as we have noted already in our sketch of his life, was put to death about 275; but the sect soon spread into proconsular Asia, and even into Africa, Sicily, and Italy, although they were vehemently opposed by the Catholic Church, and persecuted by the heathen emperors, who enacted bloody laws against them, as a sect derived from hostile Persia. The precise time when the doctrines of Mani made their way into the Roman empire it is impossible definitely to determine. The principal document on the subject, entitled *Acta disputationis Archelai, episcopi Mesopotanmice, et Manetis haeresiarchoe*, is deemed apocryphal. Diocletian, as early as A.D. 296, issued rigorous laws against the Manichaeans, which were reiterated by Valentinian, Theodosius I, and successive monarchs. Notwithstanding this, they gained numerous adherents; and very many medieval sects, as the Priscillians, Paulicians, Bogomiles, Catharists, Josephinians, etc., were suspected to be secretly Manichaeans, and were therefore called "New Manichaeans." "Indeed, the leading features of Manichaeism, the dualistic separation of soul and body, the ascription of nature to the devil, the pantheistic confusion of the moral and the physical, the hypocritical symbolism, concealing heathen views under Christian phrases, the haughty air of mystery, and the aristocratic distinction of esoteric and exoteric, still live in various forms even in modern systems of philosophy and sects of religion. The Mormons of our day strongly bring to mind, in many respects, even in their organization, the ancient Manichaeans" (Dr. Schaff). It is a remarkable circumstance in their history, that though they could not stand openly against the power and severity of their persecutors, they continued for ages, up to the very time of the Reformation, to make proselytes in secret. Their doctrines lurked even among the clergy and the monks. The profound and noble Augustine

fell under their influence, and was a member of the sect from his twentieth to his twenty-ninth year (374-383). They were still to be found in Leo's time, 440. The Arian Hunneric, in 477, began his reign with attempts to persecute them, and was mortified to find most of those whom he detected had professed to be lay or clerical members of his own sect. Gregory the Great, about 600, had to take means for extirpating them from Africa; and even after his pontificate traces of them appeared now and then in Italy, as well as other countries, threatening danger to the Church. About the year 1000 they spread from Italy into other countries, especially into southern France, Spain, and even Germany.

Literature. — Archelaus (bishop of Cascar about 278), *Acta disputationis cum Manete* (first composed in Syriac, but extant only in a Latin translation, and in many respects untrustworthy), in Routh's *Reliquiae sacrae*, v. 3-206. The Oriental accounts, of later date, indeed (the 9th and 10th centuries), but drawn from ancient sources, are collected in Herbelot, *Bibl. Orient.* (Par. 1679), s.v. Mani. See Titus Bostrensis (about 360), *Κατὰ Μανιχαίων*; Epiphanius, Haer. p. 66 (drawn from Archelaus); Zachagni, *Monumenta Ecclesiae Graecae et Latinae* (Rome, 1698); St. Augustine, *De Moribus Manicheorum; De Genesi contra Manichaeos; e duabus animabus contra Manichaeos; De Tera religione Epistola fundamentis contra Iustum*; Fabricius, *Biblioth. Graeca*, v. 284; Beausobre, *Histoire crit. de Manichee et du Scanicheisme* (Anst. 1734 and 1739, 2 vols.); F. Chr. Baur, *Deas Manichusche Religionssysteml nach den Quellen untersucht* (Tiub. 1831); Fligel, *Marni, seine Iebre u. seine Schriften* (Lpz. 1862); Trechsel, *Ueber den Kranonl die Kritiki, u. die Exeyese der Manlimchaier* (Berne, 1832); Colditz, *Entstehung d. mancich. Reli/ionss;ysntemls* (Lpz. 1837); Reichlin-Meldegg, *Theologie d.s Milliers JIansi ut. ilhr Ursprung* (Frankf. 1825); V. de Wagnerln, *Manich. indulgoentiaicum brevi totius Munich. adumilbratione, e fbnitibus descripsit* (Lpz. 1827); P. de Lagardle, *Titi Bostreni contra Manich. libri quatuor Syriace* (Berl. 1859); *Stud. und Ksrit.* vi. 3, 875 sq. (review of Baur); Schrockh, *Kirchengesch.* 4:400 sq.; 11:245 sq.; Neander, *Chl. Hist.* 2:707 sq.; Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* i, § 73; Donaldson, *Christian Orthodoxy*, p. 127 sq.; Haag, *Hist. des Dogmes Chretiens* (see Index); Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*, 1:240 sq., 337, 352, 353; Pressense, *L'histoire du Dogme* (Par. 1869), chap. 2 (J. H. W.)

Manipa

the name of a monstrous idol worshipped in the kingdoms of Tangut and Barantola, in Tartary. It has nine heads, which rise pyramidally, there being three in the first and second row, then two, and one at the top of all. A bold, resolute young fellow, dressed in armor, and prompted by enthusiastic courage, on certain days of the year, runs about the city Tanchuth, and kills every one he meets in honor of the goddess. By such outrageous sacrifices as these the devotees imagine they extremely oblige Manipa. — Kircher, *China illustr.*; Broughton, *Bibliotheca Hist. Sac.* s.v.

Maniple

an article of dress introduced when the use of the stole as a handkerchief fell into disuse. It now represents the cord with which our Lord was bound to the pillar at his scourging. — Walcott, *Sac. Archaeol.* s.v.; Siegel, *Archceol.* s.v. Manipulus.

Manitou

is the name of any object used as a fetish or amulet among some tribes of the American Indians those of the North and North-west. "The Illinois," wrote the Jesuit Marest, "adore a sort of genius which they call Manitou; to them it is the master of life, the spirit that rules all things. A bird, a buffalo, a bear, a feather, a skin — that is their manitou." "If the Indian word manitou," says Palfrey, "appeared to denote something above or beside the common aspects and agencies of nature, it might be natural, but it would be rash and misleading to confound its import with the Christian, Mohammedan, Jewish, Egyptian, or Greek conception of the Deity, or with any compound or selection from some or all of those ideas." *SEE INDIANS.*

Manley, Ira

a Congregational minister and home missionary, was born about the year 1780; was a graduate of Middlebury College, studied law, was admitted to the bar, and left a fine practice to enter the ministry. He was a home missionary for sixty years, and a pioneer in all good enterprises. The last twenty-two years of his life were mostly spent in Wisconsin. He died at Keene, Essex County, N.Y., Feb. 5, 1871. — *New Amer. Cyclop.* 1871, p. 569.

Man'lius

the name of one of the ambassadors who is said to have written a letter to the Jews confirming whatever concession Lysias had granted them. Four letters were written to the Jews, of which the last is from "Quintus Memmius and Titus Manlius (Gr. **Τίτος Μάνλιος**, v. r. **Μάνιος**; Vulg. *Titus Manilius*), ambassadors (**πρεσβῦται**) of the Romans" (2 Maccabees 11:34). There is not much doubt that the letter is a fabrication, as history is entirely ignorant of these names. Polybius (*Reliq.* 31:9, 6), indeed, mentions C. Sulpitius and *Manius* Sergius, who were sent to Antiochus IV Epiphanes about B.C. 163, an also (*Relig.* 31:12, 9) Cn. Octavius, Spurius Lucretius, and L. Aurelius, who were sent into Syria in B.C. 162 in consequence of the contention for the guardianship of the young king Antiochus V Eupator, but entirely ignores Q. Memmius or T. Manlius. We may therefore conclude that legates of these names were never in Syria. The true name of T. Manlius may be *T. Manius*, and as there is not sufficient time for an embassy to have been sent to Syria between the two recorded by Polybius, the writer may have been thinking of the former. The letter is dated in the 148th year of the Seleucidan sera (= B.C. 165), and in this year there was a consul of the name of *T. Macnilius* Torquatus, who appears to have been sent on an embassy to Egypt about B.C. 164, to mediate between the two Ptolemies, Philometor and Euergetes (Livy, 43:11; Polybius, *Relig.* 32:1, 2). The employment of this Seleucidan sera as a date, the absence of the name of the city, and especially the fact that the first intercourse of the Jews and Romans did not take place till two years later, when Judas heard of the fame of the Romans (1 Maccabees 8, I sq.), all prove that the document is far from authentic.

The three other letters do not merit serious attention (2 Maccabees 11:16-33). See Wernsdorff, *Defid. Libr. Maccab.* sec. 66; Grimm, *Exeg. Handbuch*, ad loc., and on the other side, Patritius, *De Cons. Maccabees* p. 142, 280.

Manly, Basil, D.D.

a Baptist divine and educator of note, was born in Chatham County, N. C., Jan. 28, 1798. At the age of sixteen he became a member of a Baptist Church, and not long after began speaking in public, though he was not regularly licensed till 1818. He preached his first sermon in Beaufort, S. C., and must have made a favorable impression, for he at once received an

offer of aid from a society for the education of ministers, and commenced his studies. In December, 1819, he entered the junior class in South Carolina College, and graduated with the highest honor in 1821. He immediately entered into an engagement to preach in the Edgefield District, and was ordained in March, 1822. A Church was formed at Edgefield Court-house about a year later, of which he was pastor for three years, gaining a wide reputation as a preacher in upper South Carolina. He was called in 1826 to the pastorate of the Baptist Church in Charleston, and continued there eleven years, during which time he not only sustained and extended his reputation as a preacher, but was active in the cause of liberal and theological education, effecting the establishment of what is now known as Furman University, at Greenville, S. C. At that period theological instruction was included in the plans of this and similar institutions. Dr. Manly lived to see the Baptists of the South concentrate their energies upon the establishment and support of a single theological seminary. He took a lively interest in this matter, partly, no doubt, from a sense of the disadvantages under which he had himself labored; for, though a good scholar, he was a self-educated theologian. He was chosen in 1837 to the presidency of the University of Alabama, and administered the office for about eighteen years with eminent ability and success. In 1855 he returned to Charleston, and to the pastoral office over one of the four churches that now existed in place of the one to which he had formerly ministered. He was subsequently engaged as a missionary and evangelist in Alabama, and as a pastor at Montgomery. He died at Greenville, S. C., Dec. 21, 1868. As a preacher, Dr. Manly was eminently popular. His discourses, though instructive and convincing, were also charged with the elements of emotional power, and, with all his success as an educator, this was the work in which he most delighted. Dr. Manly wrote a "treatise on Moral Science," which was for years a text-book in Southern colleges. It indicated a high order of talent. See *New Amer. Cyclop.* 1868, p. 450, Drake, *Dict. Amer. Biog.* s.v. (L. E. S.)

Mann, Cyrus

an American Congregational minister and author, was born at Oxford, N. H., April 3, 1785; was educated at Dartmouth College (class of 1806); was principal of Gilmanton Academy two years; teacher of the Troy high-school one year; tutor at Dartmouth College from 1809 to 1814; pastor of the Church at Westminster, Mass., from 1815 to 1841; then of Robinson Church, Plymouth, three years; next a teacher at Lowell several years;

finally, from 1852 to 1856 acting pastor of the North Falmouth Church. He died at Stoughton, Mass., Feb. 9, 1859. Mr. Mann published *An Epitome of the Evidences of Christianity: — History of the Temperance Reformation: — Memoir of Mrs. Myra W. Allen; and some Sermons.* — Drake, *Dict. of Amer. Biog.* p. 595.

Mann, Horace

LL.D., one of the most prominent educators in our country, a philanthropist whose name deserves to be honored by every American — “a soul whose life was a galvanic thrill along the muscles of our age” — was born, of very humble parentage, at Franklin, Mass., May 4, 1796. Though not privileged with the advantages of a careful training in his early boyhood, he yet managed to acquire a pretty good knowledge of the so-called “common branches.” At the age of twenty he resolved to secure for himself the advantages of a collegiate training. His instructors hitherto, he tells us himself, he had found to be “very good people, but very poor teachers.” He had lost his father when only thirteen years old, and since that time “all the family,” he tells us, “labored together for the common support, and toil was considered honorable, although it was sometimes of necessity excessive.” Notwithstanding all these disadvantages, Horace was bent upon a course of study in college. Within the short space of six months he had acquired a sufficient preparation to enter the sophomore year at Brown University, and at this institution he graduated, with the highest honors, in 1819. The subject of his graduating speech was “The Progressive Character of the Human Race.” This was always a favorite theme with him, and his first oration may be said to have foreshadowed his subsequent career as a philanthropist and statesman. After serving his alma mater for two years as instructor, he entered upon the study of jurisprudence at the law-school in Lichfield, and in 1823 was admitted to practice at Dedham. In 1827 he was elected to the legislature of Massachusetts, and during his connection with that body was distinguished for the zeal with which he devoted himself to the interests of education and temperance. His first speech was in favor of religious liberty. He was active in founding the State Lunatic Asylum. In 1831 he removed to Boston, and was elected in 1836 to the state senate, of which he became president.

At the organization of the Massachusetts Board of Education, June 29, 1837, Horace Mann was elected its secretary, and, as such, he served for eleven years. He now gave up all other business, withdrew from politics,

and devoted his whole time to the cause of education, introducing normal schools and paid committees. During these eleven years he worked fifteen hours a day, held teachers' conventions, gave lectures, and conducted a large correspondence. In 1843 he made a visit to educational establishments in Europe. His Report was reprinted both in England and America. In 1848 he was elected to Congress, as the successor of ex-president John Quincy Adams, whose example he followed in energetic opposition to the extension of slavery. Mr. Mann's years in Congress were those stormy cloud-gathering years whose records are labeled "Fillmore," "Fugitive-Slave Law," "New Mexico and California." Staunch and steady he stood, a man of iron, in those days of compromise and political corruption. Hating slavery through every fibre of his soul, he had his weapon drawn whenever and wherever its crest arose. His great abilities as a statesman are evinced in his letters written at this time, foreshadowing the troubles of 1861-65. His first speech in Congress was in advocacy of the right and duty of the national government to exclude slavery from the territories. In a letter dated Dec., 1848, he says on this subject, "I think the country is to experience serious times. Interference with slavery will excite civil commotion at the South. Still, it is best to interfere. Now is the time to see whether the United States is a rope of sand or a band of steel." In another letter, dated January, 1850, he says, "Dark clouds overhang the future, and that is not all; they are full of lightning." Again, "I really think that if we insist upon passing the Wilmot Proviso for the territories, that the South — a part of them — will rebel. But *I* would pass it, rebellion or no rebellion. *I consider no evil so great as the extension of slavery.*" After having spent two terms in Congress, we find Mr. Mann in 1853 embarking into a new and somewhat formidable enterprise — the establishment of a college at the West to be open to both sexes, and to be founded and conducted on the educational principles which he had espoused in Massachusetts, and which we shall presently pass in review. The experiment made here for the co-education of the sexes proved a success, and in our own day the admission of young ladies to our best and highest schools is likely to be commendatory of Mr. Mann's enterprise in 1853. The labors and anxieties of this position at Antioch College, however, proved at length too much for his health, never strong, and now undermined by a life of the most intense and unremitting activity. The fiery soul consumed the body at last, Aug. 2, 1859.

Mann on the Relation of Religion to Education. — Mr. Mann had been reared under the influence of the Calvinistic faith. While yet a youth he had cherished an aversion to this orthodox belief, because, as he tells us, it had taught him to look upon God as “Infinite Malignity personified.” When, at the mature age of forty, just as he entered on his work as an educator, he fell in with Combe’s *Constitution of Mann*, he at once became a warm admirer of the theological, psychological, or anthropological school of which Mr. George Combe was the distinguished teacher. Education has certainly no less to do with the conscience and heart than with the understanding, as “most of our relations to our fellowmen, for which education is to prepare us. grow out of our relations to God;” it therefore should derive its knowledge from the holy Scriptures, and make these, indeed, the corner-stone. Mann, however, held that it should depend for its guidance on the lights of natural religion. He came forward now to assert that “*natural religion* stands as pre-eminent over revealed religion as the deepest experience over the lightest hearsay,” and proposed to substitute, for the Christian influence which pervaded our whole educational institution, a system of “philosophical and moral doctrines,” the prevalence of which would, in his view, “produce a new earth at least, if not a new heaven.” Believing what is called the “evangelical faith,” at that time ruling New England, to be in its influence derogatory to the character of God, and dwarfing and enslaving to the mind of man, he conceived it to be his task to vindicate the former and to emancipate the latter. Especially he conceived it his mission to overcome the “foul spirit of orthodoxy,” so far as it entered the domain of the public schools, and this he believed to be “the greatest discovery ever made by man.” “Other social organizations,” he says, “are curative and remedial; this is a preventive and antidote. They come to heal diseases and wounds; this is to make the physical and moral frame invulnerable to them. Let the common school be expanded to its capabilities, let it be worked with the efficiency of which it is susceptible, and nine tenths of the crimes in the penal code would become obsolete — the long catalogue of human ills would be abridged — men would walk more safely by day — every pillow would be more inviting by night — property, life, and character held by a stronger tenure all rational hopes respecting the future brightened. It is obvious that these glowing anticipations were born of something more, if not better, than reading, writing, and arithmetic.” Education was, in Mann’s view, a word of much higher import than that popularly given to it. “Its function is to call out from within all that was divinely placed there, in the proportion requisite to

make a noble being." It was one of his maxims, however, that "every human being should determine his religious belief for himself." "It seems to me," he says, "that a generation so trained would have an infinitely better chance of getting at the truth than the present generation has had." Herein lay the greatest defect of the system he sought to establish in our schools. Stamping with the name of bigotry all religious views that did not coincide with his own, regarding orthodoxy as the great thralldom by which man was enslaved, he would introduce a system of Christian ethics and doctrine respecting virtue and vice, rewards and penalties, time and eternity, constituting the basis of his theories and schemes of popular education, which meant nothing else than the substitution of natural religion for revealed. How far Mr. Mann succeeded in this attempt we may judge by the prevalence of the doctrines of the so-called "liberal theology" in the Eastern States, particularly in Massachusetts. In the West he must certainly have been disappointed. Though more than a thousand students sat at his feet in Antioch, he was only in a very moderate degree successful in spreading "a religionism from whose features the young would not turn away." But if Mr. Mann failed in meeting that success which a person of his indomitable will, uncommon energy, and rare acquirements must have looked for and desired, we would not in the least detract from the value of his labors in behalf of education among the masses, and the greatness of his services to common-school education in America.

Besides his annual reports, a volume of lectures on education, and voluminous controversial writings, his principal work is *Slavery: Letters and Speeches* (Boston. 1851). Since his decease all his writings have been collected and published by his wife, under the title *The Works of Horace Mann* (Cambridge, 1867 sq., 2 vols. 8vo). See *Life of Horace Mann*, by his wife (Boston, 1865, 12mo); Thomas, *Dict. Biog. and Mythol.*; *Princeton Review*, 1866 (January); reprinted in the *Brit. and For. Evan. Review*, 1866 (August). (J. H. W.)

Mann, William

D.D., an American educator of note, was born in Burlington County, N. Y., about the year 1784. When quite young he was placed in a printing-office, where he remained until his fourteenth year. Though unable to attend school a single day, he acquired a thorough education by private study. He was converted in his 23d year. joined the Methodist Episcopal Church, and shortly after became a local preacher. The principal part of his

life after this time was devoted to teaching. He was for some years principal of Matthew Holly Academy, in his native state. Subsequently he removed to Philadelphia, where he maintained a high reputation for his success in teaching the classics. The degree of D.D. was conferred upon him by Dickinson College. He died in Philadelphia July 4, 1867. — *New An. Cyclop.* 1867, p. 567.

Man'na

Picture for Manna 1

([^]m; *man*, according to Gesenius, a *portion*, from the Arabic; but a different derivation is alluded to in the passage where it first occurs [see Thym, *De origine vocis Manna*, etc., Vitemb. 1641]), the name given to the miraculous food upon which the Israelites were fed for forty years during their wanderings in the desert. The same name has in later ages been applied to some natural productions, chiefly found in warm, dry countries, but which have little or no resemblance to the original manna. This is first mentioned in Exodus 16. It is there described as being first produced after the eighth encampment in the desert of Sin, as white like hoar frost (or of the color of *bdellium*, ^{<04107>}Numbers 11:7), round, and of the bigness of coriander seed (*gad*). It fell with the dew every morning, and when the dew was exhaled by the heat of the sun, the manna appeared alone, lying upon the ground or the rocks round the encampment of the Israelites. “When the children of Israel saw it, they said one to another, *What is it?* for they knew not what it was” (^{<01615>}Exodus 16:15). In the authorized and some other versions this passage is inaccurately translated — which, indeed, is apparent from the two parts of the sentence contradicting each other (“It is *manna*; for they wist not what it was”). The word occurs only in ^{<01615>}Exodus 16:15, 31, 33, 5; ^{<04106>}Numbers 11:6, 7, 9; ^{<0888>}Deuteronomy 8:3, 16; ^{<0652>}Joshua 5:12; ^{<0600>}Nehemiah 9:20; ^{<07824>}Psalms 78:24. In the Sept. the substance is almost always called *manna* (μάννα, and so the N. Test. always: ^{<01615>}John 6:31, 49, 58; ^{<03004>}Hebrews 9:4; ^{<06017>}Revelation 2:17; also the Apocrypha, Wisd. 16:20, 21) instead of *man* (μάν, ^{<01615>}Exodus 16:31, 33, 35). Josephus (*Ant.* 3:1, 6), in giving an account of this substance, thus accords with the textual etymology: “The Hebrews call this food *manna* (μάννα), for the particle *manuz* (μάν) in our language is the asking of a question, ‘*What is this?*’ (Heb. *alḥa`mī man-hu*).” Moses answered this question by telling them, “This is the bread which the Lord hath given you

to eat.” We are further informed that the manna fell every day, except on the Sabbath. Every sixth day, that is on Friday, there fell a double quantity of it. Every man was directed to gather an omer (about three English quarts) for each member of his family; and the whole seems afterwards to have been measured out at the rate of an omer to each person: “He who gathered much had nothing over, and he who gathered little had no lack.” That which remained ungathered dissolved in the heat of the sun, and was lost. The quantity collected was intended for the food of the current day only, for if any were kept till next morning it corrupted and bred worms. Yet it was directed that a double quantity should be gathered on the sixth day for consumption on the Sabbath. It was found that the manna kept for the Sabbath remained sweet and wholesome, notwithstanding that it corrupted at other times if kept for more than one day. In the same manner as they would have treated grain, they reduced it to meal, kneaded it into dough, and baked it into cakes, and the taste of it was like that of wafers made with honey or of fresh oil. In ^{<HB>}Numbers 11:6-9, where the description of the manna is repeated, an omer of it is directed to be preserved as a memorial to future generations, ‘that they may see the bread wherewith I have fed you in the wilderness;’ and in ^{<HB>}Joshua 5:12 we learn that after the Israelites had encamped at Gilgal, and “did eat of the old corn of the land, the manna ceased on the morrow after, neither had the children of Israel manna any more.”

This miracle is referred to in ^{<HB>}Deuteronomy 8:3; ^{<HB>}Nehemiah 9:20; ^{<HB>}Psalm 78:24; ^{<HB>}John 6:31, 49, 58; ^{<HB>}Hebrews 9:4. Though the manna of Scripture was so evidently miraculous, both in the mode and in the quantities in which it was produced, and though its properties were so different from anything with which we are acquainted. yet, because its taste is in Exodus said to be like that of wafers made with honey, many writers have thought that they recognized the manna of Scripture in a sweetish exudation which is found on several plants in Arabia and Persia. The name *man*, or *manna*, is applied to this substance by the Arab writers, and was probably so applied even before their time. But the term is now almost entirely appropriated to the sweetish exudation of the ash-trees of Sicily and Italy (*Ornus Europaea* and *Fiaxuinus rotundidfilia*). These, however, have no relation to the supposed manna of Scripture. Of this one kind is known to the Arabs by the name of *guzunjbin*, being the produce of a plant called *guz*, which is ascertained to be a species of tamarisk. The same species seems also to be called *turfa*, and is common along different parts

of the coast of Arabia. It is also found in the neighborhood of Mount Sinai. Burckhardt, while in the valley wady el-Sheik, to the north of Mount Serbal, says: "In many parts it was thickly overgrown with the tamarisk or *turfa*; it is the only valley in the Peninsula where this tree grows at present in any quantity, though some small bushes are here and there met with in other parts. It is from the *tufa* that the manna is obtained; and it is very strange that the fact should have remained unknown in Europe till M. Seetzen mentioned it in a brief notice of his 'Tour to Sinai,' published in the *Mines de l'Orient*. The substance is called by the Arabs *mann*. In the month of June it drops from the thorns of the tamarisk upon the fallen twigs, leaves, and thorns which always cover the ground beneath the tree in the natural state. The Arabs use it as they do honey, to pour over their unleavened bread, or to dip their bread into; its taste is agreeable, somewhat aromatic, and as sweet as honey. If eaten in any quantity it is said to be highly purgative." He further adds that the tamarisk is one of the most common trees in Nubia and throughout the whole of Arabia; on the Euphrates, on the Astaboras, in all the valleys of the Hejaz and Beja it grows in great quantities, yet nowhere but in the region of Mount Sinai did he hear of its producing manna. Ehrenberg has examined and described this species of tamarisk, which he calls *T. manunifera*, but which is considered to be only a variety of *T. gallica*. The manna he considers to be produced by the puncture of an insect which he calls *Coccus manniparus*. Others have been of the same opinion. When Lieut Wellsted visited this place in the month of September, he found the extremities of the twigs and branches retaining the peculiar sweetness and flavor which characterize the manna. The Bedouins collect it early in the morning, and, after straining it through a cloth, place it either in skins or gourds; a considerable quantity is consumed by themselves; a portion is sent to Cairo, and some is also disposed of to the monks at Mount Sinai. The latter retail it to the Russian pilgrims. "The Bedouins assured me that the whole quantity collected throughout the Peninsula, in the most fruitful season, did not exceed 150 wogas (about 700 pounds); and that it was usually disposed of at the rate of 60 dollars the woga" (*Travels in Arabia*, 1:511).

Picture for Manna 2

Another kind of manna, which has been supposed to be that of Scripture, is yielded by a thorny plant very common from the north of India to Syria, which by the Arabs is called *Al-haj*, whence botanists have constructed the name *Alhagi*. The two species have been called *Alhagi Mauorum* and *A.*

desertorum. Both species are also by the Arabs called *ushter-khar*, or “camel’s-thorn;” and in Mesopotamia *aqul*, according to some authorities, while by others this is thought to be the name of another plant. The *Alhagi Maurorum* is remarkable for the exudation of a sweetish juice, which concretes into small granular masses, and which is usually distinguished by the name of Persian manna. The late professor Don was so confident that this was the same substance as the manna of Scripture that he proposed calling the plant itself *Manna Hebraica*. The climate of Persia and Bokhara seems also well suited to the secretion of this manna, which in the latter country is employed as a substitute for sugar, and is imported into India for medicinal use through Caubul and Khorassan. In Arabian and Persian works on Materia Medica it is called *Turungbin*. These two, from the localities in which they are produced, have alone been thought to be the manna of Scripture. But, besides these, there are, several other kinds of manna. Burckhardt, during his journey through El-Ghor, in the valley of the Jordan, heard of the Beiruk honey. This is described as a substance obtained from the leaves and branches of a tree called *Gharb* or *Gasrrab*, of the size of an olive-tree, and with leaves like those of the poplar. When fresh this grayish-colored exudation is sweet in taste, but in a few days it becomes sour. The Arabs eat it like honey. One kind, called *Shir-khisht*, is said to be produced in the country of the Uzbeks. A Caubul merchant informed Dr. Royle that it was produced by a tree called *Gundeleh*, which grows in Candahar, and is about twelve feet high, with jointed stems. A fifth kind is produced on *Caloropis procera*, or the plant called *Ashur*. The sweet exudation is by Arab authors ranked with sugars, and called *Shukur-al-ashur*. It is described under this name by Avicenna, and in the Latin translation it is called *Zuccarunz-al-husar*. A sixth kind, called *Bedkhisht*, is described in Persian works on Materia Medica as being produced on a species of willow in Persian Khorassan. Another kind would appear to be produced on a species of oak, for Niebuhr says, “At Merdin, in Mesopotamia, it appears like a kind of pollen on the leaves of the tree called *Ballot* and *Afs* (or, according to the Aleppo pronunciation, *As*), which I take to be of the oak family. All are agreed that between Merdin and Diarbekir manna is obtained, and principally from those trees which yield gall-nuts.” Besides these there is a sweetish exudation found on the larch, which is called *Manna brigantiaca*, as there is also one kind found on the cedar of Lebanon. Indeed a sweetish secretion is found on the leaves of many other plants, produced sometimes by the plant itself, at others by the punctures of insects. It has been supposed also that these sweetish

exudations, being evaporated during the heat of the day in still weather, may afterwards become deposited, with the dew, on the ground and on the leaves of plants, and thus explain some of the phenomena which have been observed by travelers and others. According to Colossians Chesney, “The most remarkable production in ancient Assyria is the celebrated vegetable known here by the name of manna, which in Turkish is most expressively called *Kzudret-hal-vassiz*, or ‘the divine sweetmeat.’ It is found on the leaves of the dwarf oak, and also, though less plentifully and scarcely so good, on those of the tamarisk and several other plants. It is occasionally deposited on the sand, and also on rocks and stones. The latter is of a pure white color, and appears to be more esteemed than the tree manna. It is collected chiefly at two periods of the year, first in the early part of spring, and again towards the end of autumn; in either case the quality depends upon the rain that may have fallen, or at least on the abundance of the dews, for in the seasons which happen to be quite dry it is understood that little or none is obtained. In order to collect the manna the people go out before sunrise, and having placed cloths under the oak, larch, tamarisk, and several other kinds of shrubs, the manna is shaken down in such quantities from the branches as to give a supply for the market after providing for the wants of the different members of the family. The Kurds not only eat manna in its natural state, as they do bread or dates, but their women make it into a kind of paste; being in this state like honey, it is added to other ingredients used in preparing sweetmeats, which, in some shape or other, are found in every house throughout the East. The manna, when partially cleaned, is carried to the market at Mosul in goat-skins, and there sold in lumps at the rate of 4.5, pounds for about 2.5 d. But for family consumption, or to send to a distance out of the country, it is first thoroughly cleansed from the fragments of leaves and other foreign matter by boiling. In the natural state it is described as being of a delicate white color. It is also still, as in the time of the Israelites, like coriander seed, and of a moderate but agreeable sweetness” (*Euphrates Expedition*, 1:123).

“The manna of European commerce comes mostly from Calabria and Sicily. It is gathered during the months of June and July from some species of ash (*Ornus Europaea* and *Ornus rotundifolia*), from which it drops in consequence of a puncture by an insect resembling the locust, but distinguished from it by having a sting under its body. The substance is fluid at night, and resembles the dew, but in the morning it begins to harden.”

“The natural products of the Arabian deserts and other Oriental regions, which bear the name of manna, have not the qualities or uses ascribed to the manna of Scripture. They are all condiments or medicines rather than food, stimulating or purgative rather than nutritious; they are produced only three or four months in the year, from May to August, and not all the year round; they come only in small quantities, never affording anything like 15,000,000 pounds a week, which must have been requisite for the subsistence of the whole Israelitish camp, since each man had an omer (or three English quarts) a day, and that for forty years; they can be kept for a long time, and do not become useless in a day or two; they are just as liable to deteriorate on the Sabbath as on any other day; nor does a double quantity fall on the day preceding the Sabbath; nor would natural products cease at once and forever, as the manna is represented as ceasing in the book of Joshua. The manna of Scripture we therefore regard as wholly miraculous, and not in any respect a product of nature.”

Manna is the emblem or symbol of immortality (~~417~~ Revelation 2:17): “I will give him to eat of the hidden manna;” i.e. the true bread of God, which came down from heaven, referring to the words of Christ in ~~415~~ John 6:51, a much greater instance of God’s favor than feeding the Israelites with manna in the wilderness. It is called *hidden*, or laid up, in allusion to that which was laid up in a golden vessel in the holy of holies of the tabernacle (comp. ~~213~~ Exodus 16:33, 34, and ~~300~~ Hebrews 9:4).

See Liebertanz, *De Manna* (Vitemb. 1667); Zeibich, *De miraculo Mannae Israeliticae* (Gerae, 1770); Hoheisel, *De vasculo Mannae* (Jen. 1715); Schramm, *De urna Mannae* (Herb. 1723); Fabri *Historia Mannae*, in Fabri et Reiskii *Opusc. sled. Arab.* (Hal. 1776), p. 121; Hardwick, in *Asiatic Researches*, 14:182; Frederic, in *Transact. of the Lit. Society of Bombay* (Lond. 1819), 1:251; Ehrenberg, *Symbol. Phys.* (Berl. 1829); Martius, *Pharnakogn.* p. 327; Oedmann, *Sanml.* 6:1; Buxtorf, *Exercit.* (Basil. 1659), p. 335 (and in Ugolini, *Thesaur.* vol. viii); Rosenmüller, *Alterthumsk.* 4:316 sq.; Kitto, *Daily Bible Illust.* ad loc.; Tristram, *Nat. Hist. of Bible*, p. 362; comp. Robinson’s *Researches*, 1:470, 550; and other Oriental travelers.

Mannheimer, Isaak Noa,

one of the most celebrated of modern Jewish pulpit orators and theologians, was born at Copenhagen, Denmark, Oct. 17, 1793. His father was the reader of the synagogue of the Danish capital, and, anxious to

afford his Isaak all the advantages of modern culture, placed the child in a school at the tender age of three years and a half. When only nine years old, Isaak was introduced to the study of the Talmud, and at the age of responsibility (thirteen) was noted for his great erudition in Jewish tradition. In his secular studies, also, he made rapid progress, and promised much for the future. In 1808 he entered the gymnasium, and by 1814 he was ready to pass his examination for admission to the university. Here he devoted himself to the study of philosophy, philology, and the Oriental languages. Scarcely had his course been completed when the government offered him employment as catechist of the Jewish society of his native place; he accepted the proffered position, and served his people to their great satisfaction. About this time the reformatory movements among the Jews of Northern Europe were taking place, and Mannheimer became one of the leaders in the progressive step. He was especially encouraged by a personal acquaintance with the German-Jewish reformer Jacobson, whom he met in Berlin, .whither he was called in 1821, as pastor of the Temple. But, by the interference of the government, the reform movement was greatly barred there, and, after a vain struggle with the orthodox, he accepted a call from Vienna in 1824, and removed to the Austrian capital in June, 1825. Austria, which was always slow to grant religious liberty to non-Roman-Catholics, had not up to this time recognized the Jews as a religious sect, and, without authority to act as pastor, Mannheimer was called to perform substantially similar duties in the official capacity of "principal of the Religious School" ("Direktor der Wiener Kaiserlich Konigl. offentlichen israelitischen Religionsschule"). Though personally decidedly in favor of the reform movement inaugurated by Jacobson and others, he felt it his duty, in this new relation, to assume a conservative position, and by his moderation and wisdom succeeded in building up one of the best Jewish congregations in Germany. His great oratorical talent did much to swell the number of his auditors, but his success as a leader of the Jews of the Austrian capital is due solely to his determination "to produce no rupture in the Jewish camp." He served his people faithfully to the end of his terrestrial course, March 17, 1865. His influence on the Jews of Germany, however, still remains, and will be felt for years to come. During the stormy days of 1848 he represented his people in the nation's councils, as a deputy from Lemberg (Gallicia). His humane principles are manifest in his exertions for the abolishment of capital punishment. "Isaak Noa Mannheimer," says Grtitz (*Gesch. d. Juden*, 11:433), "might be called the embodied nobility of the Jews. He was a perfect man.... The inner and

outer man, disposition and wit, inspiration and wisdom, ideal life and practical safety, poetical talent and sober sense, childlike goodness and hitting sarcasm, gushing oratory and earnest activity, love for Judaism and a special liking for reform, were in his being most harmoniously blended.” As a pulpit orator he had no peer among his Hebrew brethren.

Unfortunately, however, but few of his sermons were ever printed. For a list of them see Kayserling. *Bibliothek jud. Kanzelredner*, Jahrgang i (Berl. 1870), p. 291. His other works consist of a translation of the Jewish Prayer-book for Sabbath and holy-days (*Sidur* and *Machzor*), a few polemical tracts, and a translation of part of the Bible for Salomon’s German version. For the study of homiletics his sermons are valued by both Christian and Jewish divines. See, besides Grätz and Kayserling, Ehrentheil *Jüd. Charakterbilder* (Rest. 1867), 1:57-66; Wolf, *Isak Noa Maneheinler* (Vienna, 1863); the same, *Gesch. d. israelit. Culiugemeinde in Wien* (1861); Geiger, *Zeitschrift*, 3:167 sq. (J. H. W.)

Manning, James

D.D., a Baptist minister, was born at Elizabethtown, N.J., Oct. 22, 1738, and was educated at Princeton College (class of 1762). Soon after the completion of his collegiate course he was ordained pastor of a Baptist Church in Morristown, N. J., but he remained only a year, and then became pastor of the Baptist Church in Warren, R. I. During his ministry there he instituted a Latin school, which seems to have been the germ of the great Baptist College, now the Brown University, he having been chiefly instrumental in the procuring of the charter in 1764. He was appointed its first president and professor of languages in 1765, when the college went into operation at Warren, whence it was removed to Providence in 1770, and was given the name it now bears. President Manning remained connected with the college until his death, July 29, 1791. During his residence at Providence, however, he was also pastor of a church for twenty years, absenting himself only for some six months in 1786, when he was chosen member of Congress for Rhode Island. “Dr. Manning was equally known in the religious, political. and literary world. Nature had given him distinguished abilities. The resources of his genius seemed adequate to all duties and occasions. He was of a kind and benevolent disposition, social and communicative in habit, and enchanting in manners. His life was a scene of labor for the benefit of others. His piety, and his fervent zeal in preaching the Gospel, evinced his love to God and man. With a most graceful form, a dignified and majestic appearance, his address

was manly, familiar, and engaging, his voice harmonious, and his eloquence irresistible. In the government of the college he was mild, yet energetic. He lived beloved and died lamented, beyond the lot of ordinary men. The good order, learning, and respectability of the Baptist churches in the Eastern States, under God, are much owing to his personal influence, and assiduous attention to their welfare” (Benedict, 2:346). See Guild (R. H.), *Life, Times, and Correspondence of Dr. James Manning* (1864, 8vo); Sprague, *Annals*, 6:89.

Manning, Owen

an English clergyman, was born at Orlingburg, Northamptonshire, in 1721; was educated at Queen’s College, Cambridge, of which he became fellow in 1741; became prebend of Lincoln in 1760; in 1763, vicar of Godalming, Surrey; in 1769, rector of Pepperharrow, and died in 1807. Mr. Manning published *Two Occasional Sermons: — Sermons on Important Subjects* (1812, 2 vols. 12mo): — *Discourse on Justification*, ~~HEB~~ Romans 3:28; published by Rev. J. H. Todd, with a discourse of Abp. Sharp’s (1829, 8vo); and several works of a secular character. — Allibone, *Dict. Brit. and Amer. Auth.* s.v.; Thomas, *Dict. of Biog.* s.v.

Mannus

according to Tacitus, the name given by the Germans to the son of the earth-born god Tuisco. From his three sons they derived their three great tribes, the Ingavones, the Iskavones, and the Herminones. Mannus belongs, not to the Teutonic people alone, but to the great mythus of the origin of the human race, common to the whole Aryan family, and, like the Hindu *Mannu* or *Manus*, stands forth as the progenitor of the inhabitants of earth endowed with reason. The name is derived from the Aryan root *mian*, to think. Compare Wackernagel, in Haupt’s *Zeitschrift für Deutsches Alterthum*, vol. vi.

Mano’äh

(Heb. *Manoach*,: j /nm; rest, as in ~~HEB~~ Genesis 8:9, and often; Sept. *Μανώε*; Josephus *Μανώχης*, *Ant.* v. 8, 2 [where the Biblical narrative is greatly embellished]; Vulg. *Manue*), the father of Samson, of the tribe of Dan, and a native of Zorah (~~HEB~~ Judges 13:2-22; 16:31). B.C. 1185. “The narrative of the Bible (~~HEB~~ Judges 13:1-23), of the circumstances which preceded the birth of Samson, supplies us with very few and faint traits of

Manoah's character or habits. He seems to have had some occupation which separated him during part of the day from his wife, though that was not field-work, because it was in the field that his wife was found by the angel during his absence. He was hospitable, as his forefather Abraham had been before him; he was a worshipper of Jehovah, and reverent even to a degree of fear. We hear of Manoah once again in connection with the marriage of Samson and the Philistine of Timnath. His father and his mother remonstrated with him thereon, but to no purpose (^{<074D>}Judges 14:2, 3). They then accompanied him to Timnath, both on the preliminary visit (ver. 5, 6) and to the marriage itself (ver. 9, 10). Manoah appears not to have survived his son: not he, but Samson's brothers, went down to Gaza for the body of the hero, and bringing it up to the family tomb between Zorah and Eshtaol, reunited the father to the son (16:31) whose birth had been the subject of so many prayers and so much anxiety. Milton, however, does not take this view. In *Samson Agonistes* Manoah bears a prominent part throughout, and lives to bury his son.' *SEE SAMSON*.

Manse

the Scottish name synonymous with our word *parsonage*. In Scotland the manse, with unendowed churches, is the property of the Church, erected and maintained by it. In the Established Church it is built and maintained by law, and belongs to the heritors. Dunlop says, "While manses and houses which had belonged to the popish clergy were still standing, these, of course, fell to be first designed for a manse, and an order of designation, similar to that prescribed by the act of 1593 as to glebes, seems to have been followed. *SEE GLEBE*. A minister accordingly was not allowed to have a manse designed to him within the precincts of an abbey or bishop's palace if there was a parson's or vicar's manse in the parish; nor was he entitled to any house which, though erected on Church lands, had not of old belonged to any kirkman, or incumbent serving at the church. Where there is no manse in a parish the minister is entitled to have designed to him by the presbytery of the bounds half an acre of land for the manse, offices, and garden, and to have the heritors ordained to erect a manse and offices thereon. The statutes regarding manses require that they shall be situated near the parish church; and in general the manse and glebe are contiguous. The presbytery are, of course, in the designation of a new manse, entitled, in the first instance, to fix its situation; and even in the case of an old manse to be rebuilt they may fix on a new situation, always, of course, within the ground or glebe allotted to the minister. The act of 1663 provides 'that

where competent manses are not already built,' the heritors shall 'build competent manses to their ministers, the expenses thereof not exceeding one thousand pounds, and not being beneath five hundred merks;' and it has been questioned whether, in respect of the phrase 'competent manses,' heritors can be compelled to expend a greater sum than one thousand pounds Scots on the erection of a manse." Hill says, "'The law of Scotland provides the minister of every country parish with a dwelling-house, called a manse, a garden, a glebe of not less than four acres of arable land, designed' out of lands in the parish near the manse, and with grass, over and above the glebe, for one horse and two cows; and with the out-houses necessary for the management of his small farm. As the act of James VI, parl. 3, c. 48, declares that the manse and glebe shall be marked and designed by the archbishop, bishop, superintendent, or commissioner of each diocese or province, upon whose testimonial being presented by the minister, the lords of Council and Session are instructed to direct letters, charging the former occupiers to remove, and entering the minister to possession; as the act of Charles II, parl. 1, sess. 3, c. 21, ordains that the heritors of the parish, at the sight of the bishop of the diocese, or such ministers as he shall appoint, with two or three of the most knowing and discreet men of the parish, build competent manses to the ministers; and as, by the settlement of presbyterian government in Scotland, the presbytery has come in place of the bishop, all applications concerning manses and glebes are made, in the first instance, to the presbytery of the bounds. After taking the regular steps suitable to the nature of the business, which, as a civil court specially constituted for that purpose, they are called to discuss, the presbytery pronounce a decret; and their sentence, unless brought by a bill of suspension before the Court of Session, is binding upon all concerned.'" Prior to the Reformation, canon 13 ordained that every parish should have a dwelling for the minister, built at the expense of the parsons and their vicars, the support of it afterwards falling as a burden on the vicars. By the General Assembly of 1563 ministers having manses were required to live in them.

Mansey, Henry Longueville,

one of the leading English divines of our day, noted particularly for his ability as a philosopher of the Hamiltonian school, was born in 1820 in the parish of Cosgrove, Northamptonshire, of which his father was then rector. He was educated at Merchant Taylors' School, and later at St. John's College, Oxford, where he graduated in 1843. He was shortly after

ordained, and served the Church in various positions until 1855, when he was appointed reader in moral and metaphysical philosophy at Magdalen College, Oxford, and in 1859 became the Waynflete professor. In 1867 he was made regius professor of ecclesiastical history, and at the same time also canon of Christ Church, Oxford. In October, 1868, he was appointed dean of St. Paul's, London, and died in the English metropolis in 1871. His works are: Aldrich's *Logic*, with Notes (1849): — *Prolegomena Logica* (1851): — article "Metaphysics," in the 8th ed. of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (1857), afterwards published separately: — *Bampton Lectures — The Limits of Religious Thought* (1858): — *The Philosophy of the Conditioned* (1866), in reply to Mill's *Review of Hamilton's Philosophy*. He was also one of the editors of Sir William Hamilton's Lectures. Mansel wrote in a clear and elegant style. His *Bampton Lectures* occasioned much controversy, both theological and philosophical. In the first one mentioned, on *The Limits of Religious Thought*, which passed through a number of editions, both in England and in this country, he takes as the basis of his arguments Sir W. Hamilton's position that "the unconditioned is incognizable and inconceivable." This treatise of Mansel is regarded as "one of the most important applications of the Hamiltonian philosophy to questions of religion." Farrar (in his *Crit. Hist. of Free Thought*, p. 470) thus speaks of *The Limits of Religious Thought*: "It is a work which is valuable for its method, even if the reader differs (as the author of these lectures does in some respects) from the philosophical principles maintained, or occasionally even from the results attained. It is an attempt to reconstruct the argument of Butler from the subjective side. As Butler showed that the difficulties which are in revealed religion are equally applicable to natural, so Mr. Mansel wishes to show that the difficulties which the mind feels in reference to religion are parallel with those which are felt by it in reference to philosophy. Since the time of Kant a subjective tone has passed over philosophy. The phenomena are now studied in the mind, not in nature; in our mode of viewing, not in the object viewed. Hence Butler's argument needed reconstructing on its psychological side. Mr. Mansel has attempted to effect this; and the book must always in this respect have a value, even to the minds of those who are diametrically opposed to its principles and results. Even if the details were wrong, the method would be correct, of studying psychology before ontology; of finding the philosophy of religion, not, as Leibnitz attempted, objectively in a theodicee, but subjectively, by the analysis of the religious faculties; learning the length of the sounding-line before attempting to fathom the

ocean." See *The Nation* (N.Y.), Jan. 10, 1867, p. 27 sq.; Grote, *Review of Niel's Examination of Hamilton's Philosophy* (Lond. 1868, 18mo), p. 43 sq.; McCosh, *Intuitions of the Mind* (see Index); Porter, *Human Intellect* (Index). **SEE HAMILTON, SIR W.** (J. H. W.)

Mansi, J., Dominicus

a noted Italian prelate, was born in Lucca Feb. 16, 1692; entered the Church at an early age, and was for a long time professor of theology at Naples. He was created archbishop in 1765, and died Sept. 27, 1769. He was distinguished for his historical and philological acquirements, as also for his zeal as a compiler. Among his principal works are *Supplementum, collectionis concilior. et decretorum Nicol. Coleti* (Lucre, 1748-52, 6 vols.): — his own very complete collection, *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et namplissima collectio*, etc. (Florent. et Venet. 1759-88. 31 vols.), which was continued after his death. He published also a valuable edition of St. Baluzii *Miscellanea* (Lucca, 1761, 2 vols.), and the splendid Lucca edition of Baronius's *Annal. Eccles.*, with the continuation by Raynaldus (1738-56); a new edition of Natalis Alexandri *Historia eccles. Vet. Novique Test.* (Lucre, 1748-52), and of J. A. Fabricii *Bibl. Lat. need. et inf. cet.* (Patavii. 1754). He also published the 2d edition of the important *Memoirie della Gran Contessa Matilda da Fr. M. liorentini* (Lucca, 1756), to which he made many important additions. He wrote also *De epochis conciliorum Sardicensis et Sirmiensem.* See Ant. Zatti, *Commentar. de vita et scriptis J. D. Mansi* (Ven. 1772); Anton. Lombardi, *Storia della letteratura Italiana nel secolo xviii* (Modena, 1827); Sarteschi, *De Scriptoribus Congreg. Matris Dei*, p. 352; Saxii *Onon. lit.* 7:4 sq.; Baur, *Neues hist. biog. — lit. Handb.* 3:488; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 33:259; Herzog, *Real-Encyclopädie*, 9:1. **SEE MAMACHI.**

Mansionarii

(**παραμονάριοι**), a class of functionaries who were not only keepers of churches, but especially bailiffs or stewards of the glebes or lands belonging to the Church or the bishop. **SEE DOORKEEPERS.**

Mansionaticum

SEE TAXES.

Manslayer

(*ἡ Χεῖρ*] *meratstse'äch*, a murderer, ἀνδροφόνος, ^{<500>}1 Timothy 1:9, as sometimes rendered), one who by an accidental homicide was entitled to the benefit of asylum (^{<4876>}Numbers 35:6,12; elsewhere usually “slayer”). *SEE BLOOD-REVENGE*. “One of the most peculiar provisions in the statute respecting the manslayer was the limitation of the period of his compulsory residence in one of the cities of refuge: The shall abide in it until the death of the high-priest, which was anointed with the holy oil.’ After that he was allowed to ‘return into the land of his possession’ (ver. 28). Different reasons have been assigned by commentators for making the one event dependent on the other, which it is unnecessary to particularize. As the enactment was intended for the whole body of the people, and is recorded in Scripture without any explanation, the most simple view that can be taken of it is likely to be the nearest to the truth. One thing, however, all knew respecting the anointed high-priest, viz. that he was the head and representative of the whole community in matters pertaining to life and death; and as some limitation would evidently require to be set to the restraint laid on the manslayer, the thought would naturally commend itself to the people to make responsibility for an accidental death cease and determine with the death of him who stood nearest to God in matters of that description. In the general relations of the community a change had entered in that respect, which touched all interests, and it was fit that it should specially touch those who had been casually bereft of the freedom of life.” “The principle on which the ‘man-slayer’ was to be allowed to escape, viz. that the person slain was regarded as delivered into his hand’ by the Almighty, was obviously open to much wilfull perversion (^{<4924>}1 Samuel 24:4, 18; 26:8; compare Philo, *De Spec. Leg.* 3:21; 2:320), though the cases mentioned appear to be a sufficient sample of the intention of the lawgiver.

- a. Death by a blow in a sudden quarrel (^{<4852>}Numbers 35:22).
- b. Death by a stone or missile thrown at random (ib. 22, 23).
- c. By the blade of an Axe flying from its handle (^{<5915>}Deuteronomy 19:5).
- d. Whether the case of a person killed by falling from a roof unprovided with a parapet involved the guilt of manslaughter on the owner is not clear; but the law seems intended to prevent the imputation of malice in any such case, by preventing, as far as possible, the occurrence of the fact itself

(^{<1218>}Deuteronomy 22:8) (Michaelis, *Oz the Laws of Moses*, arts. 223, 280, ed. Smith).

In all these and the like cases the manslayer was allowed to retire to a city of refuge. *SEE CITY OF REFUGE*. Besides these, the following may be mentioned as cases of homicide:

a. An animal, not known to be vicious, causing death to a human being, was to be put to death, and regarded as unclean. But if it was known to be vicious, the owner also was liable to fine, and even death (^{<1218>}Exodus 21:28, 31).

b. A thief overtaken at night in the act might lawfully be put to death, but if the sun had risen the act of killing him was to be regarded as murder (^{<1218>}Exodus 22:2, 3). Other cases are added by the Mishna, which, however, are included in the definitions given above (*Sanh.* 9:1, 2, 3; *Maccoth*, 2:2; compare Otho, *Lex. Rabb. s.v. Homicida*.)” *SEE MURDER*.

Mansus Ecclesiae

Mansus is in reality equivalent to *locus, ubi quis MANET*, the residence including the portion of land belonging to it (*huoba*), and both expressions are sometimes used the one for the other (see Du Fresne, s.v.; Grimm, *Deutsche Rechtsalterthümer*, p. 536; Eichhorn, *Deutsche Rechtsgeschichte*, vol. i, § 84; Guerard, *Polyptique de l'abb Irminon* [Paris, 1844, 4to]). Birnbaum, in *Die rechtliche Natur der Zehnten* (Bonn, 1831), p. 174, is of opinion that the word *mansus* is derived from *manumissio* or *mancipiumm*, from the slaves in early times becoming free in obtaining an estate, a *mansus hereditarius*. But, putting aside the philological difficulties, we find that the *mansi* were properties with which serfs (*glebae adscripti*) or even freemen were invested on some conditions, hence the distinction between *mansi serviles* and *ingenuiles* (Grimm, p. 537; Eichhorn, vol. i, § 83). In the 9th century the whole of France was divided into *mansi*, as the taxes were based on this division, as well as the obligation to military service (see *Capitulare*, i, a. 803, c. 1, a. 807, 811; Pertz, *Monumenta Germaniae*, 3:119, 172; Walter, *Corpusjuris Germanici*, 2:228; Hincnari Remensis *Annales*, ad a. 866, 877). The Church itself was not free from these taxes, but paid according to the number of *mansi* it held (see *Capitul. Aquisgran.* a. 812, cap. 11; Pertz, 3:175: ‘Ut de rebus unde census ad partem regis exire solebat, si ad

aliquam ecclesiam traditae sunt, aut tradantur propriis heredibus, aut qui eas retinuerit, vel illum censum persolvat”), with the exception of those which they held from the liberality of the king, and which were given with such immunities; as also the mansi forming the *dos* of a church, and given to it at its foundation. *SEE IMMUNITY*. In this case the immunity covered the whole mansus (*mansus integer*), and it became the duty of the incumbents to see to it that their privilege was not infringed (see *Capitulare Wormatiense*, a. 829, cap. generalia, no. 4; Pertz, 3:350). This principle was also adhered to afterwards, so that both Gratian (see c. 24, 25, can. xxiii, qu. viii) and Raymondus a Pennaforte (c. i, x, *de censibus*, 3:39) considered it well to recall these enactments. The size of the mansus did not always remain the same; yet it was at all times calculated so as to afford a *dos competens* to the church, the income from which would be sufficient to defray the expenses of worship and to supply the greater part of the requisites of the clergy (see Ziegler, *De dote ecclesiastica ejusquejuribus et privilegiis* [Wittemb. 1686, 4to], chap. vii, § 34 sq.). If we study the history of the establishment of Christianity in the different countries, we find that many adopted these principles of the French law. Thus in Prussia, at the foundation of churches, they were each endowed with eight hides of land. In 1232 we see the parishes of Kulm and Thorn receiving besides forty hides. When in 1249 peace was made with the heathen Prussians, a stipulation required that each new church should receive a *dos* of eight hides (see Voigt, *Gesch. Preussens*, 2:239, 630). The later documents on the subject (see Voigt, *Codex diplomaticus Prussicus*) show that this custom was observed in after times. This practice of church endowments was continued notwithstanding the changes introduced by the Reformation. See Jacobson, *Gesch. der Quellen d. evangelischen Kirchenrechts von Preussen*, 1:2, Urkunden, p. 8, 25, etc.; Moser, *Algem. Kimrchenbl.* 1856, p. 141 sq.; Berlin *Evang. Kirchenzeit.* 1857, No. 9; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, 9:1. (J. N. P.)

Mant, Richard

(1), D.D., an English prelate and commentator, was born at Southampton, Feb. 12, 1776; was educated at Winchester College, and Trinity College, Oxford; became fellow of Oriel College in 1798; vicar of Great Coggeshall, Essex, in 1810; of St. Botolph's, Bish. opsgate, London, in 1815; and of East Horsley, Surrey, in 1818; bishop of Killaloe and Kilfenora, in 1820; was translated to Down and Connor in 1823; and in 1842 succeeded bishop Saturin in the diocese of Dromore. He died Nov. 2, 1848. He

published, in conjunction with D'Oyly, *An Edition of the Bible, with Notes* (1817): — *Eight Sermons: — An Appeal to the Gospel or an Inquiry into the Justice of the Charge that the Gospel is not preached by the National Clergy* (1812, 8vo; 6th wc 1816, 8vo; reviewed in the *Lond. Quart. Rev.* 8:356-374, and 15:475): — *The Book of Common Prayer, selected, with Notes* (1829, 4to; abridged, 2 vols. 8vo; 5th ed. 1840, 4to): — *The Book of Psalms in an English Metrical Version, with Notes, critical and illustrative* (1824, 8vo): — *Biographical Notices of the Apostles, Evangelists, and other Saints* (1828, 8vo): — *Primitive Christianity* (Lond. 1843, 8vo): — *Hist. Ch. of Ireland* (1840, 2 vols. 8vo): — *Horae liturgicae* (1845, sm. 8vo): — *Sermons*, and other productions on various subjects. See Allibone, *Dict. Brit. and Amer. Biog. s.v.*; Darling, *Cyclop. Biogr.* s.v.

Mant, Richard

(2), D.D., an English divine, who flourished in the latter part of the 18th and beginning of the 19th century; was educated at Trinity College, Oxford, and became rector of All Saints, Southampton. He died in 1817. He published a sermon entitled *Public Worship* (1796, 8vo): — *Ordes or the Visitation of the Sick, from the Book of Common Prayer* (1805, 12mo): — *Eight Sermons on the Occurrences of the Passion Week* (1807, 12mo): — *Guide to the Understanding of the Church Catechism* (1807). — Allibone, *Dict. Brit. and Amer. Auth. S. V.*

Mantchuria

a Chinese territory in Eastern Asia, extending between lat. 42° and 53° N., is now the possession partly of the Chinese and partly of the Russians. It is bounded, according to its present limits, by the Amur on the north; by the Usuri and the Sungacha on the east, separating it from the Russian maritime territory of Orochi; by the Shan-Alin range on the south, separating it from Korea; and by a portion of the Khinganl Mountains, the river Sira-Muren, and the district of the upper Sungari, which separate it on the west from the desert of Gobi. Previously to the recent incursions of the Russians on the north, the area of this territory was about 682,000 square miles. Since the treaty of Nov. 14, 1860, the Russians possess all the territory east of the Usuri n and north and east of the Amur, and the Chinese possession is reduced to about 378,000 square miles. The population is variously estimated at from 3,000,000 to 4,000,000.

Mantchuria is divided into three provinces: Shing-King (formerly Leaotong), which alone contains upwards of 2,100,000 inhabitants, and the chief town of which, Mukden, is the seat of government for the three provinces; Girin, or Kirin; and Tsi-tsi-har. The country is mountainous, densely wooded in the south, but consisting chiefly of prairies and grass-land in the north. It is well watered and fruitful in the valleys. Chinese form the great bulk of the population. The Mantchus themselves are for the most part soldiers; they are the present rulers of China, who gradually subjugated the country. They are not a nomadic race like the Mongols, but are given to agriculture or hunting, according to the part of their country they inhabit. They are of a lighter complexion and slightly heavier build than the Chinese. have the same conformation of the eye-lids, but rather more beard, and their countenances present greater intellectual capacity. Literary pursuits are more esteemed by them than by Mongolians. They are of the same religious faith as the Chinese, but they are less under the priesthood. The Mantchus, in short, may be regarded as the most improvable race in Central Asia, if not on the continent. See Williams, *Middle Kingdomn*, 1:153 sq.; Chambers, *Cyclops* s.v. **SEE CHINA; SEE TARTARY.**

Mantelet

a long cape, with slits for the arms, worn by prelates. Regular bishops wore it without the rochet; and cardinals, vested in rochet and mozzetta, lay it aside when visiting another of their order. The *mantellone* is a purple cloak, with long, hanging sleeves. Walcott, *Sac. Archaeol.* s.v.

Mantle

Picture for Mantle

in the A.V., is the term used to render *four* Hebrew words, viz.,

1. **trDaj** *adde'reth*, from **ryDaj** “ample,” and therefore probably meaning a large over-garment like the Roman *pallium*. The Sept. renders it by **μηλωτή** (a sheep’s skin), ^{<119B>}1 Kings 19:13, etc.; **δεῖρῆς**, ^{<383B>}Zechariah 13:4: and **δορά**, ^{<0255>}Genesis 25:25. From the passages in which it is mentioned we can conjecture its nature. It is used most frequently (1 Kings 19; ^{<018>}2 Kings 2:8, 13, etc.) of Elijah’s “mantle,” which was in all probability a mere sheepskin, such as is frequently worn by dervishes and poor people in the East, and which seems, after Elijah’s time, to have been

in vogue among the prophets (^{<38104>}Zechariah 13:4). Accordingly, by it only is denoted the cape or Wrapper which, with the exception of a strip of skin or leather round his loins, formed, as we have every reason to believe, the sole garment of the prophet. The Baptist's dress was of a similar rough description, and we see from ^{<38157>}Hebrews 11:37 (ἐν μηλωταῖς, ἐν αἰγείοις δέρμασιν) that such garments were regarded as a mark of poverty and persecution. The word *addereth* twice occurs with the epithet *r[ce* "hairy" (^{<0255>}Genesis 25:25; ^{<38104>}Zechariah 13:4). On the other hand, it is sometimes undoubtedly applied to royal and splendid robes, and is even used to mean "magnificence" in ^{<36708>}Ezekiel 17:8 ("vine of magnificence") and ^{<38108>}Zechariah 11:3. It is the expression for the "goodly Babylonish garment" stolen by Achan, and the "robe" worn by the king of Nineveh (^{<00721>}Joshua 7:21; ^{<38106>}Jonah 3:6). The connection between two meanings apparently so opposite is doubtless to be found in the etymology of the word (from *ryDai* *ample*), or in the notion of a dress richly lined or trimmed with *costly furs*. **SEE ROBE.**

2. I y[æ] meil', which in the A.V. is variously rendered "mantle," "robe," "cloak;" and in the Sept. ἐπενδύτης, διπλοῖς, ὑποδύτης, ποδήρης, χιτών. Josephus calls it μεεῖρ. It is a general term derived from I [m; *to cover*, and is most frequently applied to "the robe of the ephod" (^{<02304>}Exodus 28:4, etc.; ^{<00707>}Leviticus 8:7), which is described as a splendid under-tunic of blue, wrought on the hem with pomegranates of blue, purple, and scarlet, with golden bells between them. It came below the knees, being longer than the ephod, and shorter than the *kittoneth*. It was a garment of unseamed cotton, open at the top so as to be drawn over the head, and; having holes for the insertion of the arms (Joseph. *Ant.* 3:7, 4; Jahn, *Bibl. Arc.* sec. 122; Braunius, *De Vest. Sac.* p. 436; Schroder, *De Vest. Mul.* p. 237, etc.). It was worn, however, not only by priests, like Samuel (^{<00219>}1 Samuel 2:19; 15:27; 28:14), but by kings and princes. (*Saul*, ^{<00204>}1 Samuel 24:4; *David*, ^{<31577>}1 Chronicles 15:27), and rich men (*Ezra*, 9:3-5; *Job* and his friends, 1:20; 2:12), and even by king's daughters (^{<00318>}2 Samuel 13:18), although in the latter case it seems to have had sleeves (see Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 811). Properly speaking, the *meil* was worn under the *simnlah*, or outer garment, but that it was often itself used as an outer garment seems probable from some of the passages above quoted. It is interesting to know that the garment which Samuel's mother made and brought to the infant prophet at her annual visit to the holy tent at Shiloh was a miniature of the official priestly tunic or robe; the same that the great

prophet wore in mature years (^{<0157>}1 Samuel 15:27), and by which he was on one occasion actually identified. When the witch of Endor, in answer to Saul's inquiry, told him that "an old man was come up, covered with a *meil*," this of itself was enough to inform the king in whose presence he stood — "Saul perceived that it was Samuel" (28:14).

3. hkmæ] *semikah*' (^{<0044>}Judges 4:14), the garment (marg. "rug," or "blanket") used by Jael to fling over the weary Sisera as a coverlid (Sept. ἐπιβόλαιον, but δερρίς appears to have been the reading of Origen and Augustine). The word is derived from ἔμις; *imponere*, and is evidently a general term. Hesychius defines ἐπιβόλαιον by πῶμα ἢ ῥάκος, and Suidas by τὸ τῷ προτέρῳ ἐπιβαλλόμενον. The word used in the Targum is. חקנא, which is only the Greek καυνάκη, and the Latin: *gaunacum*; and this word is explained by Varro to be. "majus sagum et amphimallon" (*De Ling. Lat.* 4:35), i.e. a larger cloak woolly on *both* sides. Hesychius differs from Varro in this, for he says καυνάκαι στρώματα ἢ ἐπιβόλαια ἑτερομαλλῆ, i.e. ewoolly on *one* side; the, Scholiast, on Aristophanes, adds that it was a Persian, and Pollux that it was a Babylonian robe (Rosenmuller, *Schol.* ad loc.). There is, therefore, no reason to understand it of a curtain of the tent, as Faber does. Since the Orientals constantly used upper garments for bedding, the rendering "mantle," though inaccurate, is not misleading (compare ^{<0009>}Ruth 3:9; ^{<0108>}Ezekiel 16:8, etc.). In the above passage the Hebrew word has the definite article prefixed, and it may therefore be inferred that it was some part of the regular furniture of the tent. The clue to a more exact signification is given by the Arabic version of the Polyglot, which renders it by *al-katifah*, a word which is explained by Dozy (*Dictionnaire des Vetements Arabes*, p. 232), on the authority of Ibn Batuta and other Oriental authors, to mean certain articles of a thick fabric, in shape like a plaid or shawl, which are commonly used for beds by the Arabs: "When they sleep they spread them on the ground. For the under part of the bed they are doubled several times, and one longer than the rest is used for a coverlid." On such a bed, on the floor of Heber's tent, no doubt the weary Sisera threw himself, and such a coverlid must the *senikah* have been which Jael laid over him.

4. twpf[] *himaataphoth*', occurs only in ^{<0122>}Isaiah 3:22. It was some article of female dress, and is derived from ἄφ[]; *to weave*. Schroder, the chief authority on this subject, says it means a large exterior tunic with

sleeves, worn next to the pallium (*De Vest. Mezl.* 15:247-277). In this same verse, and in ^{<ORIS>}Ruth 3:15, occurs the word **τῶν Πφῆμασι** *pacloth'*, A.V. "wimples," which appears to have been a sort of square covering like a plaid (Michaelis, *Supplem.* p. 1021; Rosenmüller, *Schol.*; ^{<ORIS>}Isaiah 3:22). We cannot find the shadow of an authority for Jahn's very explicit statement, that both these words mean the same article, **ἡ Πφῆμα** being the fashion for the winter, and **ἡ Πφῆμα** for the summer; though his assertion that "it covered the whole body from head to foot" may be very true (Jahn, *Bibl. Arch.* sec. 127).

For other terms, such as, **ἡ Πφῆμα** *simlah'* (^{<ORIS>}Genesis 9:23, etc.), **χλαμύς** (^{<ORIS>}Matthew 27:28), **στολή** (^{<ORIS>}Mark 12:38). etc., *SEE DRESS*. The **φελόνης** (A.V. cloke) to which St. Paul makes such an interesting allusion in ^{<ORIS>}2 Timothy 4:13, seems to have been the Latin *penula* (comp. **ἡ Πφῆμα**), a sort of travelling-cloak for wet weather. A great deal has been written about it, and at least one monograph (Stosch, *Dissert. de Pallio Pauli*, Lugd. 1709). Even in Chrysostom's time some took it to be **τὸ γλωσσόκκομον ἔνθα τὰ βίβλια ἔκειτο** (a sort of travelling-bag), and Jerome, Theophylact, Grotius, etc., shared in this opinion (Schleusuer. *Lex. N.T.* s.v. **φαιλόνης**). *SEE CLOAK*.

Manton, Thomas, D.D.

one of the most eminent of the Puritan divines of the 17th century, was born in 1620 at Lawrence-Lydiard, Somerset, England. His father and both his grandfathers were ministers. He was educated at Wadham College, Oxford, and received orders from bishop Hall before he had attained the age of twenty, being regarded by the good prelate as an extraordinary young man. The greatness of his character displayed itself even at this early age. Believing that admission to deacon's orders constituted authority to preach, he steadfastly refused priest's orders after having received deacon's. After staying a short time at Colyton, in Devonshire, he removed to London, and was printed in 1643 with the living of Stoke-Newington, near London. Here he prepared and afterwards published his *Expositions of James and Jude*. (The former was published in 1651; edited by Sherman, 1840, royal 8vo; edited by M'Donough, 1842, 8vo: the latter was published in 1658, 4to; new ed. 1838, 8vo.) During the Revolution he was frequently called to preach before Parliament, where he had the courage to speak against the death of the king. though he gave great

offense. In 1653 he was chosen preacher of St. Paul's, Covent Garden, where he had a numerous congregation of persons of great note and rank, and was eminently successful in his ministry. Joining in the Rebellion, he became one of the chaplains to the protector, and one of the committee for examining ministers under the commonwealth. He was forward, however, to promote the Restoration in 1660, was chosen one of the king's chaplains, and was also honored by Oxford at this time with the degree of D.D. by special request of king Charles II. In 1661 he was offered the deanery of Rochester, but this position he refused. Like Baxter, he clung to the last to the hope that a scheme of comprehension might be carried for the Presbyterians; and he had yielded so far as to receive episcopal institution from Sheldon to permit the reading of the Common Prayer in his church, but when he clearly saw that there was peace only within the Establishment, and by an utter abandonment of all Puritan principles, he let the deanery go, content to remain in the position he was then filling. The passing of the Act of Uniformity forced him into the ranks of the Nonconformists. Efforts were made by Calamy, Manton, and Bates, the leaders of those Presbyterians who still hoped for redress, to secure their rights from the king by personal interview, and they even received encouragement from Charles II of a favorable change, who "promised to restore them to their employments and places again, as pitying that such men should lie vacant" (Stoughton, 1:302). But the king proved false, and the Puritans lost their places. Among the Nonconformist ministers who would not quit the pulpit until forced was Thomas Manton. Deprived of a church, he opened his rooms in Covent Garden, and there gathered a congregation. Here the Oxford oath was tendered to him, and on refusal he was committed a prisoner to the Gate-house, and was kept confined for six months. He died Oct. 18, 1677. Perhaps few men of that age had more virtue and fewer failings; but his only trust was in *the Lamb of God*. As a preacher he was most highly esteemed by his contemporaries. Usher calls him "one of the best preachers in England." As a practical expositor of Scripture he was perhaps never surpassed. He left numerous writings, chiefly sermons and expositions. A collective edition of his works was published in 5 vols. 8vo, in 1681-84-89-93-1701, with *Life* by Dr. William Harris; but this collection is incomplete. A list of all his productions is given by Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* 1:1953-56. The publication of a complete collection of his works, prepared under the supervision of the Rev. Thomas Smith, D.D., and others, with full indexes and an original memoir by the Rev. J. C. Ryle, was begun in 1869, and is to be completed,

in 20 vols. demy 8vo, in 1874. See the excellent article in Allibone's *Dictionary of British and American Authors*, vol. 2, s.v.; Hook, *Ecclesiastical Biogr.* vol. 7, s.v.; Middleton, *Evangelical Biography*, 3:429. (J. H. W.)

Mantua

an Italian province, formerly an independent duchy, had a high reputation in the time of the Romans. After sharing the fate of the rest of Northern Italy, it was seized by the Gonzagas about the commencement of the 14th century. The last duke of the house of Gonzaga died childless at Padua in 1708, when Mantua fell into the hands of Austria. In 1859 the province was given up to Italy, but the town of Mantua was not restored to Italy until 1866, since which time Mantua has formed a province of the new kingdom of Italy. *SEE ITALY*. The city of Mantua is noted in ecclesiastical history for a council that was held there in 1067 to judge pope Alexander II for a charge of simony brought against him. Alexander II took an oath to deny the accusation, and, proving the validity of his election, was recognized as the proper incumbent of the papal chair; while Honorius II (q.v.), the and-pope, was unanimously condemned as simoniacal. See Landon, *Manual of Councils*, p. 390.

Mautuan, Baptist,

a famous Italian monastic and poet, was born at Mantua in 1448; joined the Carmelites, became general of the order, quitted it in 1515, and devoted himself for the remainder of his life to belles-lettres. He died in 1516. His works were published at Paris in 1513 (3 vols. fol.), with the Commentaries of S. Murrhon, S. Brant, and J. Badius; and at Antwerp in 1576 (4 vols. 8vo), under the title, *J. Baptistae Mantuani, Carmelitae, theologi, philosophi, poeta, et oratoris clarissimi, opera omnia, pluribus libris aucta et arestituta*. — *Gen. Biog. Dict.* 9:51, s.v.

Mantz, Felix

a Baptist martyr of the early part of the 16th century, and a leader of the Reformation in Germany, was a native of Zurich. In 1519 he studied Hebrew with Zwingle, under Carlstadt, and was intimate with that reformer, and also with Myconius, Capito, and other leaders of the Swiss Reformation. About 1522 he objected openly to the doctrine of infant baptism, to the tithes, usury, and other peculiarities of the Romish Church,

and thus failing to harmonize with the opinions of Zwingle, he was led to a separation from the party of that reformer, and became connected with the Baptists. In 1523 he preached publicly on the subject of baptism. In the three disputes held at Zurich in 1525, Mantz appears to have taken part, and after that of March was thrown into prison, from which, however, he escaped. He afterwards preached in different parts of Switzerland; in 1526 was imprisoned in the tower of Wellenberg, on the charge of baptizing contrary to the prohibitory edict of the magistrates of Zurich, and, refusing to recant, was condemned, and drowned in January, 1527. See Brown, *Baptist Martyrs*, p. 49 (Amer. Bap. Pub. Soec. Phila.).

Manu

(from the Sanscrit *man*, to *think*; literally, *the thinking being*) is the name of the reputed author of the most renowned law-book of the ancient Lindus, and likewise of an ancient *Kalpa sutra* (q.v.). It is matter, however, of considerable doubt whether both works belong to the same individual, and whether the name Manu, especially in the case of the author of the lawbook, was intended to designate a historical personage. In several passages of the Vedas (q.v.), as well as of the Mahaibhkirata (q.v.), Manu is spoken of as the progenitor of the human race, and in the first chapter of the law-book ascribed to him he declares himself to have been produced by Virij, an offspring of the Supreme Being, and to have created all the universe. Hindu mythology, moreover, recognizes a succession of Manus, each of whom created, in his own period, the world anew after it had perished at the end of a mundane age. The word Manu — kindred with our “man” — belongs therefore, properly speaking, to ancient Hindu mythology, and it was connected with the renowned law-book in order to impart to the latter the sanctity on which its authority rests. This work is not merely a law-book in the European sense of the word; it is likewise a system of cosmogony, or, as Sir William Jones has it, “comprises the Indian system of duties, religious and civil.” It propounds metaphysical doctrines, teaches the art of government, and, among other things, treats of the state of the soul after death. The chief topics of its twelve books are the following;

1. Creation;
2. Education and the duties of a pupil, or the first order;
3. Marriage and the duties of a householder, or the second order;
4. Means of subsistence, and private morals;

5. Diet, purification, and the duties of women;
6. The duties of an anchorite and an ascetic, or the duties of the third and fourth orders;
7. Government, and the duties of a king and the military caste;
8. Judicature and law, private and criminal;
9. Continuation of the former, and the duties of the commercial and servile castes;
10. Mixed castes, and the duties of the castes in time of distress;
11. Penance and expiation;
12. Transmigration and final beatitude.

It is the opinion of Maine (*Ancient Law*) and other eminent scholars that the code of Manu was never fully accepted or enforced in India, and remained always an ideal of the perfect Brahmanic state. It is supposed, by Wilson, Lassen, Max Müller, and Saint Martin, to have been written about B.C. 900 or 1000. The text of this work has been published in several editions both in India and Europe. An excellent English translation of it we owe to Sir W. Jones (Calcutta, 1796; 2d ed., by Haughton, Lond. 1825), and a very good French translation to A. Loiseleur Deslongchamps (Paris, 1833). See Johbintzen, *Ueber das Gesetzbuch des Malnu* (Berl. 1863); Max Müller, *Chips from a German Workshop* (Index to vol. 2); Elphinstone, *Hist. of India* (3d ed.), p. 226 sq.; Hardwick, *Christ and other Masters*, 1:194 sq.; James Freeman Clarke, *Ten Great Religions*, p. 100 sq. **SEE HINDUISM.**

Manuductor

is the name of an ecclesiastical officer whose duty it was to give the signal to the choristers to sing, to mark the measure, beat the time, and regulate the music. The word means *to lead by means of the hand*; and the officer was so called because he was required to stand in the middle of the aisle, and to guide the choir by the motions of his hand. The Greek Church has an officer who performs similar services, who is called *Mesochoros*, because he is seated in the midst of the choir.

Manuel, Charitopulus

(ὁ Χαριτόπουλος), or SARANTENUS (ὁ Σαραντηνός), or *the Philosopher*, a Greek ecclesiastic who flourished in the 12th and 13th centuries, acquired a high reputation by his philosophical attainments. He was appointed patriarch of Constantinople on the death of Maximus II,

A.D. 1215, and held the patriarchate for five years and seven months. He died about A.D. 1221. Three synodal decrees of a Manuel, patriarch of Constantinople, are given in the *Jus Graeco-Romanum* of Leunclavius (lib. iii, p. 238, etc.), who assigns them to Charitopulus, and is followed by Cave and Oudin, who have confounded Charitopulus with another Manuel (of Constantinople). Le Quien objects to this judgment of Leunclavius, as not founded on evidence, and, with better reason, adjudges them to Manuel Bryennius. Ephraem of Constantinople celebrates Charitopulus as “an exact observer of the laws and canons” (Georg. Acropolit. *Annal.* [c. 19, p. 17, ed. Paris; p. 35, ed. Bonn]; Ephraem. *De l'atriarchis* [Charitop. vs. 10, 251, ed. Bonn]; Anonymous [supposed by some to be Niceph. Callist.], *De Patriarchis Charitopolitanzis Carmen Iambicurm*, and *Patriarchae Chsaritopoleos*, apud Labbe, *De Histor. Byzant. Scriptorib.* **Προτρεπτικόν**; Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, i, col. 278; Cave, *list. Litt.* ad ann. 1240, 2:297 [ed. Oxford, 1740-42]; Oudil, *Comment de Scriptorib. et Scriptis Eccles.* iii, col. 177). — Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Roms. Biog. and Mythol.* s.v.

Manuel (I)

COMNENUS (**Μανουήλ ὁ Κομνηνός**), emperor of Constantinople from 1145 to 1180, was the fourth son of John II, and was born about A.D. 1120. Two of his elder brothers, Alexis and Andronicus, both died before their father, and a special declaration of the emperor appointed Manuel as his successor, to the prejslice of his third son, Isaac Sebastocrator. As soon as Manuel ascended the throne, he surrounded himself with the bravest warriors of the West, and soon became foremost even among them for his courage. His reign was a succession of wars, sometimes in Asia, sometimes in Europe. Conrad III and Louis VII having informed him that they were preparing a new crusade, Manuel, although apparently disposed to help them, gave secret information to the Turks of the approaching danger.

The relation which Manuel Comnenus sustained to the Church of Rome is of special interest to us. His Latin subjects he treated with kindness, embellished their churches, and readily did all they asked of him. This generous disposition on the part of Manuel Comnenus towards the Latins encouraged pope Hadrian IV (1154-1159) to make proposals for a union of the Eastern with the Western Church, but the plan failed of success because of the objections of the Greek patriarch to acknowledge the

supremacy of the pope of Rome. *SEE GREEK CHURCH*. After Hadrian's death Manuel entered into correspondence with Alexander III, declared himself in favor of the Crusades, and offered assistance. The German emperor, Frederick I, had taken sides with the rival pope Victor, and Manuel embraced this opportunity to urge upon Alexander the claims of the Greek emperor to the Roman crown, promising in return to aid the pope in establishing the papal power in all Italy, and in the union of the Eastern and Western Church. So long as the pope was in danger from the invading Allemanni, he acted as if he felt inclined to acknowledge to the true representative of Constantine and Augustus. But after the establishment of peace and friendship with Frederick, Alexander "spoke a more peremptory language, confirmed the acts of his predecessors, excommunicated the adherents of Manuel, and pronounced the final separation of the churches, or at least the empires of Constantinople and Rome" (Gibbon, v, 491). Manuel died Sept. 24, 1180. He is said to have been deeply versed in theology, but "was certainly rather a great talker than a great thinker on religion." See Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Romans Biog.* s.v.; Lebeau, *Hist. du Bas-Empire* (Paris, 1834), 16:63 sq.; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, s.v.

Manuel Of Constantinople.

There were two Manuels patriarchs of Constantinople, Manuel I (Charitopulus), and Manuel II, the subject of the present article. Cave, Oudin, and others seem to have confounded the two, for they state that Manuel Charitopulus succeeded Germanus II in A.D. 1240. Charitopulus was the predecessor of Germanus, not his successor; Manuel II was his successor, though not immediately, for the brief patriarchate of Methodius II and a vacancy in the see, of considerable but uncertain length, intervened. Manuel's death is distinctly fixed as having occurred two months before that of the emperor Joannes Ducas Vatatzes, A.D. 1255, Oct. 30. The duration of his patriarchate is fixed by Nicephorus Callisti, according to Le Quien, at eleven years; but the table in the *Parotrepticon* of Labbe assigns to him fourteen years, so that A.D. 1240 or 1244 may be assumed as the year of his accession, according as one or the other of these authorities is preferred. Manuel held, before his patriarchate, a high place among the ecclesiastics of the Byzantine court, then fixed at Nice, and was reputed a man of piety and holiness, "though married," and of a mild and gentle disposition, but by no means learned. The three *Sententice Synodales* of the patriarch Manuel given in the *Jus Graeco-Romanum*

undoubtedly belong to this patriarch, not to Charitopulus, for the second of them. *De Translatione Episcoporum*, is expressly dated July, Indict. 8, A.M. 6578, oera of Constant. = A.D. 1250. Some works in MS., especially a letter to pope Innocent by “Manuel Patriarcha CPol.,” probably belong to Manuel of Constantinople (Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, i, col. 279; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* ad ann. 1240, 2:297 [ed. Oxford, 174C-42]; Oudin, *Comment de Scriptorib. et Scriptis Eccles.* iii, col. 177; Fabricius, *Bibl. Graec.* 11:668). — Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Romans Biog. and Mythol.* s.v.

Manuel, Holoblius,

a Byzantine ecclesiastic of the 13th century, about 1261 or 1262 was cruelly mutilated by the cutting off of his nose and lips, by order of the ambitious Michael Palaeologus, because he had expressed grief at the deposition, persecution, and banishment of Joannes Lascaris, emperor of Nicwea, by Palaeologus, his successor in the empire. Holobolus was then confined to the monastery of the Precursor, where, having excellent abilities and opportunities, he pursued his studies with success. About A.D. 1267 Germanus III, bishop of Constantinople, procured for him the appointment of teacher of a school of young ecclesiastics, and prevailed upon the emperor to remit his punishment and allow him to quit the monastery. Germanus also conferred on him the ecclesiastical office of rhetor, reader and expounder of the Scriptures. When the emperor Palaeologus attempted a reconciliation of the Greek and Latin churches, he sought the counsel of Holobolus, but he declared against the plan of reconciliation. This brought upon him the emperor’s indignation, and he was obliged to take refuge in the church sanctuary to escape violence from the emperor’s courtiers; was banished thence to the monastery of Hyacinthus, at Nice, A.D. 1273; was afterwards taken back to Constantinople, and beaten and paraded ignominiously through the streets. In A.D. 1283, after the accession of Andronicus II, Palaeologus, son of Michael, who pursued with respect to the union of the churches an opposite policy to that of his father, Holobolus appeared in the Synod of Constantinople, in which Joannes Veccus was deposed from the patriarchate of Constantinople, and he took part in the subsequent disputations with that chief of the Latinizing party. Little else is known of Holobolus. See Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Romans Biog. and Mythol.* s.v.

Manuel, Paleologus.

SEE FERRARA; SEE FLORENCE, SYNOD OF.

Manuel, Niclaus,

or NICOLAS, sometimes called DEUTSCH, one of the most prominent characters in the ecclesiastical history of Switzerland, in the age just preceding the Reformation, was born at Bern in 1484, His real name is conjectured by his biographer, Dr. Gruneisen, to have been *Alleman*, but, as he was illegitimate, it was, for family reasons, changed anagrammatically into that of Manuel. It is further conjectured that he was brought up by his maternal grandfather, Thüring Frickart. He was an artist by profession, but he excelled also as a poet and author. He studied the art of painting at Colmar, under the successors of the celebrated Martin Schon, until the fame of Titian attracted him to Venice, where, about 1511, he became one of his pupils: he is the *Emanuello Tedesco* of Ridolfi and other Italian writers. He is said to have assisted Holbein, in 1515 in his "Dance of Death;" but this is very improbable, as he was himself employed at that time in painting the same subject in the cloister of the Dominican convent at Bern. It was executed in fresco or distemper. The picture consisted of forty-six subjects, forty-one of which were the actual *Todtentanz*; it has long since been destroyed, but the compositions are preserved in prints and copies: the wall on which it was painted was pulled down in 1660. Manuel was an active reformer, and many of these designs are reflections upon the abuses of the Roman Church. He also ornamented his own house with a large fresco, representing Solomon worshipping idols. But of these and several other of his works nothing now remains, except some small watercolor copies preserved in the library at Basle. However, either because his pencil did not bring him sufficient for the maintenance of his family, or from his political ardor, he was induced to engage in military and public affairs. He served, as quartermaster or commissary, among the Swiss allies who assisted Francis I in his expedition against Milan, 1522, and was present both at the storming of Novara and the battle of Bicocca. In the following year he was chosen lanedvoigt of Erlach, and from the year 1526 distinguished himself by his zeal in the cause of the Reformation. From this period he was entirely devoted to that cause, and to his various public employments. He died in 1530, when only forty-six years of age. As a writer he began to distinguish himself in 1509, by various popular poems and songs in the Swiss dialect, full of humor and sharp satire. He is said by

some to be the author of a song, which originated in the early part of the 16th century, deriding the belief in the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary. But though this be doubtful, it is certain that Manuel wielded his pen in support of the Reformation by attacking the gross abuses of the clergy and the licentiousness of monastics. His *Facstnachtsspiele*, or “Dramatic Moralities and Mysteries,” which he began to compose about 1522, are marked by the same qualities as his polemical pieces. See Dr. Grüneisen, *Nicolas Manuel, Leben und Werke eines Malers, Dichters, Kriegers, Staatsmannes, und Reformators* (Stuttgart and Tübingen, 1837); Nagler, *Neues Allgemeines Ksilstler-Lexikon*, s.v.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 9:4 sq.; *English Cyclop.* s.v.

Manure

Although the Scriptures do not furnish us with many details respecting the state of agriculture in Judaea, yet we may collect from various passages many interesting hints that will enable us to form some idea of the high state of its cultivation. *SEE AGRICULTURE*. It is not probable that the Hebrews derived their knowledge of manures from Egypt, but they doubtless adopted and preserved the customs which existed among the previous inhabitants of the country. In the parable of the fig-tree which had for three years been barren, and which the proprietor therefore doomed to be cut down, the gardener is represented as praying for delay, until he should “dig about it and dung it” (^{<2137>}Luke 13:7). To explain this, Lightfoot quotes the following from the Talmud: “They lay dung to moisten and enrich the soil; dig about the roots of trees; pluck up the seckers; take off the leaves; sprinkle ashes; and smoke under the trees to kill vermin.” In addition to the various modes of irrigation, the soil was likewise enriched by means of ashes; to which were added the straw (^{<bTe>}*teben*), stubble (^{<vqj>}*kash* husks, or chaff (^{</wcd>}*mois*), together with the brambles and grass that overspread the land during the sabbatical year; all being reduced by fire and used as manure (^{<1291>}Proverbs 24:31; ^{<2123>}Isaiah 7:23; 32:13). The burning over the surface of the land had also another good effect, that of destroying the seeds of noxious herbs (Jahn, *Bibl. Arch.* § 57). Dunghills are mentioned in ^{<1081>}1 Samuel 2:8; ^{<1311>}Ezra 6:11; ^{<2115>}Daniel 2:5; 3:29, and one of the gates at Jerusalem was called the Dung-gate. from dung being carried out there (^{<1411>}Nehemiah 2:13). That the soil was manured with dung, we learn from ^{<1397>}2 Kings 9:37; ^{<1830>}Psalms 83:10; ^{<2482>}Jeremiah 8:2; 9:22; 16:4; 25:33; ^{<2145>}Luke 14:35. The Israelites

had comparatively few horses and few swine, two sources of excellent strong manure. Their animals consisted chiefly of oxen, camels, asses, sheep, and goats. The dung of the cow and camel was used to a considerable extent for fuel, and the dung of the sacrifices was directed to be burned — circumstances calculated to diminish the supply. That salt was used for manure we learn from ^{<11613>}Matthew 5:13 and ^{<11434>}Luke 14:34, 35, and it would appear that salt was sometimes sown by itself on the land, at others mixed in the dunghill. From the Talmud we learn that a dunghill in a public place exposed the owner to the payment of whatever damage it might occasion, and any person might remove it as a nuisance. Dung might not, during the seventh year, be transported to the neighborhood of the fields intended to be manured. Under certain restrictions it was, however, permitted to fold cattle, for the sake of their manure, upon the lands that required it in the sabbatic year, and it is from this only we learn that the practice existed among the Jews, who would seem more generally to have folded their sheep within walled enclosures (^{<11011>}John 10:1-5), the occasional clearance of which must have afforded a principal supply of manure. It would seem that gardens, except a few old rose-gardens, were not allowed within the walls of Jerusalem, on account of the manure they would have required, and “because of the stench,” as the Mishnah states, this produced, as well as because of that arising from the weeds thrown out from gardens. From another passage of the Talmud we are informed that the surplus blood of the sacrifices offered in the Temple, that is to say, the blood which was poured out at the foot of the altar, after the altar had been duly sprinkled, was conducted by a subterraneous channel to the outside of the city, and was sold to the gardeners as manure for their gardens; by which we are to understand that the gardeners were allowed to use it on paying the price of a trespass-offering, without which it could not be appropriated to any common use after having been dedicated at the altar.

SEE DUNG.

Manus Mortua

SEE AMORTISATION.

Manuscripts, Biblical.

These are either Hebrew or Greek; we shall treat of them separately, referring for details to subordinate articles, where they are discussed more copiously.

I. Jewish Manuscripts. —

1. These are divided into

- (a.) *Synagogue rolls* or *sacred copies*, and
- (b.) *Private* or *common copies*.

(a.) The synagogue rolls contain the Pentateuch, the appointed sections of the prophets, or the book of Esther, which last is used only at the Feast of Purim. The three are never put together, but are written on separate rolls. They are in the Chaldee or square Hebrew character, without vowels and accents, accompanied with the *puncta extraordinaria*, and having the unusual forms of certain consonants. The parchment is prepared in a particular manner by the hands of Jews only, and made from the hides of *clean* animals, which, when duly wrought, are joined together by thongs made out of the same material. They are then divided into columns, the breadth of which must not exceed half their length. These columns, whose number is prescribed, must be of equal length and breadth among themselves, and contain a certain number of lines, each line having no more than three words. The Talmud contains strict rules concerning the material, the color, the ink, letters, divisions, writing instrument, etc., which are closely followed, especially in the Pentateuch. These rules are extracted from the Talmud, and translated in Adler's *Judaeorum Codicis Sacri rite scribendi leges*, etc. (Hamburg, 1779, 8vo). The minuteness of such regulations renders it a most irksome task for the *sopher* or scribe to write out a synagogue roll. The revision of the *Torah*, as the synagogue roll is often called, must be undertaken within thirty days after its transcription, else it is unfit for use. *Three* mistakes on one side or skin are allowable; but should there be *four*, or should there happen to be an error in the *open* and *close* sections of the law, in the position of the songs in ~~(110)~~ Exodus 5 and ~~(121)~~ Deuteronomy 22, which are the only portions of the Pentateuch written in poetical lines, then the whole copy is worthless. The great beauty of penmanship exhibited in these synagogue copies has always been admired. They are taken from authentic exemplars, without the slightest deviation or correction. Seldom do they fall into the hands of Christians; since, as soon as they cease to be employed in the synagogue, they are either buried or carefully laid aside, lest they should be profaned by coming into the possession of Gentiles.

(b.) Private MSS, are written partly in the *square* or *Chaldee* character, partly in the *Rabbinical*. They are held in far less esteem than the synagogue rolls, and are wont to be denominated *profagne* (*pesulim*). Their form is entirely arbitrary. They are in folio, quarto, octavo, and duodecimo. Of those written in the *square character*, the greater number are on parchment, some on paper. The ink of the letters is always black, but the vowel points are usually written with ink of a different color from that of the consonants. Initial words and letters are frequently decorated with gold and silver colors. The prose parts are arranged in columns; the poetic in parallel numbers. Some copies are without columns. The columns are not always occupied with the Hebrew text alone; for a version is frequently added, which is either written in the text after the manner of verses, or ill a column by itself; or in the margin in a smaller character. The number of lines is not prescribed by the Talmud. The upper and lower margin are filled with the Great Masorah, and sometimes with a rabbinical commentary; as also with prayers, psalms, and the like. The external margin is for corrections, scholia, variations, notices of the *haphtaroth* (sections from the prophets), *parshioth* (sections from the law), the commentaries of the rabbins, etc. The inner margin, or that between the columns, is occupied with the Little Masorah. The single books of the O.T. are separated from one another by spaces. except the books of Samuel, Kings, Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah, which are written continuously. The sections of the law and prophets are generally marked. In the MSS. of different countries the books are differently arranged. These copies generally pass through various hands before they are finished. The consonants proceed from the *sopher* or scribe. When the same person writes both consonants and vowels, as is frequently the case — he never makes them at the same time — the former are finished before he begins to append the latter. The *Keris* in the margin uniformly proceed from the vowel-writer. It is probable that these copies were in no instance made by Christians.

The square character employed in the MSS. of which we have spoken has varieties. The Jews themselves distinguish in the synagogue rolls — 1. the *Tam* letter, with sharp corners and perpendicular coronulee, used among the German and Polish Jews; 2. the *Velske* letter, more modern than the *Tam*, and rounder, with coronulae, particularly found in the sacred copies of the Spanish and Oriental Jews. *SEE OLD TESTAMENT.*

2. The age of Hebrew MSS. is not easily determined. It is true that they often contain subscriptions giving an account of the time when they were written, and the name of the scribe, or also of the possessor. But these accounts are often ambiguous, occasionally incorrect. Where they are altogether wanting it is still more difficult to discover the age. In the latter case the character of the writing, the color of the ink, the quality and complexion of the parchment, the absence of the Masorah, of the vowel-points, of the unusual letters, etc., have been chiefly rested upon. Still, however, such particulars are uncertain marks of age.

The oldest Hebrew MS. known to Kennicott or De Rossi was 634 of De Rossi, a mere fragment, containing small portions of Leviticus and Numbers. According to its former possessor, it belongs to the 8th century. So much uncertainty attaches to the internal marks adopted by these two Hebraists that the ages to which they assign several Hebrew MSS. are gratuitous. Since Pinner examined a number of MSS. belonging to the Bible Society of Odessa, older ones are now known. (For the dates of his MSS., see below.) In the imperial public library at St. Petersburg there is a collection of Hebrew MSS. made by Mr. Firkowicz, containing several very ancient ones. The oldest date is in a roll found in a Karaite synagogue in the Crimea, viz. A.D. 489; but that date is very suspicious. Several fragments of rolls give, as the dates of purchase or dedication, A.D. 639, 764, 781, 789, 798, 805, 815, 843, 848.

3. A few of the oldest Hebrew MSS. may be briefly described here. We begin with the *Helali* or *Hillel Codex* (yl æl herpsæ) one of the most ancient and most celebrated codices of the Hebrew Scriptures, which derived its name from the fact that it was written at Hilla (hl al hæ) a town built near the ruins of ancient Babel. Others, however, maintain that it was called *Hilali* because the name of the man who wrote it was *lillel*. But whatever uncertainty there may be about the derivation of its name, there can hardly be any doubt that it was written A.D. 600, for Sakkuto tells us most distinctly that when he saw the remainder of it (cir. A.D. 1500) the Codex was 900 years old. His words are, "In the year 4956, on the 28th of Ab (1196, better 1197), there was a great persecution of the Jews in the kingdom of Leon from the two kingdoms that came to besiege it. It was then that the twenty-four sacred books which were written long ago, about the year 600, by R. Moses ben-Hillel (on which account the Codex was called Hilali), in an exceedingly correct manner, and after which all the

copies were corrected, were taken away. I saw the remaining two portions of it — viz. the earlier and later prophets-written in large and beautiful characters, which were brought to Portugal and sold in Africa, where they still are, having been written 900 years ago. Kimchi, in his Grammar on ^{<0454>}Numbers 15:4, says that the Pentateuch of this Codex was extant in Toleti” (*Juchassin*, ed. Filipowski, Lond, 1857, p. 220). The Codex had the Tiberian vowels and accents, Masorah and Nikud glosses, and it served up to A.D. 1500 as a model from which copies were made. The Codex which Haja had in Babylon about A.D. 1000 was conveyed to Leon, in Spain, where the greater part of it became a prey to the fury of the martial hosts who sacked the Jewish dwellings in 1197. The celebrated grammarian, Jacob ben-Eleazar, fixed the renderings of the Biblical text according to this Codex, and the older philologists frequently quote it. Comp. Grätz, *Geschichte der Juden* (Lpz. 1859), 6:132, 229; Fürst, *Geschichte des Karäerthums* (Leipzig, 1869), 1:22, 138; Kimchi, *Radicum Liber ed. Biesenthal et Lebrecht* (Berolini. 1847), p. 26. **SEE JACOB BEN-ELEAZAR.**

Picture for Manuscripts 1

No. 1, Pinner. This is a Pentateuch roll on leather, containing the five Mosaic books complete. It has no vowels, accents, or Masorah. The roll consists of forty-five pieces. As to the form of the letters, it differs considerably from the present style. This is particularly **a b g z l m**. The variations in the text from the Masoretic recension are few and inconsiderable. The MS., according to the subscription, was corrected in the year 580, consequently the roll must have been written upwards of 1280 years. It was brought from Derbend, in Daghestan, and is now at St. Petersburg. If the subscription be genuine, it is the oldest MS. known, except that one in the Firkowicz collection dated 489. (See Rule, *Karaites*, p. 100 sq.)

No. 634, De Rossi, quarto. This is but the fragment of a MS., containing ^{<0219>}Leviticus 21:19 - ^{<0450>}Numbers 1:50. It is on parchment, without the vowel-points, Masorah, or Keris. It has also no interval between the parshioth or sections. But there are sometimes points between the words. It belongs, in De Rossi's opinion, to the 8th century, and is corroded by age. The character of the letters is intermediate, approaching the German. It is now at Parma.

No. 5, Pinner. This is a roll of the Pentateuch, but incomplete. The writing begins with ^{<0439>}Numbers 13:19. The form of the letters is very different from the present style. It is carelessly written, words and letters being frequently omitted. The subscription states that it was written A.D. 843.

No. 11, Pinner. This is a fragment of a synagogue roll, beginning with ^{<630>}Deuteronomy 31:1. The date is 881.

No. 503, De Rossi, in quarto. This is a MS. of the Pentateuch, made up of different pieces. It begins with ^{<0425>}Genesis 42:15, and ends with ^{<652>}Deuteronomy 15:12. There is a chasm in it from ^{<6219>}Leviticus 21:19 to ^{<0453>}Numbers 1:50, because De Rossi separated this portion, thinking it to be older than the rest, and characterized it as an independent fragment by the No. 634. The vowel-points are attached, but not throughout, evidently by the same hand as that which wrote the consonants. There are no traces of the Masorah or Keris. Sometimes its readings have a remarkable agreement with those of the Samaritan text and ancient versions. De Rossi places the various pieces of which it is made up in the 9th and 10th centuries.

No. 3, Pinner, small folio. This MS. contains the greater and lesser prophets, on 225 leaves. Every page is written in two columns, between which, as well as below, and in the outer margin, stands the Masorah. Every column contains twenty-one lines. After each verse are two points, to which, without any interval, a new verse succeeds. The vowels and accents, as well as the greater and lesser Masorah, are wholly different from the Masoretic. The former are placed above the consonants. The first page has a twofold pointing, viz. above and below, but this does not occur again except occasionally in verses or words. From ^{<346>}Zechariah 14:6 to ^{<3013>}Malachi 1:13 there is no punctuation, and the first three verses of Malachi alone have been pointed much later in the manner now usual. The whole Codex is very correctly written. The form of the consonants differs considerably from the present text. The various readings of this MS., according to Pinner's collation, are numerous and important. The date is 916. Two others in the same collection, Nos. 15 and 17, have the same vowel and accent system, i.e. the Babylonian or Eastern, which originated in the 6th century, and from which, in the 7th, that of the Western, or the school of Tiberias, was developed. Pinsker has written ably on the subject *Zeitlung in das Babylonisch-Hebräische Punktationsystem, etc., Wien*,

1683), reviewed by Furst in the *Zeitschrift der cealuschen morgenlandischen Gesellschaft*, 18:314 sq.

No. 13, Pinner, folio. This is an incomplete MS., consisting of 115 leaves, on good parchment, containing 2 Samuel from 6:10 to the end, and the books of Kings. Each page has three columns, between which, as also at the sides of the text, stands the Masorah. The vowels and accents are different from those now in use. The text has many and important readings; and the Masorah deserves to be examined. Two points stand after each verse; and 2d succeeds 1st Kings without a vacant space between. An inscription states that the MS. was purchased in 938. It is obviously an important codex.

Codex 590, Kennicott, folio. This MS. contains the Prophets and Hagiographa on parchment. The text has the vowel-points, but apparently from a later hand. The margin does not exhibit the Masorah, but variations are noted here and there. Some books have the final Masorah. The separate books have no titles, and they are arranged in the oldest order, Jeremiah and Ezekiel coming before Isaiah, and Ruth before the Psalms. According to the subscription, it was written A.D. 1019, or 1018 by another reckoning. The MS. is in the imperial library of Vienna.

Pinner, small folio. A MS. containing the Pentateuch, Prophets, and Hagiographa, on good parchment. Every page has three columns, except in Psalms, Job, and Proverbs, where there are but two. The text is furnished with vowels and accents, two points standing after each verse. The letters and accents are like those in No. 3 of Pinner. The Great and Little Masorah are in the margins. Being a Karaite MS., it has not been written with great accuracy. Words and verses are sometimes repeated. It is highly ornamented with gold and silver colors. The Codex states that it was written in Egypt in the year 1010.

The most important and oldest Hebrew MSS. collated by Kennicott, Bruns, De Rossi, Pinner, and others, are described in Davidson's *Biblical Criticism*, 1:346 sq.; and his *Text of the Old Testament considered*, etc., p. 98 sq. See also the *third* section of Tychsen's *Tentamen de svariis Codicum Hebraicorum Vet. est. SS. generibus*, etc. (Rostock, 172, 8vo), in which the learned writer examines the marks of antiquity assumed by Simon, Jablonski, Wolf, Houbigant, Kennicott, and Lilienthal, and shows that the *Masorah alone* is a certain index for determining the age and goodness of Hebrew MSS. See also the same writer's *Beurtheilung der*

Jahrzahlen in den Hebraisch-Biblischen Handschriften (Rostock, 1786, 8vo), in which the mode of determining the age of MSS. adopted by Kennicott, Bruns. and Do kossi is rejected; and Schnurrer's *Dissertatio Inauguralis de Codicum Hebraeorum Vet. Test. cetate . diculter determinandas* (Tübingen, 1772, 4to), reprinted in his *Dissertationes Philologico-Criticae* (Gotha and Amsterdam, 1790, 8vo).

Private MSS. written in the *Rabbinical character* are much more recent than the preceding, none of them being older than 500 years. They are on cotton or linen paper, in a *cursive* character, without vowel-points or the Masorah, and with many abbreviations.

The MSS. found among the Chinese Jews are partly synagogue rolls, partly private copies, whose text does not differ from the Masoretic. The Pentateuch of the Malabar Jews, brought from India to England by the late Dr. Buchanan, and described by Mr. Yeates, resembles, on the whole, the usual synagogue rolls of the Jews, except that it is written on red skins. Its text is the Masoretic, with a few unimportant deviations.

Eight exemplars are celebrated among the Jews for their correctness and value. They are now lost, but extracts from them are still preserved. From Jewish writings, and from the margin of some MISS., where a reference is made to them, we learn that they were highly prized for their singular accuracy. They formed the basis of subsequent copies. They are,

1. The Codex of Hillel (see above);
2. The Babylonian Codex;
3. The Codex of Israel;
4. An Egyptian Codex;
5. Codex Sinai;
6. The Pentateuch of Jericho;
7. Codex Sanbuki;
8. The book Taggin.

For a more copious account of Hebrew MSS. we refer to Eichhorn's *Einleitung* (Introduction), vol. 2; Kennicott's *Dissertatio generalis*; Walton's *Prolegomena to the Polyglott*, separately edited by Dathe and Wrangham; Tychsel's *Tentamene*; De Rossi's *Variae Lectiones Vet. Test.* etc.; and his *Scholia critica in V. T. libros*, etc.; De Wette, *Lehrbuch der Historisch-Kritischen selinleitun.g*; Davidson's *Treatise on Biblical*

Criticism; and his Introd. to the Old Test., in Horne. *SEE OLD TESTAMENT.*

II. *Manuscripts of the Greek Testament.* —

1. Those that have descended to our time are either on vellum or paper. The oldest material was the Egyptian papyrus, but even so early as the 4th century the N.T. was written on the skins of animals. This writing material continued in use till the 11th century, when paper began to be employed. Till the 10th century, MSS. were usually written in *capital* or *uncial* letters; then the cursive character came into use. The most ancient copies have no division of words, being written in a continued series of lines. Accents, spirits, and iota, postscripted or subscribed, are also wanting.

2. The whole of the N.T. is contained in very few MSS. Transcribers generally divided it into three parts; the first, containing the four Gospels; the second, the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles; the third, the Apocalypse of St. John. The greatest number of MSS. are those which have the four Gospels, because they were most frequently read in the churches. Those containing the Acts and Epistles are also numerous. Such as have the book of Revelation alone are extremely few, because it was seldom read in public.

Greek codices are not often complete in all their parts. They have many chasms. Again, some contain merely detached portions of the N.T., or sections appointed to be read on certain days in the churches. Such codices are called *ἀναγνώσεις* or *ἀναγνώσματα* in Greek; in Latin, *lectionaria*. Those containing lessons from the *Gospels* are called *evangelistaria*; such as were taken from the *Acts*, *πραξαπόστολοι*; those from the epistles, *epistolaria* or *ἀπόστολοι*.

Several MSS. are accompanied with a Latin translation *interlined*, or in a *parallel column*. Such have been called *bilinigues*.

3. We shall now advert to the *uncial* MS. of the Greek Testament, and to those usually quoted in the examination of the controverted passage 1 John v. 7. The former are marked with the letters of the alphabet, A, B, C, etc.; the latter by the Arabic numerals, 1, 2, 3, etc. (in some late critics by small letters, a, b, c, etc.).

The number of uncial MSS. remaining, though great when compared with the ancient MSS. extant of other writings, is inconsiderable. (See the table

in 4. below.) Tischendorf (*N.T. Praef. cxxx*) reckons 40 in the Gospels, of which 5 are entire, B K MU; 3 nearly entire, E1A; 10 contain very considerable portions, A C D F G H V X F A; of the remainder, 14 contain very small fragments, 8 fragments more (I P Q R Z) or less considerable (N T Y). To these must be added **a** (*Cod. Sinait.*), which is entire;(H), a new MS. of Tischendorf (*Not. Cod. Sin. p. 51-52*), which is nearly entire; and **Ξ** (*Cod. Zacynth.*), which contains considerable fragments of Luke. Tischendorf has likewise obtained 9 additional fragments (*l. c.*). In the Acts there are 12, of which 4 contain the text entire (**a** A B), or nearly so (E₂); 5 have large fragments (C D II₂ G₂=L₂ and P₂), 3 small fragments. In the Catholic Epistles 7, of which 5, **la** B K₂ G₂ —lare entire; 2 (C P₂) nearly entire. In the Pauline Epistles there are 18: 1 (**a**) entire; 3 nearly entire, D₂L₂P₂; 7 have very considerable portions, A B C E₃F₂G₃K₂ (but E₁s of little account); the remaining 7 some fragments. In the Apocalypse 5: 3 entire (**a** A B₂), 2 nearly entire (C P₂).

According to date these MSS. are classed as follows:

Fourth century: **a** B.

Fifth century: A C, and some fragments.

Sixth century: D P R Z E₂D₂H₃, and 9 smaller fragments.

Seventh century: Some fragments.

Eighth century: E1(A) **Ξ** B₂, and some fragments.

Ninth century: F K in V X rA II H₂G₂=L₂F G₂K₂M₂P₂, and fragments.

Tenth century: G HU (En).

A complete description of these MSS. is given in the great critical editions of the N.T.: here those only can be briefly noticed which are of primary importance.

(a.) Uncials.

a, *Codex Sinaiticus* (*Cod. Frid. Aug.* of the Sept.) at St. Petersburg, obtained by Tischendorf from the convent of St. Catherine, Mount Sinai, in 1859. The fragments of the Sept. published as *Cod. Frid. Aug.* (1846) were obtained at the same place by Tischendorf in 1844. The N.T. is entire,

and the Epistle of Barnabas and parts of the Shepherd of Hermas are added. The whole MS. was published in 1862 by Tischendorf, at the expense of the emperor of Russia. It is probably the oldest of the MSS. of the N.T., and of the 4th century (Tischendorf, *Not. Cod. Sin.* 1860). **SEE SINAITIC MANUSCRIPT.**

A, *Codex Alexandrinus* (British Museum), a MS. of the entire Greek Bible, with the Epistles of Clement added. It was given by Cyril Lucar, patriarch of Constantinople, to Charles I in 1628, and is now in the British Museum. It contains the whole of the N.T. with some chasms: Matthew 1; 25:6, ἐξέρχεσθε; ^{ⲁⲃⲏⲃ}John 6:50, ἵνα, 52, λέγει; ^{ⲁⲓⲃⲏⲃ}2 Corinthians 4:13, ἐπίστευσα 12:6, ἐξ ἐμοῦ. It was probably written in the first half of the 5th century. The N.T. has been published by Woide (1786, fol.), and with some corrections by Cowper (1860, 8vo). Compare Wetstein, *Proleg.* p. 13-30 (ed. Lotz). **SEE ALEXANDRIAN MANUSCRIPT.**

B. *Codex Vaticanus* (No. 1209), a MS. of the Greek Bible, which seems to have been in the Vatican Library almost from its commencement (cir. A.D. 1450). It contains the N.T. entire to ^{ⲁⲓⲃⲏⲃ}Hebrews 9:14, **καθα**; the rest of the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Pastoral Epistles, and the Apocalypse were added in the 15th century. Various collations of the New Test. were made by Bartolucci (1669), by Mico for Bentley (cir. 1720), whose collation was in part revised by Rulotta (1726), and by Birch (1788). An edition of the whole MS., on which Mai had been engaged for many years, was published three years after his death in 1858 (5 vols. 4to, ed. Vercellone; N.T. reprinted, London and Leipsic). Mai had himself kept back the edition (printed 1828-1838), being fully conscious of its imperfections, and had prepared another edition of the N.T., which was published also by Vercellone and others in 1859 (8vo). This was revised by Tischendorf (Lpz. 1867). The whole of Codex B is to be published by authority of the pope, and the N.T. part has already appeared (Rome, 1868), nearly complete. The MS. is assigned to the 4th century (Tischendorf, *N.T.* p. 136-149). **SEE VATICAN MANUSCRIPT.**

The Apocalypse in these last editions is taken from *Codex Vaticanus*, 2066 (formerly *Codex Basilianus*, 105), in the Vatican Library. It belongs to the 8th century (see Tischendorf's *N.T.* p. 142 sq. [7th ed.]).

C, *Codex Ephraemi rescriptus* (Paris, *Bibl. Imp.* 9), a palimpsest MS. which contains fragments of the Sept. and of every part of the N.T. In the 12th century the original writing was effaced, and some Greek writings of

Ephraem Syrus were written over it. The MS. was brought to Florence from the East at the beginning of the 16th century, and came thence to Paris with Catherine de Medici. Wetstein was engaged to collate it for Bentley (1716), but it was first fully examined by Tischendorf, who published the N.T. in 1843; the O.T. fragments in 1845. The only entire books which have perished are 2 Thessalonians and 2 John, but lacunae of greater or less extent occur constantly. It is of about the same date as the *Codex Alex.* **SEE EPHRAEM MANUSCRIPT.**

D. (of the Gospels), *Codex Bezae* (University Library, Cambridge), a Graeco-Latin MS. of the Gospels and Acts, with a small fragment of 3 John, presented to the University of Cambridge by Beza in 1581. Some readings from it were obtained in Italy for Stephens's edition, but afterwards Beza found it at the sack of Lyons in 1562, in the Monastery of St. Irenmeuts. The text is very remarkable, and, especially in the Acts. abounds in singular interpolations. The MS. has many lacunae. It was edited in a splendid form by Kipling (1793, 2 vols. fol.), but so imperfectly that it has been published anew under the care of the Rev. F. H. Scrivener (Cambr. 1864, 4to). The MS. is referred to the 6th century. Comp. Credner, *Beitrlage*, 1:452-518; Bornemann, *Acta Apostolorum*, 1848; Schulz, *De Codice D, Cantab.* 1827. **SEE CAMBRIDGE MANUSCRIPT.**

D₂ (of the Epistles), *Codex Claromontanus*, or *Regius* (in the Imperial Library at Paris, 107), marked by the same letter of the alphabet as the preceding, but containing a different part of the N.T., viz., all Paul's Epistles with the exception of a few verses. It is a Greek-Latin MS., written stichometrically, with accents and breathings, but without division into words. According to Montfaucon, it belongs to the 7th century, but Tischendorf assigns it to the 6th. The text was edited by the latter scholar in 1852, and is very valuable. Various correctors may be traced, but it is not always easy to distinguish them. The first readings are of course the principal ones (see the prolegomena to Tischendorf's edition). **SEE CLERMONT MANUSCRIPT.**

E (of the Gospels), *Codex Basiliensis* (K, 4:35 in the public library at Basle). It contains the Gospels, with a very few chasms in Luke's. In some parts smaller writing has taken the place of the older. It belongs to the middle of the 8th century, and was collated by Tischendorf in 1843. See his description in the *Studien und Kritiken* for 1844. **SEE BASILEAN MANUSCRIPT.**

E₂ (of the Acts), *Codex Laudianus*, a Greek-Latin MS. in the Bodleian Library at Oxford. The text is written stichometrically. It contains the Acts, and has a hiatus from 26:29 to 28:26. Its age is the end of the 6th century, as Tischendorf supposes; or the 7th, as Wetstein prefers. The readings are very valuable. Hearne published an edition at Oxford (1715, 8vo), and Tischendorf proposes to publish it more correctly in a future volume of his — *Monumenta Sacra*; but Scrivener has undertaken a new edition. **SEE LAUDIAN MANUSCRIPT.**

E₃ (of the Epistles). *Codex Sangermanensis* (in the Imperial Library of St. Petersburg), a very incorrect transcript of the Codex Claromontanus, and therefore possessing no authority or importance. It appears to belong to the 10th century.

F (of the Gospels), *Codex Boreeli*, now in the library of Utrecht, containing the Gospels, but with many chasms. It was collated and described by Heringa, whose work was published by Vinke (1843). The MS. belongs to the end of the 9th century. **SEE BOREELS MANUSCRIPT.**

F^a, *Codex Coislinianus*, containing a few fragments of the Gospels, Acts, and Epistles, found among the scholia of Codex Coislin. 1, which has the Octateuch, with the book of Kings. They were edited by Tischendorf in his *Monumenta Sacra inedita* (1846), p. 400 sq. The fragments belong to the 7th century. **SEE COISLIN MANUSCRIPT, 1.**

F^b, in the British Museum, 17,136, a *rescript* fragment from the Nitrian 'desert, containing a few places of John's Gospel, which were deciphered and published by Tischendorf in his *Monum. ined.* vol. 2: The text agrees with the most ancient and best authorities. Tischendorf assigns the fragment to the 4th century; it rather belongs to the 5th.

F₂ (of the Epistles), *Codex Augiensis*, a Greek-Latin MS. of St. Paul's Epistles, in the library of Trinity College, Cambridge. It wants the Epistle to the Hebrews in Greek, and ~~ROM~~ Romans 1:1-3:18. Dots are inserted between many of the Greek and Latin words. The text is ancient and valuable. It belongs to the 9th century. In 1842 and 1849 it was collated by Tischendorf, and edited by Scrivener (1859). **SEE AUGIAN MANUSCRIPT.**

G (of the Gospels), *Codex Harleianus* (5684 in the British Museum), a MS. of the four Gospels, but imperfect in many places. It belongs to the 9th or 10th century, and was collated by Tregelles and Tischendorf.

G, (of the Epistles), *Cod. Boernerianus*, a Greek-Latin MS. of Paul's Epistles, now in the Royal Library of Dresden. It has the same chasms as F, Augiensis, with which it agrees remarkably, so that both texts seem to have proceeded from the same copy. They belong to one country and age — probably to Switzerland and the 9th century. Matthaei published it in 1791, 8vo. *SEE BOERNER MANUSCRIPT.*

H (of the Gospels), *Codex Seidelii*, II, a MS. of the four Gospels in the public library of Hamburg. It is imperfect in many places, belongs to the 9th or 10th century, and was collated by Tregelles in 1850.

H, (of the Acts), *Codex Mutinensis* (196 in the Ducal Library of Modena), a MS. of the Acts, with considerable gaps. Its age is the 9th century. From ~~Acts~~ Acts 27:4 till the end was supplied in uncial letters in the 11th century. The Pauline and Catholic Epistles were added in cursive letters in the 15th or 16th century. Tischendorf collated it in 1843.

H₃ (of the Epistles), *Codex Coislinianus* (202 in the Imperial Library at Paris). This MS. contains fragments of Paul's Epistles. It consists only of twelve leaves, two which it formerly had being now at Petersburg. Another leaf was recently brought by Tischendorf from Mount Athos, containing ~~Colossians~~ Colossians 3:4-11. The fifteen leaves should be put together. It has been collated by Tischendorf, who intends to publish it all. It belongs to the 6th century. *SEE COISLIN MANUSCRIPT, 2.*

I, a MS. in the library of St. Petersburg, found by Tischendorf on his travels in the East. It is a *rescript*, containing the remains of seven very ancient MSS. exhibiting parts of the Gospels, Acts, and two Pauline Epistles. Tischendorf thinks that the first, second, and third belong to the 5th century. All are edited by him in the first volume of *Monumenta Sacra*, p. 1, etc.

I^b. See **N^b**.

K (of the Gospels), *Codex Regius*, or *Cyprius* (now 63 in the Imperial Library of Paris). It, contains the four Gospels complete, belongs to the middle of the 9th century, and was accurately collated by Tischendorf in 1842. *SEE PARIS MANUSCRIPTS.*

K, (of the Epistles), *Codex Mosquensis* (98 in the Library of the Holy Synod at Moscow), containing the Catholic and Pauline Epistles. It belongs to the 9th century, and was collated by Matthaei.

L (of the Gospels), *Codex Regius* (62 in the Imperial Library at Paris), containing the Gospels entire with the exception of five places. The text of this codex contains very old and good readings, agreeing remarkably with B. It belongs to the 8th century, and was published by Tischendorf in his *Monumn. Sacra*, 1846, p. 57. *SEE PARIS MANUSCRIPTS*.

L₂ (of the Acts and Epistles), *Codex Bibliothecae Angelicae* (A 2,15 in the library of the Augustine monks at Rome), a MS. containing the Acts, Catholic Epistles, and those of Paul. It begins with Acts viii, i0, and ends with ^{<880>}Hebrews 13:10. Its age is the 9th century. It was first collated with care by Fleck; afterwards by Tischendorf and Tregelles.

M (of the Gospels), *Codex Regius* (48 in the Imperial Library of Paris), containing the Gospels entire. This MS. has been transcribed by Tischendorf, but is not yet published. He assigns it to the latter part of the 9th century. *SEE PARIS MANUSCRIPTS*.

M₂ (of the Epistles), two fragments; one at Hamburg, the other at London. The former contains some parts of the Epistle to the Hebrews; the latter, portions of the Epistle to the Corinthians. Both were published by Tischendorf in his *Anecdota Sacra*, p. 174 sq. The text is both ancient and valuable.

N (of the Gospels), *Codex purpureus*, the fragment of a MS., of which four leaves are in the British Museum, six in the Vatican, and two at Vienna. Tischendorf has recently found 33 leaves more. containing about a third of the entire Gospel of Mark, between 6:53 and 15:3. The letters were silver on purple vellum. They are larger and rounder than in A B C. The text is in two columns. The Ammonian sections and Eusebian canons are placed in the margin. All contain portions of the Gospels. The contents of the twelve leaves were published by Tischendorf in his *Monumenta inedita*, who assigns the fragment to the end of the 6th century. *SEE PURPLE MANUSCRIPT*.

N₂ (of the Epistles), a fragment consisting of two leaves, with Galatians 5 and 6, and Hebrews 5 and 6:Assigned by Tischendorf to the 9th century.

N^b [Tisch. I^b] (Brit. Mus. *Add.* 17, 136), a palimpsest of the 4th or 5th century, deciphered by Tregelles, and published by Tischendorf (*Mon. Ined.* vol. ii).

N^c. a few fragments, now at Moscow, of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Tischendorf thinks they may be of the 6th century, but Matthaei did not state enough to determine their age.

O, a small fragment, consisting of two leaves, containing ^{<4011>}2 Corinthians 1:20-ii. 12, belonging to the 9th century.

O¹, *Codex Mosquensis* (120, at Moscow), a fragment consisting of eight leaves, containing a few parts of John's Gospel; probably of the 9th century. Matthoei published the text.

O^a, the two hymns, ^{<4046>}Luke 1:46-55 and 1:68-79, in a Latin MS. containing the grammar of Pompeius. They are written in uncial Greek letters, and belong to the 9th century. Tischendorf published them in his *Anecdota sacra et profana*, p. 206 sq.

O^b, the same two hymns, together with a third, ^{<4029>}Luke 2:29-32, in a Psalter in the Bodleian Library, No. 120, belonging to the 9th century. See Tischendorf, *Anecdota*, p. 206.

O^c, the hymn of Mary, ^{<4046>}Luke 1:46-55, contained in the Verona Psalter, and belonging to the 6th century. The Greek is in Latin letters. It was published by Blanchini in the *Psalterium duplex* appended to his *Vindiciae calonicarum Scripturarum* (Romae, 1740).

O^d, the three hymns of Luke i and ii, as contained in the Psalter of Turin, written in gold and silver letters, belonging to the 7th century. Tischendorf is about to publish the entire Psalter.

O^e, the same three hymns in a St. Gall Codex. 17, written partly in Greek and partly in Latin. Tischendorf assigns the MS. to the 9th century.

P (of the Gospels), *Codex Guelpherbytanus*, A (in the library of Wolfenbüttel), a palimpsest MS. containing fragments of the Gospels. In 1762 Knittel published all he could read. In 1854 Tischendorf succeeded in deciphering almost all the portions of the Gospels that exist, which he has published in his *Monumenta Sacra inedita* (1860). See below, Q.

P₂ (of the Acts and Epistles), a MS. of the Acts, Catholic and Pauline Epistles, and Apocalypse, belonging to the library of bishop Uspenski in St. Petersburg. This is a valuable palimpsest, consisting of upwards of 300 leaves. Though belonging to the 9th century, the text, except in 1 Peter and Acts, agrees with that of the oldest codices. The Epistles were published in 1865, and the Acts and Rev. in 1869, by Tischendorf, in his *Monum. Sacra*.

Q, *Codex Guelpherbytanus*, B, another palimpsest, containing fragments of Luke and John's Gospels, discovered by Knittel, and published with the last fragments. Tischendorf is about to re-edit it in a more complete and accurate state. According to him, P belongs to the 6th, and Q to the 5th century. *SEE WOLFENBUTTEL MANUSCRIPTS*.

Q', a papyrus fragment, containing parts of 1 Corinthians i, vi, vii, belonging to the 5th or 6th century.

R, a rescript MS. belonging to the British Museum, brought from the Nitrian desert, with many other codices, chiefly Syriac ones. The Syriac text of Severus of Antioch was written over it. The forty-eight leaves contain parts of Luke's Gospel. The writing is in two columns; and the Ammonian sections have not the canons of Eusebius. Tischendorf published *almost* the whole text (for some of it is illegible) in his *Monumenta Sacra inedita*, vol. 2. Dr. Wright found three leaves overlooked by Tischendorf, of which he gave an account in the *Journal of Sacred Literature* for January, 1864. It is assigned to the 6th century, but may belong to the 7th.

S, *Codex Vaticanus*, 354. This MS. contains the four Gospels entire. It is in the Vatican Library, where Birch carefully collated it twice for his Greek Testament. A subscription to it states that it was written A.D. 949. See Tischendorf, in the *Annales Vindobon.* (1847), where a fac-simile better than those of Blanchini and Birch is given.

T, *Codex Borgianus* (1 in the library of the Propaganda at Rome), a MS. of thirteen leaves, containing fragments of John's Gospel. The Greek text has a *Thebaic translation* by its side. Giorgi published the text in 1789 at Rome. Tischendorf, who inspected the MS. and made a facsimile of it, assigns it to the 5th century. *SEE BORGIAN MANUSCRIPT*.

T^b, six leaves, containing John 1, 2, 3, 4, belonging to the 6th century.

T^c, two leaves, containing Matthew 14, 15, belonging to the 6th century. The writing and text resemble those of the Borgian fragments.

T^d, fragments of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, from Borgian MSS. of the 7th century.

T^s, *Fragmentum Woideanum*, a few leaves, Greek and Sahidic, whose text was edited by Woide (contained in the Appendix to the Codex Alexandrinus, 1799). The one contains ~~ⲁⲓⲧⲓⲥ~~ Luke 12:15-13:32; the other, ~~ⲁⲓⲃⲃ~~ John 8:33-42. Tischendorf has discovered that these fragments are parts of T, published by Giorgi. Hence they belong to the same time.

U, *Codex Venetus Marcianus*, formerly *Nanzianus* (in St. Mark's Library at Venice), a MS. of the Gospels complete, with a text elegantly written. It was first collated accurately by Tischendorf in 1843, and again by Tregelles in 1846. According to Tischendorf it belongs to the end of the 9th or to the 10th century.

V, *Codex Mosquensis* (in the library of the Holy Synod at Moscow), a MS. of the four Gospels, with several chasms. From ~~ⲁⲓⲧⲓⲥ~~ John 7:39 has been supplied by a more recent hand of the 13th century, in cursive letters. It belongs to the 9th century, and was twice collated by Matthaei.

W^a, two leaves at the end of *Codex Regius*, now in the Imperial Library of Paris. They contain ~~ⲁⲓⲃⲃ~~ Luke 9:34-47; 10:12-22, and are the fragment of a continuous MS. of the Gospels belonging to the 8th century. Tischendorf has edited the whole in his *Monumenta Sacra inedita*.

W^b, *Codex Neapolitanus rescriptus*, consisting of fourteen leaves which contain fragments of the first three Gospels as old as the 8th century. Tischendorf edited some verses of it in the *Annales Vindobonenses* (1847); and it is described by Scotti. Tischendorf supposes that the leaves belong to the same MS. as W^a.

W^c, three leaves at *St. Gall*, containing fragments of Mark and Luke. They are a sort of palimpsest, the writing having been effaced, though nothing new was written over. Tischendorf; who copied, and intends to edit these fragments, assigns them to the 9th century.

W^d, fragments of Mark's Gospel, 7, 8, 9, found in Trinity College, Cambridge, belonging to the 9th century.

X, *Codex Monacensis*, in the library of the University of Munich, containing fragments of the four Gospels. Commentaries of several fathers, especially Chrysostom, accompany the text, except Mark's. It belongs to the 9th or 10th century. Between ~~812~~ John 2:22 and 7:1, is supplied by a later hand of the 12th century. The MS. was collated by Tischendorf and Tregelles. *SEE MUNICH MANUSCRIPT*.

Y, *Codex Barberinus*, No. 225, six leaves containing fragments of John's Gospel, belonging to the 8th century, copied by Tischendorf in 1843, and published in his *Monumenta Sacra inedita*, 1846. They are now in the Barberinian Library at Rome.

Z, *Codex Dublinensis*, in the library of Trinity College, Dublin, a palimpsest, containing fragments of Matthew's Gospel, and belonging to the 6th century. The text of this MS. presents ancient and valuable readings. It was published in facsimile by Barrett, 1801, 4to, and Tregelles has since (1853) deciphered the remainder (*Printed Text*, p. 166 sq.). *SEE DUBLIN MANUSCRIPT*.

, a MS., now in the Bodleian Library, consisting of 157 leaves large 4to. It contains Luke's Gospel entire, and parts of the other three. The form of the letters resembles the *Codex Cyprius* or K. Tischendorf, who got it in the East, assigns it to the 9th century. He collated and described it in *Anecdota sacra et profana*.

The second half of this MS. has recently been found, containing the greatest part of Matthew and John. The date is 844.

. *Codex Sangallensis*, a Greek-Latin MS. in the library of St. Gall, containing the four Gospels entire, with the exception of ~~817~~ John 19:17-35. It is very similar in character to G (*Cod. Boernerianus*), both belonging to the same age and country, i.e. they were written in the monastery of St. Gall, in Switzerland, in the 9th century. Rettig published it at Zürich, in fac-simile, in 1836. This MS., with the codices Augiensis and Boernerianus, are portions of one and the same document. *SEE GALL, ST., MANUSCRIPT*.

θ. *Codex Tischendorffianus I*, in the library of Leipzig University, consisting of four leaves, of which the third is almost decayed, containing a few fragments of Matthew's Gospel. Tischendorf assigns them to the end

of the 7th century. He published the contents in his *Monumenta Sacra inedita*, p. 1, etc.

θ^b, a fragment, containing six leaves, with Matthew 22 and 23, and Mark 4, belonging to the 7th century.

θ^c, two leaves, containing ~~421B~~ Matthew 21:19-24, and ~~418D~~ John 18:29-35, belonging to the 6th century.

θ^d, a small fragment of the 8th century, containing Luke xi.

θ^e, a fragment of Matthew 26, of the 6th century.

θ^f, four leaves, containing Matthew 26, 27, Mark 1 and 2. Of the 6th century.

θ^g, a fragment of John vi, belonging to the 6th century.

θ^h, a Greek-Arabic MS., containing three leaves, with Matthew 14 and 25, belonging to the 9th century.

Λ, a MS. in the Bodleian Library, containing the Gospels of Luke and John entire. It consists of 157 leaves, and belongs to the 9th century. Tischendorf and Tregelles have collated it.

Π, a valuable MS. of the Gospels, almost complete, brought by Tischendorf from Smyrna to St. Petersburg. It belongs to the 9th century. (See Tischendorfs *Notitia editionis codicis Bibliorum Sinaitici*, etc., p. 51.)

Ξ, *Codex Zacynthius*, a palimpsest containing fragments of Luke's Gospel, belonging to the committee of the British and Foreign Bible Society. It is of the 8th century, and is accompanied by a *catena* of the 13th. Tregelles transcribed and published the fragments (1861). **SEE ZACYNTHIAN MANUSCRIPT.**

Such are the *uncial* MSS. hitherto collated. Their number is not great, but every year is adding to it. There are known upwards of a hundred uncials, including evangelistaria and apostoli. (See the table below.)

4. The number of the *cursive* MSS. (*minuscules*) in existence cannot be accurately calculated. Tischendorf catalogues about 500 of the Gospels, 200 of the Acts and Catholic Epistles, 250 of the Pauline Epistles, and a little less than 100 of the Apocalypse (exclusive of lectionaries); but this

enumeration can only be accepted as a rough approximation. Many of the MSS. quoted are only known by old references; still more have been “inspected” most cursorily; few only have been thoroughly collated. In this last work the Rev. F. H. Scrivener (*Collation of about 20 MSS. of the Holy Gospels*, Camb. 1853; *Cod. Aug. etc.*, Camb. 1859) has labored with the greatest success, and removed many common errors as to the character of the later text. His summary is as follows:

Picture for Manuscripts 2

Among the MSS. which are well known and of great value the following are the most important:

A. Primary Cursives of the *Gospels*: 1 (Act. 1; Paul. 1; *Basileensis*, K. 3:3). 10th cent. Very valuable in the Gospels. Collated by Roth and Tregelles.

33 (Act. 13; Paul. 17; Paris, Bibl. Imp. 14). 11th cent. Coll. by Tregelles.

59 (Coll. Gonv. et Cai. Cambr.). 12th cent. Coll. by Scrivener, 1860. but as yet unpublished.

69 (Act. 31; Paul. 37; Apoc. 14; *Cod. Leicestrensis*). 14th cent. The text of the Gospels is especially valuable. Coll. by Tregelles, 1852, and by Scrivener, 1855, who published his collation in *Cod. Aug. etc.*, 1859.

118 (Bodleian. Miscell. 13; Marsh 24). 13th cent. Coll. by Griesbach, *Symnb. Crit.* i, ccii sq.

124 (Caesar. Vindob. Nessel. 188). 12th cent. Coll. by Treschow, Alter, Birch.

127 (Cod. Vaticanus, 349). 11th cent. Coll. by Birch. 131 (Act. 70; Paul. 77; Apoc. 66; Cod. Vaticanus, 360). 11th cent. Formerly belonged to Aldus Maanutius, and was probably used by him in his edition. Coll. by Birch.

157 (Cod. Urbino-Vat. 2). 12th cent. Coll. by Birch. 218 (Act. 65; Paul. 57; Apoc. 33; Caesar-Viadob. 23). 13th cent. Coll. by Alter.

238, 259 (Moscow, S. Synod. 42, 45). 11th cent. Coll. by Matthlei.

262, 300 (Paris, *Bibl. Imp.* 53, 186). 10th and 11th cent. Coll. (?) by Scholz.

346 (Milan, *Ambros.* 23). 12th cent. Coll. (?) by Scholz. 2^{de} (St. Petersburg, *Petropol.* 6:470). 9th cent. Coll. by Muralt. (Transition cursive.)

c^{scr}, g^{scr} (Lambeth, 1177, 528, Wetstein, 71). 12th cent. Coll. by Scrivener.

p^{scr} (Brit. Mus. Burney, 20). 13th cent. Coll. by Scrivener.

w^{scr} (Cambr. Coll. SS. Trin. B. 10:16). 14th cent. Coll. by Scrivener.

To these must be added the Evanglelistarium (B. M. Burney, 22), marked y^{scr}, coll. by Scrivener. (Cut, fig. 4.)

The following are valuable, but need careful collation: 13 (Paris, *Bibl. Is-p.* 50). Coll. 1797. 12th cent. (Comp.

Griesbach, *Symb. Crit.* i, cliv-clxvi.)

22 (Paris, *Bibl. Imp.* 72). 11th cent.

28 (Paris, *Bibl. Insp.* 379). Coll. by Scholz.

72 (Brit. Mus. *Harl.* 5647). 11th cent.

106 (Cod. Winchelsea). 10th cent. Coll. by Jackson (used by Wetstein), 1748.

113,114 (Brit. Mus. *Harl.* 1810, 5540). 126 (Cod. Guelpheribytanus, 16:16). 11th cent. 130 (Cod. Vaticanus, 359). 13th cent. 209 (Act. 95: Paul. 138; Apoc. 46; Venice, *Bibl. S. Marci.* 10). 15th cent. The text of the Gospels is especially valuable.

225 (Vienna, *Bibl. Insp.* Kollar. 9, Forlos. 31). 12th cent. 372, 382 (Rome, Vatican. 1161. 2017). 15th and 13th cent. 405, 408, 409 (Venice, S. Marci, i. 10, 14,15). 11th and 12th cent.

B. Primary Cursives of the *Acts and Catholic Epistles*:

13=Gosp. 33, Paul. 17.

31= Gosp. 69 (*Codex Leicestrensis*).

65=Gosp. 218. 73 (Paul. 80. Vatican. 367). 11th cent. Coll. by Birch. 95. 96 (Venet. 10, 11). 14th and 11th cent. Coll. by Rinck. 180 (Argentor. *Bibl. Sem. M.*). Coll. by Arendt.

l^{oti}=p^{scr} 61 (Tregelles, Brit. Mus. *Add.* 20,003). 11th cent. Coll. by Scrivener. See cut, fis. 2.

a^{scr} (Lambeth, 1182). 12th cent. Coll. by Scrivener. c^{scr} (Lambeth, 1184). Coll. by Sanderson ap. Scrivener. The following are valuable, but require more careful collation:

5 (Paris, *Bibl. Imp.* 106).

25, 27 (Paul. 31; Apoc. 7; Paul. 33. Brit. Mus. *Harl.* 5537, 5620). Comp. Griesbach, *Symb. Crit.* 2:184,185.

2) (Paul. 35; Genev. 20). 11th and 12th cent. 36 (*Coll. Nov.* Oxon.). 40 (Paul. 46; Apoc. 12. Alex. Vatican. 179). 11th cent. Coll. by Zacagni.

66 (Paul. 67). 68 (Paul. 73, Upsal). 12th and 11th cent. 69 (Paul. 74; Apoc. 30; Guelph. 16:7). 14th and 13th cent.

81 (Berberini. 377). 11th cent. 137 (Milan. *Ambros* 97). 11th cent. Coll. by Scholz.

142 (Mutinensis, 243). 12th cent.

Picture for Manuscripts 3

5. MSS. are sometimes divided by the critics of Germany into, 1. Such as were written before the practice of *stichometry*, a mode of dividing the text in lines or clauses. *SEE STICHOMETRY*. 2. The *stichometrical*. 3. Those written after *stichometry* had ceased. So Hug and De Wette, in their Introductions to the N.T. According to this classification, a, A, B, and C belong to the first class; D, D₂, etc.. to the second; and by far the greatest number to the third. We have alluded to them under the two great heads of *uncial* and *cursive*.

In examining MSS. and comparing their characteristic readings, it is not easy in every instance to arrive at the true original form of a passage. Many circumstances are to be taken into account, and many cautions to be observed. They are more useful in detecting interpolated passages than in restoring the correct reading. The reading of an older MS. is preferable *cceteris paribus*. In determining the age of a MS. internal marks are chiefly followed, such as the form of the letters, the divisions, abbreviations, the nature of the lines, the presence or absence of the accents, etc. These particulars, however, are not safe criteria. Age alone is not sufficient to

insure the value of the text of a MS. The copyist may have been guilty of negligence or inattention. In proportion to his accuracy or carelessness the authority of the codex will be greater or less. Again, a document certainly copied from one which is very ancient will have greater authority than an earlier taken from another of no great antiquity. Thus a MS. of the *eqiuth* century may have been directly copied from one of the *fifth*, and consequently the former will be entitled to greater estimation than one belonging to the 7th century transcribed from one of the 6th. In determining the value of a codex, it is usual to refer to the country where it was written. Griesbach and others prefer the *African*; Scholz, the *Constantinopolitan*. Those written in Egypt are the best. With respect to Hebrew MSS., it is admitted by all that the Spanish are the best. The Italian, again, are superior to the German. The reading contained in the greater number of MSS. is preferable to that of a less number. *Mere majority*, however, is not a safe criterion. A majority arising from *independent sources*, or, in other words, of those belonging to *different recensions*, can alone be relied on as decisive. But here critics are not agreed as to the number of *recensions* belonging to Greek MSS. Some have proposed four, some three, others two. Besides, the same MS. may belong to a different recension in different parts of itself. In others, the characteristic readings of two or three recensions are mingled together, rendering it difficult to determine which recension or family preponderates. Hebrew MSS. belong to one and the same recension. It is true that some have distinguished them into *Masoretic and Ante-masoretic*, but the existence of the latter is a mere fiction. One great family alone, viz. the *Masoretic*, can be distinctly traced. Since the time of Lachmann's first edition, greater importance has been attached by N.T. critics to the age of MSS. It has been the object of his followers in the same department to adhere for the most part to the oldest copies. This is right within certain limits. The true text of the N.T., as far as we can now obtain it, lies in the MSS. of the 4th till the 8th centuries, accompanied and modified by the testimony of ancient versions and fathers during that period. But within this period we can easily distinguish MSS. of a second order in goodness, viz. E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, from those of the first class, a, A, B, C, Z (see Davidson's *Biblical Criticism*, vol. ii). **SEE CRITICISM, BIBLICAL.**

Ma'och

(Heb. *Maok'*, *Ἐωφm*; *compressed*; Sept. *Ἀμμόχ*, Vulg. *Maoch*), the father of the Achish king of Gath to whom David repaired for safety (^{<1927>}1 Samuel 27:2). B.C. ante 1054. By many he has been confounded with the MAACAH of ^{<1023>}1 Kings 2:39. *SEE ACHISH*.

Ma'on

(Heb. *Maon'*, *ῶφm*; *habitation*, as often; Sept. *Μαών*), the name of a man and of a place. *SEE MAONITE*.

1. The son of Shammai, of the tribe of Judah and family of Caleb, and the “father” (i.e. founder) of Bethzur (^{<1325>}1 Chronicles 2:45). B.C. prob. post 1618.

2. A town in the tribe of Judah (^{<1655>}Joshua 15:55), which gave name to a wilderness (part of the desert of Judaea), where David hid himself from Saul, and around which the churlish Nabal had great possessions (^{<1924>}1 Samuel 23:24, 25; 25:2). Josephus calls it *Emma* (*ῶ μμᾶ*, *Ant.* 6:13, 6). Eusebius and Jerome place it to the east of Daroma (*Onomast.* s.v. *Μανῶν*, Maon). Irby and Mangles were in the neighborhood in 1818, but did not detect this and other ancient names. Robinson finds it in the present *lMain*, which is about seven miles south by east from Hebron. Here there is a conical hill about 200 feet high, on the top of which are some ruins of no great extent, consisting of foundations of hewn stone, a square enclosure, the remains probably of a tower or castle, and several cisterns. The view from the summit is extensive. The traveler found here a band of peasants keeping their flocks, and dwelling in caves amid the ruins (*Bibl. Researches*, 2:190-196). With this identification De Saulcy (*Narrative*, 1:441) and Schwarz (*Palestine*, p. 106) agree. *SEE MEHUNIM*.

Ma'onite

(Heb. same word as MAON, used collectively; Sept. and Vulg. interpret *Χαναάν* [v. r. *Μαδιόμ*], *Chanaan*, Auth. Vers. “Maonites”), an Arabian tribe mentioned in connection with the Amalekites, Sidonians, Philistines, and others as having oppressed the Hebrews (^{<1702>}Judges 10:12). They are the same as the MEUNITES (*μυνῶμ*] *Meuinim'*, the plural of MAON; Sept. *Μινᾶιοι*, confounding them with the Ammonites; Vulg. *Ammonitae*, and *tabernzacult*; Auth. Vers. “Mehunims,” and “the habitations”), elsewhere

mentioned in a similar connection (^{<101P>}2 Chronicles 26:27; ^{<1304L>}1 Chronicles 4:41). **SEE MEHUNIM**. At the present day there exists a town called *Maa'ni*, with a castle, in Arabia Petraea, to the south of the Dead Sea (see Seetzen, in Zach's *Monatl. Corresp.* 18:382; Burckhardt, *Travels in Syria*, p. 437). Prof. Robinson says, "Ma'an, the well-known town on the route of the Syrian Haj, nearly east of wady Musa, is with good reason assumed as the probable seat of the Maonites mentioned in the Scriptures. Abulfeda (*Syr.* p. 14) describes Ma'an as inhabited by Ommiades and their vassals" (*Researches*, 2:572). That the *Mincei* of Arabia (Diod. Sic. 3:42; Ptol. 6:7, 23; Strabo, 16:768) are a different people has long since been shown by Bochart (*Phaleg*, 2:23). Traces of the name *AMaon* are found in several localities besides that of the above passages. It is given to a town in the south of Judah, now identified with the ruins of Tell Main (Porter, *Handbook for S. and P.* p. 61). In pronouncing a prophetic curse upon Moab, Jeremiah mentions Beth-meon (48:23), which may perhaps be the same as the Beth-baal-meon of ^{<1637>}Joshua 13:17, and the Baal-meon of ^{<1623>}Numbers 32:38, and would thus be identical with the ruin Main, three miles south of Heshbon. **SEE BETH-BAAL-MEON**. Hence "it is probable that all these names indicate the presence of an ancient and powerful nomad tribe, which was allied to the Phoenicians (or Sidonians), whose earliest settlements were in the vale of Sodom, and with the Amalekites who dwelt in the wilderness south of Palestine. These Mnaonites migrated eastward, leaving their name at Maon in the south of Judah, where they may have had their headquarters for a time, and again at Beth-meon, on the plateau of Moab; and also at the large modern village above described."

Maoris

SEE NEW ZEALAND.

Maphrian

is in the Syrian Church the highest episcopal dignity after the patriarch of Antioch. The jurisdiction of the maphrian extends over Chaldaea, Assyria, and Mesopotamia. His residence was formerly at Tabriz, beyond the Tigris, but since this see has coalesced with that of Mosul it is at the latter place. Neale (*Introd. Hist. of the Eastern Church*, p. 152) says that "the maphrians are now only nominally distinguished from the other metropolitans."

Mapletoft, John, D.D.,

an English minister, was born at Margaret-Inge, Huntingdonshire, in 1631; received his education at Westminster School and Trinity College, Cambridge; in 1653 became fellow of Trinity; in 1658 became tutor to Joscelin, earl of Northumberland; in 1660 entered upon the study of medicine, and finally practiced it with great success, filling at one time the chair of physic in Gresham College, London. Having turned his attention to the study of divinity, he took, in 1682, both deacon's and priest's orders; was soon after presented to the rectory of Braybrooke, in Northamptonshire, by lord Griffin; in 1684 was chosen lecturer of Ipswich; in 1685 vicar of St. Lawrence, Jewry, and lecturer of St. Christopher's, in London; received his D.D. in 1689, and in 1707 was chosen president of Sion College. He died at Westminster in 1721. Dr. Mapletoft published *Principles and Duties of the Christian Religion* (2d ed., corrected and enlarged, Lond. 1713, 8vo), and other minor pieces upon moral and theological subjects.

Mappa

the name of the linen cloth with which the communion table, and subsequently the altar, was covered. It came to be considered essential that this cloth should be of linen, according to some, in commemoration of the linen cloth in which the body of the Lord was wrapped. This, however, it seems would apply better to the corporale (q.v.). Optatus of Milene, in *De schismate Donatistarum*, speaks of this custom as general. In the Roman Catholic Church there are a number of regulations concerning the *maspsa*, which is always to be blessed by the bishop, or by some one commissioned by him for the purpose. — Pierer, *Universal-Lexikon*, 10:848; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, 9:7.

Ma'ra

(Heb. *Mlara'*, **arm**; for **hrm**; *bitter*, as explained in the context; Sept. **πικρία** Vulg. *Matrl*, *id est amara*), a symbolical name proposed for herself by Naomi on account of her misfortunes (^(OLD)Ruth 1:20). **SEE RUTH.**

Mara

a famous diva of Hindu mythology mentioned in the history of *Gautsama* (q.v.).

Marabuts

a name given to the descendants of the *Moravides* (q.v.; *SEE MOHAMMEDANS*), or *Amoravides*, a certain Arabic tribe which, in 1075, founded a dynasty in the north-western parts of Africa, and held Morocco and Spain for a considerable period. The Almohades having put an end to their temporal dominion, their descendants exercise to this day a kind of spiritual superiority over the Moslem negroes in Barbary, the coast of Guinea, etc. At present the Marabuts form a kind of priestly order, officiating at mosques and chapels, explaining the Koran, providing the faithful with amulets, prophesying, and working miracles. They are looked up to with great awe and reverence by the common people, who also allow them a certain vague license over their goods and chattels, their wives not excluded. The Great Marabut ranks next to the king, and the dignity of a Marabut is generally hereditary. One of the most eminent Marabuts of our day is the celebrated Mohammedan warrior Abd-el-Kader, who was born in 1807, and in 1832 opened the contest against the French to expel the latter from African territory, which resulted so unsuccessfully to the Mohammedan cause.

Marafoschi, Prospero

an Italian prelate, was born Sept. 29, 1653, at Macerata; entered the priesthood while yet a youth; became canon of St. Peter's at Rome, and later bishop in partibus of Cyrene. He enjoyed the favor and confidence of several of the incumbents of the papal chair. Clement XI, in 1721, gave him the archiepiscopal see of Cesarea and Cappadocia; Benedict XIII created him cardinal in 1724, and in 1726 made him vicar-general of Rome. He died Feb. 24, 1732. — Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 23:347.

Ma'rah

(Hebrew *Marah'*, *hṛm*; *bitterness*, from the taste of the water; Sept. *Μεῦρᾶ, Πικρία*, *Vulg. Mara*), a brackish fountain, forming the sixth station of the Israelites, three days distant from their passage across the Red Sea (^{<0215>}Exodus 15:33; ^{<0218>}Numbers 23:8). Finding here a well so

bitter that, thirsty as they were, they could not drink its water, they murmured against Moses, who at the divine direction cast in “a certain tree,” by which means it was made palatable. “It has been suggested (Burckhardt, *Syria*, p. 474) that Moses made use of the berries of the plant *Ghurkud* (Robinson says [i. 26] the *Peganum retusum* of Forskal, *Flora Egy. Arab.* p. lxvi; more correctly, the *Nitraria tridentata* of Desfontaines, *Flora Atlant.* 1:372), and which still, it is implied, would be found to operate similarly. Robinson, however (1:67), could not find that this or any tree was now known by the Arabs to possess such properties; nor would those berries, he says, have been found so early in the season as the time when the Israelites reached the region. It may be added that, had any such resource ever existed, its eminent usefulness to the supply of human wants would hardly have let it perish from the traditions of the desert. Further, the expression ‘the Lord showed’ seems surely to imply the miraculous character of the transaction.” With regard to the cure of the water, it has been well argued (Kitto, *Pictorial History of Palestine*, p. 209) that no explanation of the phenomena on natural grounds has proved consistent or satisfactory; neither is there any tree in that region or elsewhere now known which possesses such virtue in itself, or which is used for a similar purpose by the Arabs. We are therefore compelled to conclude, as, indeed, the narrative spontaneously suggests, that the shrub selected was indifferent, being one nearest at hand, and that the restorative property ceased with the special occasion which had called for its exercise, leaving the well to resume its acrid taste as at present found.

The name Marah, in the form of *Anmarah*, is now borne by the barren bed of a winter torrent, a little beyond which is still found a well called *Howarah*, the bitter waters of which answer to this description. Camels will drink it, but the thirsty Arabs never partake of it themselves — and it is said to be the only water on the shore of the Red Sea which they cannot drink. The water of this well, when first taken into the mouth, seems insipid rather than bitter, but when held in the mouth a few seconds it becomes exceedingly nauseous. The well rises within an elevated mound surrounded by sand-hills, and two small date-trees grow near it. The basin is six or eight feet in diameter, and the water about two feet deep. (See Burckhardt, *Trav. in Syria*, p. 472, Robinson, *Researches*, 1:96 sq.; Bartlett, *Forty Days in the Desert*, p. 30; and other travelers.) “Winer says (*Handwb.* s.v.) that a still bitterer well lies east of Marah, the claims of which Tischendorf, it appears, has supported. Lepsius prefers *wady*

Ghürundel. Prof. Stanley thinks that the claim may be left between this and Howarah, but adds in a note a mention of a spring south of Howarah ‘so bitter that neither men nor camels could drink it,’ of which ‘Dr. Graul (2:254) was told.’ The *Ayouni Motlsal*, ‘wells of Moses,’ which local tradition assigns to Marah, are manifestly too close to the head of the gulf, and probable spot of crossing it, to suit the distance of ‘three days’ journey.’ The soil of this region is described as being alternately gravelly, stony, and sandy; under the range of the Gebel Wardan chalk and flints are plentiful, and on the direct line of route between Ayoun Mousa and Howarah no water is found (Robinson, 1:67).” **SEE EXODE.**

Mar’alah

(Heb. *Maraalah*’, **חל [ח]חי**, a *trembling*; Sept. **Μαραλά** , a place on the southern boundary of Zebulun, but apparently within the bounds of Issachar, west of Sarid and east of Dabbasheth (⁶⁹¹Joshua 19:11). These indications point to some locality not far from the present *Mujeidil*, although the name would seem to agree better with that of the neighboring site, *Melul*. The latter place agrees with the identification of Porter, who remarks that Malul is a little village about four miles south-west of Nazareth, on the top of a hill, containing the ruins of a temple, and other vestiges of antiquity. In the surrounding rocks and cliffs are some excavated tombs (*Handbook*, p. 385). **SEE NAHALAL.**

Maran-a’tha

(**Μαράν ἄθα**, from the Aramean **hta}ʿrṁ**; *maran’athah*’, *our Lord comes*, i.e. to judgment, Buxtorf, *Lex. Chald.* col. 1248, and so found in the Peshito version), a phrase added to the sentence of excommunication by way of appeal to the divine Head of the Church for ratification (⁶⁹²1 Corinthians 16:22). **SEE ANATHEMA.** “In the A. V. it is combined with the preceding ‘anathema,’ but this is unnecessary; at all events it can only be regarded as adding emphasis to the previous adjuration. It rather appears to be added ‘as a weighty watchword’ to impress upon the disciples the important truth that the Lord was at hand, and that they should be ready to meet him (Alford, *Gr. Test.* ad loc.). If, on the other hand, the phrase be taken to mean, as it may, ‘our Lord has come,’ then the connection is, ‘the curse will remain, for the Lord has come who will take vengeance on those who reject him.’ Thus the name ‘Maronite’ is explained by a tradition that the Jews, in expectation of a Messiah, were

constantly saying *Maran*, i.e. Lord; to which the Christians answered *Maranatha*, the Lord is come, why do you still expect him? (Stanley, *Corinthians*, ad loc.).”

Maranos

is one of the names used to designate the new Christians of Spain, i.e. those Jews (q.v.) who, during the religious persecutions under Romish rule, publicly avowed conversion to Christianity and yet privately confessed the religion of their fathers, as e.g. the family of Maimonides (q.v.). The name owes its origin to the fact that not only Jews, but also *Moors* (q.v.) made a feigned profession of conversion to the Christian faith. *SEE INQUISITION; SEE SPAIN.*

Maran(Us), Prudentius,

a noted French theologian, was born, according to Winer (*Theol. Literatur*, p. 654), at Sezanne, whilst Le Cerf (*Biblioth. historique tde la Cong. de St. Maur*, p. 293) and Zedler (*Universal-lexikon*) consider him to have been born at Troyes, in Champagne, October 14, 1683. In 1703 he entered the Congregation of St. Maur, taking the vows at the Abbey of St. Faron, at Meaux. He subsequently resided at the Convent of St. Germain des Pros, Paris. He died April 2, 1762. He published the works of Cyril of Jerusalem in Greek and Latin (Paris, 1720; Venice, 1763). Though the best edition of Cyril's works, it was attacked by the author of the *Memoires de Trevoux*. Maranus defended himself in his *Dissertation sur les semi-Ariens* (Paris, 1722). He also completed the edition of the works of Cyprian commenced by St. Baluze (Paris, 1726; Venice, 1728), and published the works of Justin Martyr in Greek and Latin, with a valuable introduction (Paris, 1742; Venice, 1747). He published also a work of his own on the divinity of Christ, under the title *Divinitas Domuin oi nosti Jesu Ciristi manifesta in scripturis et traditione* (Paris, 1746). This work is divided into four parts. The first treats of the proofs contained in the Old and the New Testaments; the second, of the unanimity, on this point, of the Roman Catholic Church and of the different sects; the third, of the continuous controversies with the Jews, heathen, and heretics; and the fourth, of the unanimous testimony of the fathers. It contains, besides, arguments to prove the divinity of the Holy Ghost. Maranus took also an active part in the controversies arising from the bull “Unigenitus Dei filius,” siding with the party called *appellants*; and, although he had written nothing on the subject, he had in

consequence to endure great annoyances from the *acceptants*, who were the strongest. — Herzog, *Real-Encyclopadie*, 9:9. *SEE JANSENISTS*. (J.N.P.)

Maratta Or Maratti, Carlo,

a celebrated Italian painter, was born at Camurano, near Ancona, May. 1625; became a pupil of Andrea Sacchi and a devout student of Raphael's works, and chose Rome as his permanent residence. He was employed by Clement IX and by four other successive popes, and received the title of painter ordinary to Louis XIV, for whom he painted a picture of Daphne. His Madonnas are admired for modest dignity and amiable expression. Maratta also excelled in the art of etching. He was the last great painter of the Roman school. He died in 1713.

Maraviglia

(Latin *Mirabilia*), GIUSEPPE MARIA, an Italian philosopher, a native of Milan, flourished near the middle of the 17th century. He at first belonged to the body of regular clergy, was commissioned in 1651 to teach ethics in Padua, and exchanged the duties of provincial prior for those of bishop at Novara in 1667. He died there in 1684. Among his works we find *Leges honestae Vitae* (Ven. 1657, 12mo), a moral treatise dedicated to Christine, queen of Sweden: — *Legees Doctrinae a sanctis Patribus* (Venice, 1660, 24mo): — *Proteus ethicopoliticus seu de multiformi hominis statu* (Venice, 1660, folio): — *Pseudomantia veterum et recentiorum explosa, seu de fide divinationibus adhibenda* (Ven. 1662, fol.): — *De erroribus virorum, doctorum* (Ven. 1662, 12mo; Rome, 1667, 4to): — *Legatus ad principes Christianos* (Ven. 1665, 12mo): — *Anancestramenti dell anima Christianas* (Novara, 1675, 8vo). — Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog.* ¹⁷³³Genesis 33:362.

Marbach, Johann,

an eminent German Protestant theologian, was born at Lindau Aug. 24, 1521, and was educated at the University of Wittenberg, where he commenced in 1539 the study of theology. He became successively deacon at Jena in 1540, preacher at Ivry in 1544, and at Strasburg in 1545. He was afterwards sent by the latter city to the Council of Trent, together with Sleidan. In 1552 he was appointed chief pastor and professor of theology. Here he labored to introduce the Lutheran doctrines in the place of the

Reformed, whereby he became involved in numberless controversies. In 1556 he was employed by the elector Otto Henry to organize the Reformation in the Palatinate, and in 1557 was present at the Diet of Worms. He ceased preaching in 1558, and died deacon of Thomas College, March 17, 1581. He wrote *Christlicher und wahrhafter Unterricht von d. Worten d. Einsetzung d. heil. Abendmalls*, etc. (Strasb. 1565, 8vo), and other similar works, all upholding the ultra-Lutheran views. See Treuss, *Situation interieure de l'eglise Lutherienne de Strasbourg sous la direction de Mabach* (Strasb. 1857); Pierere, *Universal-Lexikon*, 10:852; Herzog, *Real-Encykl.* 9:10.

Marban, Pedro De,

a Spanish Jesuit and missionary, flourished near the close of the 17th century. In 1675 he went to Bolivia, and later to Mexico, and labored industriously to spread the Gospel of Christ among the savages of America, and finally became superior of all the missions of the Jesuits in this quarter. He wrote *Arte de la Lengua Moxa, con su vocabulario y catechismo* (Lima, 1701, 8vo). — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog.* ~~1833~~ Genesis 33:361.

Marbeck Or Merbecke, John,

the composer of the solemn and now venerable notes set to the "Preces" and Responses in use in the cathedrals of England, to our day with only slight modifications, was organist of Windsor during the reigns of Henry VIII and his successor. A zeal for religious reformation led him to join a society in furtherance of that object, among the members of which were a priest, a singing-man of St. George's Chapel, and a tradesman of the town. Their papers were seized, and in the handwriting of Marbeck were found notes on the Bible, together with a concordance, in English. He and his three colleagues were found guilty of heresy, and condemned to the stake. The others were executed according to their sentence; but Marbeck, on account of his great musical talents, and being rather favored by Gardiner, bishop of Winchester, was pardoned, and lived to witness the triumph of his principles, and to publish his work, which appeared under the title of *The Boke of Common Pralier, noted*. The colophon is "Imprinted by Richard Grafton, printer to the kinges majestic, 1550, cum privilegio ad imprimendum solum" (a verbatim reprint was given by John Pickering, London, 1848, sm. 4to). In the same year appeared also his *Concordance of the Whole Bible* (1550, folio), the first complete work of the kind in

English; and, in 1574, *The Lives of Holy Saints, Prophets, Patriarchs, and others*; and, subsequently, his other books connected with religious history and controversy. See Allibone, *Dict. of British and Amer. Authors*, vol. 2, s.v.; *English Cyclop.* s.v.

Marble

is the rendering in the Auth. Vers. of two forms of the same Heb. word, and is thought by some to be signified by others differently rendered. **vve** (*shesh*, ^{<7006>}Esther 1:6, Sept. **πάρινος**; ^{<2155>}Song of Solomon 5:15, Sept. **μαρμάρινος**), or **vyxi** (*sha'yish*, ^{<1392>}1 Chronicles 29:2, Sept. **πάριος**), so called from its whiteness, undoubtedly refer to a pure kind of marble, **μάμαρος** (^{<6812>}Revelation 18:12). Primary limestone, or marble, is a simple rock, consisting of carbonate of lime. In its pure state, it is granular, crystalline, and of a color varying from pure white to gray and yellowish. It is sometimes found in irregular masses, or beds, or large nodules, with little or no appearance of stratification; more generally, however, it is regularly stratified, and these strata alternate with other rocks, and are of all varieties of thickness. The texture varies from a highly crystalline, of a larger or finer grain, to a compact and even earthy. Other substances are sometimes combined with the simple rock, which modify its appearance and texture, such as mica, quartz, hornblende. It is never found in veins, except in the form of regular crystals, and, in this respect, it exactly resembles quartz. There is considerable difficulty in drawing the line of distinction between the primary and secondary limestones, where the latter do not happen to contain organic remains. In the primary limestone, strictly speaking, no organic remains have yet been discovered. With one or two exceptions, and as a general rule, it may be said, they, like the primary schists, are almost destitute of organic bodies. Like the strata which it accompanies, beds of limestone are often bent and contorted, evidently from disturbance below. The colors vary from a pure white, which constitutes the statuary marble, to various shades of gray, brown, black, and green. These tints are derived from a carbonaceous matter or oxide of iron, or an admixture of other minerals.

Several other terms occur in ^{<7006>}Esther 1:6, as the names of stones in the pavement of the magnificent hall in which Ahasuerus feasted the princes of his empire. That rendered "white" marble, is **rDj dar**, which some take to signify Parian marble, others white marble; but nothing certain is known

about it. In Arabic, the word *dar* signifies a large pearl. Now pearls were certainly employed by the ancients in decorating the walls of apartments in royal palaces, but that pearls were also used in the pavements of even regal dining-rooms is improbable in itself, and unsupported by any known example. The Septuagint refers the Hebrew word to a stone resembling pearls (πίννινος λίθος), by which, as J. D. Michaelis conjectures, it intends to denote the *Alabastrites* of Pliny (*Hist. Nat.* 36:7, 8), which is a kind of alabaster with the gloss of mother-of-pearl. **SEE ALABASTER.** — The **fhB**;(bahat'; Sept. **σμαραγδίτης**, "red" marble) of the same passage was, Gesenius thinks, the *verdeantique*, or half-porphry of Egypt. The **trj so**(soche'reth; Sept. **Πάρινος λίθος**, "black" marble) is likewise there mentioned with the other kinds of marble for forming a pavement. Gesenius says, perhaps tortoiseshell. Others, from the rendering of the Syriac, think it refers to black marble. It was probably some spotted variety of marble. **SEE MINERALOGY.** The pavement in the palace of Ahasuerus was no doubt of mosaic work, the floors of the apartments being laid with painted tiles or slabs of marble, in the same way as Dr. Russell describes the houses of the wealthy in modern times. In these a portion of the pavement of the courts is of mosaic, and it is usually that part which lies between the fountain and the arched alcove on the south side that is thus beautified. **SEE HOUSE.**

"The marble pillars and tesserae of various colors of the palace at Susa came doubtless from Persia itself, where marble of various colors is found, especially in the province of Hamadan, Susiana (Marco Polo, *Travels*, p. 78, ed. Bohn; Chardin, *Voy.* 3:280, 308, 358, and 8:253; P. della Valle, *Viaggi*, 2:250). The so-called marble of Solomon's architectural works, which Josephus calls **λίθος λευκός**, may thus have been limestone — (a) from near Jerusalem; (b) from Lebanon (Jura limestone), identical with the material of the Sun Temple at Baalbek; or (c) white marble from Arabia or elsewhere (Josephus, *Ant.* 8:3, 2; Diod. Sic. 2:52; Pliny, *H. N.* 36:12; Jamieson, *Mineralogy*, p. 41; Raiumer, *Pal.* p. 28; Volney, *Trav.* 2:241; Kitto, *Plays. Geogr. of Pal.* p. 73, 88; Robinson, 2:493; 3:508; Stanley, *S. and P.* p. 307, 424; Wellsted. *Trav.* 1:426; 2:143). That this stone was not marble seems probable from the remark of Josephus, that whereas Solomon constructed his buildings of 'white stone,' he caused the roads which led to Jerusalem to be made of 'black stone,' probably the black basalt of the Hauran; and also from his account of the porticoes of Herod's temple, which he says were **μόνολιθοι λευκότητης μαρμάρου**

(Josephus, *Ant.* 1. c., and *War*, v. 5, 1, 6; Kitto, *ut sup.* p. 74, 75, 80, 89). But whether the ‘costly stone’ employed in Solomon’s buildings was marble or not, it seems clear, from the expressions both of Scripture and Josephus, that some, at least, of the ‘great stones,’ whose weight can scarcely have been less than forty tons, must have come from Lebanon (~~1~~1 Kings 5:14-18; 7:10; Josephus, *Ant.* 8:2, 9). There can be no doubt that Herod, both in the Temple and elsewhere, employed Parian or other marble. Remains of marble columns still exist in abundance at Jerusalem (Josephus, *Ant.* 15:9, 4, 6, and 11,3, 5; Williams, *Holy City*, 2:330; Sandys, p. 190; Robinson, 1:301, 305).” **SEE STONE.**

Marburg Bible

is the name given to an edition of the holy Scriptures, published at Marburg (1712, 4to), under the care of Prof. Dr. Horch (with the aid of others, particularly of inspector Scheffer, in Berleburg). It contains the text of Luther’s, corrected by comparison with the original texts, and gives, in the introductions and in the headings, commentaries on the most important allegories and prophecies (by Cocceius). The most complete of these are the notes on Solomon’s Song and the Apocalypse. It was highly prized by the theologians and Mystics of that time, and was the predecessor of the Mystic Berleburg Bible (1726-74, 8 vols. fol.), hence it is sometimes called the *little* Mystic Bible. — Herzog, *Real-Encyclopädie*, 9:13. **SEE BERLEBURG BIBLE.**

Marburg Conference

a gathering of all the reformed theological leaders, held at the city of Marburg, Oct. 3, 1529, and designed to bring about, if possible, an agreement between Luther and Zwingli and their adherents. The landgrave Philip of Hesse, one of the noblest princes of the Reformation days, believing that the dissensions in the Protestant camp should be allayed, directed all his energies towards the conciliation of the two reformed factions, caused by a difference of opinion as to the proper observance of the eucharistic ceremony. With such a purpose in view, he invited the principal theologians of both parties to meet for the purpose of comparing their opinions in a friendly manner. Melancthon had already, in 1529, at the Diet of Spires, declared his readiness to attend such a conference (*Corp. Ref.* 1:1050 and 1078), and even had gone so far as to declare that he attached no special importance to the differences concerning the Eucharist

(*Corp. Ref.*: 1:1046). Philip of Hesse now applied to Zwingli (*Zwingli Opp.* 8:287), who also expressed his willingness to come (*Zwingli Opp.* 8:662). Luther, however, at first strongly opposed the plan, fearing that it might result in more harm than good; but the landgrave persisting, Luther finally consented, and on Sept. 30, 1529, Luther, Melancthon, Cruciger, Jonas, Mykonius, and Menius, accompanied by the Saxon counsellor Eberhard, went to Marburg, where Philip had called the conference. The Swiss theologians had arrived the day before; among them, Zwingli, professor Rudolph Collin, OEcoulampadius, Sturm, Bucer, and Hedio. Osiander, Brenz, and Agricola arrived only on October 2. A number of other theologians and eminent persons from all parts of Germany were also present. After a private conference between Luther and (Ecolampadius, and Zwingli and Melancthon, the public debates commenced. "In the first place, several points were discussed touching the divinity of Christ, original sin, baptism, the Word of God, etc., regarding which the Wittenbergers suspected the orthodoxy of Zwingli. These were all secondary matters with Zwingli, in reference to which he dropped his unchurchly views, and declared his agreement with the views of the oecumenical councils. But in regard to the article of the Lord's Supper he was the more persistent. Appealing to ~~John~~ John 6:33, 'The flesh profiteth nothing,' he argued the absurdity of Luther's view" (Kurtz). Luther had insisted upon the literal interpretation of the expression, *Hoc est corpus mncum*. Both parties disputed without arriving at any better appreciation of each other's views. "Agreement was out of the question. Zwingli, nevertheless, declared himself ready to maintain fraternal fellowship, but Luther and his party rejected the offer. Luther said, *Ihr habt einen andern geist denn wir.*" "Still the conference, while failing in its main object, was not entirely fruitless. "Luther found that his opponents did not hold as offensive views as he supposed, and the Swiss also that Luther's doctrine was not so gross and Capernaite as they thought." Both parties engaged to refrain in future from publishing injurious pamphlets against each other as they had formerly done, and agreed "to earnestly pray God to lead them all to a right understanding of the truth." At the request of the landgrave, Luther drew up a series of fifteen articles (Articles of Marburg), containing the common fundamental principles of the Reformation, which were subscribed to by the Zwinuglians. "In the first fourteen they declared unanimous consent to the oecumenical faith of the Church against the errors of papists and Anabaptists. In the fifteenth the Swiss conceded that the body and blood of Christ were present in the *sacrament*, but they could not

agree to his *corporeal presence in the bread and wine*" (Kurtz). The Articles of Marburg were subsequently used as a basis for the Confession of Augsburg (q.v.). See L. J. K. Schmitt, *Das Religionsgespräch z. Marburg* (Marb. 1840); A. Ebrard, *D. Gesch. ud. Dogma's v. h. Abendmahle*, 2:268; Hassenkamp, *Hessische Kirchengesch.* 2:1, p. 35 sq.; H. Heppel, *D. fünfzehn Marrburger Artikel* (Cassel, 1847 and 1854); Krauth, *Te Conservative Reformationa* (Philadel. 1871, 8vo), p. 355 sq., 427; Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*, 2:309, 314; Gieseler, *Eccles. Hist.* (Harper's edit.), 4:133; Kurtz, *Ch. Hist. since the Reformation*, p. 72 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, 9:13 sq. (J. H. W.)

Marbury, Edward

an English minister of the 17th century, became rector of St. James's, Garlickhithe, London, in 1613; subsequently rector of St. Peter's, Paul's Wharf, and retired from public labors during the Rebellion. He died about 1655. Marbury published *A Commentary on Obadiah* (Lond. 1649, 4to): — *A Commentary on Habakkuk* (1650, 4to). — Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.

Marca, Pierre De

a French Roman Catholic theologian and historian, was born at Pan, in Beam, Jan. 24, 1594. He was of good family, was brought up by the Jesuits of Auch, and afterwards studied law at Toulouse. In 1613 he became member of the Council of Pan, and when, in 1621, this body was erected into a parliament by Louis XIII, he was appointed its president, as a reward for his services to Romanism. After the death of his wife, which occurred in 1632, he entered the Church. In 1639 he was made counselor of state. Cardinal de Richelieu having commissioned him to reply to Hersent's *Optatus Gallus*, Marca composed *De Concordia Sacerdotii et Imperii* (Paris, 1641 sq.), which is his ablest work, and was rewarded by the bishopric of Conserans, to which he was appointed in 1643. The pope, however, would not approve the Gallican writer as incumbent of the episcopal office, and the appointment was not sanctioned at Rome until Marca had recalled the work in 1647. In 1652 he was promoted to the archbishopric of Toulouse; later was transferred to the archiepiscopal see of Paris, and there died in the year of his transfer, 1662. He wrote also *Dissertatio de Priimatu Lu. dunensi et caeteris rimatibus* (1644, 8vo): — *Relation de ce qui s'est fait depuis 1653 dans les assemblees des iveques*

au sujet des cinq propositions (Paris, 1657, 4to). This was unfavorable to the Jansenists, and was refuted by Nicole in his *Belga percoantator*, and some other writers. Collections of some other writings of Marca on divers subjects were published by Baluze (1669 and 1681, 2 vols. 8vo) and abbé Faget (1668, 4to), who, however, brought out the best edition of Marca's *De Concordia* (Paris, 1663, and often). See *Gallia Christiana*, vols. i and vii; De Faget, *Vie de Pierre de Marca*; Bompert, *Eloge de Marca* (Paris, 1672, 8vo); De Longuerue, *Dissertations diverses*; *AMercure de France*, 1644 to 1662; Fisquet, *France Pontificate*. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 33:374; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 9:17 sq.

Marcella

ST., is the name of two saints in the Romish Church. (1) One of these was a Roman widow, the intimate friend of Paula and of Eustochius, and a pupil of the noted Church father Jerome, who said of her that we could judge of her merits by her noble disciples. Marcella was a Christian, and deeply learned in the Scriptures. She was greatly opposed to the errors of Origen, who mingled the dogmas of Oriental philosophy with the truths of Christianity. On difficult passages of Scripture she consulted Jerome; but she herself was consulted from all parts as a great theologian, and her answers were always dictated by prudence and humility. She died A. D. 409, soon after Rome was taken by the Goths, from the effects of the assault and abuse of the troops of Alaric. She is commemorated January 31. (2) The second, a martyr of the Church in Alexandria, flourished in the days of the emperor Severus. She is commemorated June 28.

Marcellians

a sect of heretics who flourished towards the close of the 4th century; so called from Marcellus of Ancyra, whom the Arians unjustly accused of reviving the errors of Sabellius. Epiphanius informs us that great diversity of opinion prevailed in his day on the justness of charging Marcellus of Ancyra with the heretical tendencies of the so-called Marcellians. The latter denied the three hypostases, holding the Son and the Holy Ghost as two emanations from the divine nature, to exist independently only until the performance of their respective offices, and then to return again into the substance of the Father. *SEE MARCELLUS OF ANCYRA.*

Marcellina

a noted female pupil of Carpocrates (q.v.), commenced teaching at Rome the Gnostic system of her instructor, in 160, under Anicetus, and met with so great success (see Ireneus, *Adv. Haer.* 1:25, 6; Epiphanius, *Haer.* 27, 6) that her followers and pupils were denominated *Marcellinists*. This is the sect mentioned by Celsus (*Orig. c. Celsum*, vol. v), and are not to be mistaken for the followers of Marcellus of Ancyra, the *Marcellians*. Origen asserts that he could find no trace of the Marcellinists. Another Marcellina was the sister of Ambrosius, and a strict ascetic. — Herzog, *Real-Encyclopädie*, 9:20; Pierer, *Universal-Lexikon*, 10:855.

Marcellinus

a native of Rome, son of Projectus, is said to have been made bishop of Rome May 3, 296. As he lived in a period of violent persecution, we have but little certain information concerning him; the acts of a synod said to have been held at Sinuessa in 303 (published by Mansi, *Coll.* 1:1250 sq.; and Hardouin, *Coll. Cone.* 1:217 sq.) relate as follows: Diocletian had succeeded in compelling the hitherto steadfast bishop to come with him into the temple of Vesta and His, and to offer up incense to them; this was afterwards proclaimed by three priests and two deacons who had witnessed the deed, and a synod was assembled to investigate the affair at Sinuessa, at which no less than three hundred bishops were present — “a number quite impossible for that country, especially in a time of persecution” (Dr. I. B. Smith, in Dillinger’s *Fables*, p. 82, foot note). Marcellinus denied everything for the first two days, but on the third came in, his head covered with ashes, and made a full confession, adding that he had been tempted with gold. The synod declared that Marcellinus had condemned himself, for the *prima sedes nonjudicatur a quoquam*. This resulted, however, in Diocletian causing a large number of the bishops who had taken part in the synod, and even Marcellinus himself, to be put to death, August 23, 303. Although the Roman Breviary itself credits this account of the weakness and punishment of Marcellinus (in Nocturn. ii, April 26), this account of the synod is now considered spurious both by Romanists and by Protestants. Indeed, Augustine (*De unico baptismo contra Petilianum*, c. 16) and Theodoret (*Hist. Eccles.* 1:2) declared the statement of Marcellinus having betrayed Christianity and offered sacrifices to idols false. Dr. Dollinger, in his *Fables respecting Popes in the Middle Ages* (edit. by Dr. H. B. Smith, N. Y. 1872, 12mo), p. 84, says “the acts of the

pretended synod are evidently fabricated in order to manufacture a historical support for the principle *that a pope can be judged by no man*. This incessantly-repeated sentence is the red thread which runs through the whole; the rest is mere appendage. By this means it is to be inculcated on the laity that they must not venture to come forward as accusers of the clergy, and on the inferior clergy that they must not do the like against their superiors." As the date and occasion of the fabrication, Dr. Dollinger assigns "those troubled sixteen years (498-514) in which the pontificate of Symmachus ran its course. At that time the two parties of Laurentius and Symmachus stood opposed to one another in Rome as foes. People, senate, and clergy were divided; they fought and murdered in the streets, and Laurentius maintained himself for several years in possession of part of the churches. Symmachus was accused by his opponents of grave offenses. . . The hostile party were numerous and influential... and therefore the adherents of Symmachus caught at this means of showing that the inviolability of the pope had been long since recognized as a fact and announced as a rule... This was the time at which Eunodius wrote his apology for Symmachus, and this, accordingly, was also the time at *which* the Synod of Sinuessa, as well as the *Constitution* of Sylvester, was fabricated." Marcellinus is commemorated in the Romish Church April 24. See Pagi, *Crit. in annales Baronii ad ann.* 302, n. 18; Papebroch, *Acta Sancta in Propyl. Meji*, t. 8; Xaver de Marco, *Difesa di alcuni pontefici di errore*, c. 12; Bower, *Hist. of the Popes*, 1:80 sq.; Hefele, *Conciliengesch.* 1:118; 3, § 10, note 2, where the main authorities against the fable are cited. (J. H. W.)

Marcellus

ST. (*martyr*). Aside from Marcellus I, pope of Rome (q.v.), and Marcellus of Apamea (q.v.), the martyrologues mention a number of other martyrs of that name, the more important of which are:

I. MARCELLUS who perished during the persecution of Antoninus Philosophus. Having refused to participate in a repast with the prefect Priscus, and remonstrated with the latter and his guests on account of their idolatry, he was half buried in the ground, in the open air, and died thus after three days. The year 140 is given as the date of his death; he is commemorated on September 4. See Surius, T.V. Gregorii Turon. *Lib. de gloriamart.* c. 53; Ruinart, *Acta primorum martyrum*, p. 73.

II. MARCELLUS, the chief of the Trajan Legion, who, for refusing to participate in heathen sacrifices at Tingis, in Mauritania, was beheaded by order of the governor, Aurelianus Agricola, in 270. See Surius, vol. 5; Ruinart, p. 302 sq. He is commemorated on Oct. 20.

III. MARCELLUS who suffered at Argenton, in France, under Aurelian. He was a native of Rome, son of a heathen father and a Christian mother, who brought him up a Christian. When of age, he fled to Argenton on account of the persecution of Aurelian. Here he wrought some wonderful cures, which attracted the attention of the prefect Heraclius. Arrested, he fearlessly confessed his faith, and, after scourging, was roasted on a spit; but as this neither converted nor killed him, he was beheaded. He is commemorated on June 29. See Gregorii Turon. *Lib. de gloria mart.* c. 52.

IV. MARCELLUS, bishop of Die, in France, was born at Avignon of Christian parents, and religiously brought up. He was ordained by his brother, who was bishop of Die before him. At the time of his election another was also appointed, but he was taken to the church by his adherents and there reconciled with his adversaries. On this occasion. it is said, a dove was seen to descend upon his head. He was thrown into prison by the Arians for opposing their views, and died there in the beginning of the 6th century. He is commemorated on April 9. See Gregorii Turon. *Lib. de gloria confess.* c. 7. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, 9:22; Pierer, *Univ. — Lexikon*, 10:855. (J. N. P.)

Marcellus

bishop OF ANCYRA, in Galatia, noted for the part he took in the Synod of Ancyra (314 or 315), held at the end of the persecution of Maximin, **SEE ANCYRA**, made himself conspicuous at the Council of Nicaea (325) by his homoousian views, and was upheld by Athanasius and the whole Western Church. We next find him at the Council of Tyre (335), where he opposed the condemnation of Athanasius, and of Maximus III, patriarch of Jerusalem. In the Council of Jerusalem, of the same year, he declared against the admission of Arius to communion. At the Council of Constantinople, in 336, the Arians having the majority, Marcellus was deposed with the assent of the emperor. who had been prejudiced against him. After the death of Constantine, May 22, 337, he was restored to his bishopric; but once more expelled, he sought refuge in the West, where he was absolved by the councils of Rome and of Sardica (347). He returned to

Ancyra, but Basil, *who* had been appointed bishop in his place, refused to surrender his seat. Marcellus, who was already well advanced in years, retired to a monastery, where he subsequently died. St. Jerome states that he wrote several works, principally against the Arians; but we now possess under his name only a *letter* addressed to Julius I, containing an exposition of his doctrine, given by St. Epiphanius; two *confessions of faith*, given by his disciples; and some passages, quoted by Eusebius. of his work against Asterius. There has been great diversity of opinion concerning his orthodoxy. His confessions are perfectly correct; but in the passages of the work against Asterius, his doctrine, otherwise very difficult to make out, seems to border on Sabellianism. Photinus of Sirmium, who was condemned as a heretic, was his disciple, and had been his deacon, and a sect who refused to admit the three hypostases took the name of *Marcellians* (q.v.). Yet all ecclesiastical writers agree in calling him a saint; and it is possible that his enemies, the Arians and others, unjustly made Marcellus the father of heretic views. See Athanasius, *Apoll.* 2; Basilins, *Epist.* 52; Theodoret, *Hist. Eccl.* vol. 2; Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.* vol. 1; Sozomen, *Hist. Eccl.* vol. 2 and 3; Hermani, *Vie de Si. Athanase*; Du Pin, *Bibl. Ecclesiastique*, 2:79; Rettberg, *Marcelliana* (Gotting. 1794); Klose, *Gesch. u. Lehre des Marcellus und Photin* (Iamb. 1837); Zahn, *Marcellus von Ancyra* (Gotha, 1867, 8vo); Willenborg, *Ueber die Orthodoxie des Mearcellus* (Aullnich, 1859); Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* 3:651 sq.; Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines*, 1:255, 263, 368; Lardner, *Works* (see Index); Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, 9:22 sq.

Marcellus

bishop OF APAMEA (1), in Syria, near the close of the 4th century, distinguished himself particularly by his zeal for the destruction of the heathen temples. He considered them as maintaining heathen tenencies among the people. Having attempted to destroy the main temple of the city with the help of soldiers and gladiators, he was taken by the people and put. to death. His sons sought to avenge his death, but were restrained by the provincial synod, held in 391.

(2.) Another Marcellus of Apamea is mentioned, who is said to have lived in the 5th century. He was a native of Syria, of a wealthy family, and after the death of his parents went to Antioch, where he devoted himself to study. Dividing his fortune among the poor, he went to Ephesus, and there attempted to support himself by copying books. He subsequently joined

abbot Alexander at Constantinople, and was afterwards chosen as his successor. To avoid this honor, Marcellus fled to a neighboring convent until another abbot had been selected, and then returned and was made deacon. The new abbot, named John, however, became jealous of his deacon, and obliged him to perform menial service. Marcellus cheerfully submitted; but after the death of John he was again appointed abbot. Under his direction the convent acquired such reputation that it had to be greatly enlarged, and other convents applied to be governed by pupils of Marcellus. He died in 485. See Fleury, *Hist. ad a.* 448; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, 9:25; Lardner, *Works* (see Index).

Marcellus I

Pope, son of Benedict, a Roman priest, succeeded Marcellinus (q.v.) as bishop of Rome (according to Pagi, June 30, 308), but held that position only during eighteen months. He endeavored to restore ecclesiastical discipline, which had become much relaxed during the persecutions. For this purpose he organized in Rome twenty dioceses, the incumbents of which were to administer to converts from heathenism the sacraments of baptism and penance. They were also bound to attend to the burial of the martyrs. By command of Maxentius, who had ordered him to resign his office of bishop and to sacrifice to idols, he was imprisoned, and condemned to serve as a slave in the imperial stables. After nine months he was freed by his clergy, and concealed in the house of a Roman matron named Lucinia, who, it is said, converted that house afterwards into a church. Maxentius was so angry when he heard of it that he commanded the church to be turned into a stable, and condemned Marcellus to the lowest employment about the stables. Marcellus is said to have died a martyr. He is commemorated on the 16th of January. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 9:21; Pierer, *Universal-Lexicon*, 10:855. (J. N. P.)

Marcellus II

Pope, succeeded Julius III, April 9, 1555, but died twenty-two days afterwards. He was a native of the Papal States, and was originally named *Mezarcello Cervini*. He was first secretary of Paul III, and afterwards cardinal of Santa Croce. By appointment from pope Julius III, he took part in the Council of Trent as cardinal legate, and evinced in that capacity great talents, as well as moderation. His election gave rise to many hopes, which were speedily crushed by his death, the result, no doubt, of poison. He is

also noted for the minor but curious circumstance of his refusing to comply with the ancient custom by which the pope, on his election, lays aside his baptismal name and assumes a new one. Marcello Cervini retained on his elevation the name which he had previously borne. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, 9:21; Pierer, *Universal-Lexikon*, 10:855; Chambers, *Cyclop.*; Bower, *Hist. of the Popes*, 7:459, Riddle, *Papae* (see Index); Artaux de Montor, *Hist. des Souverains Pontifes Romains*, s.v.

Marcellus, Aaron A.

a (Dutch) Reformed minister, was born in Amsterdam. N. Y., May 11, 1799; was prepared for college by the Rev. Drs. Van Zandt and Spencer, of Brooklyn, N. Y.; graduated at Union College, N. Y., in 1826, afterwards followed teaching, and for some years had charge of the Female Seminary in Syracuse, and subsequently of Schenectady, N. Y. He removed to New York, and was for a short time superintendent of the Orphan Asylum; but, feeling that his duty pointed in the direction of the ministry, he entered the Theological Seminary of the Reformed (Dutch) Church at New Brunswick, N. J., and graduated in 1830. He was licensed by the New York Classis, and in July, 1830, became pastor of the Reformed (Dutch) Church at Lysander, N. Y.; subsequently of the Church of Schaghticoke; missionary near the Dry Dock, New York; principal of the Lancaster County Academy, Pa.; pastor at Freehold, N. J., in 1839; of the Church in Greenville, N. Y., in 1856; and in 1859 removed to Bergen, N. J., where he labored as a teacher until he died, May 24, 1860. Mr. Marcellus was courteous and refined in manners, an earnest preacher, and an excellent instructor of youth. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1861, p. 252.

Marcheshvan

(יַבִּי מַרְחֶשְׁוֵן *Marcheshvan*’, of the later Hebrew; Josephus, *Ant.*

Μαρσούνης, 1:3, 3; the Macedonian ἴος) is the name of that month which was the eighth of the sacred and the second of the civil year of the Jews, and began with the new moon of our November. There was a fast on the 6th in memory of Zedekiah’s being blinded, after he had witnessed the slaughter of his sons (^{<1220>}2 Kings 25:7). This month is always spoken of in the Old Testament by its numerical designation; except once, when it is called *Bul* (I WB, ^{<1068>}1 Kings 6:38; Sept. Βαάλ). According to Kimchi, *Bul* is a shortened form of the Hebrew *l wby*, “rain,” from *l by* The signification of *rain-month* is exactly suitable to November in the climate

of Palestine. Others derive it from **b.** Benfey, availing himself of the fact that the Palmyrene inscriptions express the name of the god Baal, according to their dialect, by **l wb** (as **l wbl g[** , **Ἀγλιβόλος**), has ventured to suggest that, as the months are often called after the deities. **Bul** may have received its name from that form of Baal (*Monatsnamen*, p. 182). The rendering of the Sept. might have been appealed to as some sanction of this view. He supposes that *Marcheshvain* is a compound name, of which the syllable *mar* is taken from the Zend *Amersettf*, or its later Persian form *Mordad*, and that *cheshvan* is the Persian *chezdn*, “alutumn,” both of which are names belonging to the same month (1. c. p. 136 sq.). See **BUL**.

Marchetti, Francois

an eminent French writer and archaeologist, was born at Marseilles about the opening of the 17th century; was educated at a college of the “Fathers of the Oratory,” entered their order in 1630, and became one of the ablest members. He died at his native place in 1688. Of his works the following are of particular interest to us: *Paraphrase sur les Epitres de Saeint Pierre* (1639), and *Traite sur la Messe caec l’explication de ses ceremonies*.

Marchetti, Giovanni

an Italian ecclesiastic of note, was born at Empoli, in Tuscany, in 1753, of humble parentage. After struggling for years to secure the advantages of a thorough education, he entered the priesthood in 1777. Later he took up the pen in defense of the rights of the Roman see. His works, which made him known as a brilliant writer and a learned student, attracted the attention of pope Pius VI, who accorded him a pension and invested him with different offices. In 1798, after Rome had been proclaimed a republic, he was banished. In 1799 he was conducted to Florence, where he endured imprisonment for one month. On his return to Rome (1800) he opened an academy of theology’. When the excommunication of the emperor Napoleon by Pius VII became known (1809), Marchetti and cardinal Mattel, accused of aiding the pope in this violent part, were imprisoned in the castle of St. Angelo. Some time after Marchetti obtained permission to go to his native town. He returned to Rome in 1814; in 1822 was appointed vicar of Rimini; in 1826 became secretary of the Assembly of Bishops, and died Nov. 15, 1829. Among his works, which have been translated into many languages, we find *Saggio critico sopra la Storia*

Ecclesiastica di Fleury (Rome, 1780, 1.2mo): — *Critica della Storia Ecclesiastica e de' discorsi di Fleury* (Bologne, 1782, 2 vols. 12mo): — *Esceritazioni Cipriatiche circa il battesimo degli eretici* (Rome, 1787, 8vo): — *Del concilio di Sardica* (Rome, 1785, 8vo): — *I Christianesimo dimostrabile sopra i suoi libri* (Rome, 1795, 8vo): — *Strattesnimenti di Jfanmillia sulla storia della religione con le sue prove* (Rome, 1800, 2 vols. 8vo): *La Provvidenza* (Rome, 1797, 12mo): — *Metamzorfosi ver" dute da Basilide l' eremita sul terminare del secolo xviii* (Florence, 1799, 8vo): — *Il si ed il no, parallelo delle doctrine e regole ecclesiastiche* (Rome, 1801, 8vo): — *Lezioni sacre dall' ingresso del popolo di Dio in Cananea fino alla schiavitù di Babilonia* (Rome, 1803-8, 12 vols. 8vo): — *Della Chiesa quanto alto stato politico della citta* (Rome, 1817-18, 3 vols. 8vo): — *La vita razionale dell' uonzo* (Rome, 1828, 8vo). He also contributed many articles to the *Generale lecclesiastico* (Rome) from 1788 to 1798. See Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 33:491.

Marcion

(*Μαρκίων*), founder of the sect of Marcionites, flourished near the middle of the 2d century.. He was a native of Sinope. According to Tertullian, he was a pilot. Some critics have expressed their doubts that so learned a man should have followed such a trade, but nothing proves Marcion having been a very learned man. He seems to have at first connected himself with the Stoics, and, although his father was a bishop (probably of Sinope), he long inquired into the merits of Christianity before becoming a convert to it. He either retained some of his former views, or else indulged in new speculative views which caused him to be excommunicated by his own father. Epiphanius, who states that Marcion was driven out of the Church for having seduced a young girl (not credited any longer by modern scholars, as Beausobre and Neander), affirms that he afterwards endeavored to regain admission into it by affecting to be deeply penitent, but his father refused to admit him again. Marcion now went to Rome, where he arrived, according to Tillemont, in 142, or, according to Lipsius (*Zeitschrij für wissenschaftl. Theologie*, 1847, p. 77), in 143 or 144, but, more probably, in 138, as St. Justin mentions his residence in Rome in his *Apology*, written in 139. According to St. Epiphanius, Marcion's first step upon reaching Rome was to ask readmission into the Church, but he was refused. The same writer further states that Marcion aimed to succeed pope Hyginus, who had just died, and that his regret at having failed was the cause of his accepting Gnosticism. These Oriental doctrines were then

preached at Rome by a Syrian named Cerdon. Marcion joined him, and proclaimed his intention of creating an abiding schism in the Christian Church. Quite different is the statement of Epiphanius. Marcion, says he, was at first received into the Church at Rome, and professed at first orthodox views, but being of a speculative turn of mind, his prying, the rising intellect constantly led him into opinions and practices too hostile to the opinions and practices of the Church to escape opposition, and he was therefore constantly involved in controversies, in which he often espoused heretical views. After repeated warnings, he was finally cut off from communion with the Church, “in perpetuum discidium relegatus.” He continued to teach, still hoping to become reconciled with the Church. Finally he was offered reconciliation on the condition of returning with all his followers, but *die*. while endeavoring to do so. His disciples were then but few, and did not hold all the doctrines afterwards maintained by the Marcionites, who flourished as a sect, in spite of untold persecution, until the 6th century, particularly in Egypt, Palestine, and Syria. The most distinguished among his disciples and followers were Apelles, Lucanus, Basilus, Blastus, and Potitus.

The fundamental point of Marcion’s heresy was a supposed irreconcilable opposition between the Creator and the God of the Christians, or, in other words, between the two religious systems, the Law and the Gospel. His theological system is but imperfectly known. St. Epiphanius accuses him of recognizing three first principles, one supreme, ineffable, and invisible, whom he calls good; secondly, the Creator thirdly, the devil, or perhaps matter, source of evil. According to Theodoret, he admitted three, the good God, the Creator, matter, and evil which governs matter, i.e. the devil. It is proved that Marcion believed in the eternity of matter, but it is uncertain whether he considered the Creator as a first principle, or as, in some degree, an emanation of the good God. At any rate, he considered them as essentially antagonistic. This conclusion he arrived at because he could not find in the O.T. the love and charity manifested in the Gospel of Christ. He therefore made the Creator, the God of the O.T., the author of evil, “malorum factorem,” by which he meant suffering, not moral evil. The old dispensation was, according to his views, the reign of the Creator, who chose the Jews for his own special people, and promised them a Messiah. Christ is not this Messiah, but is the Son of the invisible, good Go, and appeared upon earth in human form (being, perhaps, but a phantom), to free the soul and overthrow the dominion of the Creator. Marcion also

supposed that when Christ descended into hell, he did not deliver those who in the O.T. are designated as saints, such as Abel, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Moses, David, etc., but rather those who had disobeyed and rejected the Creator, like Cain, Esau, Korah, Dathan, and Abiram. The other doctrines of Marcion were the natural consequences of these principles. He disapproved of marriage, and did not admit married persons to baptism, considering it wrong to propagate a race subject to the cruel dominion of the Creator. His disciples, convinced that this world is a prey to evil, hailed death, even a martyr's, as freeing them from it. They denied the resurrection of the body, and, notwithstanding Epiphanius's assertion, it appears doubtful whether they believed in the transmigration of the soul. They were in the habit of being baptized several times, as if the sins of every day diminished the effect of that sacrament; but this custom, which is not mentioned by Tertullian, was probably introduced after the death of Marcion. Women were allowed to baptize persons of their sex, and the new converts were admitted to witness the mysteries. To make the Scripture agree with his views, Marcion rejected a large portion of the N.T. He looked upon the O.T. as a revelation of the Creator to the Jews, his chosen people, which not only differed from, but was entirely opposed to Christianity. He admitted but one Gospel, and that a truncated version of Luke's, the first four chapters of which he rejected, making it to commence by the words: In the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Caesar, God came to Capernaum, a town in Galilee, and spoke on the Sabbath. He carefully omitted all the passages in which Christ acknowledged the Creator as his Father. Among the Epistles, he admitted those to the Romans. 1st and 2d to the Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, 1st and 2d to the Thessalonians, Philemon, and some part of a supposed Epistle of St. Paul to the Laodiceans; but all these Epistles were expurgated and interpolated to suit his views. Marcion also composed a work entitled *Antithesis*; it is a collection of passages from the O. and the N.T. which he looked upon as contradictory. In reality, the system of Marcion bore a close resemblance to that of Mani (q.v.); it was an attempt to explain the origin of evil. Marcion, as afterwards Mani, thought to solve the problem by supposing two first principles; but there is this essential difference between them, that while Marcion based his system on the Scriptures, interpreted with daring subtlety, Mani derived his from Parseeism, without direct reference to Christian dogmas or traditions. See Tertullian, *Contra Marcionem*, libri v; *De Praescriptione haereticorum*; Justin, *Apologia*; Irenaeus, *Adversus Haeres.*; Clement of Alexandria,

Stromata, 3:3; St. Epiphanius, *Panarium*; Ittigius, *De Haeresiarchis*, sect. ii, c. 7; Cave, *Historia Litteraria*, 1:54; Tillemont, *Memoires Eccles.* 2:266; Beausobre, *Hist. du Manichéisme*, lib. iv, c. vs viii; Lardner, *ITist. of Heretics*, vol. ii, c. x; Esnig, *Darstelluan des marcionitischen Systems*, from the Armenian by Neumann, in the *Zeitschrift für hist. theol.* 1834; Hahn, *Antithesis Marcionis* (1823); id. *De canone Marcionis and/hozi* (1824); Becker, *Examen critique de l'évangile de Marcion* (1837); Ritschl, *Das Evangelium Marcion's u. d. Evangel. des Lukas* (1846); Hilgenfeld, *Krit. Untersuchungen 2:d.Evangel. Justinus d. clement. liom. u. Marscion's* (1852); Heim, *Marcion, sa doctrine et son evangile* (1862); Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* 1:245; Milman, *Ilist. of Latin Christianity*; Donaldson, *Literature*; Werner, *Gesch. d. apologet. u. polenr. Literatur*; Hagenbach, *Ilist. of Doctrines*, 1:58 sq., 85, 190,198; *Zeitschr.f. Wissensch. theol.* 1860, 2:285; *Stud. u. Krit.* 1855, 2:296; *Am. Presb. Rev.* 1860 (May), p. 360; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 2:458 sq.; id. *Christian Dogmas* (see Index); Baur, *Dogmengesch.* vol. ii (see Index); Bayle, *Dict. Hist. and Crit.*; *Dict. des Sciences philosophiques*; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 33:505; Smith, *Dict. Gr. and Romans Biog.* s.v. **SEE TRINITY.**

Marcionites

SEE MARCION. (above).

Marcites Or Marcitze

a sect of heretics in the 2d century, who also called themselves the *Perfecti*, and made profession of doing everything with a great deal of liberty, and without fear. This doctrine they borrowed from Simon Magus, who, however, was not their chief; for they were called Marcites, from one Marcus, who conferred the priesthood and the administration of the sacraments on women.

Marck, Johann Van

a distinguished Dutch theologian, was born Dec. 31, 1655, at Sneek, in Friesland, and educated at the University of Leyden. His early reputation was such that before the completion of his twenty-first year he was appointed to the professorship of theology at Franeker. In 1682 he removed to Groningen as professor primarius of theology and university preacher. In 1690 he accepted a theological chair at Leyden, and in 1720 succeeded the younger Spanheim as professor of ecclesiastical history. He

died Jan. 30, 1731. He wrote several works on dogmatic theology, which are highly esteemed in the Reformed Church, and made various valuable contributions to the interpretation of the Scriptures. His principal works are, *De Sybyllinis carminibus* (Frankf. 1682, 8vo): — *In Apocalysm Commentaria sea analysis exegetica* (Lugd. Bat. 1689, ed. auct. 1699, 4to): — *In Canticum Salomonis Commentarius seu analysis exegetica cum analysi Psalm xly* (Lugd. 1703, 4to): — *In praecipias quasdam partes Pentateuchi Commentarius, sea ultinorum Jacobi, reliquorum Bilhami et novissimorum Mosis analysis exegetica* (Lugd. 1713, 4to): — *Commentarii sea analysis exegetica in Prophetas minores* (Amsterd. 1696-1701, 5 vols. 4to). This is a very complete and carefully-executed work. Walch characterizes it as one of the best of the commentaries on the minor prophets: — *Sylloge dissertationum philologico-exegeticarum u ad selectos quosdam textus N.T.* (Rotterd. 1721, 4to): — *Compendium theologiae Christianae didactico-elencticum* (Amsterd. 1722, 4to): — *Fasciculus dissertationum philologico-exegeticarum ad selectos textus V. et N. Testamenti* (Lugd. 1724-27, 2 vols.), etc. A selection from his works was published at Groningen in 1748, in 2 vols. 4to. See Kitto, *Cyclop. of Bibl. Lit.* vol. 3, s.v.; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* vol. 2, s.v.

Marckius

SEE MARCK.

Marconville Or Marcouville, Jean De

a French writer of note, who flourished in the second half of the 16th century at Paris, is the author of several works of interest to the theological student. Among them the following deserve special mention: *L'origine des temples des Juifs, Chretiens, et Gentiles* (Paris, 1563, 8vo): — *La diversites des opinions de l'homme* (1563, 8vo): — *Chretien avertissement aux refroidis et ecartes de la vraie et ancienne Eglise Catholique* (1571, 8vo), a work in which Marconville, though displaying great attachment to the Roman Catholic Church, condemns her conduct towards the Protestants. See Hofer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 32:509.

Marcomanni

a Germanic tribe of the Suevic branch, dwelt from the Helvetian border to the Main, and from the Rhine to the Danube. They are first mentioned by Julius Caesar in his Gallic wars (1:51), who reckons them among the forces

of Ariovistus, king of the Suevi. The conquests of the Romans brought them into dangerous proximity to the Marcomanni, and induced the latter to seek a new home in modern Bohemia. They were led by Marobodhus, a man of noble rank among them, trained in the Roman armies, and he became their king after the conquest of Bohemia. The Marcomanni quickly acquired influence, and were greatly strengthened by alliances with all the neighboring tribes, so that their power became threatening to the empire. Tiberius concluded a treaty of peace with them, which secured the empire against an attack, but turned against them the hatred of the remaining Germanic tribes. Led by Arminius, these enemies defeated the Marcomanni in A.D. 17, after which date their history presents an almost uninterrupted succession of conflicts. They defeated the emperor Domitian (Dio Cassius, 57, 7), and in A.D. 164 advanced to Aquileia, in Italy. The fruits of a decisive victory over them, won by the generals of M. Aurelius, were lost by a treaty which the emperor Commodus concluded with them (A.D. 180), and they continued to make frequent irruptions into the neighboring provinces of the empire, penetrating in A.D. 270 even to Milan, besieging Ancona, and threatening Rome itself. Their name gradually disappears from history during the 5th century, when the migration of more distant barbarians brought a succession of new peoples into their land.

It is not definitely known how or when they became acquainted with Christianity. Their frequent incursions into the empire doubtless brought them into contact with its disciples, some of whom must have been among their prisoners of war. A statement in the life of St. Ambrose, by Paulinus — which, however, is not confirmed by any contemporaneous author — relates that in the time of that bishop an Italian Christian had visited the Marcomanni, and had awakened the interest of their queen in Christianity to an extent that led her to apply to Ambrose for instruction. He sent, in compliance with her request, a work in the form of a catechism, by which both she and the king were led to embrace Christianity towards the close of the 4th century. See Schrickh, *Kirchengesch.* 7:347; Hefele, *Gesch. d. Einführung des Christenthums im süd-westl. Deutschland*, vol. 7; Tacitus, *Annals*; Dio Cassius, *Hist. Romans* 1, 54, and Greek and Roman historians of this period. See also Herzog, *Real-Encyclopädie*, 9:112; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* s.v. (G. M.)

Marcosians Or Colobarsians

an ancient sect in the Church, making a branch of the Valentinians. Irenaeus speaks at large of the leader of this sect, Marcus, who, it seems, was reputed a great magician. The Marcosians had a great number of apocryphal books, which they held as canonical, and of the same authority with ours. Out of these they picked several idle fables touching the infancy of Jesus Christ, which they circulated as authentic histories. Many of these fables are still in use and credit among the Greek monks. *SEE VALENTINIANS.*

Mar'cus

(^{<S1040>}Colossians 4:10; Philemon 24; ^{<M153>}1 Peter 5:13). *SEE MARK.*

Marcus, Pope

one of the early bishops of Rome, succeeded Sylvester Jan. 18, 336; but little is known either of his life or administration. Anastasius states that by him the bishop of Ostia was first appointed to ordain the bishop of Rome. He died October 7 of the same year in which he had been chosen and was buried in the cemetery of Balbina, which was thenceforth called after his name. "His body," says Bower, "has since been worshipped in the church of St. Lawrence at Florence, though no mention has been made by any writer of its having been translated thither." Novaes relates that Marcus bore the title of cardinal before his election, and that with him originated this dignity of the Church of Rome. He is also by some writers believed to have been the first pontiff to order the reading of the Nicene confession of faith, after the Gospels, in the celebration of mass. See Bower, *History of the Popes*, 1:114; Shepherd, *Hist. of the Church of Rome to Damasus* (A.D. 384), p. 77.

Marcus Of Alexandria,

a patriarch of Alexandria, flourished early in the 13th century, and was particularly well versed in ecclesiastical law. He proposed certain questions for solution on various points of ecclesiastical law or practice. Sixty-four of these questions, with the answers of Theodorus Balsamon, are given in the *Jus Orientale* of Bonafidius, p. 237, etc. (Paris, 1573, 8vo), and in the *Jus Graeco-Romanum* of Leunclavius, 1:362-394 (Frankfort, 1596, fol.). Some MSS. contain two questions and solutions more than the printed

copies. Fabricius suggests that Mark of Alexandria is the Marcus cited in a MS., *Catena in Masthici Evangelium*, of Macarius Chrysocephalus, extant in the Bodleian Library at Oxford. — Cave, *Hist. Litt.* ad ann. 1203, 2:279 (ed. Oxford, 1740-42); Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Romans Biog. and Mythol.* s.v.

Marcus Of Arethusa,

a bishop in the Eastern Church, was one of three prelates sent to Rome, A.D. 342, by the emperor Constantius II, to satisfy the Western emperor Constans of the justice and propriety of the deposition of Athanasius of Alexandria and Paulus of Constantinople. Marcus and his fellow-prelates are charged with having deceived Constans by presenting to him as their confession of faith, not the Arian or Eusebian confession, lately agreed on at the Synod of Antioch, but another confession of orthodox complexion, yet not fully orthodox, which is given by Socrates. Marcus appears to have acted with the Eusebian or Semi-Arian party, and took part on their side, probably in the Council of Philippopolis. held by the prelates of the East after their secession from Sardica (A.D. 347), and certainly in that of Sirmium (A.D. 359), where a heterodox confession of faith was drawn up by him. The confession which is given as Marcus's by Socrates is believed by modern critics not to be his. They ascribe to him the confession agreed upon by the Council of Ariminum, A.D. 359, and also given by Socrates. During the short reign of Julian, Marcus, then an old man, was cruelly tortured in various ways by the heathen populace of Arethusa, who were irritated by the success of his efforts to convert their fellow-townsmen to Christianity. He appears to have barely survived their cruelty. His sufferings for the Christian religion seem to have obliterated the discredit of his Arianism, for Gregory Nazianzen has eulogized him in the highest terms, and the Greek Church honors him as a martyr. See Athanasius, *De Synodis*, c. 24, s.v.; Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.* 2:18, 30, 37, with the notes of Valesius; Sozomen, *Hist. Eccles.* 3:1.0: 4:17; v. 10; Theodoret, *Hist. Eccles.* 3:7; Gregorius Naz. *Oratio iv*; Bolland, *Acta Sanctor. Mart.* 3:774, etc.; Tillemont, *Memoires*, vol. vi and vii; Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol.* s.v.; Neander, *Hist. of Chr. Ch.* 2:51, 61.

Marcus Aurelius.

SEE AURELIUS.

Marcus, Diadochus,

who flourished probably in the 4th century, was the author of a short treatise entitled *τὸν μακαρίου Μάρκου τοῦ ἰαδόχου κατὰ Ἀρειανῶν λόγος*, *Beati Marci Diadochi Sermo contra Arianos*, published with a Latin version by Jos. Rudolph. Wetstenius, subjoined to his edition of Origen, *De Oratione* (Basle, 1694, 4to; reprinted with a new Latin version in the *Bibliotheca Patrum* of Galland, v. 242). See Fabricius, *Bibl. Graeca*, 9:266 sq.; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* ad ann. 356, 1:217; Galland, *Biblioth. Patrum*, Proleg. ad vol. v, c. 14; Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Romans . Biog. and Mythol.* s.v.

Marcus, Eremita

(*οῦ ρημίτης*, *the Ascetic*, called also *Μόναχος*, *Ἀββάς*, and *Ἀσκητής*, or *Excercitator*), a disciple of Chrysostom, and contemporary of Nilus and Isidore of Pelilium, was a celebrated Egyptian hermit of the Scythian deserts, who lived at the close of the 4th and the beginning of the 5th century. From early manhood he was noted for his piety, meekness, and ascetic virtues, and for his exact acquaintance with the holy Scriptures, the whole of which he had committed to memory; and in his old age he enjoyed the repute of an especial sanctity and wonder-working power. Palladius, who visited him in person about A.D. 395, Sozomen, and the Greek menologies relate many of his miracles; but some of them are elsewhere attributed to Macarius (q.v.). Indeed, the writings of Palladius and the monkish traditions seem frequently to confound the names of Marcus and Macarius; and, as both names were common among monks, it is difficult to decide whether the scattered notices of a prominent saint of this name that have reached us refer to one person or to several. There are traces of a younger Marcus, living early in the 5th century, and of others living in the 9th and 10th centuries. Bellarmine attributes the nine or ten tracts of Marcus Eremita which still exist, and are classed among the most interesting relics of the mystico-ascetic literature of the Greek Church, to a monk of the 9th century; but trustworthy authorities assign to them a much earlier date. Photius (‘ 891) mentions nine tracts of Marcus (*Bibl. cod.* 200, p. 519, edit. Bekker), which are identical with ours. Maximus Confessor, in the 7th century, furnishes a work by Marcus (ed. of Combefis, 1:702 sq.); and Dorotheus cites expressions from him in the 6th century (comp. Tillemont, 10:801; Ceillier, 17:504). Besides, the contents of these tracts are so related to what is found in Chrysostom, Macarius,

and to some extent in Jovinian (comp. Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 2:390), that we are compelled to recognize in their author a contemporary of Chrysostom. The only remaining question is, whether the author of the tracts be identical with the Marcus of Palladius and Sozomen, or a younger contemporary. The preponderance of authority points decidedly to the former (see *Prolegomena* in Galland's *Bibl. Patr.* 8:3 sq.; and works on Church history and history of literature, especially Du Pin, *Nouv. Bibl.* 3:8, 2 sq.; Oudin, *Comm. de scr. eccl.* 1:902 sq.; Ceillier, *Auteurs eccl.* 17:300 sq.; Cave, *Script. eccl. hist. bibl.* 1:372 sq.; Tillemont, *Memoires*, vols. 8 and 10). The Roman Catholic Church historians generally ignore him. Marcus Eremita is said to have died about A.D. 410, aged more than a hundred years. The Greek Church surnamed him the wonder-worker, and commemorated him on the 25th of March; a day in October was formerly observed in his honor by a portion of the Latin Church.

The nine tracts of Marcus are, in brief, as follows:

1. **Περὶ νόμου πνευματικῶν**, *De lege spiritualis. de paradiso*, "Profitable for those who have chosen an ascetic life." It comprises an introduction, which is followed by two hundred separate propositions designed to comment on the scriptural expression **νόμος πνευματικός**. The leading thoughts are: All good centers in God; without his aid men can neither believe nor do good. Hence humility is necessary to obedience, and its expression is to be found in restraining our passions rather than in an ascetic hatred of God's creatures.
2. **Περὶ τῶν οἰομένων ἐξ ἔργων δικαιῶσθαι**, *De his qui putant se ex operibus justificari*, seems originally to have formed part of the first, and comprises two hundred and eleven capita or propositions, treating mainly of justification by faith. Saving faith must be accompanied by works of righteousness, but heaven cannot be earned. The kingdom of God is of grace, which God has provided for his faithful servants. Such as do good for a reward, serve not God, but their own will.
3. **Περὶ μετανοίας τῆς πάντοτε πᾶσι προσηκούσης**, *De penitentia cunctis necessaria*. Repentance consists of three parts: purification of our thoughts, persistent prayer, and patient endurance of tribulation. None can be saved except they continually repent, and none are damned except they despise repentance.

- 4.** *Of baptism*; a series of questions and answers relating to the worth and effects of baptism. It is represented as the channel through which Christ imparts gracious aid, rather than as an agency that works perfection in its subject.
- 5.** *Salutary precepts, addressed to the monk Nicholas, and showing how to lead a Christian life, and especially how to restrain anger and fleshly lusts.* Ascetic exercises are rejected as a means, and looking to Jesus is recommended as pre-eminently the way to virtue and true Christianity. Annexed is a reply from Nicholas, returning thanks for this counsel.
- 6.** *Brief reflections of a pious and mystical character,* generally bearing on some passage or expression of the Scriptures, treated in the freest style of allegorical interpretation. A state of mystical ecstasy, in which the soul is lost to all created things, and in an ecstasy of love is wholly absorbed in God, is characterized as the most exalted spiritual condition, and ascetic duties are accorded only a secondary value. Another tract, upon the subject of fasting, is wanting in the older editions, and was first published in 1748 by Remondini. It possibly formed a part of 6, which closes abruptly.
- 7.** *General questions of Christian morality*; a disputation with a jurist as to the possibility of reconciling capital punishment with Christian principles, and a discussion of the nature and use of prayer, of the various ways to honor God, of the desire to please men, etc.
- 8.** *A mystical dialogue between the soul and spirit concerning sin and grace,* chiefly remarkable because of its decided rejection of the doctrine of original sin, and of its clear and pointed statement of the doctrines of the Greek fathers respecting sin and human freedom. We are to seek the source of our sinfulness neither in Satan, Adam, nor other men. No power can compel us to good or evil, but rather the condition of every person is that which he has chosen from the time of his baptism. The same passions which seduced Adam and Eve still exist in human nature, and produce a like result in every soul that, in the exercise of its freedom, submits to their control. The conflict with sin is therefore a struggle against our own will, in which Christ aids us when we keep his commandments to the extent of our power.
- 9.** *Christ's relation to Melchisedek.* This tract is directed against a class who regarded Melchisedek as a divine being; probably the Origenistic sect founded in Egypt by Hieracas, who were said to regard Melchisedek as the

holy Spirit or an incarnation of the Spirit. While combating such views, the tract reveals a tendency to Monophysitism, in ascribing to the human nature of Jesus all the attributes of the Godhead. These tracts of Marcus Eremita reveal to us the memorials of a partly ascetic, partly ecstatic mysticism, which was especially cultivated among the Egyptian monks, and which aimed to spiritualize the practices of Monachism. In its excess of pious feeling over dogmatic conceptions, it contained the seeds of many diverse systems of dogmatics and ethics. Monophysitism had essentially its root in the mysticism of the Egyptian monks; and in these writings are found, in curious juxtaposition, Pelagianism and Augustinism, the strongest assertion of human freedom and of the sole efficiency of grace in the work of salvation, the evangelical view of justification by faith and the Roman Catholic doctrine of works. Hence Bellarmine and other Roman Catholics supposed that modern heretics had forged these writings, while Protestant writers have remarked their Pelagian cast. The tracts of Marcus were in the 17th century placed in the Index, as “caute legenda.” They are chiefly important as a connecting link between the mysticism of Macarius and that of the Areopagite and Maximus Confessor.

Eight of the above mystical treatises are (λόγοι ὀκτώ, “equal to the number of the universal passions.” A Latin version of all together was prepared by Joannes Picus (Paris, 1563, 8vo; later editions in *Bibl. Patr.*); a Greek version by Guillaume Morel, with the *Antirrhetica* of Hesychius of Jerusalem (Par. 1563, 8vo). Both versions were reprinted in the first volume of the *Auctarium* of Duxeus (Paris, 1624, folio), in the eleventh volume of *Bibl. Patrum* (Paris, 1654, folio), and in the eighth volume of the *Bibl. Patrum* of Galland. Marcus Eremita was probably the author also of the tract Περὶ νηστείας, *De Jejunio*; Latin version by Zinus (Venice, 1574, 8vo). Two of Marcus’s tracts — the first and second, viz. Περὶ νόμου πνευματικοῦ, *De Lege Spirituali*, and Περὶ τῶν οἰομένων ἔξ ἔργων δικαιοῦσθαι, *Deus qui putant se Operibus justificari*, were published together by Vincentius Opsopoeus, with a Latin version (Hagenau, 1531, 8vo). The first was reprinted in the *Alicro presbyton* (Basle, 1550), and in the *Orthodoxographa* (Basle, 1555). The tract *De Jejunio*. and another, *De Alelchizedek*, were first published by B. M. Remondinus (Rome, 1748). See Fabricius, *Biblioth. Græca*, 9:267; Cave, *Histor. Litt.* ad ann. 401, 1:372; Oudin, *De Scriptor. Eccles.* i, col. 902 sq.; Tillemont, *Memoires*, 10:8)01; Galland, *Biblioth. Patrum*, Proleg. ad viii,

c. 1; Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol.* s.v.; and especially Wagenmann, in Herzog, *Real-Encyk.* 20:85-91. (G. M.)

Marcus Eugenycus.

SEE EUGENICUS.

Marcus Of Gaza,

the biographer of St. Porphyry of Gaza, lived in the 4th and 5th centuries; was probably a native of Proconsular Asia, whence he traveled to Palestine, there became acquainted with Porphyry, and then lived at Jerusalem some time before A.D. 393. Porphyry sent him to Thessalonica to dispose of his property in those parts, and after his return Marcus appears to have been the almost inseparable companion of Porphyry, by whom he was ordained deacon, and sent (A.D. 398) to Constantinople to obtain of the emperor Arcadius an edict for destroying the heathen temples at Gaza. He obtained an edict to close, but not to destroy them. This, however, was not effectual for putting down heathenism; and Porphyry went in person to Constantinople, taking Marcus with him, and they obtained an imperial edict for the destruction both of the idols and the temples of the heathen. Marcus afterwards returned with Porphyry to Gaza, where he probably remained till his death, of which we have no account. He wrote the life of Porphyry, the original Greek text of which is said to be extant in MS. at Vienna; it has never been published. A Latin version, *Vita St. Porphyrii Episcopi Gazensis*, was published by Lipomanus in his *Vitae Sanctorum*; by Surius, in his *De Probatis Sanctorum Vitis*; and by the Bollandists, in the *Acta Sanctorum Februar.* 3:643 sq., with a *Commentarius Praevius* and notes by Henschenius. It is given also in the *Bibliotheca Patrum* of Galland, 9:259 sq. See Fabricius, *Biblioth. Graeca*, 10:316; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* ad ann. 421, 1:403; Oudin, *De Scriptor. Eccles.* i, col. 999; Galland, *Bibl. Patrum*, Proleg. ad ix, c. 7; Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Romans Biog. and Mythol.* s.v.

Marcus The Heresiarch,

sometimes called *the Gnostic*, a teacher of Gnosticism in the 2d century, thought by Jerome to be a native of Egypt; by Lardner, of Proconsular Asia; and by Neander, of Palestine. That Jerome's conjecture is correct, seems probable from the statement of Ireneoous that Marcus was a disciple of Valentinus. The followers of Marcus were called Marcosians. His

peculiar tenets were founded on the Gnostic doctrine of aeons; professing to derive his knowledge of these aeons, and of the production of the universe, by a revelation from the four primal emanations in the system of aeons, who descended to him from the region of the ineffable and invisible in the form of a female. He set forth his system in a *poem*, in which he introduced the divine aeon discoursing in liturgical forms, and with gorgeous symbols of worship. He prominently developed in his system the idea of a **λόγος τοῦ ὄντος**, of a word manifesting the hidden divine essence in the creation-creation being a continuous *utterance* or *becoming expressed* of the ineffable. See Irenaeus, *Adv. Haeres.* 1:8-18; Epiphanius, *Haeres.* 34, s. ut alii, 14; Tertullian, *De Prescrip. liceret.* c. 50 sq.; id. *Adv. Valent.* c. 4; id. *De Resurrect. Carnsis,* c. 5; Theodoret, *Haereticarum Fabularum Compend.* c. 9; Eusebius, *I.E.* 4:11; Philastrius, *De lcaresib. post Christum,* c. 14; Predestinatus, *De Haeresib.* 1:14; Augustin. *De Iacres,* c. 15; Jerome, *Comm. ad Ist.* 64:4, 5; *Ep. ad Theod.* 29; Ittigius, *De Haeresiarchis,* lect. ii, c. 6, § 4; Tillemont, *Memoirs,* 2:291; Lardner, *Hist. of Heretics,* book ii, e. 7; Neander, *Hist. of the Christ. Ch.* 1:440; Mosheim, *Eccles. Hist.* 1:147; Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog. and Mythol.* s.v. **SEE MARCOSIANS; SEE VALENTINIANS.**

Marcus The Heretic

(sometimes confounded with MARCUS THE HERESIARCH), a native of Memphis, in Egypt, flourished in the 4th century. He is said by Isidore of Seville, and Sulpicius Severus in *Hist. Sacra*, to have been a skillful magician — a Manichaeon, perhaps personally a disciple of Manes, and the originator of the doctrine of the Priscillianists. **SEE PRISCILLIANISTS.** He traveled to Spain, and is said to have disclosed his doctrines to Elpidius, a rhetorician, and to his wife Agape; from them the doctrines were communicated to Priscillian, **SEE PRISCILLIAN**, who, by embodying them in systematic form and giving them spread, became the founder of the sect. — Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog. and Mythol.* s.v.; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 2:710.

Marcus, Hieromonichus

said by Oudin to have been a monk of the convent of St. Saba, near Jerusalem, flourished in the opening of the 11th century. He wrote **Σύνταγμα εἰς τὰ ἀπορούμενα τοῦ τυπικοῦ**, *De .Dubiiis quae ex Typico oriuntur*, contained in the *Typicum*, or ritual directory of the Greek

Church (Τυπικὸν σὺν θεῷ ἀγίῳ παρείχον πᾶσαν τὴν διάταξιν τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἀκολουθίας τοῦ χρόνου ὅλου, *Typicum, favens Deo, continens integrum Officii Ecclesiastici Ordinem per totum Annum*). See a description of the work in Cave, *Hist. Litt.* vol. ii; *Dissert.* 2:38. This commentary is adapted to the arrangement of the *Typicum*., ascribed to St. Saba, but which Oudin supposes to have been drawn by Marcus himself, and produced by him as the work of St. Saba, in order to obtain for it an authority which, had it appeared in his own name, it would not have secured. *A Life of Gregory of Agrigentum* is supposed to be by the same author as the *Typicum*. See Cave, *Hist. Litt.* vol. ii; *Dissert.* 1:13; Oudin, *De Scriptorib. Eccles.* ii, col. 584, etc.; Fabricius, *Bibl. Graec.* 10:232, 678; Smith, *Dict. of Biog. and Mythol.* s.v.

Marcus Bishop Of Otranto,

probably of the 8th century. Allatius says he was oeconomus or steward of the great Church of Constantinople before he became bishop, which seems to be all that is known of him. He wrote Τῷ μεγάλῳ σαββάτῳ ἡ ἀκροστιχίς, [*Hymnus Acrostichus in Mllagnume Sabbatum, s. In Magno Sabbato Capita Versuum*, published by Aldus Manutius, with a Latin version, in his editions of Prudentius and other early Christian poets (Venice, 1501, 4to). A Latin version of the hymn is given in several editions of *Bibliotheca Patrum*. — Fabricius, *Bibl. Graec.* 11:177, 677; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* ad ann. 750, 1:630; Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol.* . v.

Mardochoae'us

(Μαρδοχαῖος). the Sept. or Greek equivalent of MORDECAI *SEE MORDECAI* (q.v.), in the Apocrypha; namely,

(a.) the uncle of Esther, in the apocryphal additions (¹⁷⁰⁰ Esther 10:1; 11:2, 12; 12:1-6; 16:13; 2 Maccabees 15:36). The 14th of the month Adar, on which the feast of Purim was celebrated, is called in the last passage “Mardochoaeus’s day” (ἡ Μαρδοχαϊκὴ ἡμέρα).

(b.) A Jew who returned with Zerubbabel and Joshua (1 Esdras 5:8; comp. ¹⁵⁰⁰ Ezra 2:2).

Mardochai

a name borne by many rabbins and Jewish savans. The most renowned of them are the following:

1. MARDOCHAI ASHKENASI, a fanatical adherent of Sabbathai Zewi, flourished very near the middle of the 17th century. A man of prepossessing appearance, and remarkably talented as a pulpit orator, he traveled through Hungary, Moravia, and Bohemia, everywhere preaching the Sabbathical doctrines, and declaring himself a prophet, insisted upon the duty of his people to welcome Sabbathai Zewi as the veritable Messiah. The persecutions which were so frequent at that time in Germany, France, and Spain had softened the hearts of the poor Jews, and they were anxiously looking for relief from some quarter. Finding that his declarations were favorably received, Mardochai finally announced that he himself was the risen Zewi, who had been dead three years, and actually found many adherents, especially in Italy and in Poland. He is said to have lost his reason, and to have died, a poor and forsaken wretch, somewhere in Poland, about 1682. See Gratz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, 10:334 sq.; and 42, in Appendix.

2. MARDOCHAI BEN-ELEASAR COMINO (or *Comiano*) flourished in the second half of the 15th century (1460-1490) first at Constantinople, later at Adrianople. A thorough master of mathematics and astronomy, he fell in with the writings of Aben-Ezra (q.v.), and became one of his most ardent admirers and devoted followers. He commented on the sacred writings, and by his generous ways secured the love and admiration of both Karaites and Rabbinites. He also studied the Aristotelian philosophy, introduced by the works of Moses Maimonides, and thus as a philosopher secured no mean reputation. He wrote *hrwt rtk*, a *Commentary on the Pentateuch* (1460); a *Commentary on Aben-Ezra's azwm dwsy*; a *Commentary on Ezra's muh rps*; a *Commentary on Ezra's dj ah rps*; a *Commentary on Maimonides's Logik*, and other logical writings, etc.

3. MARDOCHAI BEN-HILLEL, a German rabbi, who, while a resident of Nuremberg, was accused of insulting the Christian faith and defending the cabalistic writers, and was visited with the death penalty for his hasty conduct in 1310. He wrote *Mardochai Magnus*, a commentary on Alphesius's *Compendium Talmudicum* (Riva, 1559, 4to; Cracow, 1598, folio, and often): — *De Ritibus mactationis* (Venice, 8vo). See Auerbach,

Benit A braham, p. 15; Wiirfel, *Hist. N'achricht von der Judengemeinde in Nürnberg*.

4. MARDOC-HA- BEN-NISSAN, a Polish rabbi, flourished at Crosni-osthro, in Galicia, in the second half of the 17th century. He wrote , *ykd̄rm d̄wd*, or “the friend of Mardochai” (Hamb. 1714 and 1721, 4to, with a Latin transl. by Wolf, in *Notitia Karaiorum*), a work which contains a complete expose of the doctrines of the Karaites. Mardochai was himself a Karaite, and wrote this work by special request of the learned Trigland, who afterwards translated this valuable contribution to the history of the Karaite Jews. Mardochai ben-Nissan wrote also *twkl m ʕwbl* (published by Neubauer), another work on Karaism. See Wolf, *Bibl. iebrs.*; Fürst, *Bibl. Judaica*; Gratz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, 10:301, and note 5 in the Appendix.

5. MARDOCHAI, ISAAC NATHAN, an Italian rabbi, flourished at Rome near the middle of the 11th century. He was the author of *Concordantiae Hebraicae* (Basle, 1581, fol.; Cracow, 1584, 4to, with a German transl.; Rome, 1622, fol., with additions by Mario de Calasio; London, 1747-49, 4 vols. fol.); a Latin translation was published at Basle in 1556.

6. MARDOCHAI, JAPHE SCHLESINGER, a noted rabbi and learned cabalist, flourished at Prague, in Bohemia, near the opening of the 17th century. He was a pupil of the celebrated Isserles (q.v.), when the latter lived at Cracow. He was a native of Prague, and was born, according to Gritz (*Gesch. d. Juden*, 9:485), about 1530, and lived in the capital of Bohemia until the persecutions against the Jews made his stay impossible; he went first to Venice, and later returned to Poland, where he was successively rabbi at Grodno, Lukin, Krzemnitz (1575-1592), and, in a good old age, found a refuge in his native place. He died at Prague about 1612, as rabbi of his people. He wrote *twrqy ʕwbl* , a cabalistic treatise, divided into six books. which is believed to have been completed about 1560. It has been frequently published at Cracow (1594-1599, 4 vols. fol.), Prague (1609, 1623, 1688, 1701), and Venice (1622, fol.).

7. MARDOCHAI IBN-ALCHARBIJA. *SEE SAAD ADDANLA*. (J. H.W.)

Marechal, Ambroise

D.D., a Roman Catholic prelate, was born at Ingre, near Orleans, France, in 1769, and was educated at the seminary of St. Sulpice. He came to Baltimore in 1792; returning to France, he was from 1803 to 1811

professor in the seminaries of St. Fleur, Aix, and Lyons; afterwards became coadjutor to the archbishop of Baltimore, whom he succeeded on his decease, Dec. 14, 1817. He visited Rome in 1821-2, to procure aid for his Church in Baltimore. He died Jan. 29 1828.

Marechal, Bernard

a noted French writer, was born at Rethel in 1705, and, after completing his studies under the guidance of the congregation of the Benedictines of St. Maur, took the vows in 1721; in 1755 he became prior of Beaulieu, in Aragon. After this we know of him only as a writer. He died at Metz July 19, 1770. He wrote *Concordance des Saints Peres de l'Elise, Grecs, et Latins, ou l'on se propose de meostrer leurs sentiments sur le dogme, la morale, et la discipline*, etc. (Paris, 1739, 2 vols. fol.; in Latin, Strasb. 1769, 2 vols. fol.); the work comprehends the fathers of the Church of the first three centuries. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 33:522; Francois, *Biblioth. de l'ordre de Saint-Benoit*, 2:367.

Marechal, Pierre Sylvain

a noted French atheist, was born at Paris, Aug. 15, 1750, and was destined by his father to the mercantile profession. Preferring a literary life, his father educated him for the profession of law. Pierre, however, was determined to get a livelihood from his friends, and eschewed all personal care. When inclined to work, he would write something for the daily press, and, endowed with great facility of the pen and a vivid imagination, he soon gained great notoriety for his excellences as a writer. Had he remained within his legitimate channels, his name would have had no interest for us; but Pierre, believing that popularity must be gained at the expense even of manhood and morality, courted the tendency of his age, and became a scoffer of religion and decency. In imitation of Lucretius, he published the fragments of a *moral* (!) poem, which denies the existence of a God. Not sufficing to provoke public attention to him, he next attacked the Bible, parodied the prophetic writers, and applied himself to all manner of work to further the interests of atheism. Sad, indeed, was the life of such a being as Pierre Sylvain Marechal, and as his life so was his death. When the hour of his departure had arrived, Jan. 18, 1803 (at Montrouge, near Paris), he was heard to exclaim, “Mes amis, la nuit est venue pour moi.” His works are noticed in detail in Hoefer’s *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 32:522 sq. See also Lalande, *Notice sur S. Marechal* (1803). (J. H.W.)

Mar'eshah

(Hebrew *Mareshah*', *hvr̥m̥j* fully, *hvar̥m̥j* ^{<0654>}Joshua 15:44; ^{<1322>}1 Chronicles 2:42; 4:21; Sept. *Μαρισά* and *Μαρησά*, but in ^{<1322>}1 Chronicles 2:42, *Μαρισάς*), the name of one or two men, and also of a place, possibly settled by one of them.

1. A person named as the “father” of Hebron among the descendants of Judah, but it is only left to be inferred that he was the brother of Caleb’s son Mesha, with whom the Sept. confounds him (^{<1322>}1 Chronicles 2:42). B.C. prob. ante 1612.
2. In ^{<1322>}1 Chronicles 4:21, a person of the name of Mareshah is apparently mentioned as the son of Laadah, of the family of Shelah, perhaps as being the founder of the city of the same name (B.C. cir. 1612); possibly identical with the foregoing.
3. A town in the tribe of Judah, “in the valley,” enumerated with Keilah and Achzib (^{<0654>}Joshua 15:44), rebuilt (comp. ^{<1402>}2 Chronicles 4:21) and fortified by Rehoboam (^{<1408>}2 Chronicles 11:8). The Ethiopians under Zerah were defeated by Asa in the valley of Zephathah, near Mareshah (^{<1449>}2 Chronicles 14:9-13). It was the native place of Eliezer ben-Dodavah, a prophet who predicted the destruction of the ships which king Jehoshaphat had built in conjunction with Ahaziah of Israel (^{<1407>}2 Chronicles 20:37). It is included by the prophet Micah among the towns of the low country which he attempts to rouse to a sense of the dangers their misconduct is bringing upon them (^{<3000>}Micah 1:15). Like the rest, the apostrophe to Mareshah is a play on the name: “I will bring your heir (*yoresh*) to you, O city of inheritance” (*Mareshah*). The following verse (16) shows that the inhabitants had adopted the heathen and forbidden custom of cutting off the back hair as a sign of mourning. In the time of the Maccabaeans it was occupied by the Idumseans (2 Maccabees 12:35), but it was laid desolate by Judas on his march from Hebron to Ashdod (1 Maccabees 5:65-68; Josephus, *Ant.* 12:8, 6). Only a few years later it is again reckoned to Idumaea; and Hyrcanus I took it and compelled its inhabitants to practice circumcision (Josephus, *Ant.* 13:9, 1). Josephus mentions it among the towns possessed by Alexander Jannismus, which had been in the hands of the Syrians (*Ant.* 13:15, 4); but by Pompey it was restored to the former inhabitants, and attached to the province of Syria (*ib.* 14:1, 4). *Maresa* was among the towns rebuilt by Gabinius (*ib.* 14:5, 3), but was again destroyed

by the Parthians in their irruption against Herod (*ib.* 14:13, 9). A place so often mentioned in history must have been of considerable importance; but it does not appear that it was ever again rebuilt (see Reland, *Palest.* p. 888). The site, however, is set down by Eusebius and Jerome (*Onomast.* s.v. Morasthi) as within two miles of Eleutheropolis, but the direction is not stated. Dr. Robinson (*Bibl. Researches*, 2:422) found, at a mile and a half *south* of the site of Eleutheropolis, a remarkable *tel*, or artificial hill, with foundations of some buildings. As there are no other ruins in the vicinity, and as the site is admirably suited for a fortress, this, he supposes, may have been Mareshah. According to Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 104) these ruins are still known by the Arabs by the name *Marasa*, probably the *Marash* described by Tobler (*Dritte Wand.* p. 129, 142) as lying on a gently swelling hill leading down from the mountains to the great western plain, from which it is but half an hour distant (Van de Velde, *Memoir*, p. 333).

Maresius Or Marets, Jean De

a most remarkable character in French history, flourished in the 17th century. In his youth he was an infidel. He has himself left us a picture of his morals in early life, which is by no means an advantageous one; for he owns that, in order to triumph over the virtue of such women as objected to him the interest of their salvation, he made no scruple to lead them into atheistical principles. "I ought.," says he, "to weep tears of blood, considering the bad use I have made of my address among the ladies; for I have used nothing but specious falsehoods, malicious subtleties, and infamous treacheries, endeavoring to ruin the souls of those I pretended to love. I studied artful speeches to shake, blind, and seduce them; and strove to persuade them that vice was virtue, or, at least, a thing natural and indifferent." But after his conversion Marets ran into as great extremes in the opposite direction. In short, he became at last a visionary and a religious fanatic, dealing in nothing but inward lights and revelations. Among other things, he promised the king of France, upon the strength of some prophecies, whose meaning, he tells us, was imparted to him from above, that he should overthrow Moharmmedanism and become the promoter of Christian unity, under the leadership of the pope of Rome. But Maresius deserves our attention especially for the relation he sustained to the Jansenists. Appointed inquisitor, he became one of the severest persecutors of Jansenism, and was bent upon the extirpation of this heresy from French ground. In *Delices de l'esprit*, one of his productions, he

seriously boasts that “God, in his infinite goodness, had sent him the key of the treasures contained in the Apocalypse, which was known but to few before him;” and that, “by the command of God, he was to levy an army of 144,000 men, part of which he had already enlisted, to make war upon the impious and the Jansenists” (p. 76). He died in 1676. See *Genesis Biog. Dict.* vol. 9, s.v.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, vol. 33, s.v.

Maresius

(*Des Marets*), Samuel, a noted French Reformed theologian, was born at Oisemond, Picardy, in 1599; was educated at Geneva and at Paris; studied theology at Saumur and Geneva, entered the ministry in 1620, and was settled at Laon by the Synod of Charenton. His experience in this place was rather of a peculiar nature. He was stabbed one night, and this attack on his life is charged to the Jesuits, because he had violently opposed them, and had, in a pamphlet defending the Protestant faith, severely criticized their conduct. In 1624 he accepted a call to Sedan, both as pastor and theological instructor in the school of theology situated in this place, lately so celebrated in history. Before he entered upon this new position he went to Leyden, and there secured the degree of D.D. in July, 1625. Having made a small tour into England, he returned to Sedan. In 1632 he was called as pastor to Maestricht; in 1636 he removed to Herzogenbusch as minister and professor at the *Schola illustris*; in 1640 he had an invitation to a professorship at Franeker, and to another at Groningen in 1642. This last he accepted, and from that time to his death did such great services to that university that it was reckoned one of the most flourishing in the Netherlands. The magistrates of Bearn, well informed of his abilities and learning, offered him, in 1671, the professor of divinity’s chair at Lausanne; and in 1673 the University of Leyden invited him to a like professorship there. He accepted this last, but died before he had taken possession of it (May 18, 1673). Maresius’s literary activity was very great, and his ability as a writer equal to that of any man of his day. He was an able polemic, and wrote much against the Roman Catholics, the Socinians, the Millenarians, and the Arminians, and even against many of his own confession. Indeed, Maresius was quite a literary pugilist. His contest with Voetius, the Utrecht professor, is famous. **SEE VOETIUS**. His ablest work is his *Systemna theologiae* (Gron. 1673), in the appendix of which is found a list of all the productions from his pen. Their number is prodigious, and the variety of their subjects shows an unbounded genius. He designed to collect all his works into a body, as well those which had been already

published as those which were in MS. He revised and augmented them for that purpose, and had materials for four volumes in folio, but his death prevented the execution of that project. The first volume was to have contained all those works which he had published before settling at Groningen. The second his *Operac theologicct didacfica*. The third his *Opera theologica polemicac*. The title of the fourth was to have been *Impietals triumnphacta*. Its contents were to have been the “Hydra Socinianismi expugnata,” one of the ablest works against the Socinians, the “Biga fanaticorum eversa,” and the “Fabula preadamitarum refuttat,” three works which had been printed at different times. Marets’s system of divinity was found to be so methodical that it was made use of at other academies; indeed, his reputation procured him so much authority in foreign countries as well as his own that a person in Germany who had published some severe censures against Marets received orders to suppress his book. See *Genesis Biog. Dict.* vol. 9, s.v.; Bayle, *Dict. Hist.* s.v. larets; *Effigies et Vitae professorumn Groning.*; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, vol. 9, s.v. (J. H.W.)

Marets

SEE MARESIUS.

Marezoll, Johann Gottlob,

a German theologian, was born at Plauen, grand-duchy of Saxe-Weim. — Eis., Dec. 25, 1761; studied theology at the University of Leipsic from 1779 to 1783; became then tutor for three years in a private family; in 1789 became preacher of the University of Gottingen, with the dignity of professor extraordinary of divinity, and lectured with success on moral philosophy and homiletics; in 1794 was honored by the University of Helmstadt with the doctorate of divinity, and in the same year also accepted a call to Copenhagen as pastor primarius of the German St. Peter’s Church, where he was allowed much time for study; but the northern climate injuring his health, he obtained in 1802, by Herder’s influence, a position at Jena as superintendent and pastor of the town church, and at the same time commenced lectures on homiletics at the university of that place. He died Jan. 15, 1828. Marezoll was a child of the rationalistic times in which he flourished; but still, with a strong desire to preach and spread abroad the teachings of the Gospel, and gifted with a spirited language and animating mode of delivery, he became a blessing to

many thousands of hearers, and an example and a subject of imitation to thousands of students. His productions were repeatedly reprinted, and translated into several languages, and effected much good. He is justly styled one of Germany's greatest preachers of the 19th century. He wrote *Das Christenthum ohne Gesch. u. Eisklein dummig* (1787): — *Bestimmung des Kanzelredners* (1793), besides his sermons, published in 1790-1, 1806, 1811, 1829, etc.: — *Predigten zur Erinnerung an die fortdauernde Wirksamkeit der Reformation* (Jena, 1822): — Homilien (1828): — *Nachgelassene Predigten* (1852, and since). See Herzog, *Real-Encyclopädie*, vol. 20, s.v.; Doring, *Kanzelredner d. 18^{ten} u. 19^{ten} Jahrh.* s.v.

Margaret

ST., the name of several Roman Catholic saints.

I. The latest of these was canonized through the influence of the Dominicans, who manifested a special interest in her, both before and after her death; she is patronized, however, simply in the neighborhood of her native village, San Severin, in the duchy of Ancona. From the former name of that place, she was called *Septenmpeda*; the practice of such virtues as are common among saints, and which she cultivated during her widowhood, gave her the surname *Vidua*; and since, in her humility, she would never wear shoes, she received the appellation *Discalceata*. The only inheritance left to her daughter comprised a pair of shoes and the soles of her feet, which became loosened in death and assumed the form of shoes, and which were the principal relics exhibited in her memory by the Dominicans. She died in 1395.

II. The merely beatified saints, *SEE BEATIFICATION*, of this name belong, without exception, to the monastic orders; and in their legends the fancy and the jealousy of the monks are equally apparent. The more celebrated are:

1. A beautiful Italian from the neighborhood of Perugia, who had up to her twenty-fifth year led a grossly licentious life, but afterwards, having been awakened by a startling incident, distinguished herself by turning to a life of the severest penance in the convent of the Franciscans at Cortona (hence called *Margaret de Cortona*). Her confessor, however, resisted her desire to revisit the scenes of her former shame, accompanied only by an old woman. She is usually represented with the instruments of torture, because

in spirit she experienced the entire passion of the Savior, who refused to designate her his handmaiden, but honored her as his friend. Her conversations with Christ and the Virgin Mary served to endorse the more lenient treatment of the Spiritualists (*Act. SS.*, 1. c., p. 648). When she died, in 1297, the Franciscans claimed that they saw her soul ascend from purgatory to heaven. In 1623 Urban VIII permitted them to pay her religious honors.

2. As an offset to Margaret de Cortona, the Dominicans raised up one of their tertiaries, a blind girl of Urbino, in whose heart were found, after death, three wondrous stones, bearing the image of the Virgin Mary with the child in the manger (*Act. SS.*, April 13; beatified Oct. 19, 1609).

Other Margarets, including a royal princess of Hungary, who died a Dominican, Jan. 28, 1271, are obscure. They are found in the *Act. SS.* under Jan. 23; Feb. 11; March 5, 7, 13, and 22; April 12 and 30; May 15, 18, and 23; and June 4, 10, and 13. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 9:54; Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 6:835.

Margaret Of France,

duchess of Berry and Savoy, daughter of Francis I, was born in 1523, and received a superior education. She was a patroness of the sciences and learned men; and after the death of her father gained a high reputation by her beauty, piety, learning, and amiable qualities. She married Philibert, duke of Savoy, in 1559, and died in 1574, aged fifty-one. The most illustrious of the literati contended who should praise her best, and her subjects called her the *Mother of her People*.

Margaret (Or Marguerite) Of Orleans,

duchess of Alençon and afterwards queen of Navarre, occupies an important place in the history of French Protestantism. She was born at Angoulême April 11, 1492, and was brought up at the court of Louis XII. Her brother, afterwards Francis I, after he had ascended the throne, employed her in numerous important affairs, and she went to Madrid to attend to him when he was a prisoner there. In 1509 she was married to duke Charles of Alençon, but he dying in 1525, she in 1527 again married, this time Henry d'Albret, king of Navarre, and from this marriage was born Jeanne d'Albret, mother of Henry IV. Henry d'Albret died in 1544, and Margaret continued to govern the kingdom with great wisdom. She died

Dec. 21, 1549. She was very handsome and highly talented, and her court was the refuge of all persecuted for the sake of their religious belief; yet very different opinions have been advanced concerning her personal views. Some consider her a fervent Protestant, whilst others look upon her as a very orthodox Roman Catholic, and still others as a free-thinker. The fact seems to be that she observed Roman Catholic practices, although firmly believing in the doctrine of justification by faith in Christ only; she protected the Protestants, without herself leaving the Roman Church; she loved poetry and even pleasure, although strictly moral and truly pious. All these apparent contradictions find a natural explanation in her inclination towards mysticism, verging even on quietism, and resulting in indifference towards the mere externals of religion — a tendency common also to a number of the most distinguished theologians of that time, and one that helps us to understand many otherwise obscure points in the early history of the Reformation in France. Her private character was the object of many attacks, yet none of these accusations have been substantiated; they were all made by her enemies. Margaret of Orleans wrote *1 Miroir de l'dme pecheresse* (1533), which was condemned by the Sorbonne, as it made no mention either of the saints or of purgatory: — *L'Heptameron des nouvelles*, a collection of tales after the manner of Boccaccio, but intended as moral lessons; they have since been used as illustrating the supposed immorality of her life. The work was first published under the title *Histoires des amants fortunes* (Paris, 1558; afterwards by Gruget, Paris, 1559, 2 vols.; Amsterd. 1698; Berne, 1780, 3 vols.; Leroux de Lericy, Paris, 1853, 3 vols.; Lacroix, Paris, 1857; in English dress it is published in Bohn's collection, *extra volumes*): — fragments published after her death by Jean de la Haye, under the title *Mtarguerites de la marguerite des Princesses* (Lyon, 1547; Par. 1554). Her *Correspondance* was published by Geinin (Par. 1842); also *Nouvelles letties de la Reine de Netarre* (Par. 1842). The *Hist. de L. (le Valois, etc., published at Amsterdam (1693, 2 vols.)*, is a mere novel. In the library of Rouen there is to be found a MS. of the 17th century, entitled *Intrigues secretes de la reyne Marguerite pour etablir les erreurs et les nouveautes le Calvin et de Luther dans son royaume de Beamn et de Navarre*. See Bayle, *Dict. Hist.v.*; Polenz, *Gesch. des franzosischen Calvinismus*, 1:199 sq.; Haag, *La France Protestante*, 7:228 sq.; Victor Durand, *Marguerite de Valois et la Cour de Francis I* (1848, 2 vols. 8vo); Miss Freer, *Life of Marguerite, Queen of Navarre* (1855); Herzog, *Real-Encykcllop.* 9:55 sq.; Pierer, *Universal-Lexikon*, 10:867; *Foreign Quar. Rev.* (October, 1842).

Margaret Of Scotland,

daughter of king Edward III, fled to Scotland with her brother, Edgar Edelings, when William the Conqueror invaded England, and in 1070 there married king Malcolm, who afterwards died fighting against William II of England, she following him only four days later to the grave (Nov. 16, 1093). She was canonized by Innocent IV in 1251, and in 1673 Clement X made her the patron saint of Scotland. According to the statement of her confessor Theodoric, Margaret of Scotland was very active, generous, and even lavish in helping the poor. She had regularly 300 persons dependent on her charity, and did much towards softening the native rudeness of the Scottish nobility. She founded a number of churches, working herself in adorning them, and gained her place in the Martyrologium Romanum by her efforts to unite the Church of Scotland with that of Rome, and to civilize the country. She had worked no miracles, but her children were accounted such; among them was David I, ‘splendor generis,’ who Romanized Scotland. In after times her cathedral was destroyed by the Puritans, and her relics were scattered; such portions as were subsequently collected were transferred by Philip II to the Escorial. The “toast of Margaret” is named after her; pope Eugenius IV in 1430 attached to it an indulgence of forty days. but with the express condition that this toast should be the last. Margaret is commemorated June 16 by, the Church of Rome. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 9:54. (J. N. P.)

Margarit (Or Marguerit), Juan Dei,

a Spanish cardinal, was born at Girona about 1415. He belonged to an ancient and illustrious house of Catalonia; one of his ancestors, Beranger, distinguished himself at the siege of Tyre. Margarit became doctor of theology at Girona; in 1453 he was elevated to the episcopal see of Elna. The king of Aragon, Alfred V, employed him in several important diplomatic missions to Naples, and he was so successful that he was made ambassador to pope Pius II. In 1461 Margarit became chancellor at Girona, and in this office mediated peace between Sixtus IV and the king of Naples, Ferdinand I. For his services to the holy see he was honored with the cardinal’s hat towards the close of 1443. He died at Rome in 1444. See Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 33:543.

Margarita

(μαργαρίτις , *margaritum*), *the pearl*, was the name given in the Greek Church to the vessel in which the consecrated host was kept. Margaritue, on the other hand, designated the pieces of the host which the priests preserved in a special vessel for the use of the sick. These pieces were dipped in consecrated wine, and given to the sick with a spoon. See Du Fresne, *Gloss. Latin.* 2:510.

Magarites

SEE PEARL.

Margil, Jesus De

(*Feather Antonio*), an early Franciscan missionary to Texas, was born at Valencia Aug. 18, 1657, and died in Mexico Aug. 6, 1726. He was the author of *El Peregrino Septentrional Atlante* (Valencia, 1742). He is styled “Notario Apostolico,” “Commissario del Santo Oficio,” “Fundador y ex Guardian de tres Coligios,” and “Prefecto de has Misiones de *Piropagande Fide* en todas has Indias Occidentales.” See *Hist. Mag.* June, 1864, s.v.; Drake, *Dict. Amer. Biog.* s.v.

Marguerite Of Valois.

SEE MARGARET OF ORLEANS.

Margunius, Maximus

an Eastern theologian, was born in Crete in 1522; studied divinity at Padua and Venice; became a monastic; in 1589 bishop of Cythera (Cerigo); and died at Crete in 1602. He published *Μηνολόγιον* and *Βίοι ἁγίων*, as well as a collection of sacred poems in Old Greek (Leyden, 1592). and *ἑ μνοι Ἀνακρεόντιοι*. — *Regensburger Real- Encyklopädie*, vol. 9, s.v.

Marheineke, Philip Konrad,

an eminent German theologian and writer, was born at Hildesheim May 1, 1780. He studied theology at Göttingen, where he was made a professor in 1805. He afterwards became successively professor in the University of Heidelberg in 1807, and professor in the university, and, in 1810, minister of the Trinity Church of Berlin, as colleague of the renowned Schleiermacher. He died in the capital of Prussia, May 31, 1846.

Marheineke's studies were especially directed towards Christian symbolics and dogmatics, which he treated from the speculative stand-point of Daub and Hegel. He was, indeed, the head of that fraction of the Hegelian school which asserted the coincidence of the Hegelian philosophy with Christianity. He was equally distant from the strict orthodox views held by the Lutheran, as from Rationalism, or from the old supernaturalism. He wrote *Gesch. d. christlichen Moral seit d. Anfange d. Reformation* (Nuremb. 1805): — *Universalhistorie d. Christenthums* (Erlangen, 1806): — *Christliche Symbolik* (Heidelb. 1810-13, 3 vols.): — *Grundriss d. Homiletik* (Hamb. 1811; 2d edit. 1827): — *institutiones symbolicae* (1812; 3d edit. 1830): — *Aphorismen z. Erneuerung d. Kirchlichen Lebens* (1814): — *Predigten (1814-18)*: — *Geschichte d. deutschen Reformation* (Berl. 1816, 2 vols.; 2d edit. 1831-34, 4 vols.): — *Grundlehren d. christlichen Dogmatik* (Berl. 1819; other edit. 1827): — *Ottomar. Gespräche 2*: — *Freiheit d. Willens u. göttliche Gnade* (Berl. 1821): — *Lehabuck d. christl. Glaubens u. Lebens* (Berl. 1823; 2d edit. 1836): — *Betrachtungen u. d. Lebe d. Lehre d. Welterlssers* (Berl. 1823): — *Ueber d. wahre Stelle d. liturgischen Rechtes* (1825): — *Katechismus d. christlichen Lehre* (1825; 2d edit. 1840): — *Entwurf d. praktischen Theologie* (Berl. 1837): — *Predigten z. Vertheidigung d. evangelischen Kirche gegen d. papstliche* (1839): — *Einleitung in d. öffentl. Vorlesungen 2:s. Bedeutvng d. Degelschen Philosophie in d. christl. Theologie* (Berl. 1842): — *Das gottesdienstliche Leben d. Christen* (Magdeb. 1842): — *Zur Kritik der Schellinyschen Offenbarungsphilosophie* (Berl. 1843): — *Der Erzbishop Clemens August als Friedensstifter zwischen Staat u. Kirche* (Berl. 1843): — *Die Reform der Kirche durch den Staat (1844)*: — *Kurze Erzählung d. Reformation* (1846). After his death his lectures were published under title *Vorlesungen über die christliche Dogmatik* (1847); *über die theologische Moral* (1847); *über die christliche Symbolik* (1848); and *über die Dogmengeschichte* (1849). See Saintes, *list. of German Rationalism*, p. 284; Kahnis, *Mod. German Protestantism*, p. 244 sq.; Morell, *Hist. of Mod. Philos.* 2:199, 203; Bretschneider, *Dogmatik*, 1:115 sq.; Farrar, *Crit. Hist. of Free Thought*, p. 265; and the excellent articles in Wagner, *Staats-Lexikon*, s.v.; Pierer, *Universal-Lexikon*, 10:871; Herzog, *Real-Encyclopädie*, 9:62.

Maria Angelica, De S. Magdalena

is the name by which *Jaqueline*, one of the daughters of Anthony Arnauld (q.v.), was known after she became the prioress of the noted convent of Port Royal. "She at first led a very dissolute life, such as was common at that time in the French nunneries; but in 1609 the fear of God came upon her, and she entered upon a very different course of life; and afterwards becoming intimate first with Francis de Sales, and then, in 1623, with the abbot of St. Cyran, she conformed both herself and her convent to their views and prescriptions.... . The consecrated virgins inhabiting it followed with the utmost strictness the ancient, severe, and almost everywhere abrogated rule of the Cistercians; nay, they imposed on themselves more rigors and burdens than even that rule prescribed." Dr. Murdoch's Mosheim, *Eccles. s. is.* bk. iv, cent. xvii, sec. ii, pt. i, ch. i, § 46. **SEE PORT ROYAL.** The relation which this retreat sustained to the Jansenists has been detailed in the article JANSENIUS, CORNELIUS (2).

Maria Theresa

empress of Austria and Germany. the daughter of Charles VI, was born at Vienna May 13, 1717, and succeeded to the throne, by the "Pragmatic Sanction," Oct. 21, 1740. With her secular history we have nothing to do here, but as to her influence on the interests of Romanism and Protestantism, we must add here a few particulars to the article on *Austria*. Although herself a zealous Roman Catholic, she maintained the rights of her crown against the court of Rome, and endeavored to correct some of the worst abuses in the Church. She prohibited the presence of priests at the making of wills, abolished the right of asylum in churches and convents, suppressed the Inquisition in Milan, and in 1773 the Order of Jesuits. She also forbade that any person, male or female, should take monastic vows before the age of twenty-five years. She did nothing, however, to ameliorate the treatment of the Protestants in her dominions. She professed personal sympathy with their oppressed condition, but pretended to be unable to do anything for them on account of her coronation oaths and the laws of the country. This was especially the case in Hungary. Maria Theresa died Nov. 29, 1780, leaving as her successor to the throne Joseph II, who is noted for his generous efforts in behalf of his Protestant subjects. See Duller, *M. Theresia u. Joseph II* (Wiesbaden, 1844); Ramshorn, *M. Theresia u. ihre Zeit* (Lpz. 1859 sq.); Wolf, *Oestereich unter Maria Theresa* (1855); Coxe, *House of Austria*, 3:189 sq., 241 sq.; Vehse,

Memoirs of the Court of Austria, 2:164 sq. **SEE AUSTRIA**; **SEE BOHEMIA**; **SEE HUNGARY**.

Mariales, Xantis,

an Italian theologian, was born at Venice at the close of the 16th century. He belonged to a patrician family of the Pinards. He was appointed lecturer at Padua, and afterwards inspector of the schools. These offices he filled till 1624, when he retired in order to give his whole time to politics. His zeal for Rome and his hatred towards France caused his expulsion from his native country twice. He retired to Boulogne, afterwards obtained his recall from banishment, and died in April, 1660. We give him place here mainly on account of his many theological productions. The most important are *Controversie ad universam summam Theologiae St. Thomae Aquinatis* (Venice, 1624, fol.): — *Biblioth. Intepretun ad univ. sum s theol. St. Thomae* (Ven. 1660, 4to): — *Stravaganze nuovanzente segnite nel Christianissimo regno di Francia* (Colossians 1646 4to): — *Enormita inaudita nuovamente uscite in luce nel Christianismo regno di Francia, contra il decoro delta sede apostolica Romana in due libri intitolati; l'uno: Dell' arrogante potesta de Papi in difesa della chiesa Gallicana; l'altro Del Dititto della Regalia* (Frkf. 1649,4to). — Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 33:615.

Mariamne

(**Μαριάμνη**, a Greek form of the Heb. *Miriam*), the name of several females of the Herodian family, whose history is detailed by Josephus, especially the two following (see Smith, *Dict. of Class. Biog.* s.v.):

1. The daughter of Alexander, son of Aristobulus, and of Alexandra, daughter of Hyrcanus, high-priest of the Jews, was the most beautiful princess of her age. She married Herod the Great, by whom she had two sons, Alexander and Aristobulus, and two daughters, Salampso and Cypros; also a son called Herod, who died young, during his studies at Rome. Herod was excessively fond of Mariamne, who but slightly returned his passion, and at length cherished a deadly hatred towards him. Herod had her put to death, but afterwards his affection for her became stronger than ever. Josephus mentions a tower that Herod built in Jerusalem, which he named Marianne. **SEE HEROD**.

2. A daughter of the high-priest Simon, and likewise wife of Herod the Great; by him she had a son called Philip, who married first the infamous Herodias, afterwards paramour of Herod Antipas, and the instigator of the death of John the Baptist. *SEE HERODIAN FAMILY.*

Mariana, Juan

a distinguished Spanish Jesuit, was born at Talavera, in the diocese of Toledo, in 1537. In 1554 he joined the Jesuits, and soon acquired great reputation for his historical, theological, and philological learning. In 1561 he taught theology at Rome (where the celebrated Bellarmine was one of his pupils), and in 1565 in Sicily; in 1569 he went to Paris, where he remained five years, and lectured on Thomas Aquinas. In 1574 he returned to Spain on account of his health, and died there in 1624. Among Mariana's works we notice *De rege et regis institutione* (Toledo, 1598), written at the request of Garcia de Loayso, and dedicated to Philip III. In this work he expresses his views on royalty with the greatest freedom, even going so far as to maintain that, under certain circumstances, it may be legitimate to put a king to death. The sixth chapter of the first book is entirely taken up with the question whether it is allowable to assassinate a tyrant, and he concludes affirmatively. Mariana begins by an account of the murder of Henry III, and quotes the divers opinions expressed by others on this event, but it is easy to perceive that he approves of the deed. From this individual fact he passes to the general theory, which he bases on the principle that regal power is intrusted to a king by his people under certain conditions, and that the nation therefore retains the supreme right of making kings accountable for their conduct, and revoking them if need be. From this principle, that sovereignty resides essentially in the nation, he deduces the following consequences:

- 1,** according to theologians and philosophers, every citizen has a right to kill a prince who has usurped sovereign authority without the consent of the nation (“perimi a quoconque, vita et principatu spoliari posse”);
- 2,** if a prince regularly elected, or who has regularly come on the throne by succession, seeks to overthrow religion or the laws, and refuses to listen to the remonstrances of the nation, he is to be got rid of by the surest possible means;

- 3**, the surest way is to assemble the states-general, who will depose him, and, should he resist, proclaim him an enemy of the country, and treat him accordingly;
- 4**, the states-general have the right to condemn to death a prince declared the enemy of the country, and every citizen has then a right to kill him;
- 5**, if it is impossible to assemble the states-general, and yet it is the wish of the nation that the tyrant perish, then a citizen is not guilty who accomplishes this general wish (“qui votis publicis favens eum perimere tentavit haudquaquam inique eum fecisse existimabo”). Mariana, however, puts one restriction to the exercise of this terrible right he declares that the judgment of one or several citizens is not sufficient; that the general wish of the nation must have been clearly expressed, and that the advice of serious and well-informed men should also be taken. After thus justifying the assassination of kings under certain circumstances, Mariana examines the means by which it may be accomplished. All means, he thinks, are allowable, but such as will be least likely to commit the nation or the individual are to be preferred. He shows some partiality for poison, yet maintains that it should not be administered in the food, but rather placed in things of daily use, such as the clothes, etc. The appearance of this work created quite a sensation in France. The Sorbonne and Parliament informed against his book; the Jesuits’ congregation of the province of France condemned Mariana, and the condemnation was approved by general Aquaviva (Mariana had formerly opposed him in Spain) until the book should be revised. *SEE JESUITS*. After the murder of Henry IV the Parliament condemned the book to be publicly burned, July 8, 1610, and his treasonable doctrines, as they were called, continued during the whole of that age of loyalty and part of the following to furnish a common subject of animadversion, and a chief ground of accusation against the Jesuits. It is, however, but just to add here that like doctrines were taught also by Protestant contemporaries of Mariana, and that by no means should the Society of Jesus be held accountable for the propagation of such views (Compare Hallam, *Literary History*, 3:130-140). The Jesuits have, indeed, occasionally supported the claims of the people against their rulers, but always with a view to the interests of their own body only. Mariana, on the contrary, discussed this subject on better and higher grounds. Mankind occupied his thoughts, and had a much stronger hold on his affections than the interests and plans of his order. When Leon de Castro questioned the orthodoxy of Arias Montanus for introducing rabbinical readings and

commentaries into the *Plantina Regia* or *Philippina Polyglot*, a new edition of the *Conplutensis* which Montanus had undertaken at the command of Philip II, Mariana silenced the noisy polemic by his historical, ecclesiastical, and Biblical lore, as well as by the fair and candid tone of his discussion; but by this step he lost all chance of preferment, which, however, he was glad to exchange for learned leisure and the gratification of his love of historical research. Mariana published next, in 1599, his imperfect work, *De Ponderibus et Mensuris*, a subject which his countrymen Lebrija, or Nebrija, Diego Covarrubias, Pedro Ambrosio Morales, and Arias Montanus had treated before, and which Eisenschmidt, Freret, Paucton, etc., have pursued much further since. Observing that the sudden rise and ascendancy of Spain excited a general interest and curiosity abroad, while its origin and causes were either unknown or misunderstood, and that the Spanish historians, though numerous, were at that time little read, and some of them hardly known, he came forward with a *History of Spain* (in twenty books, under the title *Historiae de rebus Hispaniae*, Toleti. 1592, lib. xx, fol., but subsequently extended to thirty books, in the complete edition of 1605, publ. at Mayence). This is a compact and lucid exhibition of an unbroken chronological narrative, from the origin of the Spanish nation to the death of Ferdinand the Catholic (a period of twenty-five centuries at least), and embraces the history of all the Spanish kingdoms, which had hitherto been treated separately. A subject so extensive, expressed in classical Latin, met with universal favor and acceptance. A Spanish translation soon became necessary, and fortunately Mariana accomplished the task himself, and carried the work through four successive Spanish editions in his lifetime. Mariana has been charged with credulity; but traditions held sacred in times past, although rejected in the present ageprodigies which formed part of history, and which Mariana could not dismiss with the disdainful smile of modern criticism, are spots which will never obscure the brilliancy of his digressions on some of the most important events of the world—events which appear as great causes when so admirably interwoven with those peculiarly belonging to the history of Spain. The manly feelings of the historian, his noble indignation against crimes, his bold exposure of the misdeeds of princes and their abettors, deserve still higher commendation. Yet he, as well as Ferreras and Masdeu more recently, has spared a gross instance of queen Urraca's licentious conduct; but, on the other hand, the defense of queen Blanca's honor is highly creditable to Mariana. It is true also that Mariana did not always examine all the original authorities, as Ranke observes in the *Kritik*

neueere Geschichtsschreiber; but to institute an inquiry into every minor detail, to comprehend a wide field of inquiry, and yet to open new and to disdain all trodden paths, would have required the perusal of whole libraries, and a single life would not have been sufficient to complete the undertaking. And if others had been invited to join in the labor of the investigation, a motley compilation might have been the only result of so much research, which it is almost impossible ever to combine into one harmonious whole. Mariana's portraits of lords and favorites were found too original and faithful by the living, as in the case of the detestable Fernandez Velasco, of Castile, and his worthy secretary Pedro Mantaono. The secretary, after having been a panegyrist of the new historian, tried to serve his master by his attack on Mariana, entitled *Advertencias a la Historia de Marsians*. He was discovered, however, and roughly treated by Tamayo Vargas in *La Defensa de Mariana*. Probably to this criticism may be traced many improvements in Mariana's second Spanish edition of his history, which appeared at Madrid in 1608. It is on this edition, and the various readings selected from the editions of 1617 and 1623, that the edition of Valencia is based, which contains ample notes and illustrations (1783-96, 9 vols. 8vo). This edition also closes, like the original, with the reign of Ferdinand the Catholic (1515-16). There have subsequently been published at Madrid —

1. The continuation of Mariana by Mifiana, translated from the Latin by Romero (1804, fol.);
2. A complete Mariana, continued down to the death of Charles III, 1788, by Sabau y Blanco (1817-22, 20 vols. 4to);
3. Another by the same, brought down to the year 1808 (9 vols. 8vo, with portraits).

The profound erudition of Mariana is also displayed in another publication, his *Tractastus Septem* (Cologne, 1609). The second of these treatises, *De Editione Vulgatta*, is an epitome. of his report on the fierce controversy between Ariastloiltanus and Leon de Castro. The fourth, *De Mutatione Monetæ*, provoked the indignation of the duke of Lerma and his partners in the system of general peculation and frauds which Mariana exposed. He foretold the calamities which threatened the Spanish nation; and his words, which had been disregarded, were remembered when the opportunity was gone. As a reward for proclaiming such unwelcome truths, at the age of seventy-three he suffered a whole year of judicial trickery, humiliations,

and confinement in the convent of St. Francis at Madrid. In searching his papers another exposure was found, entitled *Del Gobierno de la Compañia*, or on the defects of his order, in which he also pointed out the means of correcting them. Copies of this MS. had multiplied so alarmingly that, the year after the author's death, the general of the Jesuits, Vitaleschi, issued a circular, dated Rome, July 29, 1624, enjoining the collection of such papers in order to be burned. Still that measure did not prevent its being printed at Bordeaux in 1625, and reprinted elsewhere in several languages. This curious circular was found in the archives of the Jesuits of Valencia at the time of their sudden expulsion from the Spanish dominions in 1767. After his persecution he made an epitome of the *Bibliotheca* of Photius, translated some homilies, revised his *History of Spain*, and published a supplement, or, rather, a summary, of concise annals of Spain from 1515 to 1612. At the age of eighty-three he published his *Scholia* on the Old and New Testament, availing himself of the best Hebrew commentaries, and some valuable and very early MSS., which dated from the age of the ancient Gothic dominion in Spain. This work, though written at this advanced stage of life, "displays a degree of vigor and of learning which might well provoke the admiration of modern Biblical students." It secured for him a place among the best commentators in the *Histoire Critique du Vieux Testament* of the hypercritical father Simon, who is usually unfavorable to Spaniards. Bayle, in his *Dictionary*, supposes Mariana to be also author of a work *Republica Christiana*, but neither Alegambe nor Nicolas Antonio, both of them Spaniards, mentions it. Stevens, the English translator of Mariana's history, misstates some particulars of the author's life, and very unaptly compares him with Raleigh. Mariana left MSS. of at least twice the extent of all his publications. He died Feb. 6, 1623, in the eighty-seventh year of his age and the forty-ninth of his retirement to Toledo. See Mondejar, *Advertencias a Mariana; Juicio y Noticia de los Historiadores de Espana; Andrade, Vidas de Mariana; Acosta, Vida de Marina; Andr. Schot., Illispsan. Illustrat.; Baronius, Annal. Ecclesiast.; Bernard. Gerald., Pro Senatu Veneto*, quoted in Colomesius, *Hispania Orientalis; Rene Rapin, Reflexions sur Histoire.; Nicolas Antonio, Bibliotheca Hispanonova; Saaveelra, Republica Litalria; Tamayo de Vargas, Vidan del P. Julai Marianat; Alegambe, Biblioth. script. societatis Jesu; Bayle, Hist. Dict. s.v.; Prosper Marchand, Dictionnaire: Freher, Theatrum Virorum clorum, 1:347; Woltmann, *Gesch. u. Politik*, 1801, 1:265; Sismondi, *Litterature du Middle. l'Europe*, 4:100; Bouterweck, *Hist. de la**

Litterature Espagnole, 1812, vol. ii; Ticknor, *History of Spanish Literature*, 3:143; Ranke, *Zur Kritik neuerer Geschichtsschreiber* (1824); Herzog, *Real-Encyclopadie*, 9:105 sq.; Pierer, *Universal-Lexikon*, 10:884; *Engl. Cyclopaedia*, s.v.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 33:618 sq. (J. N. P.)

Marianists

an order of knighthood. *SEE KNIGHTHOOD*; *SEE TEUTONIC KNIGHTS*.

Marianus Scotus

a noted ecclesiastic, was born in Ireland or Scotland A.D. 1028; became a monk; traveled on the Continent in 1058, especially in Germany, and frequented the German monasteries of Cologne, Fulda, and Mentz, and died A.D. 1086. Marianus Scotus was the first to correct the inaccurate chronologies of the chronicles in his *Chronicon* (3 vols. to 1084; continued by Dodechin up to 1200). It is published among the *Scriptores rerum Germanlicarum* by Struve and others. The most valuable is the 3d volume, treating of the Carolingian and following emperors. See Hansen, *De antiquiss. codice chronici Mariani Scoti* (Frankfort-on-the-Oder, 1782).

Mariastein

a noted place of pilgrimage in the Swiss canton of Solothurn, is annually visited by some 60,000 persons. The pilgrimages to this place began in the Middle Ages, and continue unabated to our day. During the first and second French Revolutions the place was ransacked by the French soldiers, but the monastics of the adjoining convent repaired and rebuilt it each time. See Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 12:767.

Mariazell

a famous place of pilgrimage in Austria, situated on the north border of the crown-land of Styria, twenty-four miles north of Bruck. It consists of a number of inns or lodging-houses, and contains 1200 inhabitants. It is visited by 300,000 pilgrims annually, who come hither to pay homage to an image of the Virgin believed to possess the power of working miracles, which was brought to Mariazell about 1157 by the Benedictine St. Lanmbrecht. A pilgrim chapel was first erected there about 1200 by margrave Henry I of Moravia. King Louis I of Hungary built a pilgrim

church in 1343. The large pilgrim church now standing was built near the end of the 17th century; the miracleworking image is within a chapel, closed by a heavy gate of solid silver. During the great annual procession from Vienna, the greater part of the pilgrims of both sexes spend the night in the woods in drinking, singing, and general riot and debauchery. See Hillbach, *Der Pilger u. Tourist nach Maria Zell* (Vienna, 1857, 8vo).

Marie, A Li, Coque,

a visionary, whose real name was *Margaret*, was born July 22, 1647, at Lauthecour. in the diocese of Autun, France. She boasted of religious transports, and heavenly visions and revelations, besides which she is reported to have worked manifold wonders. She evinced a deep aversion to all evil in her infancy, and from her fourth year maintained an intimate communion with God. On the death of her father, which took place in the eighth year of her age, she entered a convent. Attributing the cure of a disease that had afflicted her during four years to the Virgin Mary, she gratefully adopted the name "Marie," and always used it by preference. She entered the Order of Salesians on the 27th of August, 1671, as a novice, and on the 6th of November. 1672, took the veil. From this time she claimed to be constantly favored with visions and revelations, and is said to have performed many miracles; such were her transports that she carved in large letters the name of Jesus on her breast. She had knowledge of the time when she should die, and prepared for that event in deep retirement, closing her life Oct. 17, 1690. She left a small work of a mystical character, entitled *La derotion au coeur de Jesus*, and others of a similar nature. Her life was published by Jean Joseph Languet under the title *La vie de la venerable mere Afarsquerite Marlie*; but her memory has been kept alive chiefly through the four songs, *-ler-Vet*, in *OEuvres de M. Gresset* (Amsterd. 1748), 1:9-45. On the 4th of February, 1836, the advocate of the pontifical consistory addressed the pope, for the first time, on the process of her beatification; but Talleyrand, as bishop of her native diocese, had already sought to effect her canonization during the last decennials of the 18th century. — Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* 20:92 sq.

Maria, De Lincarnation,

a French female missionary, whose original name was *Guyard*, was born at Tours in 1599. She early joined the Ursuline nuns; visited Canada in 1639, where she made many converts among the Indians; and founded a convent

of her order. She died in 1672. See Charlevoix, *Vie de la Mere Marie de l'Incarnation; Biographie Universelle*, s.v.

Marietiu

a celebrated Hindu sage or demi-god, was, according to one account, the son of Brahma—according to another, the son of Bhrigu. He was the father of Kasyapa. By some he is considered as the god of “light,” which appears to be the etymological signification of his name. See Moor, *Hindu Pantheon; Institutes of Manu*, chap. i; Thomas, *Dict. of Biog. and Mythology*, s.v.

Marillac, Charles De,

a noted prelate of the Church of Rome, was born at Auvergne, in France, about 1510. He was advocate in the Parliament of Paris when, perceiving himself suspected of Lutheranism, he followed John de la Forest, ambassador of France to Constantinople, and thus avoided persecution from the inquisitors. He afterwards became abbot of St. Pere and archbishop of Vienne; also counselor in the privy council when the assembly of notables convened at Fontainebleau in 1560, and in it advocated the calling of a national council and a meeting of the states-general, but without much effect. He endeavored to take measures to prevent the mischiefs threatening the country at that time, but, despairing of success, he became melancholic, was preyed upon by disease, and died at his abbey of St. Pere, in December, 1560.

Mar'imoth

(2 Esdras 1:2), the Latin form of MEREMOTH *SEE MEREMOTH* (q.v.).

Marin, Michel Ange

a French ecclesiastical writer, was born of a noble family at Marseilles in 1697. In 1714 he was admitted to the order of the Minimes; was employed in their schools, and four times filled a provincial office. He possessed not only a liking for theology and natural history, but also a natural taste for belles-lettres. His style is a little diffuse, and sometimes weak and incorrect, without being entirely void of elegance. He died April 3, 1767, at Avignon. His works are mainly in the department of practical religion. We note *Lei desastres de Barbacan chin errant d'izs Aviqlnoun* (Avignon, 1722, 1759, 16mo; Aix. 1744): — *Conduite Spirituelle de le soeur Violet* (Avignon,

1740, 12mo): — *Adelaide de Witsbury ou. la Pieuse pensionnaire* (Avignonu, 1744, 12mo): — *La Parfaite Religieuse* (Avign. 1752, 12mo): — *Viri inie, ou la virge Chrietieszze, histoire Sicilienne* (Avignon, 1752, 2 vols. 12mo): — *Vies des Peres des deserts d'Orient, avec leur doctrine spirituelle et leur discipline monastique* (Avignon, 1761-64, 3 vols. 4to. or 9 12mo; Lyons, 1824, 9 vols. 8vo): — *Le Barons de Van Hesden, ou la republique des incredules* (Toulouse, 1762, 5 vols. 12mo): — *Agnes de Saint-Amour, ou la fervente novice* (Avignon, 1762, 2 vols. 12mo; Marseilles, 1829): — *Theodule ou l'enfint le la beUenliction* (Avignon, 1762, 12mo): — *Farfalla, ou la commendienne convertie* (Avignon, 1762, 12mo): — *Agelique* (Avignon, 1766, 2 vols. 12mo; Marseilles, 1830): — *La Marquise de los Valientes, ov, la Damue Chretienne* (Avignon, 1765, 2 vols. 12mo): *Lettres ascetiques et morales* (Avignon, 1769, 2 vols. 12mo). — Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Marina De Escobar.

SEE ESCOBAR.

Mariner

(*j Lmi nmallach*’, a *seat man*, comp. Gr. ἄλιεύς, Eng. “an old salt;” ^{<570>}Ezekiel 27:9, 27, 29; ^{<3005>}Jonah 1:5; *myfæe shatim*’, ^{<5708>}Ezekiel 27:8, “rowers,” as in ver. 26), a sailor. SEE SHIP.

Marini, Giovanni Filippo,

an Italian Jesuit and missionary, was born near Genoa in 1608; resided fourteen years at Tonking, Japan, and died in that country in 1677. He published *.Della Missione de padri della comp. di Giesu nella provincia di Giappone e particolarmente di quella di Tunchino* (Rome, 1663, 4to); and *A New and Cursious Account of the Kingdoms of Tonquin and Laos* (1666), considered quite valuable. — Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Marino

or SAN MARINO, one of the most ancient and most limited republican states of Europe, consists of a craggy mountain 2200 feet in height, situated amid the lesser ranges of the Apennines. and encircled by provinces formerly belonging to the pontifical states. It possesses a total area of twenty-one miles, and comprises a town of the same name, and

several villages in the adjacent territory. The climate is healthy, but, owing to its exposure, high winds and frequent rains prevail. ‘The inhabitants, who are reckoned at 8000, are noted for their hospitality, sobriety, industry, and general morality. They are sensitively jealous of their rights, and cling with tenacity to their territorial and legislative independence. The religion of the country is Roman Catholic. The early history of the republic is very obscure. During the mediaeval wars of Italy, Marino had its pigmy feuds and factions, which seem to have been none the less envenomed from the pettiness of the arena in which they were enacted. In 1740 the democratical form of government was securely guaranteed against further assault. The rights of this miniature state were scrupulously respected by Napoleon during his Italian campaign. The government, designated the Sovereign Grand Council (*Generale Consiglio Principe*), is composed of sixty members, of whom one third are nobles. From this number are selected the smaller ‘‘Council of Twelve’’ (two thirds from the town and the rest from the country), who, with the assistance of a jurisconsult, decide in questions of the second and third instance. The representatives of the state are termed captains-regent (*capitani reggenti*). They are chosen, the one from the party of the nobles, the other from the bourgeoisie. They each hold office only for six months. The army, or rather the militia of the republic, numbers 1189 men.

Marinus

a martyr of the second half of the 3d century, is mentioned by Eusebius in *Hist. Eccl.* 7:15. According to this authority, Marinus was of a high family, served in the army, and was about to be appointed centurion by Gallienus (266-268) when he was denounced as a Christian by one of his fellow-soldiers. Brought before judge Achaeus, he acknowledged his Christian faith, and was given three hours to recant. During this respite he was taken to church by bishop Theoteknos, who, presenting him a sword with one hand and the Gospel with the other, bade him choose between them. Marinus joyfully chose the latter, returned to the judge, to whom he declared his choice, and was at once executed. A Roman senator, Asterius, who was a witness of the execution, carried away the body upon his own shoulders, laid him out in fine clothes, and buried him (see *Acta Sanct.* ap. Bolland, t. 1, 3d of March). *SEE MARTIN II* and III.

Another St. Marinus is commemorated on the 4th of September. He was a native of Dalmatia, and worked on the bridge of Rimini, when his piety

attracted the notice of bishop Gaudentius of Brescia, who persuaded him to enter the Church, and made him deacon. Marinus retired on the mountain of Titano, where he erected a hermitage, and died towards the close of the 4th century. According to the legend, the miracles wrought at his tomb attracted a number of pilgrims to the place, who settled there, and this gave rise to his saintship. Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 9:108; Pierer, *Universal-Lexikos*, 10:893; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 33,769.

Mariolatry

(Gr. *Μαρία*, *Mary*, and *λατρεία*, *adorations*) is the technical term given by the Protestant world to the worship which Romanists render to the Virgin Mary. Romanists themselves term this worship *Hyperdulia* (q.v.), to distinguish it from the worship paid to God, which they term *Latria* (q.v.), and adoration paid to saints, *Dulia* (q.v.). In our articles *SEE HYPERDULIA*, *SEE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION*, and *SEE INVOCATION OF SAINTS*, we have already pointed out the great difficulty of bringing distinctions so refined within the comprehension of the common mind, so as to prevent the multitude from worshipping the creature instead of the Creator. “As mother of the Savior of the world,” says Dr. Schaff (*Ch. Hist.* 2:410), “the Virgin Mary unquestionably holds forever a peculiar position among all women and in the history of redemption;” and, from this point of view, he remarks that it is “perfectly natural, nay, essential to sound religious feeling, to associate with Mary the fairest traits of maidenly and maternal character, and to revere her as the highest model of female purity, love, and piety.... But, on the other hand, it is equally unquestionable that she is nowhere in the N.T. excepted from the universal sinfulness and the universal need of redemption, nor represented as immaculately holy, or as in any way an object of divine veneration.” Roman Catholics, however, have insisted upon the *adoration*, as they term worship in this instance, of the mother of Jesus, holding that Mary has been assumed in the Trinity, so as to make it a Quaternity; that “Mary is the complement of the Trinity” (Pusey, *Eirenicon*, 2:167), and that *the intercession of Mary is needed for the salvation of the followers of Jesus Christ*. We quote the words of Liguori himself: “We most readily admit that Jesus Christ is the only Mediator of Justice, and that by his merits he obtains us all grace and salvation; but we say that Mary is the Mediatrix of Grace; and that receiving all she obtains through Jesus Christ, and because she prays and asks for it in the name of Jesus Christ, yet all the same, whatever graces we receive, they come to us through her intercession”

(*Glories of Mary*, p. 124). There is certainly not a word in the Bible, nor in the creeds of the Apostolic Church, nor even in the writings of the Church fathers of the first five centuries, to warrant any Christian in assigning such a position to Mary, the mother of Jesus, as the Catholic Church, both Latin and Greek, has dared to bestow upon her. One of the accepted interpreters of the Church of Rome, Liguori, in commenting on the exalted position which the Virgin Mary should hold in the estimation of Latin communicants, says that she is Queen of Mercy (p. 13); that she is the Mother of all mankind (p. 23); that she offered her Son to the Father on Mount Calvary (p. 23); that she is especially the Mother of repentant sinners (p. 42); that she is our Life (p. 52); that God was reconciled with sinners by the humility and purity of Mary (p. 56); that she obtains us perseverance (p. 59); that she renders death sweet to her clients (p. 68); that she is our Protectress at the hour of death (p. 71); that she is the Hope of all (p. 79); that she is our only Refuge, Help, and Asylum (p. 81); that she is the Propitiatory of the whole world (p. 81); that she is the one City of Refuge (p. 89); that it is her office to withhold God's arm from chastising sinners until he is pacified (p. 93); that she is the Comfortress of the world, the Refuge of the unfortunate (p. 100); that we shall be heard more quickly if we call on the name of Mary than if we call on the name of Jesus (p. 106); that she is our Patroness (p. 106); that she is Queen of heaven and hell, of all saints, and all evil spirits, because she conquered the latter by her virtues, and the devil by her fair humility and holy life (p. 110); that she protects us from the divine justice and from the devil (p. 115); that at the name of Mary every knee bows and hell trembles (p. 116); that she is the Ladder of paradise, the Gate of heaven, the most true Mediatrix between God and man (p. 121); that her intercession is necessary for salvation (p. 122); that she is the Mediatrix of grace (p. 124); that in her is all hope of life and virtue, all grace of the Way and Truth (p. 125); that in her we find eternal salvation (p. 125); that no one can enter heaven except by her (p. 127); that all graces of the spiritual life are transmitted by Mary (p. 127); that all gifts, virtues, graces are dispensed by her, to whomsoever, when, and as she pleases (p. 128); that from her the world receives every good (p. 128); that she is the Helper of the Redemption (p. 133); that she and her Son redeemed the world (p. 133); that she is the Co-operator in our justification (p. 133); that the way of salvation is open to none otherwise than through Mary (p. 135); that God says, "Go to Mary," when we seek for grace from him (p. 136); that the salvation of all depends on the favor and protection of Mary (p. 136); that the other saints intercede

with her (p. 138); that she is a tender Advocate; that all power is given unto her in heaven and earth (p. 145); that God obeys the command of Mary (p. 146); that Mary is omnipotent (p. 146); that the whole Church is under the dominion of Mary (p. 146); that what she wills is necessarily done (p. 147); that her prayers have something of a command in them (p. 151); that Jesus Christ is under an obligation to her to grant all she asks (p. 152); that she is the singular Refuge of the lost (p. 156); that she is the Advocate of the whole human race (p. 161); that her chief office in the world is to reconcile fallen souls with God (p. 167); that she is the great Peace-maker who obtains reconciliation, salvation, pardon, and mercy (p. 165); that in her is established the seat of God's government (p. 179); that she delivers her clients from hell (p. 183); that her clients will necessarily be saved (p. 184); that she has sent back many from hell to earth who have died of mortal sins (p. 188); that she consoles, relieves, and succors her clients in purgatory (p. 195); that she delivers her clients from purgatory by applying her merits (p. 195); that she carries away from purgatory all who wear the Carmelite scapulary on the Saturday after they die, provided they have been chaste and have said her office (p. 196); that she does not suffer those who die clothed in the scapulary to go to hell (p. 185); that Mary leads her servants to heaven (p. 198); that she has the key of the gate of paradise (p. 199); that she is the Way of our salvation (p. 200); that it is for the love of Mary and on account of her merits that God is more merciful under the New than under the Old Dispensation (p. 214); that her powerful intercession sustains the world (p. 214); that she is the Throne of grace to which St. Paul bids us fly (p. 215); that Christ has promised that all who invoke the holy name of Mary with confidence shall have perfect sorrow for their sins, atonement for their crimes, strength to attain perfection, and shall reach the glory of paradise (p. 226), etc.

We will also cite for the benefit of our readers some passages from the writings of Liguori bearing more directly on the field of *doctrinal* theology. Mary is not only titled by him "Queen, Mother, and Spouse of the King: to her belongs dominion and power over all creatures" (p. 12); "She is Queen of Mercy, as Jesus Christ is King of Justice" (p. 13). "If Jesus is the Father of souls. *Mary* is also their Mother. On two occasions, *according to the holy fathers*, Mary became our spiritual Mother. The first, according to blessed Albert the Great, was when she *merited* to conceive in her virginal womb the Son of God. This was revealed by our Lord to S. Gertrude. who was one day reading the above text, and was perplexed, and could not

understand how Mary, being only the Mother of Jesus, could be said to have brought forth her first-born. God explained it to her, saying that Jesus was Mary's first-born according to the flesh, but that all mankind were her second-born according to the Spirit.... The second occasion on which Mary became our spiritual Mother, and brought us forth to the life of grace, was when *she offered* to the eternal Father the life of her beloved Son on Mount Calvary with such bitter sorrow and suffering" (p. 23). "Thus it is that in every engagement with the infernal powers we shall always certainly conquer by having recourse to the Mother of God, who is also our Mother, saying and repeating again and again, 'We fly to thy patronage, O holy Mother of God; we fly to thy patronage, O holy Mother of God!' Oh, how many victories have not the faithful gained over hell by having recourse to Mary with this short but most powerful prayer! Thus it was that that great servant of God, sister Mary, the crucified, of the Order of S. Benedict, always overcame the devils" (p. 26). "' Since the very tigers,' says our most loving Mother Mary, 'cannot forget their young, how can I forget to love you, my children?'" (p. 30). "Our Blessed Lady herself revealed to sister Mary, the crucified, that the fire of love with which she was inflamed towards God was such that, if the heavens and earth were placed in it, they would be instantly consumed; so that the ardors of the Seraphim, in comparison with it, were but as fresh breezes" (p. 31). "Let us love her like a S. Francis Solano, who, maddened as it were (but with holy madness) with love for Mary, would sing before her picture, and accompany himself on a musical instrument, saying that, like worldly lovers, he serenaded his most sweet Queen" (p. 38). "Let us love her as so many of her servants have loved her, and who never could do enough to show their love. Father Jerome of Texo, of the Society of Jesus, rejoiced in the name of slave of Mary; and, as a mark of servitude, went often to visit her in some church dedicated in her honor. On reaching the church, he poured out abundant tears of tenderness and love for Mary; then prostrating, he licked and rubbed the pavement with his tongue and face, kissing it a thousand times, because it was the house of his beloved Lady" (p. 38). "Mary is the Mother of repentant sinners" (p. 42). "When Mary sees a sinner at her feet imploring her mercy, she does not consider the crimes with which he is loaded, but the intention with which he comes; and if this is good, even should he have committed all possible sins, the most loving Mother embraces him, and does not disdain to heal the wounds of his soul" (p. 45). "' My God,' she says, 'I had two sons — Jesus and man; man took the life of my Jesus on the cross, and now thy justice would condemn the guilty

one. O Lord! my Jesus is already dead; have pity on me; and if I have lost the one, do not make me lose the other also!’ And most certainly God will not condemn those sinners who have recourse to Mary, and for whom she prays, since he himself commended them to her as her children” (p. 47). These passages are taken almost at random from Liguori’s *Glories of Mary*, chapter 1, which is a paraphrase of the words *Hail, holy Queen, Mother of Mercy!* Yet these claims are moderate compared with those set up in the fifth chapter, entitled, *Of the Necessity of the Intercession of Mary for our Salvation*. “S. Lawrence Justinian asks, ‘How can she be otherwise than full of grace who has been made the *Ladder to paradise, the Gate of heaven, the most true Mediatrsix between God and man?*’”(p. 121). “That which we intend to prove here is that the intercession of Mary is now *necessary* to salvation; we say necessary— not absolutely, but morally. This necessity proceeds from the will itself of God that all graces that he dispenses should pass by the hands of Mary, according to the opinion of S. Bernard, and which we may now with safety call the general opinion of theologians and learned men. The author of *The Reign of Mary* positively asserts that such is the case. It is maintained by Vega, Mendoza, Pacciuchelli, Segnori, Poire, Crasset, and by innumerable other learned authors” (p. 122).

Now what have we in holy Scripture to warrant such a position as is here taken by Liguori? Comparison, as distinct from contrast, requires the existence of some similitude, but take any passage in which Mary is mentioned, from the salutation down to the period after the ascension, and there is nothing in any way similar. It only remains, therefore, to contrast instead of comparing. But our readers are so well acquainted with holy Writ that we remit the task to them, only begging them to remember four things:

1. That Mary is represented as she is, and not otherwise in the Gospels;
2. That she is not mentioned at all in the Acts after the first chapter, or in the Epistles, although St. Paul has entered so minutely into the economy of the Christian scheme of salvation;
3. That all that prophet and apostle has said of our Lord is by Romanists transferred to Mary;
4. That all those passages which speak of one Mediator between God and man not only ignore, but exclude the modern doctrine, pronounced

by Dr. Schaff “one of the principal points of separation between Graeco-Roman Catholicism and evangelical Protestantism” (*Ch. Hist.* 2:411).

Lest the charge should be brought to our door that we have attributed to the Church of Rome the doctrines held by only a part of her communicants, or even only one of her priests, we continue our quotations from some of her most eminent writers, affording ample proof of the manner in which the Roman Catholic is taught to look upon the Virgin: “O thou, our Governor and most benignant Lady, in right of being his Mother, command your most beloved Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, that he deign to raise our minds from longing after earthly things to the contemplation of heavenly things” (from the *Crown of the Blessed Virgins*, Psalter of Bonaventura). “We praise thee, Mother of God; we acknowledge thee to be a virgin. All the earth doth worship thee, the Spouse of the eternal Father. All the angels and archangels, all thrones and powers, lo faithfully serve thee. To thee all angels cry aloud, with a neverceasing voice, Holy, holy, holy, Mary, Mother of God.... he whole court of heaven doth honor thee as queen. The holy Church throughout all the world doth invoke and praise thee, the Mother of divine Majesty... Thou sittest with thy Son on the right hand of the Father.... In thee, sweet Mary, is our hope; defend us forever more. Praise becometh thee; empire becometh thee; virtue and glory be unto thee forever and ever” (from a *Parody on the Te Deum.*, by the same writer). “Whosoever will be saved, before all things it is necessary that he hold the right faith concerning Mary; which faith, except one do keep whole and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly... He (Jesus Christ) sent the Holy Spirit upon his disciples, and upon his Mother, and at last took her up into heaven, where she sitteth on the right hand of her Son, and never ceaseth to make intercession with him for us, This is the faith concerning the Virgin Mary, which, except every one do believe faithfully and firmly, he cannot be saved” (from a *Parody on the Athanasian Creed*, by the same writer). “During the pontificate of Gregory the Great, the people of Rome experienced in a most striking manner the protection of the Blessed Virgin. A frightful pestilence raged in the city to such an extent that thousands were carried off, and so suddenly that they had no time to make the least preparation. It could not be arrested by the vows and prayers which the holy pope caused to be offered in all quarters, until he resolved on having recourse to the Mother of God. Having commanded the clergy and people to go in procession to the church of our Lady, called St.

Mary Major, carrying the picture of the Holy Virgin, painted by St. Luke, the miraculous effects of her intercession were soon experienced: in every street as they passed the plague ceased, and before the end of the procession an angel in human form was seen on the Tower of Adrian, named ever since the Castle of St. Angelo, sheathing a bloody sabre. At the same moment the angels were heard singing the anthem, ‘Regina Caeli,’ ‘Triumph, O Queen,’ Hallelujah. The holy pope added, ‘Ora pro nobis Deum,’ ‘Pray for us,’ etc. The Church has since used this anthem to salute the Blessed Virgin in Easter time” (from Alphonsus Liguori’s *The Glories of Mary*). Gabriel Biel, *Supuer Casaonens Mllisse*, says “that our heavenly Father gave the half of his kingdom to the most Blessed Virgin, Queen of heaven; which is signified in the case of Esther, to whom Ahasuerus promised the half of his kingdom. So that our heavenly Father, who possessed justice and mercy, retained the former, and conceded to the Virgin Mary the exercise of the latter.” Antoninus, archbishop of Florence, goes further yet than Gabriel Biel. We hesitate to record the profane blasphemies which are found in the writings of various popes, prelates, and divines on this subject. Stories of the Middle Ages, many ludicrous, many trivial, one or two sublime, are all penetrated with this single thought, that from Mary, and Mary alone, could heart worship, and repentance, and prayer, in the very second of death, in the very act of sin, without the Eucharist, without the priest, at sea, in the desert, in the very home of vice, obtain instant and full remission; but, with Elliott (*Delineation of Romanism*, p. 754), “we refuse even to name the vulgar preaching and rude discourses of friars and priests who induct the multitude into this worship, as being too indelicate for the ears of even an intelligent Romanist.” The following we take from a *Prayer of St. Bernard*: “Remember, O most Holy Virgin Mary, that no one ever had recourse to your protection, implored your help, or sought your mediation without obtaining relief. Confiding, therefore, in your goodness, behold me, a penitent sinner, sighing out my sins before you, beseeching you to adopt me for your son, and to take upon you the care of my eternal salvation. Despise not, O Mother of Jesus, the petition of your humble client, but hear and grant my prayer.” “*Prayer.* — O God of goodness, who hast filled the holy and immaculate heart of Mary with the same sentiments of mercy and tenderness for us with which the heart of Jesus Christ, thy Son and her Son, was always overflowing; grant that all who honor this virginal heart may preserve until death a perfect conformity of sentiments and inclinations with the sacred heart of Jesus Christ, who, with thee and the

Holy Ghost, lives and reigns one God, forever and ever. Amen.”

“*Aspiration.* — O Mary:! Thou art light in our doubts. consolation in our sorrows, and protection in our dangers! After thy Son, thou art the certain hope of faithful souls! Hail, hope of the desponding and refuge of the destitute, to whom thy Son has given such power that whatever thou evillest is immediately done!” From the *Breviary*: “O Holy Mary. succor the miserable, help the faint-hearted, comfort the afflicted, pray for the people, intercede for the clergy, make supplication for the devout female sex; let all be sensible of thy help who celebrate thy holy commemoration.”... “Grant, we beseech thee, O Lord God, that we, thy servants, may enjoy perpetual health of mind and body, and, by the glorious intercession of Blessed Mary, ever virgin, may be delivered from present sorrows, and come to eternal joy, through our Lord Jesus Christ.” The *Litany of the Sacred Heart of Mary* deserves to be added:

“Lord have mercy on us!

Son of God, have mercy on us!

Holy Ghost, have mercy on us!

Jesus Christ, hear us!

Jesus Christ, graciously hear us!

God, the Father of heaven, have mercy on us!

God, the Son, Redeemer of the world, have mercy on us!

God, the Holy Ghost, have mercy on us!

Holy Trinity, one God, have mercy on us!

Heart of Mary, conceived without the stain of sin!

Heart of Mary, full of grace!

Heart of Mary, sanctuary of the Trinity!

Heart of Mary, tabernacle of the incarnate Word!

Heart of Mary, after God’s own heart!

Heart of Mary, illustrious throne of glory!

Heart of Mary, perfect holocaust of divine love!

Heart of Mary, abyss of humility!

Heart of Mary, attached to the cross!

Heart of Mary, seat of mercy!

Heart of Mary, consolation of the afflicted!

Heart of Mary, refuge of sinners!

Heart of Mary, advocate of the Church, and mother of all faithful!

Heart of Mary, after Jesus, the most assured hope of the agonizing!

Heart of Mary, queen of angels and the saints!

Lamb of God, who takest away the sins of the world, spare us!

Lamb of God, who takest away the sins of the world, hear us, O Lord!

Lamb of God, who takest away the sins of the world, have mercy on us, O Lord!
 O most sacred and amiable heart of Mary, Mother of God, pray for us!
 That our hearts may be inflamed with divine love.”

The following is an extract from the encyclical letter addressed by Gregory XVI to all patriarchs, primates, archbishops, and bishops, bearing date Aug. 15, 1832, affording ample evidence that the same doctrine was approved by the highest authorities of the Romish Church even prior to the promulgation of the dogma of *immaculate conception* (q.v.): “Having at length taken possession of our see in the Lateran Basilica, according to the custom and institution of our predecessors, we turn to you without delay, venerable brethren; and, in testimony of our feelings towards you, we select for the date of our letter this most joyful day, on which we celebrate the solemn festival of the most Blessed Virgin’s triumphant assumption into heaven; that she, who has been through every great calamity our patroness and protectress, may watch over us writing to you, and lead our mind by her heavenly influence to those counsels which may prove most salutary to Christ’s flock... . But, that all may have a successful and happy issue, let us raise our eyes to the most Blessed Virgin Mary, who alone destroys heresies, who is our greatest hope, ya, the entire ground of our hope.” (Comp. here Kitto, *Journal Sacred Lit.* 9:25; 15:211; *English Review*, 10:350 sq.; *Christ. Remembrancer*, 1855 [Oct.], p. 417 sq.; especially p. 443 and 449.) In view of such a document emanating from the head of the Church, what account can we make of the declaration of the Romish vicars apostolic in Great Britain that “Catholics do solicit the intercession of the angels and saints reigning with Christ in heaven; but in this, when done according to the principles and spirit of the Catholic Church, there is nothing of superstition, nothing which is not consistent with true piety. For the Catholic Church teaches her children not to pray to the saints as to the authors or givers of divine grace, but only to solicit the saints in heaven to pray for them in the same sense as St. Paul desired the faithful on earth to pray for him;” except to consider it as a document well calculated for a Protestant latitude, but liable to be looked upon in Rome as semi-heretical? “What ideas also are we to entertain of the candor or veracity of those Romanists who cease not. after Bossuet and others, to affirm that ‘they only pray to saints to intercede for them ?’ Here is the head of their Church performing a solemn act of worship to the deified Mary, on a day dedicated to her presumed assumption, invoking her, as his patroness and protectress, in a time of great calamity, entreating her to aid him by her heavenly influence to that which would be salutary for the

Church. Is this *only* to pray to her to undertake for us? The leader in this act of devotion is the supreme earthly oracle; the visible, living, speaking guide of the Church. If this be not idolatry, then idolatry exists only in name” (Elliott, p. 754). Nor do we find in the present pontiff less devotion to the Virgin, if we may base our knowledge on the official documents issued in his name. In the decree of Dec. 8, 1854, Pius IX urges all Catholics, *colere, invocare, exorare beatissimam Dei genitricem*, translated as follows by the *Tablet* (Jan. 27): “Let all the children of the Catholic Church most dear to us hear these words; and, with a most ardent zeal of piety and love, *proceed to worship, invoke, and pray to* the most Blessed Virgin Mary, Mother of God, conceived without original sin” — the head of the Roman Catholic Church urging on his subjects a *greater* zeal and ardor in the worship of Mary than that which St. Alfonso had displayed. In the same decree he states that “the true object of this devotion” is Mary’s “conception.” How that act can be an object of devotion, it is difficult intelligently to imagine. But such is *Mariolatry*. Not only do we now find the adoration of the Mother of God permitted, but actually *commanded*. “The devout Roman Catholic,” says Cramp (p. 400) justly, “pays Mary the most extravagant honor and veneration. The language adopted in addressing the ‘Queen of heaven’ cannot be acquitted of the charge of blasphemy, since prayers are offered directly to her as if to a divine being, and blessings are supplicated as from one who is able to bestow them. In all devotions she has a share. The *Ave Maria* accompanies the *Pater Noster*. ‘Evening, morning, and at noon,’ said the Psalmist, ‘will I pray unto thee, and cry aloud;’ the pious Roman Catholic transfers these services to the Virgin. In tender childhood he is taught to cherish for her the profoundest reverence and the highest affection; throughout life she is the object of his daily regard, and five solemn festivals, annually observed to her honor, call forth his ardent love and zeal, and in the hour of death he is taught to place reliance on her mercy. To the ignorant devotee she is more than Christ, than God; he believes that she can command her Son, that to her intercession nothing can be denied, and that to her power all things are possible.” But if the Latin Church be adjudged guilty of Mariolatry, it must not be forgotten that the same sentence of condemnation should fall still more heavily on the Greek Church; for “it cannot be denied,” says Pusey (*Eirenicon*, 2:425), “that the orthodox Greek Church does even surpass the Church of Rome in exaltation of the Blessed Virgin in their devotions.”

Mariolatry likewise appears in the favorite prayer to Mary, the angelic greeting, or the *Ave Maria*, which in the Catholic devotions runs parallel with the *Pater Noster*, and of which we had occasion to speak above. It takes its name from the initial words of the salutation of Gabriel to the Holy Virgin at the annunciation of the birth of Christ. It consists of three parts:

- (1) The salutation of the angel (~~4018~~Luke 1:28): *Ave Maria, gratiae plena, Dominius tecuhl!*
- (2) The words of Elizabeth (~~4014~~Luke 1:42): *Benedicta tu in mnulieribus, et benedictusfructus ventris tui, Jesus.*
- (3) The later unscriptural addition, which contains the prayer proper, and is offensive to the Protestant and all sound Christian feeling: *Sancta Maria, mater Dei, ora pro nobis peccatoribus, nunc et in hora mortis. Amen.* (For the English, etc., *SEE AVE MARIA.*) “Formerly this third part, which gave the formula the character of a prayer, was traced back to the anti-Nestorian Council of Ephesus in 431, which sanctioned the expression *mater Dei*, or *Dei genitrix* (θεοτόκος); but Roman archaeologists (e.g. Mast, in *Wetzer und Welte* [Romans Cathol.], *Kirchen-Lexikon*, 1:563) now concede that it is a much later addition, made in the beginning of the 16th century (1508), and that the closing words, *nunc et in hora mortis*, were added even after that time by the Franciscans. But even the first two parts did not come into general use as a standing formula of prayer until the 13th century. From that date the *Ave Mairia* stands in the Roman Church upon a level with the Lord’s Prayer and the Apostles’ Creed, and with them forms the basis of the rosary” (Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* 2:424, 425).

The chief festivals of the Virgin, common to the Western and Eastern churches, celebrating the most important facts and fictions of her life, and in some degree running parallel with the festivals of the birth, resurrection, and ascension of Christ, are the *Conception* (q.v.), the *Nativity* (q.v.), the *Purification* (q.v.), the *Annunciation* (q.v.), the *Visitation* (q.v.), and the *Assumption* (q.v.). All these festivals are observed also in the English Church, but from a quite different standpoint, of course. The Roman Church has, besides these, several special festivals, with appropriate offices—all, however, of minor solemnity. *SEE MARY, THE VIRGIN.*

Origin of Mariolatry. — We have detailed somewhat at length the views held by the Graeco-Roman theologians on the adoration they consider due

to the Virgin Mary to afford a fair insight into Mariolatry as now practiced. It remains, however, to examine how the *veneration* of Mary degenerated into the *worship* of Mary, a worship which itself “was originally only a reflection of the worship of Christ... designed to contribute to the glorifying of Christ” (Schaff, 2:410). All unbiassed historians agree in regarding the worship of Mary as an echo of ancient heathenism. Polytheism was so deeply rooted among the non-Israelites of the days of Christ that it reproduced itself even among the followers of Jesus, though it is true it appeared clothed in a Christian dress. “The popular religious want,” says Dr. Schaff, “had accustomed itself even to female deities, and very naturally betook itself first of all to Mary, the highly favored and blessed mother of the divine-human Redeemer, as the worthiest object of adoration.” But, though it is apparent that remnants of ancient heathenism thus laid hold even on the newly-found doctrines, it is quite certain also that during the first ages the invocation of the Virgin and of saints must have held a subordinate place in Christian worship, for there is not a word about it in the writings of the fathers of the first five centuries. “We may scan each page that they have left us, and we shall find nothing of the kind. There is nothing of the sort in the supposed works of Hermas and Barnabas, nor in the real works of Clement, Ignatius, and Polycarp; that is, the doctrine is not to be found in the 1st century. There is nothing of the sort in Justin Martyr, Tatian, Athenagoras, Theophilus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian; that is, in the 2d century. There is nothing of the sort in Origen, Gregory Thaumaturgus, Cyprian, Methodius, Lactantius; that is, in the 3d century. There is nothing of the sort in Eusebius, Athanasius, Cyril of Jerusalem, Hilary, Macarius, Epiphanius, Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, Ephrem Syrus, Gregory of Nyssa, Ambrose; that is, in the 4th century. There is nothing of the sort in Chrysostom, Augustine, Jerome, Basil of Seleucia, Orosius, Sedulius, Isidore, Theodoret, Prosper, Vincentius Lirinensis, Cyril of Alexandria, popes Leo, Hilarus, Simplicius, Felix, Gelasius, Anastasius, Symmachus; that is, in the 5th century.” Nor is there the least trace of Mariolatry among the remains of the Catacombs. Says a writer in the *London Qu. Rev.* July, 1864, p. 85: “As regards the sacred person of the Virgin, she takes that place only in the art of the Catacombs which the purity of earlier Christianity would lead us to predicate. She is seen there solely in a scriptural and historical sense — in the subject of the Adoration of the Wise Men who found ‘the young child and his mother.’ And this even takes its place among the later productions of classic — Christian art; while the subject of the Nativity, which occurs

on two sarcophagi, evidently belongs to the last decline of that period. With these two exceptions, no trace of a representation of the Virgin can be found in the mural or sculptural art of the Catacombs." We cannot do better than sum up this portion of our subject in the words of the Rev. E. Tyler, to whose conscientious labors every student of Christian antiquities is so much indebted: "We have examined to the utmost of our ability and means the remains of Christian antiquity. Especially have we searched into the writings of those whose works (A.D. 492) received the approbation of the pope and his council at Rome; we have also diligently sought for evidence in the records of the early councils; and we find all the genuine and unsuspected works of Christian writers — not for a few years, or in a portion of Christendom, but to the end of the first five hundred years and more, and in every country in the Eastern and the Western empire, in Europe, in Africa; and in Asia — testifying as with one voice that the writers and their contemporaries knew of no belief in the present power of the Virgin, and her influence with God; no practice, in public or private, of prayer to God through her mediation, or of invoking her for her good offices of intercession, and advocacy, and patronage; no offering of thanks and praise made to her; no ascription of divine honor and glory to her name. On the contrary, all the writers through those ages testify that to the early Christians God was the only object of prayer, and Christ the only heavenly Mediator and Intercessor in whom they put their trust" (p. 290). There is not a shadow of doubt that the origin of the worship of Mary is to be traced to the apocryphal legends of her birth and of her death, which, in the course of time, decorated the life of Mary with fantastic fables and wonders of every kind, and thus furnished a pseudo-historical foundation for an unscriptural Mariology and Mariolatry (compare Janus, *Pope and Council*, p. 34 sq.). It is in these productions of the Gnostics (q.v.) that we find the germ of what afterwards expanded into its present portentous proportions. Some of the legends of her birth are as early as the 2d or 3d century. But to the honor of the Christians of that *day* be it remembered that they unanimously and firmly rejected these legends as fabulous and heretical. Witness the conduct of the Church towards the *Collyridians* (q.v.), and the excesses in the opposite direction it gave rise to by the formation of a sect known as the *Antidicomarianites* (q.v.). "The whole thing," says Epiphanius, when commenting upon the unwarranted practices of the Collyridians, "is foolish and strange, and is a device and deceit of the devil. Let Mary be in honor. Let the Lord be worshipped. Let no one worship Mary" (*Haeret.* 89, in *Opp.* p. 1066, Paris, 1662).

Indeed, down to the time of the Nestorian controversy of A.D. 430, the cultus of the Blessed Virgin, it would appear, was wholly external to the Church, and was regarded as heretical. It was this controversy that first produced a great change of sentiment in men's minds. Nestorius had maintained, or at least it was the tendency of Nestorianism to maintain, not only that our Lord had two natures, the divine and the human (which was right), but also that he was two persons, in such sort that the child born of Mary was not divine, but merely an ordinary human being, until the divinity subsequently united itself to him. This was condemned by the Council of Ephesus in the year 431; and the title **θεοτόκος**, loosely translated "Mother of God," was sanctioned. The object of the council and of the Anti-Nestorians was in no sense to add honor to the Mother, but to maintain the true doctrine with respect to the Son. Nevertheless the result was to magnify the Mother, and, after a time, at the expense of the Son. For now the title **θεοτόκος** became a shibboleth, and in art the representation of the Madonna and Child became the expression of orthodox belief. Very soon the purpose for which the title and the picture were first sanctioned became forgotten, and the veneration of Mary began to spread within the Church, as it had previously existed external to it. The legends, too, were no longer treated as apocryphal. Neither were the Gnostics any longer the objects of dread. Nestorians, and afterwards Iconoclasts, in turn became the objects of hatred. The old fables were winked at, and thus they universally became the mythology of Christianity among the southern nations of Europe, while many of the dogmas which they are grounded upon have, as a natural consequence, crept into the faith. "Thenceforth the **εοτόκος** was a test of orthodox Christology, and the rejection of it amounted to the beginning or the end of all heresy. The overthrow of Nestorianism was at the same time the victor of Mary-worship. With the honor of the Son, the honor also of the Mother was secured. The opponents of Nestorius, especially Proclus, his successor in Constantinople († 447), and Cyril of Alexandria († 444), could scarcely find predicates enough to express the transcendent glory of the Mother of God. She was the crown of virginity, the indestructible temple of God, the dwelling-place of the Holy Trinity, the paradise of the second Adam, the bridge from God to man, the loom of the incarnation, the scepter of orthodoxy; through her the Trinity is glorified and adored, the devil and daemons put to flight, the nations converted, and the fallen creature raised to heaven. The people were all on the side of the Ephesian decision, and gave vent to their joy in boundless enthusiasm, amid bonfires, processions,

and illuminations” (Schaff, 2:426). “Yet it is not exactly the fact that the giving of this title (Theotokos) was the cause of the *cultus*, for some of the fathers before that time had employed the word to express the doctrine of the incarnation, as the two Gregorids did; it was the Nestorian heretics who really drove the Catholic mind to paying her the tribute of devotion; and even then it seems as if the *cultus* of that time was far more in honor of the Son than of the Mother, more a mode of testifying the belief in the verity of the true doctrine of the incarnation, denied by the heretics, than of giving her an undue worship. When she was addressed as the ‘Mother of God,’ when she was represented as the Mother with her infant Son, she appeared, it is true, as the prominent figure; but it was to express clearly the Catholic doctrine of the in, carnation-the two natures in the one person of Christ. We can see how easily the mind of the worshipper would penetrate further, and, from looking at her merely as the Theotokos, would see in the Mother of God one possessed of a mother’s influence and power” (*Christian Remembrancer*, 1868, July, p. 136,137).

From this time the worship of Mary grew apace; it agreed well with many natural aspirations of the heart. To paint the mother of the Savior an ideal woman, with all the grace and tenderness of womanhood, and yet with none of its weaknesses, and then to fall down and worship that which the imagination had set up, was what might easily happen, and did happen. Evidence was not asked for. Perfection was becoming the mother of the Lord, therefore she was perfect. Adoration “was befitting” on the part of Christians, therefore they gave it. Any tales attributed to antiquity were received as genuine, any revelations supposed to be made to favored saints were accepted as true; and the Madonna reigned as queen in heaven, in earth, in purgatory, and over hell. The mother of the Savior soon became the Mother of Salvation, as John of Damascus calls her (*Homil. in Annun.*), “the common salvation of all in extremity” (ἡ πάντων ὁμοῦ τῶν πεπάτων τῆς γῆς κοινὴ σωτηρία). “The alone Mother of God, who art to be worshipped (ἡ προσκυνητή) forever.” Nestorianism lived on, and lives still, when other earlier heresies on the nature of Christ-like Arianism have died; nay, it was once a great ecclesiastical power. Catholics showed their orthodoxy by honoring the Mother of God, their abhorrence of heresy by rendering her worship. Thus arose the story of her assumption, and the festival (Aug. 15) in honor of that supposed event. She then became the *Mater Coronata*, endued with power both in heaven and earth. Language was addressed to her such as belonged only to God; e.g. Peter Damian, in a

sermon (*Isn Natetiv. B. . il.*), speaks thus: “Et data est tibi omnis potestas in coelo et in terra: nil tibi impossibile, cui possibile est desperatos in spem beatitudinis relevare. Quomodo enim illa potestas tuse potentiae poterit obviare, quae de carne tua carnis suscepit originem? Accedis enim ante illud aureum humanae reconciliationis altare, non solum regnans sed imperans, domina non ancilla.” Under such teaching as this we need not wonder at the extent to which her *cultus* went. “From that time,” says Dr. Schaff, “numerous churches and altars were dedicated to the holy Mother of God, the perpetual Virgin; among them also the church at Ephesus in which the anti-Nestorian Council of 431 had sat. Justinian I, in a law, implored her intercession with God for the restoration of the Roman empire, and on the dedication of the costly altar of the church of St. Sophia he expected all blessings for church and empire from her powerful prayers. His general, Narses, like the knights in the Middle Age, was unwilling to go into battle till he had secured her protection. Pope Boniface IV, in 608, turned the Pantheon in Rome into a temple of Mary *ad martyres*; the pagan Olympus into a Christian heaven of gods. Subsequently even her images (made after an original pretending to have come from Luke) were divinely worshipped, and, in the prolific legends of the superstitious Middle Age. performed countless miracles, before some of which the miracles of the Gospel history grow dim. She became almost coordinate with Christ, a joint redeemer, invested with most of his own attributes and acts of grace. The popular belief ascribed to her, as to Christ, a sinless conception, a sinless birth, resurrection and ascension to heaven, and a participation of all power in heaven and earth. She became the center of devotion, cultus, and art, and the popular symbol of power, of glory, and of the final victory of Catholicism over all heresies” (2:424, 425). In the 6th century the practice became general within the Church, both in the East and in the West, and the writers, commencing with the post-Nicene period, which had brought in this innovation with many others, down to the 16th century, are now found to relate the untold privileges of the Virgin, and with an enthusiasm constantly growing until checked by the opposition of the Reformers, we are told of the efficacy of Mary as a mediator with her Son. This devotional enthusiasm was carried to its greatest height by St. Bernard (q.v.), and still more so by Bonaventura (cited above), who, Dr. Wiseman says, was one of the saints and luminaries of the Roman Catholic Church, and every Roman Catholic prays that he may be enlightened by his teaching and benefited by his prayers. It is Bonaventura who gave the following version of the 51st Psalm: “Have pity upon me, O great Queen, who art called the

Mother of Mercy; and, according to the tenderness of that mercy, purify me from my iniquities.” And so it runs throughout. The 149th Psalm is — “Sing a new song in honor of our Queen. Let the just publish her praises in their assemblies. Let the heavens rejoice in her glory; let the isles of the sea and all the earth rejoice therein. Let water and fire, cold and heat, brightness and light, praise her. Let the mouth of the just glorify her; let her praises resound in the triumphant company of the saints. City of God, place thy joy in blessing her, and let songs of praise continually be sung to her by thy illustrious and glorious inhabitants.”

Promotion of Mariolatry by religious Art. — Ever since the condemnation of Nestorius the popular doctrine had found its ablest support in art. The representation of that beautiful group, since popularly known as the Madonna and Child, became the expression of the orthodox faith. “Every one who wished to prove his hatred of the arch-heretic exhibited the image of the maternal Virgin holding in her arms the infant Godhead, either in his house as a picture, or embroidered on his garments, or on his furniture, or his personal ornaments — in short, wherever it could be introduced” (Mrs. Jameson, *Legends of the Madonna*, p. 21). With the extension and popularity of the worship of the Virgin, the multiplication of her image, in every form and material, naturally enough spread throughout Christendom, until suddenly checked by the iconoclastic movements of the 8th century, **SEE ICONOCLASM**, and, descending the Middle Ages, we find Christian art generally at its lowest ebb in the 10th and 11th centuries. The pilgrimages to the Holy Land and the Crusades mark the renaissance, but it was not until the 13th century that Mariolatry received more aid from religious art. Then the popular enthusiasm was kindled anew by the exertions of Bonaventura, and by the formation of many chivalric brotherhoods that vowed her especial service (as the *Serviti*, who were called in France *les esclaves de Marie*), and by the action of the great religious communities, at this time comprehending all the enthusiasm, learning, and influence of the Church. These had placed themselves solemnly and especially under the protection of the Virgin. “The Cistercians wore white in honor of her purity; the Servi wore black in respect to her sorrows; the Franciscans had enrolled themselves as champions of the immaculate conception; and the Dominicans introduced the Rosary. All these richly endowed communities vied with each other in multiplying churches, chapels, and pictures in honor of their patroness, and expressive of her several attributes. The devout painter, kneeling before his easel,

addressed himself to the task of portraying these heavenly lineaments, which had visited him perhaps in dreams. Many of the professed monks and friars became themselves accomplished artists" (Mrs. Jameson). Poetry also came to the altar of sacrilege, and made her offering in the person of the immortal Dante, who, "through the communion of mind, not less than through his writings, infused into religious art that mingled theology, poetry, and mysticism which ruled in the Giottesque school during the following century, and went hand in hand with the development of the power and practice of imitation.... His ideas respecting the Virgin Mary were precisely those to which the writings of St. Bernard, St. Bonaventura, and St. Thomas Aquinas had already lent all the persuasive power of eloquence, and the Church all the weight of her authority" (Mrs. Jameson). He hastened to render these doctrines into *poetry*, and in the *Paradiso* Mary figures as the Mystic Rose (Rosa mystical and Queen of heaven, with the attendant angels, circle within circle, floating round her in adoration, and singing the Regina Coeli, and saints and patriarchs stretching forth their hands towards her. "Thus," says Mrs. Jameson (p. 30), "the impulses given... continued in progressive development... the spiritual sometimes in advance of the material influences; the moral idea emanating, as it were, from the soul, and the influences of external nature flowing *into* it; the comprehensive power of fancy using more and more the apprehensive power of imitation, and both working together till their 'blended might' achieved its full fruition in the works of Raphael" (q.v.). The Hussite war, and the iconoclastic spirit of the Bohemians, rather strengthened the Churchmen than otherwise, and contributed to the growth of the impulse to worship Mary. But strange fancies were now as freely interpolated in the productions of the artist, which, though themselves but "the reflex influence of that interpolation of new doctrines which had been going on in the Church for so many centuries" (Hill, *Engl. Monasticism*, p. 320), nevertheless received the disapproval of pious Catholics of that age, who "cried out 'temerarium, scandalosum, et periculosum,' when they saw the most solemn spectacle in the world's history made the sport of wanton imaginations... the sorrow of the cross made to rest more heavily upon the mother of Christ than upon him" (Hill). The Council of Trent felt itself forced to denounce the impropriety of certain pictures, and it was generally acknowledged that paganized and degenerate influences had overruled spiritual art, that the latter was indeed no more, that "it was dead; it could never be revived without a return to those modes of thought and belief which had at first inspired it" (Mrs. Jameson).

Just at this time “theological art,” as Mrs. Jameson calls it, came to the rescue of Mariolatry. It is true the Reformation at the opening of the 11th century had dealt a severe blow at all the various institutions of Romanism savoring of idolatry and superstition, but this was only an additional reason why the Church of St. Peter should seek to fortify herself the more strongly in the fortress so severely assailed by the enemy. Mariolatry had served her purpose ably, and just now, if ever, needed re-enforcing. Deprived of the aid of “religious art,” the poets and artists no longer wrought up to a wild pitch of enthusiasm to inspire the spirit of worship of the Virgin, the infallible guide of the Church himself came to the rescue, and supplied by “theological art” what was needed. In 1571 the battle of Lepanto was fought. In it the combined fleets of Christendom, led by Don Juan of Austria, were arrayed against the Turks, and achieved a memorable victory over the devout adherents of the prophet of Mecca. Pope Pius V quickly availed himself of this opportunity to attribute the victory “to the special interposition of the Blessed Virgin.” From a very early period in Mariolatry we find festivals instituted in honor of the “Blessed Virgin,” but now a new festival, that of the Rosary, was added to those already observed, a new invocation added to her litany, under the title of *Auxilium Christianorum*, and, more than all, many sanctuaries were declared to be especially sacred to her worship, and thus a prominence was given to her devotion which found its full expression only in our own day. on Dec. 8, 1854, when this dogma, conceived in the silence of the cell by the brain of infatuated monks, was canonized by a helpless pontiff, and the doctrine established “that not only did the Virgin Mary immaculately conceive her son Jesus Christ (as Protestants hold), but was as immaculately conceived herself” (Hill, p. 314; comp. Krauth, *Conservative Reformation*, p. 381 sq.). Well, indeed, may it be said that “the controversy with Rome threatens more and more to resolve itself into the question whether the creed of Christendom is to be based upon the life of Jesus or the life of Mary, upon the canonical or the apocryphal Gospels” (Plumptre, *Christ and Christendom* [Boyle Lect. 1866], p. 342). Need we wonder, then, that Bishop Bull waxes warm when this abomination presents itself for his comments, and is made to speak in the following severe strain: “We abominate the impious imposture of those who have translated the most humble and holy Virgin into an idol of pride and vanity, and represented her as a vainglorious and aspiring creature; like Lucifer (I tremble at the comparison), thirsting after divine worship and honor, and seeking out superstitious men and women, whom she may oblige to her more special service, and make them her perpetual votaries.

For what greater affront than this could they have offered to her humility and sanctity? How fulsome, yea, how perfectly loathsome to us are the tales of those that have had the assurance to tell us of the amorous addresses of the Blessed Virgin to certain persons, her devout worshippers, choosing them for her husbands, bestowing her kisses liberally on them, giving them her breasts to suck, and presenting them with bracelets and rings of her hair as love-tokens ‘The fables of the Jewish Talmudists, yea, of Mohammed, may seem grave, serious, and sober histories, compared to these and other such impudent fictions. Insomuch that wise men have thought that the authors of these romances in religion were no better than the tools and instruments of Satan, used by him to expose the Christian religion, and render it ridiculous, and thus introduce atheism. And, indeed, we are sure that the wits of Italy, where these abominable deceits have been and are chiefly countenanced, were the first broachers and patrons of infidelity and atheism in Europe, since the time that Christianity obtained in it.’ ‘We honor the Virgin Mary,’ says Mr. Endell Tyler (*Worship*, p. 391), one of the latest and most critical students of early Church history and Christian antiquities, ‘we love her memory, we would, by God’s grace, follow her example in faith and humility, meekness and obedience; we bless God for the wonderful work of salvation, in effecting which she was a chosen vessel; we call her a blessed saint and a holy Virgin; we cannot doubt of her eternal happiness through the merits of him who was ‘God of the substance of his Father before the world, and man of the substance of his mother born in the world.’ But we cannot address religious phrases to her; we cannot trust in her merits, or intercession, or advocacy, for our acceptance with God; we cannot invoke her for any blessing, temporal or spiritual; we cannot pray to God through her intercession, or for it. This in us would be sin. We pray to God alone; we offer religious praise, our spiritual sacrifices, to God alone; we trust in God alone; we need no other mediator, we apply to no other mediator, intercessor, or advocate, in the unseen world, but Jesus Christ alone, the Son of God and the Son of man. In this faith we implore God alone, for the sake only of his Son, to keep us steadfast unto death; and, in the full assurance of the belief that this faith is founded on the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief cornerstone, we will endeavor, by the blessing of the Eternal Shepherd and Bishop. of souls, to preserve the same faith, as our Church now professes it, whole and undefiled, and to deliver it down, without spot or stain of superstition, to our children’s children, as their best inheritance forever.’”

Literature. — *Bonaventura, Opera*, vol. 1, part ii, p. 466473 (Mogunt. 1609, folio); Canisius (R. C.), *De Maria Virgine libri quinque* (Ingolst. 1577); Lambertini (R. C.), *Comment. duce de J. Christi, matrisque ejusfestis* (Petav. 1751); Perrone (R. C.), *De Immaculata B. V. Iars-ice conceptu* (Romans 1848) (in defense of the new papal dogma of the sinless conception of Mary); *The Glories of Mary, Mother of God*; transl. from the Italian of blessed Alphonsus Liguori, and carefully revised by a Catholic priest (John Coyne, Dublin, 1833); Horne, *Marliolatry, or Facts and Evidences*, etc. (Lond. 1841); Townsend, *Travels in Spain; Abstract of the Douay Catechism*, p. 76; *The Garden of the Soul*; Jowett, *Christian Researches in the Mediterranean*; *Roman Catholic Missal for the Use of the Laity*; Gilly, *Tour in Piedmont*; Graham, *Three Months' Residence in the Mountains East of Rome*; *Laity's Directory*, 1833; *Greg. P. XVI Epist. Ency.* 18 Kalend. Sept. 1832; S. Antonini *Suznmic Theol.* pars iv, tit. xv, p. 911-1270; Farrar, *Eccles. Dict.*; Elliott, *Delineation of Romanism*, bk. iv, p. 754 sq.; Hook, *Church Dict.*; Cramp, *Text-Book of Popery*, p. 400 sq.; Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* 2:409 sq.; Mrs. Jameson, *Legends of the Madonna*, especially the *Introduction*; Tyler, *Worship of the Blessed Virgin Mary* (Lond. 1844); Mozley, *Moral and Devotional Theol. Ch. of Rome* (Lond. 1857); Lord Lindsay, *Christian Art* (London. 1847), vol. i: Miss Twining, *Symbols of Early Christian Art*; F. W. Genthe, *Die Jungfrau Maria, ihre Evangelien u. ihre Wunder* (Halle, 1852); *Bible and Missal*, p. 1, 35; *Christian Remembrancer*, July, 1852, p. 200; 1854; Oct. 1855, art. vi; July, 1868, art. vii; *Conteip. Rev.* Nov. 1868, p. 454; *Brit. und For. Ev. Rev.* Oct. 1866, p. 729. Comp. also the elaborate, article *Maria, Mutter des Herrn*, by Steitz, in Herzog's *Real-Encyklop.* 9:74 sq.; and the article *Maria, die heil. Jungfrau*, by Reithmayr (R. C.), in Wsetzer und Welte, *Kirch.-Lex.* 6:835 sq.; also the *Eirenicon* controversy between Pusey and Newman (1866). (J. I. W.)

Marion, Elie,

a prophet of the Cevennes, was born in 1678 at Barre. Being destined for the bar by his family, he studied for that profession till October, 1701, when he became possessed with the religious fanaticism of the Camisards, and returned to his native country in order to take part in the movement already began there. He shortly after announced himself a prophet. He joined a troop of Camisards and became their leader, but soon capitulated to marshal Villars (Nov. 1704), and was expelled from the kingdom. After a brief stay in Geneva and Lausanne, he yielded to the solicitations of

Flottard, and returned to France with more Camisards. Not succeeding in the enterprise which he meditated, he obtained a new capitulation, and returned to Geneva in August, 1705. The following year he went to England. A great number of refugees hastened part way to meet him. The sensation which they produced was profound, and their feigned inspiration was the cause of a lively controversy. *SEE FRENCH PROPHETS*. Marion having publicly denounced both episcopacy and royalty, the government obliged him to leave England. He then went to Germany, where he found a few adherents. His works are *Avertissements prophetiques d'Elie Marion, ou discours prononces par sa bouche, sous l'inspiration du Saint-Esprit et fidelement regus dans le temps qu'il parlait* (Lond. 1707, 8vo): — *Cri d'Alarme, ou alvertissement aux nations qui sortent de Babylone* (London, 1712, 8vo): — *Quand vous aurez saccage, vous serez saccages* (Lond. 1714, 8vo): — *Plan de la justice de Dieu sur le terre dans ces derniersjours* (Lond. 1714, 8vo). Letters signed by Allut, Marion, Fatio and Pourtales, translated into Latin, were published by Fatio (1714, 8vo). See Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Gener.* vol. 33:791.

Maris

a name of frequent occurrence among the Orientals, and especially in Syria and Persia.

- 1.** The later Nestorians circulated a legend concerning a person of this name, whom they claimed to have been one of the seventy-two disciples of Christ, a disciple of Thaddueus, colaborer with Thomas, and founder and first bishop of the Church at Seleucia-Ctcsiphson. This legend is connected with that of Abgarus (q.v.), and deserves no credit. The Chaldaean Christians class him with their principal saints as the Apostle of Mesopotamia, and ascribe to him the composition of their liturgy in part.
- 2.** A second Maris, better known in the West, is noted solely because to him is addressed the letter of Ibas, president of the theological school at Edessa, which is preserved in Mansi (t. ix, col. 298-300), among the acts of the fifth oecumenical council held at Constantinople in 553, and which the Nestorians afterwards regarded as a kind of confession of faith.
- 3.** Another Maris as was surnamed *Bar-Tobi*. He became patriarch of the Persian Nestorians in 987, and is remarkable as the first patriarch who derived his authority from the caliphs.

4. A fourth of this name, distinguished by the name of *Solomon's son*, lived in the 12th century, and wrote a history in Arabic of the Nestorian patriarchs, of which Assemani (*Bibliotheca Orient.* 3:554 sq., 581 sq.) furnishes an epitome.

5. Finally, Theodoret (q.v.) narrates an anecdote of still another Maris, which is noteworthy chiefly because of the light which it throws on the views of that bishop, and of the use which Romanists have made of it. Maris was a hermit, who had long desired to see "the most sacred, mysterious sacrifice" offered, and Theodoret joyfully complied with his wish. The sacred vessels were taken to his retreat, the hands of the deacons served as an altar, "and thus," says the bishop, "I offered the mysterious, divine, and saving sacrifice" in his presence. Romish writers find in these words of the distinguished father and historian of the 5th century an argument in favor of the Mass. See Theodoret, *Religiosa historia*, c. 2; Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 12:769. *SEE NESTORIUS.*

Mar'isa

(Μαρισά), the Graecized form (2 Maccabees 12:35) of MARESHA (q.v.).

Marius, Avenicus

a Swiss prelate, was born of a noble French family of Autun, near the middle of the 6th century. From childhood he was destined for the Church, and his literary remains furnish evidence that he received a careful training. He was made bishop of Avenicum, now Avenches, in the canton Waadt, in 573, or, as some state, in 580. The times were tumultuous, the population depleted, the country impoverished. In these circumstances he distinguished himself by a praiseworthy frugality, and a devotion to agricultural pursuits that furnished the means for a lavish liberality. He was bounteous to the poor, and generous to the Church. In honor of Mary **θεοτόκος**, he rebuilt the town of Payerne (Paterniacum) on his own lands, and dedicated its church to her; he also donated to this church many of his adjoining lands, on condition, however, that the chapter of Lausanne should derive its tithes from Payerne and two neighboring towns. In the specific work of the episcopal office he was tireless model ecclesiastic for the times. Serving his God with reverence and in humility, he was an impartial judge, a protector of the oppressed, and a devoted shepherd to his flock. Towards the close of his life he translated his see to Lausanne, which from that time gave its name to the diocese. The only additional fact

connected with his life that has come to our knowledge is that he was present at the Synod of Macon in 585, which was convened by Guntram, a son of Chlotar, to attempt the purification of the Church in his dominions by executing justice on unworthy members of the clergy. Marius is supposed to have died in 593, and was commemorated at first on the 31st of December, but now on the 4th of February. His *Annals*, a continuation of the work of Prosper Aquit., are the only writings of his that have reached our time which may justly be ascribed to him. They were published at Paris, in the collections of Du Chesne and Dom Bouquet; at Venice, in the *Bibliotheca veter. patrum*; and, the best manual, by Rickly, in the *Memoires et documens publics par la societe d'histoire de la Suisse Romande*, ton. 13: See Zurlauben, *Memoire sur Marius*, in the *Meims. de l'A cad. roy. des inscript.* (Paris, 1770); Herzog, *Real-Encycloped.* 9:108 sq.; Wetzter und Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, 6:891.

Marius, Mercator

a layman in the Church of the 4th century, flourished at Constantinople after 421. Dr. Murdock, the editor of Mosheim, says that Marius Mercator “was undoubtedly a layman, a friend and admirer of Augustine, and an active defender of his doctrines from A.D. 418 to the year 451.” Dr. Schaff (*Ch. Hist.* vol. iii), however, speaks of Marius Mercator first as a layman (p. 716), and later (p. 784) mentions him as a learned Latin monk in Constantinople (A.D. 428-451). Marius Mercator was, so supposes his biographer Baluze (*Præfat. in Mercat.* p. 7), an African by birth, who went to Rome about 417, when Julius and the other Pelagian chiefs were disputing in the Eternal City, and then and there produced a work against the Pelagian heresy, which is probably the *Hypognosticon*, printed in the Appendix of vol. 10 of the works of St. Augustine (comp. Ceillier, *Hist. des Aut. Stc.* 8:498 sq.). Ceillier gives us 421 (p. 501) as the date of Marius Mercator’s arrival at Constantinople, and as the date of his decease 449 (p. 507); and says, “On ne voit pas qu’il ait été employé dans le ministère ecclésiastique, et il ne prend d’autre qualité dans ses écrits que celle de serviteur de Jésus-Christ.” Marius Mercator’s works as collected are almost wholly translations from the Greek fathers, particularly Nestorius, Theodosius of Mopsuestia, Cyril of Alexandria, Proclus, Theodoret, etc., accompanied with prefaces and notes or strictures by the translator. Himself one of the most bitter opponents of Pelagianism (q.v.), his writings are all designed to confute either the Pelagian or Nestorian errors. They were edited, with notes, by Joh. Garnier (Paris, 1673, folio), and still better

by Stephen Baluze (*Opera*, Stephanus Baluzius ad fidem veterum codicum MSS. emendavit, et notis illustravit, Paris, 1684, 8vo). (J. H. W.)

Mark

(**Μάρκος**, from the frequent Latin surname *Marcus*, as the word is Anglicized only in ^{<51040>}Colossians 4:10; Philemon 24; ^{<6163>}1 Peter 5:13), the evangelist, is probably the same as “John whose surname was Mark” (^{<4122>}Acts 12:12, 25). Grotius indeed maintains the contrary, on the ground that the earliest historical writers nowhere call the evangelist by the name of John, and that they always describe him as the companion of Peter and not of Paul. But John was the Jewish name, and Mark, a name of frequent use among the Romans, was adopted afterwards, and gradually superseded the other. The places in the N.T. enable us to trace the process. The John Mark of ^{<4122>}Acts 12:12, 25, and the John of ^{<4135>}Acts 13:5, 13, becomes Mark only in ^{<4153>}Acts 15:39; ^{<51040>}Colossians 4:10; ^{<51041>}2 Timothy 4:11; Philemon 24. The change of John to Mark is analogous to that of Saul to Paul; and we cannot doubt that the disuse of the Jewish name in favor of the other is intentional, and has reference to the putting away of his former life, and entrance upon a new ministry. No inconsistency arises from the accounts of his ministering to two apostles. The desertion of Paul (^{<4133>}Acts 13:13) may have been prompted partly by a wish to rejoin Peter and the apostles engaged in preaching in Palestine (Benson; see Kuinol’s note), and partly from a disinclination to a perilous and doubtful journey. There is nothing strange in the character of a warm impulsive young man, drawn almost equally towards the two great teachers of the faith, Paul and Peter. Had mere cowardice been the cause of his withdrawal, Barnabas would not so soon after have chosen him for another journey, nor would he have accepted the choice.

John Mark was the son of a certain Mary, who dwelt at Jerusalem, and was therefore probably born in that city (^{<4122>}Acts 12:12). He was of Jewish parentage (^{<51040>}Colossians 4:10). He was the cousin (**ἀνεὶ ἰός**) of Barnabas (^{<51040>}Colossians 4:10). It was to Mary’s house, as to a familiar haunt, that Peter came after his deliverance from prison (^{<4122>}Acts 12:12), and there found “many gathered together praying;” and probably John Mark was converted by Peter from meeting him in his mother’s house, for he speaks of “Marcus my son” (^{<6163>}1 Peter 5:13). This term has been taken as implying the natural relation by Bengel, Neander, Credner, Hottinger, Tholuck, Stanley (*Serm. on the Apost. Age*, p. 95), but this is contrary to

the view of the earlier writers (Origen, ap. Eusebius, *H. E.*, 6:25; Eusebius, *H. E.* 2:15; Jerome, *De Vir. h. c.* 8). The theory that he was one of the seventy disciples is without any warrant. Another theory, that an event of the night of our Lord's betrayal (A.D. 29), related by Mark alone, is one that befell himself (Olshausen, Lange), must not be so promptly dismissed. "There followed him a certain young man, having a linen cloth cast about his naked body; and the young men laid hold on him: and he left the linen cloth, and fled from them naked" (^{<4151>}Mark 14:51, 52). The detail of facts is remarkably minute; the name only is wanting. The most probable view is that Mark suppressed his own name, while telling a story which he had the best means of knowing. Awakened out of sleep, or just preparing for it, ill some house in the valley of Kedron, he comes out to see the seizure of the betrayed Teacher, known to him and in some degree beloved already. He is so deeply interested in his fate that he follows him even in his thin linen robe. His demeanor is such that some of the crowd are about to arrest him; then, "fear overcoming shame" (Bengel), he leaves his garment in their hands and flees. We call only say that if the name of Mark is supplied, the narrative receives its most probable explanation. John (^{<4040>}John 1:40; 19:26) introduces himself in this unobtrusive way, and perhaps Luke the same (John 24:18). Mary the mother of Mark seems to have been a person of some means and influence, and her house a rallying point for Christians in those dangerous days (^{<4121>}Acts 12:12). A.D. 44. Her son, already an inquirer, would soon become more. Anxious to work for Christ, he went with Paul and Barnabas as their "minister" (^{<4125>}ὕπηρέτης) on their first journey; but at Perga, as we have seen above, turned back (^{<4125>}Acts 12:25; 13:13). On the second journey Paul would not accept him again as a companion, but Barnabas his kinsman was more indulgent; and thus he became the cause of the memorable "sharp contention" between them (^{<4155>}Acts 15:36-40). Whatever was the cause of Mark's vacillation, it did not separate him forever from Paul, for we find him by the side of that apostle in his first imprisonment at Rome (^{<5040>}Colossians 4:10; ^{<5024>}Philemon 1:24). A.D. 56. In the former place a possible journey of Mark to Asia is spoken of. Somewhat later he is with Peter at Babylon (^{<4153>}1 Peter 5:13). Some consider Babylon to be a name here given to Rome in a mystical sense — surely without reason, since the date of a letter is not the place to look for a figure of speech. Of the causes of this visit to Babylon there is no evidence. It may be conjectured that he made the journey to Asia Minor (^{<5040>}Colossians 4:10), and thence went on to join Peter at Babylon. On his return to Asia he seems to have been with

Timothy at Ephesus when Paul wrote to him during his second imprisonment, and Paul was anxious for his return to Rome (¹2 Timothy 4:11). A.D. 64.

When we desert Scripture we find the facts doubtful, and even inconsistent. If Papias be trusted (quoted in Eusebius, *H. E.* 3:39), Mark never was a disciple of our Lord, which he probably infers from ¹1 Peter 5:13. Epiphanius, on the other hand, willing to do honor to the evangelist, adopts the tradition that he was one of the seventy-two disciples who turned back from our Lord at the hard saying in John 6 (*Cont. Haer.* 51:6, p. 457, Dindorf's recent edition). The same had been said of Luke. Nothing can be decided on this point. The relation of Mark to Peter is of great importance for our view of his Gospel. Ancient writers with one consent make the evangelist the interpreter (*ἑρμηνευτής*) of the apostle Peter (Papias in Eusebius, *H. E.* 3:39; Irenaeus, *Haer.* 3:1; 3:10, 6; Tertullian, *c. Marc.* 4:5; Jerome, *ad Ifedib.* vol. ix, etc.). Some explain this word to mean that the office of Mark was to translate into the Greek tongue the Aramaic discourses of the apostle (Eichhorn, Bertholdt, etc.); while others adopt the more probable view that Mark wrote a Gospel which conformed more exactly than the others to Peter's preaching, and thus "interpreted" it to the Church at large (Valesius, Alford, Lange, Fritzsche, Meyer, etc.). The passage from Eusebius favors the latter view; it is a quotation from Papias. "This also [John] the elder said: Mark, being the interpreter of Peter, wrote down exactly whatever things he remembered, but yet not in the order in which Christ either spoke or did them; for he was neither a hearer nor a follower of the Lord's, but he was afterwards, *as I [Papias] said, a follower of Peter.*" The words in italics refer to the word *interpreter* above, and the passage describes a disciple writing down what his master preached, and not an interpreter orally translating his words. **SEE MARK, GOSPEL OF.** The report that Mark was the companion of Peter at Rome is no doubt of great antiquity. Clement of Alexandria is quoted by Eusebius as giving it for "a tradition which he had received of the elders from the first" (*παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνεκὰθεν πρεσβυτέρων*, Eusebius, *H. E.* 6:14; Clem. Alex. *Hyp.* p. 6). But the force of this is invalidated by the suspicion that it rests on a misunderstanding of ¹1 Peter 5:13, Babylon being wrongly taken for a typical name of Rome (Eusebius, *H. E.* 2:15; Jerome, *De Vir. ill.* c. 8). Sent on a mission to Egypt by Peter (Epiphanius, *Haer.* 2:6, p. 457, Dindorf; Eusebius, *H. E.* 2:16), Mark there founded the Church of Alexandria (Jerome, *De Vir. ill.* c. 8),

and preached in various places (Nicephorus, *H. E.* 2:43), then returned to Alexandria, of which Church he was bishop, and suffered a martyr's death (Nicephorus, *ibid.* and Jerome, *De Vir. ill.* c. 8) in the eighth year of Nero. According to the legend, his remains were obtained from Alexandria by the Venetians through a pious stratagem, and conveyed to their city, A.D. 827. Venice was thenceforward solemnly placed under his protection, and the lion, which mediaeval theology had selected from the apocalyptic beasts as his emblem, became the standard of the republic. The place of the deposition of his body having been lost, a miracle was subsequently wrought for its discovery, A.D. 1094, which figures in many famous works of art. Where his remains now lie is, according to the Roman Catholic Eustacius, "acknowledged to be an undivulged secret; or, perhaps, in less cautious language, to be utterly unknown.

Mark, Gospel Of,

the second of the evangelical narratives in the N.T. Although the shortest of the four Gospels, its treatment is beset with difficulties in some respects peculiar to itself. *SEE NEW TESTAMENT.*

I. Authorship. — The voice of the Church with one consent assigns our second Gospel to Mark, the "son" (~~of~~ 1 Peter 5:17) and "interpreter" (Papias, ap. Eusebius, *H. E.* 3:39) of Peter. The existence of this ascription is the best evidence of its truth. Had not Mark been its author, no sufficient reason can be given for its having borne the name of one so undistinguished in the history of the Church. His identity with the "John Mark" of the Acts and Epistles has usually been taken for granted, nor (see last article) is there any sufficient ground for calling it in question. It must, however, be acknowledged that there is no early testimony for the fact—as there is none *against* it — which appears first in the preface to the *Commentary* on the evangelist usually attributed to Victor of Antioch, cir. A.D. 407 (Cramer, *Catena*, 1:263), and in a note of Ammonius (*ibid.* ii, iv), where it is mentioned with some expression of doubt *τάχα οὗτός ἐστιν Μάρκος ὁ εὐαγγελιστής πιθανὸς δὲ ὁ λόγος* (Westcott, *Introd.* p. 212). An argument in favor of their identity has been drawn with much acuteness by Tregelles (*Journ. of Philol.* 1855, p. 224; Horne's *Introd. to N.T.* p. 433) from the singular epithet "stump-fingered," *κολοβοδάκτυλος*, applied to the evangelist in the *Philosophumena*, 7:30, as illustrated by the words of the Latin preface found in some MSS. "at least nearly coeval with Jerome," "amputasse sibi post fidem pollicem

dicitur ut sacerdotio reprobis haberetur;” as if, by his desertion of the apostles (⁴¹³³Acts 13:13), he had become figuratively a “pollice truncus” — a poltroon.

II. Source of this Gospel. — The tradition of the early Church asserts that Mark wrote his Gospel under the special influence and direction of the apostle Peter. The words of John the presbyter, as quoted by Papias (Eusebius, *H. E.* 3:39), are explicit on this point: “This, then, was the statement of the elder: Mark, having become Peter’s interpreter (ἑρμηνευτής), wrote accurately all that he remembered (ἐμνημόνευσε); but he did not record the words and deeds of Christ in order (οὐ μὲν τοι τάξει τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἢ λεχθέντα ἢ πραχθέντα), for he was neither a hearer nor a follower of our Lord, but afterwards, as I said, became a follower of Peter, who used to adapt his instruction to meet the requirements of his hearers, but not as making a connected arrangement of our Lord’s discourses (ἀλλ’ οὐχ σπερσύνταξιν τῶν κυριακῶν ποιούμενος λόγων); so Mark committed no error in writing down particulars as he remembered them (ἔνια γρά ας ὡς ἀπεμνημόνευσεν), for he made one thing his object — to omit nothing of what he heard, and to make no erroneous statement in them.” The value of this statement, from its almost apostolic date, is great, though too much stress has been laid upon some of its expressions by Schleiermacher and others, to discredit the genuineness of the existing Gospel of Mark. In addition to Peter’s teaching having been the basis of the Gospel, we learn from it three facts of the greatest importance for the right comprehension of the origin the he Gospels: “The historic character of the oral Gospel, the special purpose with which it was framed, and the fragmentariness of its contents” (Westcott, *Introd.* p. 186). The testimony of later writers is equally definite, though probably to a certain extent derived from that of Papias. Justin quotes from the present Gospel under the title τὰ ἀπομνημονεύματα Πέτρον. Irenaeus (*H. E.* 3:1) asserts that Mark “delivered in writing the things preached by Peter;” and Origen (*ibid.* 6:25) that he “composed it as Peter directed him” (ὡς Πέτρος ὑφηγήσατο αὐτῷ ποιήσαντα). Clement of Alexandria enters more into detail, and, according to Eusebius’s report of his words (*H. E.* 6:14; 2:15), contradicts himself. He ascribes the origin of the Gospel to the importunity of Peter’s hearers in Rome, who were anxious to retain a lasting record of his preaching from the pen of his ἑρμηνευτής, which, when completed, the apostle viewed with approbation, sanctioning it with his authority, and

commanding that it should be read in the churches; while elsewhere we have the inconsistent statement that when Peter knew what had been done “he neither forbade nor encouraged it.” Tertullian’s testimony is to the same effect: “Marcus quod edidit evangelium Petri affirmatur” (*Adv. Marc.* 6:5); as is that of Eusebius (*H. E.* 3:5) and Jerome (*De Vir. ill.* c. 8; *ad hedib.* c. 2), who in the last passage writes, “Cujus (Marci) evangelium Petro narrante et illo scribente compositum est.” Epiphanius says that, immediately after Matthew, the task of writing a Gospel was laid on Mark, “the follower of Peter at Rome” (*Haer.* 51).

Such, so early and so uniform, is the tradition which connects, in the closest manner, Mark’s Gospel with the apostle Peter. To estimate its value we must inquire how far it is consistent with facts; and here it must be candidly acknowledged that the Gospel itself supplies very little to an unbiased reader to confirm the tradition. The narrative keeps more completely to the common cycle of the Synoptic record, and even to its language, than is consistent with the individual recollections of one of the chief actors in the history; while the differences of detail, though most real and important, are of too minute and refined a character to allow us to entertain the belief that Peter was in any way *directly* engaged in its composition. Any record derived immediately from Peter could hardly fail to have given us far more original matter than the slender additions made by Mark to the common stock of the Synoptical Gospels. It is certainly true that there are a few unimportant passages where Peter is specially mentioned by Mark, and is omitted by one or both of the others (^{<4036>}Mark 1:36; 5:37; 11:20; 13:3; 16:7); but, on the other hand, there are still more numerous and more prominent instances which would almost show that Mark was less intimately acquainted with Peter’s life than they. He omits his name when given by Matthew (^{<4055>}Matthew 15:15; comp. ^{<4077>}Mark 7:17); passes over his walking on the sea (^{<4048>}Matthew 14:28-31; comp. ^{<4061>}Mark 6:50-51), and the miracle of the tribute-money (^{<4074>}Matthew 17:24-27; comp. ^{<4083>}Mark 9:33), as well as the blessing pronounced on him by our Lord, and his designation as the rock on which the Church should be built (^{<4067>}Matthew 16:17-19; comp. ^{<4089>}Mark 8:29, 30). Although Peter was one of the two disciples sent to make ready the Passover (^{<4218>}Luke 22:8), his name is not given by Mark (^{<4143>}Mark 14:13). We do not find in Mark the remarkable words, “I have prayed for thee,” etc. (^{<4231>}Luke 22:31, 32). The notice of his repentance also, ἐπιβαλὼν ἑκκλαίε (14:72), is tame when contrasted with the ἐξελαθὼν ἕξω ἑκκλαυσεν πικρῶς of Matthew

and Luke. Advocates are never at a loss for plausible reasons to support their preconceived views, and it has been the habit from very early times (Eusebius, Chrysostom) to attribute these omissions to the modesty of Peter, who was unwilling to record that which might specially tend to his own honor — an explanation unsatisfactory in itself, and which cannot be applied with any consistency. Indeed, we can hardly have a more striking proof of the readiness with which men see what they wish to see, and make the most stubborn facts bend to their own foregone conclusions, than that a Gospel, in which no unbiassed reader would have discovered any special connection with Peter, should have yielded so many fancied proofs of Petrine origin.

But while we are unable to admit any considerable *direct* influence of Peter in the composition of the Gospel, it is by no means improbable that his oral communications may have *indirectly* influenced it, and that it is to him the minuteness of its details and the graphic coloring which specially distinguish it. are due. While there is hardly any part of its narrative that is not common to it and some other Gospel, in the manner of the narrative there is often a marked character, which puts aside at once the supposition that we have here a mere epitome of Matthew and Luke. The picture of the same events is far more vivid; touches are introduced such as could only be noted by a vigilant eye-witness, and such as make us almost eye-witnesses of the Redeemer's doings. The most remarkable case of this is the account of the demoniac in the country of the Gadarenes, where the following words are peculiar to Mark: "And no man could bind him, no, not with chains: because that he had often been bound with fetters and chains, and the chains had been plucked asunder by him, and the fetters broken in pieces: neither could any man tame him. And always night and day he was in the mountains crying and cutting himself with stones. But when he saw Jesus afar off, he ran," etc. Here we are indebted for the picture of the fierce and hopeless wanderer to the evangelist whose work is the briefest, and whose style is the least perfect. He sometimes adds to the account of the others a notice of our Lord's look (<A034>Mark 3:34; 8:33; 10:21; 10:23); he dwells on human feelings and the tokens of them; on our Lord's pity for the leper, and his strict charge not to publish the miracle (<A044>Mark 1:41, 44); he "loved" the rich young man for his answers (<A021>Mark 10:21); he "looked round" with anger when another occasion called it out (<A035>Mark 3:5); he groaned in spirit (<A074>Mark 7:34; 8:12). All these are peculiar to Mark, and they would be explained most readily by the theory that one of

the disciples most near to Jesus had supplied them. To this must be added that while Mark goes over the same ground for the most part as the other evangelists, and especially Matthew, there are many facts thrown in which prove that we are listening to an independent witness. Thus the humble origin of Peter is made known through him (^{<4016>}Mark 1:16-20), and his connection with Capernaum (^{<4019>}Mark 1:29); he tells us that Levi was “the son of Alphaus” (^{<4014>}Mark 2:14), that Peter was the name given by our Lord to Simon (^{<4016>}Mark 3:16), and Boanerges a surname added by him to the names of two others (^{<4017>}Mark 3:17); he assumes the existence of another body of disciples wider than the twelve (^{<4013>}Mark 3:32; 4:10, 36; 8:34; 14:51, 52); we owe to him the name of Jairus (v. 22), the word “carpenter” applied to our Lord (^{<4013>}Mark 6:3), the nation of the “Syro-Phoenician” woman (^{<4026>}Mark 7:26); he substitutes Dalmanutha for the “Magdala” of Matthew (8:10); he names Bartimeus (10:46); he alone mentions that our Lord would not suffer any man to carry any vessel through the Temple (^{<4016>}Mark 11:16); and that Simon of Cyrene was the father of Alexander and Rufus (^{<4021>}Mark 15:21). Thus in this Gospel the richness in subtle and picturesque touches, by which the writer sets, as it were, the scene he is describing before us in all its outward features, with the very look and demeanor of the actors, betoken the report of an eye-witness; and with the testimony of the early Church before us, which can hardly be set aside, we are warranted in the conclusion that this eye-witness was Peter. Not that the narrative, as we have it, was his; but that when Mark, under the Holy Spirit’s guidance, after separation from his master, undertook the task of setting forth that cycle of Gospel teaching to which — from grounds never yet, nor perhaps ever to be satisfactorily explained — the Synoptists chiefly confine themselves, he was enabled to introduce into it many pictorial details which he had derived from his master, and which had been impressed on his memory by frequent repetition.

III. Relation to Matthew and Luke. — The question of priority of composition among the Synoptic Gospels has long been the subject of vehement controversy, and to judge by the diversity of the views entertained, and the confidence each appears to feel of the correctness of his own, it would seem to be as far as ever from being settled. (For monographs under this head, see Volbeding, *Index*, p. 3; Danz, *Worterbuch*, s.v. Marcus.)

The position of Mark in relation to the other two has, in particular, given rise to the widest differences of opinion. The independence of his record was maintained up to the time of Augustine, but since his day three theories have been entertained.

(a.) That father conceived the view, which, however, he does not employ with much consistency, that Mark was merely “tanquam pedissequus et breviator” of Matthew (*De Consens. EV.* 1:4); and from his day it has been held by many that Mark deliberately set himself to make an abridgment of one or both the other Synoptists. Griesbach expressed this opinion most decidedly in his *Commentatio quo Marci Evangelium totum a Matthaei et Lucae commentariis decemptum esse monstratur* (Jena, 1789-90; also in Velthuysen, *Comment.* 1:360 sq.); and it has been stated in a more or less modified form by Paulus, Schleiermacher, Thiele, De Wette, Delitzsch, Fritzsche, and Bleek, the last two named adding John’s Gospel to the materials before him. Nor can it be denied that at first sight this view is not devoid of plausibility, especially as regards Matthew. We find the same events recorded, and apparently in the same way, and very often in the same words. Mark’s is the shorter work, and that principally, as it would seem, by the omission of the discourses and parables, which are a leading feature in the others. There are in Mark only about three events which Matthew does not narrate (~~40123~~ Mark 1:23; 8:22; 12:41), and thus the matter of the two may be regarded as almost the same. But the form in Mark is, as we have seen. much briefer, and the omissions are many and important. The explanation is that Mark had the work of Matthew before him, and only condensed it. But many would make Mark a compiler from both the others (Griesbach, De Wette, etc.), arguing from passages where there is a curious resemblance to both (see De Wette, *Handbuch*, § 94 a). Yet, though this opinion of the dependence, more or less complete, of Mark upon the other Gospels, was for a long time regarded almost as an established fact, no very searching investigation is needed to show its baselessness. Instead of Mark’s narrative being an abridgment of that of Matthew or of Luke, it is often much fuller. Particulars are introduced which an abridger aiming at condensation would have been certain to prune away if he had found them in his authority; while the freshness and graphic power of the history, the life-like touches which almost put us on the stage with the actors, and his superior accuracy as regards persons, words, times, and places, prove the originality and independence of his work.

(b.) Of late, therefore, opinion has been tending as violently in the opposite direction, and the prevailing view among modern critics is that in Mark we have the primitive Gospel, "*Urevangelium*," from which both those of Matthew and Luke were derived. This is held by Weisse, Wilke, Ewald, Lachmann, Hitzig, Reuss, Ritschel, Thiersch, Meyer, etc., and has lately been maintained with considerable ingenuity in Mr. Kenrick's *Biblical Essays*.

(c.) Hilgenfeld again adopts an intermediate view, and considers Mark to have held a middle position both as regards form and internal character; himself deriving his Gospel from Matthew, and in his turn supplying materials for that of Luke; while doctrinally he is considered to hold the mean between the Judaic Gospel of the first, and the universal Gospel of the third evangelist.

Many formidable difficulties beset each of these theories, and their credit severally is impaired by the fact that the very same data which are urged by one writer as proofs of the priority of Mark, are used by another as irrefragable evidence of its later date. We even find critics, like Baur, bold enough to attribute the vivid details, which are justly viewed as evidences of the independence and originality of his record, to the fancy of the evangelist; thus importing the art of the modern novelist into times and works to the spirit of which it is entirely alien.

So much, however, we may safely grant, while maintaining the substantial independence of each of the Synoptical Gospels — that Mark exhibits the oral tradition of the official life of our Lord in its earliest extant form, and furnishes the most direct representation of the common basis on which they all rest. "In essence, if not in composition," says Mr. Wescott, *Introd.* p. 190 (the two not being necessarily identical, the earlier tradition being perhaps possibly the latest committed to writing), "it is the oldest." The intermediate theory has also so much of truth in it, that Mark does actually occupy the central position in regard to diction; frequently, as it were, combining the language of the other two (1:32; comp. ^{<0186>}Matthew 8:16; ^{<0140>}Luke 4:40: 1:42; comp. ^{<0188>}Matthew 8:3; ^{<0153>}Luke 5:13: 2:13-18; comp. ^{<0189>}Matthew 9:9-14; ^{<0157>}Luke 5:27-33: 4:30-32; comp. ^{<0135>}Matthew 13:31-33; ^{<0138>}Luke 13:18-21), as indeed would naturally be the case if we consider that his Gospel most closely represents the original from which all were developed. In conclusion we may say, that a careful comparison of the three Gospels can hardly fail to convince the unprejudiced reader that,

while Mark adds hardly anything to the general narrative, we have in his Gospel, in the words of Meyer (*Comment.*), “a fresher stream from the apostolic fountain,” without which we should have wanted many important elements for a true conception of our blessed Lord’s nature and work.

If now we proceed to a detailed comparison of the matter contained in the Gospels, we shall find that, awhile the history of the conception, and birth, and childhood of our Lord and his forerunner have no parallel in Mark, afterwards the main course of the narrative (^{<4095>}Luke 9:51-18:14, being of course excepted) is on the whole coincident; and that the difference is mainly due to the absence of the parables and discourses, which were foreign to his purpose of setting forth the *active* ministry of Christ. Of our Lord’s parables he only gives us four: “the sower,” “the mustard seed,” and “the wicked husbandmen” — common also to Matthew and Luke; and one, “the seed growing secretly,” ^{<4095>}Mark 4:26-29 (unless, indeed, it be an abbreviated and independent form of the “tares”), peculiar to himself. Of the discourses, he entirely omits the sermon on the mount, the denunciations against the Scribes and Pharisees, and almost entirely the instructions to the twelve; while of the other shorter discourses he only gives that on fasting (^{<4029>}Mark 2:19-22), the Sabbath (^{<4025>}Mark 2:25-28), the casting out devils by Beelzebub (^{<4023>}Mark 3:23-29), on eating with unwashed hands, and corban (^{<4006>}Mark 7:6-23), and divorce (^{<4105>}Mark 10:5-9). That on “the last things” (chap. 13) is the only one reported at any length. On the other hand, his object being to develop our Lord’s Messianic character in deeds rather than words, he records the greater part of the miracles given by the Synoptists. Of the twenty-seven narrated by them, eighteen are found in Mark, twelve being common to all three; three — the Syro-Phœnician’s daughter, the feeding of the four thousand, and the cursing of the fig tree — common to him and Matthew; one — the daemoniac in the synagogue — to him and Luke; and two — the deaf stammerer (^{<4073>}Mark 7:31-37), and the blind man at Bethsaida (^{<4032>}Mark 8:22-26) (supplying remarkable points of correspondence, in the withdrawal of the object of the cure from the crowd, the use of external signs, and the gradual process of restoration) — peculiar to himself. Of the nine omitted by him, only three are found in Matthew, of which the centurion’s servant is given also by Luke. The others are found in Luke alone. If we suppose that Mark had the Gospels of Matthew and Luke before him, it is difficult to assign any tolerably satisfactory reason for his omission of these miracles, especially that of the centurion’s servant, so

kindred to the object of his work. On the contrary hypothesis, that they copied from him, how can we account for their omitting the two remarkable miracles mentioned above?

The arrangement of the narrative, especially of our Lord's earlier Galilean ministry, agrees with Luke in opposition to that of Matthew, which appears rather to have been according to similarity of subject than order of time.

According to Norton (*Genuineness of Gospels*), there are not more than twenty-four verses in Mark to which parallels, more or less exact, do not exist in the other Synoptists. The same painstaking investigator informs us that, while the *general* coincidences between Mark and one of the other two amount to thirteen fourteenths of the whole Gospel, the *verbal* coincidences are one sixth, and of these four fifths in Mark occur in the recital of the words of our Lord and others; and only one fifth in the narrative portion, which, roughly speaking, forms one half of his Gospel.

Additions peculiar to Mark are, "the Sabbath made for man" ([Mark 2:27](#)); our Lord's friends seeking to lay hold on him ([Mark 3:21](#)); many particulars in the miracles of the Gadarene daemoniac ([Mark 5:1-20](#)); Jairus's daughter, and the woman with issue of blood ([Mark 5:22-43](#)); the stilling of the tempest ([Mark 4:35-41](#)), and the lunatic child ([Mark 9:14-29](#)); the salting with fire ([Mark 9:49](#)); that "the common people heard him gladly" ([Mark 12:37](#)); the command to watch ([Mark 13:33-37](#)); the young man with the linen cloth about his body ([Mark 14:51](#)); the want of agreement between the testimony of the false witnesses ([Mark 14:59](#)); Pilate's investigation of the reality of Christ's death ([Mark 15:44](#)), and the difficulty felt by the women as to the rolling away the stone ([Mark 16:3, 4](#)). Mark has also preserved several words and phrases, and entire sayings of our Lord, which merit close attention ([Mark 1:15](#); [4:13](#); [6:31, 34](#); [Mark 7:8](#); [8:38](#); [9:12, 39](#); [Mark 10:21, 24, 30](#); [11:17](#); [13:32](#); [Mark 14:18-37](#); [16:7 \[15-18\]](#)).

The hypothesis which best meets all these facts is, that while the matter common to all three evangelists, or to two of them, is derived from the oral teaching of the apostles, which they had purposely reduced to a common form, our evangelist writes as an independent witness to the truth, and not as a compiler; and the tradition that the Gospel was written under the sanction of Peter, and its matter in some degree derived from him, is made probable by the evident traces of an eye-witness in many of the narratives. The omission and abridgment of our Lord's discourses, and the sparing use

of O.T. quotations, might be accounted for by the special destination of the Gospel, if we had surer data for ascertaining it; since it was for Gentiles, with whom illustrations from the O.T. would have less weight, and the purpose of the writer was to present a clear and vivid picture of the acts of our Lord's human life, rather than a full record of his divine doctrine. We may thankfully own that, with little that is in substance peculiar to himself, the evangelist does occupy for us a distinct position, and supply a definite want, in virtue of these traits.

IV. Characteristics. — Though this Gospel has little historical matter which is not shared with some other, it would be a great error to suppose that the voice of Mark could have been silenced without injury to the divine harmony. The minute painting of the scenes in which the Lord took part, the fresh and lively mode of the narration, the very absence of the precious discourses of Jesus, which, interposed between his deeds, would have delayed the action, all give to this Gospel a character of its own. It is the history of the war of Jesus against sin and evil in the world during the time that he dwelt as a Man among men. Our Lord is presented to us, not as in Matthew, as the Messiah, the Son of David and Abraham, the theocratic King of the chosen people; nor, as in Luke, as the universal Savior of our fallen humanity; but as the incarnate and wonderworking Son of God, for whose emblem the early Church justly selected “the lion of the tribe of Judah.” His record is emphatically “the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God” (Mark. 1:1), living and working among men, and developing his mission more in acts than by words. The limits of his narrative and its general character can hardly be better stated than in the words of his apostolic teacher, ^{<4403>}Acts 10:36-42. Commencing with the Baptist preaching in the wilderness, and announcing the “Mightier One” who was at hand, he tells us how, at his baptism, “God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power,” and declared him to be his “beloved Son:” gathering up the temptation into the pregnant fact, “He was with the wild beasts;” thus setting the Son of God before us as the Lord of nature, in whom the original grant to man of dominion over the lower creation was fulfilled (Maurice, *Unity of the N.T.* p. 226; Bengel, ad loc.; Wilberforce, *Doctrine of Incarnation*, p. 89. 90). As we advance, we find him detailing every exercise of our Lord's power over man and nature distinctly and minutely — not merely chronicling the incidents, as is Matthew's way, but surrounding them with all the circumstances that made them impressive to the bystanders, and making us feel how deep that impression was; how

great the e a and wonder with which his mighty works and preaching were regarded, not only by the crowd (^{<4012>}Mark 1:22, 27; 2:12; 6:2), but by the disciples themselves (^{<4041>}Mark 4:41; 6:51; 10:24, 26, 32); how the crowds thronged and pressed upon him (^{<4030>}Mark 3:10; 5:21, 31; 6:33; 8:1), so that there was scarce room to stand or sit (^{<4012>}Mark 2:2; 3:32; 4:1), or leisure even to eat (^{<4030>}Mark 3:20; 6:31); how his fame spread the more he sought to conceal it (^{<4045>}Mark 1:45; 3:7; 5:20; 7:36, 37); and how, in consequence, the people crowded about him, bringing their sick (^{<4032>}Mark 1:32-34; 3:10); and whithersoever he entered into villages, or cities, or country, they laid the sick in the streets, and besought that they might touch if it were but the border of his garment: and as many as touched were made perfectly whole” (^{<4056>}Mark 6:56); how the unclean spirits, seeing him, at once fell down before him and acknowledged his power, crying, “Thou art the Son of God” (^{<4023>}Mark 1:23-26; 3:11); how, again, in Peter’s words, “He went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil, for God was with him.”

But while the element of divine power is that which specially arrests our attention in reading his Gospel, there is none in which the human personality is more conspicuous. The single word ὁ τέκτων (6:3) throws a flood of light on our Lord’s early life as man in his native village. The limitation of his knowledge is expressly stated (^{<4132>}Mark 13:32, οὐδὲ ὁ ἰός); and we continually meet with mention of human emotions—anger (^{<4035>}Mark 3:5; 8:12, 33; 10:14), wonder (^{<4036>}Mark 6:6), pity (^{<4064>}Mark 6:34), love (^{<4021>}Mark 10:21), grief (^{<4074>}Mark 7:34; 8:12); and human infirmities — sleep (^{<4038>}Mark 4:38), desire for repose (^{<4061>}Mark 6:31), hunger (^{<4112>}Mark 11:12).

In Mark we have no attempt to draw up a continuous narrative. His Gospel is a rapid succession of vivid pictures loosely strung together (usually by **καί καὶ πάλιν**, or **εὐθὺς**), without much attempt to bind them into a whole, or give the events in their natural sequence. This pictorial power is that which specially characterizes this evangelist; so that, as has been well said, “if any one desires to know an evangelical fact, not only in its main features and grand results, but also in its most minute and, so to speak, more graphic delineation, he must betake himself to Mark” (Da Costa, *Four Witnesses*, p. 88). This power is especially apparent in all that concerns our Lord himself. Nowhere else are we permitted so clearly to behold his very gesture and look; see his very position; to read his feelings and to hear his very words. It is Mark who reveals to us the comprehensive

gaze of Christ (περιβλε ἄμενος, <4086> Mark 3:5, 34; 5:32; 10:23; 11:11); his loving embrace of the children brought to him (ἐναγκαλισάμενος, <4086> Mark 9:36; 10:16); his preceding his disciples, while they follow in awe and amazement (<4072> Mark 10:32). We see him taking his seat to address his disciples (καθίσας, <4084> Mark 9:34), and turning round in holy anger to rebuke Peter (ἐπιστραφεῖς, <4083> Mark 8:33); we hear the sighs which burst from his bosom (<4074> Mark 7:34; 8:12), and listen to his very accents (“Talitha cumi,” v. 41; “Ephphatha,” <4074> Mark 7:34; “Abba,” <4146> Mark 14:36). At one time we have an event portrayed with a freshness and pictorial power which places the whole scene before us with its minute accessories — the paralytic (<4001> Mark 2:1-12), the storm (<4095> Mark 4:36-41), the demoniac (<4050> Mark 5:1-20), Herod’s feast (<4021> Mark 6:21-29), the feeding of the 5000 (<4050> Mark 6:30-45), the lunatic child (<4094> Mark 9:14-29), the young ruler (<4007> Mark 10:17, 22), Bartimeus (<4006> Mark 10:46-52), etc. At another, details are brought out by the addition of a single word (κύ ας, <4007> Mark 1:7; σχιζομένους, <4010> Mark 1:10; σπλαγχνισθεῖς, <4044> Mark 1:41; τοῖς ἕξω, <4041> Mark 4:11; προσωρμίσθησαν, <4063> Mark 6:53; ἔσωθεν, ἕξωθεν, <4021> Mark 7:21, 23; κράξας, σπαράξας, <4026> Mark 9:26; στυγνάσας, <4022> Mark 10:22; συντρί ασα, <4143> Mark 14:3; ἐμβλέ ασα, <4145> Mark 14:67), or by the substitution of a more precise and graphic word for one less distinctive (ἐκβάλλει, <4012> Mark 1:12; ἐξίστασθαι, <4022> Mark 2:12; γεμίζεσθαι <4057> Mark 4:37; ἐξηράνθη i, 5:29; ἀποταξάμενος, <4046> Mark 6:46; ἀθετείτο, <4009> Mark 7:9; ἐκθαμβεῖσθαι, <4143> Mark 14:33). It is to Mark also that we are indebted for the record of minute particulars of persons, places, times, and number, which stamp on his narrative an impress of authenticity.

(1.) *Persons.* — <4002> Mark 1:20; 2:14; 3:5, 17, 32, 34; <4041> Mark 4:11; 5:32, 37, 40; <4064> Mark 6:40, 48; 7:1, 25, 26; <4080> Mark 8:10, 27; 9:15, 36; <4006> Mark 10:16, 23, 35, 46; 11:21, 27; <4100> Mark 13:1, 3; 14:20, 37, 65; <4157> Mark 15:7, 21, 40, 47; 16:7.

(2.) *Places.* — <4028> Mark 1:28; 4:1, 38; 5:11, 20, 21; <4065> Mark 6:55; 7:17, 31; 8:10, 27; <4020> Mark 9:30; 11:4; 12:41; <4146> Mark 14:66; 15:16, 39; 16:5.

(3.) *Time.* — <4032> Mark 1:32, 35; 2:1, 26; <4045> Mark 4:35; 5:2, 18, 21; <4002> Mark 6:2; 11:11, 19, 20; <4140> Mark 14:1, 12, 17, 30, 68, 72; <4150> Mark 15:1, 25, 33, 34, 42; 16:1, 2.

(4.) *Number.* — ^{<40613>}Mark 5:13, 42; 6:7; 8:24; ^{<4140>}Mark 14:30, 72. Other smaller variations are continually occurring.

Here a single word, there a short parenthesis, sometimes an apparently trivial accession — which impart a striking air of life to the record; e.g. Zebedee left with the hired servants (^{<4002>}Mark 1:20); our Lord praying (^{<4065>}Mark 1:35); the paralytic borne of four (^{<4003>}Mark 2:3); the command that a ship should wait on him (^{<4009>}Mark 3:9); “thy sisters” (^{<4002>}Mark 3:32); our Lord taken “even as he was in the ship” (^{<4065>}Mark 4:36); “other little ships with them” (*ibid.*); Jairus’s daughter “walked” (^{<4062>}Mark 5:42); “divers came from far” (^{<4003>}Mark 8:3); only “one loaf” in the ship (^{<4084>}Mark 8:14); “so as no fuller on earth can white” (^{<4002>}Mark 9:2); the danger of *trusting* in riches (^{<4004>}Mark 10:24); “with persecutions” (^{<4003>}Mark 10:30); “no vessel suffered to be carried through the Temple” (^{<4116>}Mark 11:16); “a house of prayer for *all* nations” (^{<4117>}Mark 11:17); “she hath done what she could” (^{<4148>}Mark 14:8); Barabbas, one of a party of insurrectionists *all* guilty of bloodshed (^{<4157>}Mark 15:7).

We cannot conclude our remarks on this head better than in the words of Mr. Westcott (*Introd.* p. 348) — that “if all other arguments against the mythic origin of the evangelic narratives were wanting, this vivid and simple record, stamped with the most distinct impress of independence and originality, would be sufficient to refute a theory subversive of all faith in history.”

V. Style and Diction. — The style of Mark may be characterized as vigorous and abrupt. His terms of connection and transition are terse and lively; he is fond of employing the direct for the indirect (^{<4003>}Mark 4:39; 5:8, 9, 12; 6:23, 31, 37; ^{<4025>}Mark 9:25, 33; 12:6), the present for the past (^{<4025>}Mark 1:25, 40, 44; ^{<4003>}Mark 2:3, 4, 5; 3:4, 5, 13, 20, 31, 34; ^{<4065>}Mark 4:37, etc.), and the substantive instead of the pronoun; he employs the cognate accusative (^{<4038>}Mark 3:28; 7:13; 13:19; ^{<4044>}Mark 4:41; 5:42), accumulates negatives (οὐκ ἐτι οὐδεις, ^{<4072>}Mark 7:12; 9:8; ^{<4124>}Mark 12:34; 15:5; οὐκ ἐτι οὐ μή, ^{<4145>}Mark 14:25; μηκ ἐτι μηδεις, ^{<4114>}Mark 11:14), and for sake of emphasis repeats what he has said in other words, or appends the opposite (^{<4022>}Mark 1:22, 45; 2:27; 3:26, 27, 29; ^{<4047>}Mark 4:17, 33, 34), and piles up synonymes (^{<4046>}Mark 4:6, 8, 39; 5:12, 23; 8:15; 13:33; ^{<4148>}Mark 14:68), combining this forcible style with a conciseness and economy of expression consistent with the elaboration of every detail.

Mark's diction is nearer to that of Matthew than to that of Luke. It is more Hebraistic than the latter, though rather in general coloring than in special phrases. According to Davidson (*Introd.* 1:154), there are forty-five words peculiar to him and Matthew, and only eighteen common to him and Luke. Aramaic words, especially those used by our Lord, are introduced, but explained for Gentile readers (^{<4107>}Mark 3:17, 22; 5:41; 7:11, 34; 9:43; 10:46; ^{<4146>}Mark 14:36; 15:22, 34). Latinisms are more frequent than in the other Gospels: **κεντυρώϊν**, ^{<4159>}Mark 15:39, 44, 45; **σπεκουλάτωρ**, ^{<4107>}Mark 6:27; **τὸ ἰκάνον ποιῆσαι**, ^{<4155>}Mark 15:15; **ξέστης**, ^{<4104>}Mark 7:4, 8, are peculiar to him. Others **δηνάριον, κῆνσος, λεγίων, πραιτώριον, φραγελλόω, κοδράντης** — *he* has in common with the rest of the evangelists. He is fond of *diminutives* — **θυγάτριον, κοράσιον, κυνάρια, ὠτάριον** — *but* they are not peculiar to him. He employs unusual words and phrases (e.g. **ἀλαλάζειν, ἐπισυντρέχειν, κωμόπολις, μεγιστᾶνες, νάρδος πιστική, νουνεχῶς, παιδιόθεν, πλοιάριον, προμεριμνᾶν, τρυμαλία, ὑπολήνιον, στοιβάς, συμρνιζόμενος οἶνος συνθλίβειν, ἐνειλεῖν**). Of other noticeable words and expressions we may remark, **ἀκάθαρτον πνεῦμα**, eleven times, Matthew six, Luke three; **ἤρξατο λέγειν, κράζειν**, twenty-five times; **διεστείλατο**, and **στέλλετο**, five times, Matthew once; compounds of **πορεύεσθαι**: e.g. **εἰσπορ.**, eight times, Matthew once, Luke four; **ἐκπορ.**, eleven times, Matthew six, Luke three; **παραπορ.**, four times, Matthew once; **προσπορ.** The verb **ἐπερωτάω** occurs twenty-five times, to eight times in Matthew and eighteen in Luke; **εὐαγγέλιον**, eight times, Matthew four, but the verb not once; **εὐθέως**, forty times, Matthew fifteen, Luke eight. Other favorite words are, **κηρύσσειν**, fourteen, Matthew nine, Luke nine; **μακρόθεν**, five, Matthew two, Luke four; **οὐκέτι** and **μηκέτι**, ten, Matthew three, Luke four; **περιβλέρω**, six times, Luke once; **πιστεύω**, fourteen, Matthew eleven, Luke nine; **πρωῖ**, six times, Matthew twice, John once; **φέρω**, thirteen, Matthew four, Luke four times. Of words only found in Mark, as compared with Matthew and Luke, we may mention—**ἀνάρτημα, ἀναθεματίζω, ἐξάπινα εὐκαιρος** and **ρως, εὐσχήμων, ἡδῶές, θαμβεῖσθαι, θυρωρός, κτίσις, κυλίομαι, μογ λαλος, μορφή, παραβάλλειν, παραδέχεσθαι, παρόμοιος, προστρέχω, συμπόσια, συστασιαστής, στίλβειν, σκώληξ** Words not found at all, or found less frequently in Mark, are — **ἀγαθός**, only twice, in the same context (^{<4107>}Mark 10:17,18), Matthew sixteen, Luke fifteen times; **νόμος, παῖς, στόμα, σπερ, ἀνοίγω, ἄξιος, κελεύω, μεριμνάω, μακάριος, ὀφείλω, καλέω** only three times, to

Matthew twenty-six, Luke forty-two; **πέμπω**, only once; **Χριστός**, seven, Matthew sixteen, Luke thirteen. Publicans are only mentioned twice, Samaria and its inhabitants not once.

VI. Persons for whom the Gospel was written. — A dispassionate review of the Gospel confirms the traditional statement that it was intended primarily for Gentiles, and among these the use of Latinisms, and the concise abrupt character: suitable for the vigorous intelligence of a Roman audience” (Westcott, *Introd.* p. 348), seem to point out those for whom it was specially meant. In consistency with this view, words which would not be understood by Gentile readers are interpreted: Boanerges (^{<4067>}Mark 3:17); Talitha cumi (^{<4054>}Mark 5:40); Corban (^{<4071>}Mark 7:11); Bartimaeus (^{<4106>}Mark 10:46); Abba (^{<4146>}Mark 14:36); Eloi lama sabachthani (^{<4154>}Mark 15:34); two mites “make a farthing” (^{<4122>}Mark 12:42); Gehenna is “unquenchable fire” (^{<4093>}Mark 9:43). Jewish usages, and other matters with which none but Jews could be expected to be familiar, are explained, e.g. the washing before meals (^{<4008>}Mark 7:3, 4); in the days of unleavened bread the Passover was killed (^{<4142>}Mark 14:12); at the Passover the season of figs had not come (^{<4113>}Mark 11:13); the preparation is “the day before the Sabbath” (^{<4152>}Mark 15:42); the Mount of Olives is over against the Temple” (^{<4133>}Mark 13:3); Jordan is a “river” (^{<4006>}Mark 1:5; ^{<4036>}Matthew 3:6); the Pharisees, etc., “used to fast” (^{<4028>}Mark 2:18; ^{<4094>}Matthew 9:14); the Sadducees’ worst tenet is mentioned (^{<4128>}Mark 12:18); and explanations are given which Jews would not need (^{<4156>}Mark 15:6, 16). All reference to the law of Moses is omitted, and even the word **νόμος** does not occur; the Sabbath was appointed for the good of man (^{<4027>}Mark 2:27); and in the quotation from ^{<2807>}Isaiah 56:7 he adds “of all nations.” The genealogy of our Lord is likewise omitted. Other matters interesting chiefly to the Jews are similarly passed over, such as the reflections on the request of the Scribes and Pharisees for a sign (^{<4028>}Matthew 12:38-45); the parable of the king’s son (^{<4021>}Matthew 22:1-14); and the awful denunciation of the Scribes and Pharisees (Matthew 23). Matter that might offend is omitted, as ^{<4005>}Matthew 10:5, 6; 6:7, 8. Passages, not always peculiar to Mark, abound in his Gospel, in which the antagonism between the pharisaic legal spirit and the Gospel come out strongly (^{<4002>}Mark 1:22; 2:2; 5; 8:15), which hold out hopes to the heathen of admission to the kingdom of heaven even without the Jews (^{<4129>}Mark 12:9), and which put ritual forms below the worship of the heart (^{<4028>}Mark 2:18; 3:1-5; 7:5-23). Whilst he omits the invective against the Pharisees, he indicates by a touch of his own

how Jesus condemned them “with anger” (^{<4186>}Mark 3:5). Mark alone makes the Scribe admit that love is better than sacrifices (^{<4123>}Mark 12:33). In conclusion, the absence of all quotations from the O.T. made on his own authority, with the exception of those in the opening verses from ^{<3981>}Malachi 3:1; ^{<2348>}Isaiah 40:3 (^{<4153>}Mark 15:28 being rejected as interpolated), points the same way. The only citations he introduces are those made by our Lord, or by those addressing him.

VII. Citations from Scripture. — The following are the only direct citations:

Picture for Mark

Of these,

(a) is the only one peculiar to Mark. In

(b) we have the addition of a few words to the Synoptical quotation. We have also references to the O.T. in the following passages:

VIII. Time and Place of Composition. — On these points the Gospel itself affords no information, except that we may certainly affirm, against Baur, Hilgenfeld, Weisse, etc., that it was composed before the fall of Jerusalem, since otherwise so remarkable a fulfillment of our Lord’s predictions could not but have been noticed. Ecclesiastical tradition is, as usual, vacillatory and untrustworthy. Clement, as quoted by Eusebius (*uit sup.*), places the composition of the Gospel in the lifetime of Peter; while Irenaeus, with much greater probability, asserts that it was not written till after the decease (^{<1508>}ἔξοδον, not “departure from Rome,” Mill, Grabe, Ebrard) of Peter and Paul. Later authorities are, as ever, much more definite. Theophylact and Euthym. Zigab., with the Chron. Pasch., Georg. Syncell., and Hesychius, place it ten years after the Ascension, i.e. A.D. 40; Eusebius, in his *Chronicon*, A.D. 43, when Peter, Paul, and Philo were together in Rome. It is not likely that it dates before the reference to Mark in the Epistle to the Colossians (4:10), where he is only introduced as a relative of Barnabas, as if this were his greatest distinction; and this Epistle was written about A.D. 57. If, after coming to Asia Minor on Paul’s sending, he went on and joined Peter at Babylon, he may have then acquired, or rather completed that knowledge of Peter’s preaching, which tradition teaches us to look for in the Gospel, and of which there is so much internal evidence; and soon after this the Gospel may have been

composed. We may probably date it between Peter's martyrdom, cir. A.D. 63, and the destruction of Jerusalem, A.D. 70.

As to the place, the uniform testimony of early writers (Clement, Eusebius, Jerome, Epiphanius, etc.) is that the Gospel was written and published in Rome. In this view most modern writers of weight agree. Chrysostom asserts that it was published in Alexandria, but his statement is not confirmed — as, if true, it must certainly have been — by any Alexandrine writer. Some (Eichhorn, R. Simon) maintain a combination of the Roman and Alexandrine view under the theory of a double publication, first in one city and then in the other. Storr is alone in his view that it was first made public at Antioch.

IX. Language. — There can be no reason for questioning that the Gospel was composed in Greek. To suppose that it was written in Latin — as is stated in the subscription to the Peshito, and some early Greek MSS., *ἔγρᾶφη Ῥωμαῖστι ἐν Ῥώμῃ* — because it was intended for the use of Roman Christians, implies complete ignorance of the Roman Church of that age, which in language, organization, and ritual was entirely Greek, maintaining its character in common with most of the churches of the West as “a Greek religious colony” (Milman, *Lat. Christ.* 1:27). The attempt made by Baronius, Bellarmine, etc., to strengthen the authority of the Vulgate by this means was therefore, as one of their own Church, R. Simon, has shown, entirely futile; and the pretended Latin autograph, said to be preserved in the library of St. Mark's at Venice, turned out to be part of an ancient Latin codex of the four Gospels, now known as Codex Forojuliensis.

X. Contents. — The Gospel of Mark may be divided into three parts:

- (1.) The occurrences previous to the commencement of the public ministry of our Lord, including the preaching and baptism of John, our Lord's baptism and temptation (^{<4010>}Mark 1:1-13).
- (2.) Our Lord's ministry in Galilee, including that in Eastern Galilee (^{<4014>}Mark 1:14- ^{<4023>}Mark 7:23); that in Northern Galilee (^{<4024>}Mark 7:24- ^{<4037>}Mark 9:37); that in Persea, and the journeyings towards Jerusalem (^{<4038>}Mark 9:38- ^{<4052>}Mark 10:52).
- (3.) His triumphant entry, passion, death, resurrection, and ascension (^{<4103>}Mark 11:1- ^{<4143>}Mark 14:8 [20]).

XI. Genuineness and Integrity. — The genuineness of Mark's Gospel was never doubted before Schleiermacher, who, struck by an apparent discrepancy between the orderly narrative we now possess and the description of Papias (*ut sup.*), broached the view followed by Credner, Ewald, and others, that the Gospel in its present form is not the work of Mark the companion of Peter. This led to the notion, which has met with much acceptance among German critics (Baur, Hilgenfeld, Kostlin, etc.), of an original, precanonical Mark, "the Gospel of Peter," probably written in Aramaic, which, with other oral and documentary sources, formed the basis on which some unknown later writers formed the existing Gospel. But even if, on other grounds, this view were probable, all historical testimony is against it; and we should have to account for the entire disappearance of an original document of so much importance without leaving a trace of its existence, and the silent substitution of a later work for it, and its acceptance by the whole Church. If ordinary historical testimony is to have any weight, we can have no doubt that the Gospel we now have, and which has always borne his name, was that originally composed by Mark. We can have no reason to think that either John the presbyter or Papias were infallible; and if the ordinary interpretation of ὁὐ τάξει was correct, and the description of the Gospel given by Papias was really at variance with its present form, it would be at least equally probable that their judgment was erroneous and their view mistaken. There can, however, be little doubt that the meaning of τάξει has been strained and distorted, and that the words do really describe not Mark's alone, but all three Synoptic Gospels as we have them; not, that is, "Lives of Christ" chronologically arranged, but "a summary of representative facts" given according to a moral and not a historic sequence, following a higher order than that of mere time.

As regards the *integrity* of the Gospel, Ewald, Reuss, and others have called in question the genuineness of the opening verses (ⲁⲓⲓⲃ Mark 1:1-13). But the external evidence for them is as great as that for the authenticity of any part of the Gospels. Internal evidence is too subtle a thing, and varies too much with the subjectivity of the writer, for us to rely on it exclusively.

The case is different with the closing portion (ⲁⲓⲓⲃ Mark 16:9-20), where the evidence, both external and internal, is somewhat strong against its having formed a part of Mark's original Gospel, which is thought to have broken off abruptly with the words ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ (for various theories to account for this, the death of Peter, that of Mark, sudden persecution,

flight, the loss of the last leaf, etc., see Hug, Mieser, Schott). No less than twenty-one words and expressions occur in it, some of them repeatedly, which are never elsewhere used by Mark. This alone, when we remember the peculiarities of diction in the pastoral epistles, as compared with Paul's other writings, would not be sufficient to prove that it was not written by the same author; though when taken in connection with the external evidence, it would seem to show that it was not composed at the same time. On this ground, therefore, we must conclude that if not the 'work of another hand, it was written at a later period than the rest of the Gospel. The external evidence, though somewhat inconsistent, points, though less decidedly, the same way. While it is found in all codices of weight, including A, C, D, and all versions, and is repeatedly quoted, without question, by early writers from the time of Irenaeus (*Haer.* 3:10, 6), and appears in the very ancient Syriac recension published by Cureton, it is absent from the Vatican and Sinaitic MSS. (in the former of which, after the subscription, the greater part of the column and the whole of the next are left vacant, a phenomenon nowhere else found in the N.T. portion of that codex), while in several MSS. that contain it, it is noted that it is wanting in others, and those the most accurate copies. Jerome (*ad Hedib.* 4:172) speaks of it as being found in but few copies of the Gospels, and deficient in almost all the Greek MSS. Eusebius (*ad Marin.* quaest. I) states that it is wanting "in nearly all the more accurate copies," while the canons that bear his name and the Ammonian sections do not go beyond v. 8. Of later critics, Olshausen and De Wette pronounce for its genuineness. The note of the latter may be consulted, as well as those of Alford and Meyer, who take the other side, for a full statement of the evidence for and against. See also Burgon, *The last twelve Verses of Mark vindicated* (Lond. 1871).

XII. Canoncity. — The citation of v. 19 as Scripture by Irenaeus appears sufficient to establish this point. With regard to other passages of Mark's Gospel, as it presents so few facts peculiar to himself, we cannot be surprised that there are but few references to it in the early fathers. The Muratorian canon, however (cir. A.D. 170), commences with words which evidently refer to it. It is mentioned by Papias. Justin Martyr refers to it for the name Boanerges (*Trymph.* 106), as the "Memoirs of Peter." Irenaeus, as we have seen above, quotes from it, and in the 19th Clementine Homily (ed. Dusseldorf, 1853) a peculiar phrase of Mark (~~Mark~~ Mark 4:34) is repeated verbally. The fact also recorded by Irenaeus (*Haer.* 3:11, 7), that

the Docetic heretics preferred the Gospel of Mark to the others, affords an early proof of its acceptance in the Church.

XIII. Commentaries. — The following are the special exegetical helps on the entire Gospel of Mark; to a few of the most important we prefix an asterisk: Victor of Antioch, *In Marcum* (Gr. ed. Matthai; also in the *Bibl. Max. Patr.* 4:370); Jerome, *Expositio* (in *Opp. [Suppos.]*, 11:758); also *Commentarius* (*ibid.* 11:783); Possinus, *Catena Gr. Patrum* (Romans 1673, fol.); Bede, *Expositio* (in *Opp.* v. 92; *Works*, 10:1); Aquinas, *Catena* (in *Opp.* iv; also in vol. ii of Engl. transl.); Albertus Magnus, *Commentarius* (in *Opp.* ix); Gerson, *Lectiones* (in *Opp.* 4:203); Zwingle, *Annotationes* (in *Opp.* 4:141); Brentius, *Homilics* (in *Opp.* v); Myconius, *Commnentrius* (Basil. 1538, 8vo); Hegendorphinus, *Annotationes* (Hag. 1526, 1536, 8vo); Sarcer, *Scholia* (Basil. 1539, 1540, 8vo); Bullinger, *Commentaria* (Tigur. 1545, fol.); Hofmeister, *Commentarius* [includ. Matthew and Luke] (Lovan. 1562, fol.; Par. 1563; Colon. 1572, 8vo); Danaeus, *Questiones* (Genev. 1594. 8vo); Gualther, *tomilimc* (Heidelb. 1608, fol.); Winckelmann, *Commentarius* (Francof. 1612,8vo); Del Pas, *Commentaria* (Romans 1623, fol.); Novarinus, *Expensio* (Lugd. 1642, fol.); Petter, *Commentary* (London, 1662, 2 vols. fol.); Heartsocker, *A antekeningeen* (Amsterd. 1671, 4to); De Veiel, *Explicatio* [includ. Matt.] (Lend. 1688, 8vo); Dorche, *Commentacrius* (Kilon. 1690, 4to); Heupel, *Notce* (Argent. 1716, 8vo); Klemm, *Exercitia* (Tiibing. 1728, 4to); *Elsner, *Commentarius* (Traj. 1773, 4to); Cunningham, *Thoughts* (Lond. 1825,12mo); Hinds, *Manual* (Lond. 1829, 8vo); Bland, *Annotations* (Lond. 1830, 8vo); *Fritzsche, *Commentarii* (Lips. 1830, 8vo); For(d, *Illustrations* (Lond. 1849, 1864, 8vo); Hilgenfeld, *D. Marcus — evangelium* (Halle, 1850, 8vo); Cumming, *Readings* (Lond. 1853, 8vo); *Alexander, *Explanation* (N.Y. 1858,12mo); Klostermann, *D. Markus-evangeliumm* (Gitting. 1867, 8vo); Goodwin, *Notes* (Lond. 1869, 8vo).
SEE GOSPELS.

Mark On The Person

(in this sense **W**T; *tav*, ^{<3190>}Ezekiel 9:4, 6; **χάραγμα**, Revelation 13 sq.), a brand or other character fixed upon the forehead (q.v.), hand, etc., usually of slaves, for the purpose of identifying them. **SEE SLAVE.**

In the case of Cain (^{<0045>}Genesis 4:15), a special token (**twa**, *sign*, as elsewhere rendered) was assigned him in assurance of safety. **SEE CAIN.**

Mark, (Mark), Georg Joachim,

a German theologian, was born at Schwerin March 1, 1726; was educated at the University of Kiel; in 1745 entered the ministry; and in 1747 was appointed a member of the philosophical faculty of his alma mater. In 1752 he accepted a call as librarian to the prince Louis of Mecklenburg-Schwerin; in 1758, as professor ordinary of divinity to the University of Kiel; in 1766 he was honored with the degree of doctor of divinity. He died March 5, 1774. Gifted with a quick perception and a good memory, Mirk acquired great learning, particularly in theology and philosophy. By his indefatigable diligence as an author he kept the press almost constantly busy. Of his works the following have special interest for us: *Aleditationes de Sapientia sanctissima rite colenda* (Kiel, 1762, 4to): — *Primcelince juris divini evangelici* (ibid. 1763, 4to): — *Diss. de divina vocatione honinum miserorum ad fidem et salutem* (ibid. 1767, 4to): — *Causa Dei et sub ipso imuperlantium contra theologiam Jesuitarun* (ibid. 1767, 4to). — Döring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands*, s.v.

Market

(br[̄]ni maarab'), a mercantile term, found only in Ezekiel 27 (rendered "merchandise," except in ver. 13, 17, 19, 25), in several senses:

(a) properly *barter*, and so trade, traffic (ver. 9, 27);

(b) place of barter, *zmart* (ver. 12, 13, 17, 19);

(c) *gain*, wealth, acquired by traffic (ver. 27, 34; plur. ver. 33, perh. *precious wares*), like rj šī "merchandise," and w̄bz[̄] æfair, "ware." In the N. Test. the word *agora* (ἀγορά), thus rendered ("market-place" in ^{<1018>}Matthew 20:3; ^{<1128>}Mark 12:38; ^{<1072>}Luke 7:32; ^{<1169>}Acts 16:19), denotes generally any place of public resort in towns and cities where the people came together; and hence more specially it signifies

(a) a *public place*, a broad street, etc. (^{<1016>}Matthew 11:16; 20:3; 23:7; ^{<1066>}Mark 6:56; 12:38; ^{<1072>}Luke 7:32; 11:43; 20:46);

(b) *ajo ruin* or market-place, where goods were exposed for sale, and assemblies or public trials held (^{<1169>}Acts 16:19; 17:17). In ^{<1071>}Mark 7:4 it is doubtful whether ἀγορά denotes the market itself, or is put for that which is brought from the market; but the known customs of the Jews suggest a preference of the former signification. From this is derived the term

agorceus (ἀγοραῖος), properly signifying the things belonging to, or persons frequenting the *agora*; improperly rendered “in law” in ^{<4198>}Acts 19:38, where it is applied to the days on which public trials were held in the forum; and in ^{<4175>}Acts 17:5 (where it is rendered “ba^{ser} sort”) it denotes idlers, or persons lounging about in the markets and other places of public resort. There is a peculiar force in this application of the word, when we recollect that the market-places or bazaars of the East were, and are at this day, the constant resort of unoccupied people, the idle, and the newsmongers.

In very early periods markets were held at or near the gates of cities, sometimes within and sometimes without the walls. Here commodities were exposed for sale, either in the open air or in tents (^{<1178>}2 Kings 7:18). It is still not unusual in the East for the wholesale market for country produce and cattle to be held (for a short time in the early part of the morning) at the gates of towns; but manufactured goods and various sorts of fruits are retailed in the bazaars within the towns. In the time of our Savior, as we learn from Josephus, the markets were enclosed in the same manner as the modern Eastern bazaars, which are shut at night, and contain traders’ shops disposed in rows or streets; and in large towns the dealers in particular commodities are confined to certain streets. That this was also the case in the time of the prophet Jeremiah, we may infer from his expression, “the bakers’ street” (^{<2871>}Jeremiah 37:21). That a close connection existed between those of the same craft, we learn incidentally from ^{<4192>}Nehemiah 3:32. In rebuilding Jerusalem after the exile, “the goldsmiths and the merchants” acted together in repairing the walls. Josephus calls the valley between Mounts Zion and Moriah the “Tyropoeon (τυροποιῶν), i.e. the valley “of the cheesemakers.” In like manner there is mentioned the valley of Charashim, or “the craftsmen” (^{<1314>}1 Chronicles 4:14; ^{<4115>}Nehemiah 11:35). Josephus also mentions a street of the meat-dealers. The streets of Eastern cities are generally distinguished from each other, not by the separate names which they bear, but by the sort of traffic or business carried on in them. Thus at Cairo and other large Oriental cities we hear of the market of the butchers, of the fruit-dealers, the copper-ware sellers, the jewelers, and so on; each consisting of a row of shops on each side of the street devoted to that particular kind of trade (Hackett, *Illustra. of Script*, p. 61). **SEE BARGAIN; SEE BAZAAR; SEE COMMERCE; SEE MERCHANT.**

Märklin, Johann Friedrich,

a German theologian, was born at Reichenbach, in Württemberg, Feb. 6, 1732; was educated at the University of Tübingen; in 1755 became archdeacon at Waiblingen; in 1760 lectured at his alma mater; in 1767, archdeacon; in 1786 was raised to the dignity of professor of divinity, the department of exegesis of the Old Test. and Oriental literature falling to him. In 1797 he was made general superintendent of the churches of Württemberg, and died May 13, 1804. He was a distinguished interpreter of the O.-T. Scriptures. Of his productions we only mention *Diss. inaug. de Sermone Dei ad ioh. 28, 29 ejusque Scopis* (Tubingae, 1754, 4to): — *Diss. de religione, imprimis Christiana, magno in officiis*, etc. (ibid. 1786, 4to). — Doring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands*, s.v.

Marks, Richard T.,

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Louisville, Ga., Sept. 24, 1809. He was educated a printer. In 1827 he removed to Columbus, Ga., and united with Mr. Larmar in establishing the *Columbus Inquirer*, the first paper started in the western part of Georgia. Soon after, feeling called to the ministry, he commenced the study of theology under Thomas Goulding, D.D.; was licensed in 1837, and ordained in 1839. He labored as a minister mostly in missionary fields, or where the destitution was so great that unrequited labor had to be given. He preached in the following places, all in Georgia: Muscogee, Greenville, West Point, Hamilton, Columbus, Emmaus, Americus, Mount Tabor, Ephesus, and White Sulphur Springs. He died Dec. 6, 1867. Mr. Marks was a ready writer, an excellent preacher, and an editor of great power and influence. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1868, p. 342.

Mark's, St., Day

the 25th of April, observed at least since the 6th century, in commemoration of St. Mark, the evangelist. It is celebrated in most parishes of the Romish Church by a solemn, supplicatory procession, mentioned as early as pope Gregory the Great. Walafrid Strabo states (*De reb. eccl.* c. 8) that it was instituted by that pope at the commencement of his pontificate, with a view to supplicate God for deliverance from a pestilence which was devastating Rome; and it is certain that Gregory held a procession in A.D. 590, in order to avert the pestilence. But the two ceremonies are clearly not identical. The latter was held in August, and

continued during three days; and while, in the procession of St. Mark, the faithful issued from seven separate churches, in this they all proceeded from a single sanctuary. In churches of which St. Mark is the patron, a mass is celebrated in connection with the procession, in which the color used is blue, indicative of the penitential feeling which predominates in the ceremony. An occasional removal of the festival to another day does not set aside the procession, which is always held on the 25th of April, unless Easter Sunday falls on that date. — Wetzter und Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 6:832.

Mark's, St., Liturgy

SEE LITURGY.

Marlatt, Archibald G.,

a noted educator and minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Warren County, N. J., in 1829, and educated at Dickinson College (class of 1850); was junior preacher on Carlisle Circuit in 1851; was the following year appointed to Lock Haven Circuit, where a bronchial affection developed itself, which compelled him to locate in 1854. In this same year he was appointed professor of a high literary institution in Washington City, where he remained until 1856, when he accepted the presidency of the newly-founded Irving Female College, and to this institution he devoted his energy and talents until Jan. 2, 1865, when he "fell asleep in Jesus." "The personal character of our brother may be included in the comprehensive title 'a Christian gentleman,' the highest style and type of manhood. As a gentleman, a scholar, and a minister of truth, his was a noble candor.... In everything that bore upon truth or purity he was a decided man. Of his mental power and literary culture it may be safely said that he possessed a clear intellectual perception; rapid insight, coupled with careful analysis and broad power of generalizing; a vivid sensibility of nature, a keen discrimination of character, a large acquaintance with ancient and modern belles-lettres; and from the college under his presidency have been sent forth those that shall shine brightly in the literary world." — *Conf. Minutes*, 1865, p. 12.

Marlay, Michael, D.D.,

a noted Methodist minister, was born, of Roman Catholic parentage, in Berkeley County, Va., June 21, 1797. In the year 1818 he migrated to the

State of Ohio, and settled near Dayton. In 1821 he united it the Methodist Episcopal Church, and was soon after appointed a class-leader. The Church, recognizing his gifts and graces, speedily licensed him as an exhorter, and afterwards as a local preacher. In the fall of 1831 he was received on trial as a traveling preacher by the Ohio Conference. He quickly rose to a commanding position in the ministry, and was widely known as a sound theologian, an able preacher, and a skillful administrator of discipline. So great was his reputation as an executive officer, that more than half of his ministry of thirty-five years was spent in the office of presiding elder. He was twice an active and influential member of the General Conference, by which body he was appointed, in 1852, one of the commissioners of the Methodist Episcopal Church to manage the suit in the then pending trial for the property of the Western Book Concern. In 1860 he received the degree of D.D. from the Indiana State University. He died of cholera, while in attendance upon the session of the Cincinnati Conference, at Ripley, Ohio, Sept. 2, 1866. The late bishop Thomson thus spoke of Dr. Marlay shortly after his decease (*Christian Advocate*, N. Y., vol. 41, No. 43): "His strong frame of medium size, fine proportion, and high health, admirably fitted him for itinerant labors; his benignant countenance, amiable spirit, and gentle manners rendered him a welcome guest wherever he went. His fine head indicated great intellectual power; his habits of study seemed to render certain his constant improvement, while his clear call to the ministry insured his unwavering devotion to its duties.... In Biblical science, as well as in theoretical, practical, and experimental divinity, he was a master... He was a great man in private as well as in public life; and one of the strongest proofs of his high moral worth is the fact that, of a large family which he leaves behind him, every one is an ornament to society.... He expired in the arms of his brethren, and they buried him, feeling that they could lay in the tomb no man to whom the Methodist Church in Ohio has been more indebted." See also *Ladies' Repository*, 1866, Jan.; *Conf. Minutes*, 1866, p. 262. (J. F. M.)

Marlorat(Us), Augustine,

a French Protestant theologian, was born at Bar-le-Duc in 1506. At an early age he was put in an Augustine convent, and took the vows in 1524. He soon acquired great reputation as a preacher. Having been appointed prior of a convent of his order at Bourges, he commenced to entertain Protestant views, as is evinced in the sermons he delivered after 1533 at Bourges, Poitiers, and Angers. He was designated to preach during the

Lenten season at Rouen, when he openly separated from the Church. Pursued as a heretic, he sought refuge at Geneva, where he lived for a time by correcting proofs for the printers. He then went to Lausanne, to perfect his knowledge of theology. In 1549 he was appointed pastor at Crissier, and afterwards at Vevay. The consistory of Geneva sent him in 1559 to Paris, and in the beginning of the year following he was called to take charge of the Reformed Church at Rouen. His talents and his personal qualities now had a fair opportunity for display, and soon gained him great influence in that city, and brought many converts to the Church. In 1561 he went to the Colloquy of Poissy, where, next to Theodore de Beza, he stood at the head of the Protestants, and on the 15th of May he presided over the provincial synod assembled at Dieppe. The opposition of the government towards all expression of religious opinion adverse to Roman Catholicism, and more particularly the bloody deeds of Vassy on March 1, 1562, had greatly exasperated the Protestants, *SEE HUGUENOTS*; and the latter, feeling that there was only one alternative for them, either to fight for their conscience sake or abjure their honest convictions, took to arms all over France. The opening scene had been made at Paris. At Rouen the Protestants were in the majority (if we may follow Beza; according to Floquet [Rom. Cath.], however, they only constituted one fifth of the population), and, anxious to secure the city for the armies of Conde, made themselves masters of the place by stealth in the night of April 15 to 16. An independent government was established, and unbounded religious toleration exercised towards non-Protestants. The masses, however, in the hour of excitement behaved madly. A spirit of iconoclasm took hold upon them, and within twenty-four hours they destroyed some of the most valuable works of art in fifty churches. For this and other outrages the Protestant leaders, of whom Marloratus was one, were not responsible either directly or indirectly. Yet, when the Roman Catholics succeeded in retaking the city, he was one of the first accused, and, though he had done no more than simply battle for the grant of religious freedom, he was arrested Oct. 26, 1562, brought before the bar of the Parliament, which had re-entered Rouen with the Roman Catholic forces, and condemned, as a traitor and heretic, to be drawn on a hurdle through the streets of the town, and then hung in front of his own church. After the execution, which took place Nov. 1, 1563, his head was severed from the trunk, and exposed on the bridge of the town. The Huguenots revenged this outrage by the execution of two leading Romanists in their hands. The widow and

five children of Marloratus fled to England, where they were for a long time maintained by the French Protestants.

As a writer Marloratus figures very prominently also. His exegetical works are numerous and valued, because of the accuracy and scholarship which they evince in the author. "They may be best described as painstaking and not injudicious selections of the interpretations of other writings" (Kitto). His earliest production is *Remonstrances à la reyne mere par ceux qui sont persecutes pour la parole de Dieu* (1561, 12mo; 2d ed. 1561, 8vo); but one of his most important productions is his *Novi Testamenti catholica expositio*, etc. (Geneva, 1561, fol.; 2d ed. 1605, fol.). This is a valuable work, containing Erasmus's Latin version of the N.T., with the expositions of the fathers of the Church, and of Bucer, Calvin, Erasmus, Muscululus, Melancthon, Sarcerius, Brentius, Bullinger, Zwiginlius, Vitus Theodorus, etc. His object seems to have been to prove to Romanists the identity of the Protestant and the Apostolic Church, and the essential oneness of the two Protestant parties. He himself leaned towards Calvinism. Parts of it were translated into English, and published under the following titles: *A Catholike and Ecclesiastical Exposition of the holy Gospell after S. Mathewe. Translated out of Latine into Englishe by Thomas Tymnze, in lynister* (Lond. 1570, fol.); *A Catholike and Ecclesiastical Exposition upon the Apocalyps of S. John the Apostle. Translated* (black letter, Lond. 1574, 4to). Translations have also been published of his *Exposition of St. Mark* (1583, 4to); *St. John* (1574, 4to); *St. Jude* (1584, 4to), etc. He also wrote *Genesis, cum catholica Expositione*, etc. (Geneva, 1562, fol., often reprinted); *In CL Psalmos et aliorum S. S. Prophetarum — Expositio ecclesiastica, etc., Item Cantica sacra ex divinis Bibliorum locis cum simili expositione* (Geneva, 1562, fol., often reprinted; and in English under the title *Prayers in the Psalms*, Lond. 1571, 16mo); etc. See Haag, *La France Protestante*; Chevrier, *Menm. pour servir à l'histoire des hommes illustres de la Lorraine*; *Notice sur Aug. Marlorat*, in the *Bulletin de la Societ de l'Hist. du Protestantisme 'Frangais*, une annue, p. 109; *Augustin Marlorat, sa vie et sa mort* (Caen, 1862, 8vo); Floquet's Beza, *Histoire Ecclesiastique*, passim, and especially 2:610 sq.; Schott, in Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 20:92-96; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 33:858; Darling, *Cyclopaedia Bibliographica*, 2:1965; Middleton, *Ev. Biog.* 2:82. (J. H.W.)

Marmontel, Jean Francois

a celebrated French critic, and a leader in the Φρενχη school of infidelity which flourished under the guidance of Diderot, Holbach, and Voltaire, was born at Bort, in Limousin, in 1723, of humble parentage. He was educated at the Jesuits' college at Mauriac, but, not inclining towards asceticism, went to Paris finally (1746), and there became intimate with the great freethinkers of the 18th century. Marmontel wielded an able pen, and largely devoted himself to authorship, producing both original works and translations of valuable English writers. By intercession of Madame Pompadour, he secured a secretaryship at Versailles in 1753. Later he became editor of the *Mercure*, for which he wrote, in part, his celebrated *Contes Moraux*, afterwards published in book form (Paris, 1761, 2 vols.). These *Moral Tales* were received with extraordinary favor, and were translated into most of the languages of Europe. Though written with great elegance and animation, their morality is rather questionable, and, appearing at a time when literature was unusually weighed down by freethinkers and atheists, the French clergy declaimed against the *Contes Moraux*. The opposition of the clergy became more decided against Marmontel in 1767, when he published his *Belisaire*, a political romance. A chapter of it treats on toleration. This part of the work was specially objected to by the doctors of the Sorbonne "as heretical and blasphemous," and quickly the cry resounded through the pulpits of the capital, and thence into those of the inland towns, until the excitement became general. *Belisaire* was condemned by the archbishop of Paris. Voltaire could hardly say enough in its praise, and the empress Catharine II honored it by a special order for its immediate translation into Russian. Marmontel himself came off victor in this contest with the Sorbonne and the clergy, and gained the honorable appointment of historiographer of France. To the *Encyclopedie* (s.v.) he contributed "Elements de Litterature" (1787, 6 vols. 8vo); he had charge, moreover, of its departments of poetry and general literature. During the Revolution he retired to the country, and died at the village of Abloville, near Evreux, December 31, 1799. An edition of his (*Euvres Completes* was published by himself in 17 vols.; another in 18 vols. (Paris, 1818); a third in 7 vols. (Paris, 1819-20). See Saint-Surin, *Notice sur Marmontel* (1824); Sainte-Beuve, *Causeries du Lundi*, vol. iv; Morellet, *Eloge de Marmontel* (1805); Villenave, *Notice sur les Ouvrages de Marmontel* (1820); *Edinb. Rev.* 1806 (Jan.); Schlosser, *Gesch. d. 18^{en}*

u. 19en Jahrhundert, 2:2, § 1; Thomas, *Diet. of Biog. and Mythol.* s.v.; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v. (J. H. W.)

Mar'moth

(Μαρμωθί), a less correct form (1 Esdras 8:62) of the Heb. name MEREMOTH (1 ~~Esdr~~ Ezra 8:33).

Marne, Jean-Baptiste De,

a Flemish ecclesiastic and historian, was born at Douai in 1699. He entered the Society of Jesus in 1619; was appointed minister to Namur, after having taught belles-lettres and theology in many cities, and filling different missions. Afterwards he was called to Liege, and became confessor to John-Theodore of Bavaria, and synodal examiner of the diocese. Ten years later he retired to Liege. He died Oct. 9, 1756. Marne wrote *Martyr du secret de la confession, ou la Vie de Saint Jean Nepourneine* (Paris, 1741, 12mo; Avignon, 1820, 18mo). See Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 33:907.

Marnix, Philippe Van, De Ste. Aldegonde,

occupies a distinguished place in the history of the Netherlands during the Reformation period. He was born at Brussels in 1538, of parents thoroughly identified with the interests of their country, and was carefully educated at home, and later at Geneva under Calvin and Beza. After returning to his home in 1560, he spent six years in retirement, but became known, notwithstanding his seclusion, as a careful observer of events, and respected as a patriot and a man of honor. His devotion to the cause of the Reformation, whose influence he steadily endeavored to extend, could not remain concealed; nor could his learning, his keen understanding, and his power as a writer escape recognition. He was soon in intimate relations with the leaders of the nation, and the rapid progress of events forced him into prominence. He is universally held to be the author of the so-called compromise (about 1565-66) by which the nobles and others pledged themselves to resist, by all lawful means, the introduction of the Inquisition. The league soon attained such proportions that it dared to present (April 5, 1566) a petition to the regent for the suppression of the institution. Soon after, when Protestant field-preaching was introduced, he placed himself at the head of the movement, and insisted that the Protestants should be permitted to worship in Antwerp itself. On the 19th

of August an iconoclastic mob destroyed the many works of art that adorned the churches, etc., of Antwerp, and the regent, in alarm, permitted Protestant worship in specified places; and under this sanction the first synod of the Walloon churches assembled in Antwerp Oct. 26, 1566. Marnix presided, and by his influence contributed to the adoption of the reformed confession, by which event the Calvinists acquired a pre-eminence that still continues. The government now adopted more energetic measures to restrain the Protestants, by placing garrisons in important towns, and even besieging such as refused to admit them. This was the case at Valenciennes; and Marnix, while seeking to aid the beleaguered city, was defeated, his brother killed, himself banished, and his property confiscated. During his exile he was influential in converting William of Orange and Nassau to the Protestant faith, and formed a connection with him that was only dissolved by death. In the mean time, however, Marnix had entered the service of the Palatine Frederick III, and fixed his residence at Heidelberg, where he was largely engaged in theological investigations; but, with the consent of the elector, he was often employed in the affairs of his own country, under the direction of the prince of Orange, being present at the defeat of Louis of Nassau at Jemmingen in July, 1568, etc. He attended the synod of the exiled clergy at Wesel in November, 1568, and his influence is seen in the constitution of the Church then adopted. A second important synod was held at Emden, Oct. 4 to 14, 1571, at which Marnix was also present, and which selected him to write a history of recent events in the Netherlands; but the needs of his country prevented the execution of this task. In July, 1572, he was sent by the prince of Orange to confer with the delegates of Holland, who were assembled at Dort, and succeeded in inducing them to pledge their readiness to make every sacrifice to throw off the Spanish yoke. Thenceforward his activity was incessant. He was taken prisoner by the Spaniards in November, 1573, but his life was spared, as the prince of Orange had threatened to retaliate. and Requesens, successor to the duke of Alba, employed him in an attempt to negotiate a peace, which was defeated by the sagacity of Orange. A similar office, undertaken after his exchange on the order of the prince of Orange, likewise failed, as did his mission to induce queen Elizabeth of England to accept the sovereignty of the Netherlands. He assisted in the negotiations that resulted in the "Pacification of Ghent" in November, 1576, and in the formation of the second union between the provinces at Brussels in December, 1577. In May, 1578, he represented the Netherlands at the Diet of Worms, and prevailed on the German states to remain neutral in the

contest with Spain. In the mean time religious intolerance had led to gross outrages among his countrymen, and the bitter feeling between the parties threatened ruin to the union that had been secured with so much effort. An attempt to reconcile these differences, in which he was engaged on his return, failed, and several of the Roman Catholic provinces withdrew, and placed themselves and their religion under Spanish protection. An alliance with France was now thought of, and Marnix exerted his influence successfully to induce the states-general to offer the crown to Francis, duke of Anjou-Alenon. This prince reached Antwerp on Feb. 19, 1572; but an attempt to seize Antwerp and other important towns led to his expulsion from the land before he had reigned a year, and both Orange and Marnix were suspected of connivance with the French. In consequence, Marnix retired from public life; but the progress of the Spaniards, under the duke of Parma, induced William of Orange to recall him, and he was appointed to the office of first burgomaster of Antwerp, in order that he might direct its defense. He entered on its duties Nov. 15, 1583, and a few days later the siege began. It was continued until Aug. 17, 1585, when the city honorably capitulated. With this event his political career was ended, and he retired to his estates, devoting himself mainly to theological studies. In 1596, having been appointed by the states-general to translate the Bible into Dutch, he removed to Leyden, in order to avail himself of its library, and of the assistance of his friends Scaliger, Lipsius, Jeunius, and others. He only lived, however, to complete the book of Genesis. He died Dec. 15, 1598. "He was," says Motley, "a man of most rare and versatile genius—scholar, theologian, diplomatist, swordsman, orator, pamphleteer; he had genius for all things, and was eminent in all." The theological works of Van Marnix were chiefly of a polemical character. The principal one, *The Beehive*, is a satire after the manner of Von Huttsen, and written in the style of Rabelais. It was probably intended to promote a reconciliation between the Romish and the Protestant provinces of his country. Another able contribution is his *Tableau des differences de la religion* (1669, and often). A complete edition of his works, in 8 vols., was published at Brussels, 1857-60, under the title (*Euvres de Philippians de Marnix de Ste. Aldegonde*; vol. iv contains a brief memoir, and a notice bibliographique. His life has been frequently written; among others, Th. Juste has treated it in connection with his studies of the Netherlands (1858). Motley's *Rise of the Dutch Republic*, and *Hist. of the United Netherlands*, vol. 1, chap. 3, are valuable aids to the study of this career. See also Prins, *Leven van P. v. Marznix* (1782); Dresselhuis, *F. v. Marnix*

(1832); Broes, *F. v. Marnix* (1838-40, 2 vols. 8vo); Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* 20:96 sq.; Edgar Quinet, in the *Revue des deux Mondes*, 1854.

Maron, Johannes

a noted Eastern patriarch, supposed to be the founder of the *Maaronites*, was born at Sirum, near Antioch, in Syria, about the middle of the 7th century; studied at Constantinople, and became monk and priest in the convent of St. Maron. Elevated to the bishopric of Botoys in 676, according to some, by the papal legate, he brought, if we may follow Romish authority, all the Christians of Lebanon within the communion of the Church of Rome; was then made patriarch of Antioch, and confirmed by pope Honorius; and died in 707. See however, MARONITES. (below)

Maronites

Picture for Maronites

a community or sect of Christians, numbering some 150,000, in Syria, particularly in the northern part of Mount Lebanon, and said to be of very ancient origin.

I. History. — Considerable controversy has arisen as to the real origin of this most peculiar Christian people; the most probable account represents them as descendants of a remnant of the *honothelites* (q.v.), who, fleeing from the repressive measures of the emperor Anastasius II, in the early part of the 8th century, settled on the slopes of the Lebanon, and gradually yielded their distinctive Monothelite views. According to Mosheim (*Eccles. Hist.* 1:457; 3:127), many Monothelites, after the Council of Constantinople, found a refuge among the Mardaites, signifying in Syriac *rebels*, a people who took possession of Lebanon A.D. 676, and made it the asylum of vagabonds, slaves, and all sorts of rabble; and about the conclusion of the 7th century these Monothelites of Lebanon were called Maronites, after Maro, their first bishop. None, he says, of the ancient writers give any certain account of the first person who converted these mountaineers to Monothelitism; it is probable, however, from several circumstances, that it was John Maro, whose name they have adopted; and that this ecclesiastic received the name of Maro from his having lived, in the character of a monk, in the famous convent of St. Maro, upon the borders of the Orontes, before his settlement among the Mardaites of Mount Libanus. Gieseler (*Eccles. Hist.* 2:419), however, takes exception

to this identification of the *Maronites* with the *Mardaites*, and, by authority derived from the writings of Anquetil Duperron (*Recherches sur les migrations des Mardes*, in the *Mellr. de l'Acad. des Inscript.* 1:1), holds that “the Mardaites or Mards, a warlike nation of Armenia, were placed as a garrison on Mount Libanus by Constantine Pogonatus, A.D. 676 (Theophanes, p. 295), and were withdrawn as early as 685 by Justinian II (Theophanes, p. 302). Madden (*Turkish Empire*, 2:154), upon the authority of the learned Benedictine St. Maur (*Histoire Maonastique de l'Orient*, p. 348), holds that the Maronites were founded by St. Maro, a patriarch of Syrian Christians in the 5th century, and that they existed under that name in the 7th century, when the Saracens ravaged the country, and were afterwards persecuted as *Mardaites* (comp. here Churchill, *Mount Lebanon*, 3:58). There is certainly much in favor of this argument, not the least of which is the fact that, “at the commencement of the 7th century, the entire range of mountains from Antioch to Jerusalem was in the hands of the Syrian Christians, who formed a political power under chiefs or emirs, exercising a hereditary government” (Churchill). But, however great may be the darkness surrounding their earliest history, one thing is certain, from the testimony of William of Tyre and other unexceptionable witnesses, as also from the most authentic records, namely, that the Maronites retained the opinions of the Monothelites until the 12th century, when, abandoning and renouncing the doctrine of one will in Christ, they were readmitted into the communion of the Roman Church. Jacques de Vitry, bishop of Acre in the 12th century, thus speaks of the Maronites in his *Historia Hierosolymitanza*, drawn up at the request of pope Honorius III: “Men armed with bows and arrows, and skillful in battle, inhabit the mountains in considerable numbers, in the province of Phoenicia, not far from the town of Biblos. They are called Maronites, from the name of a certain man, their master, Maron, a heretic, who affirmed that there was in Jesus but one will or operation. The Christians of the Lebanon, dupes of this diabolical error of Maron remained separate from the Church nearly five hundred years. At last, their hearts being turned, they made profession of the Catholic faith in presence of the venerable father Amaury, patriarch of Antioch, and adopted the traditions of the Roman Church.” The most learned of the modern Maronites have left no method unemployed to defend their Church against this accusation; they have labored to prove, by a variety of testimonies, that their ancestors always persevered in the Catholic faith, and in their attachment to the Roman pontiff, without ever adopting the doctrine of the Monophysites or

Monothelites (compare Churchill, *Mount Lebanon*, 3:51). But all their efforts are insufficient to prove the truth of these assertions, and the testimonies they allege appear absolutely fictitious and destitute of authority.

There can be no doubt that the Maronites were brought back to the communion of Rome by the influence of the Crusaders. Even in our day the Maronites, “warranted, indeed, both by historical and traditional records, allude in terms of pride and satisfaction to the service done by their ancestors to the armies of the Crusaders, and estimate in round numbers 50,000 of their population as having fallen under the standards of the Cross” (Churchill). During the early part of the 12th century the communications between the Maronite patriarch and the papal see were of frequent recurrence, and thus the way was easily paved for reunion. But though the Maronites joined the communion of Rome in this very age, it required three centuries more before the sturdy mountaineers could be brought to acknowledge Rome’s supremacy in matters of ecclesiastical discipline, and we are afforded a picture of a Christian Church existing for three centuries, “popish in all its forms and doctrines, saving the cardinal point of submission to the pope.” They had entered the Romish communion on the establishment of the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem in the 12th century, but they did not enter into a formal act of union with Rome until the Council of Florence in 1445, and only formally subscribed to the decrees of the Council of Trent in 1736. Mosheim observes that the subjection of the Maronites to the spiritual jurisdiction of the Roman pontiff was agreed to with this express condition, that neither the popes nor their emissaries should pretend to change or abolish anything that related to the ancient rites, moral precepts, or religious opinions of this people; so that, in reality, there is nothing to be found among the Maronites that savors of popery, if we except their attachment to the Roman pontiff. It is also certain that there are Maronites in Syria who still hold the Church of Rome in the greatest aversion and abhorrence (Schaff, *Church Hist.* 3:783); nay, what is still more remarkable, great numbers of that nation residing in Italy, even under the eye of the pontiff, opposed his authority during the 17th century, and threw the court of Rome into great perplexity. One body of these non-conforming Maronites retired into the valleys of Piedmont, where they joined the Waldenses; another, above six hundred in number, with a bishop and several ecclesiastics at their head, flew into Corsica, and implored the protection of the republic of Genoa

against the violence of the inquisitors. Their union with Rome gave the Maronites the protection of European powers, especially that of the devoted Frank; but when the Franks were expelled from Syria, in 1300, by Malek Ashraf, the Maronites were compelled to defend their independence against the Mameluke sovereigns, and the greater part of them became mixed up with the Druses, still keeping up, however, their connection with Rome. In the 17th century they placed themselves under the direct protection of France, Louis XIV and Louis XV granting them "Letters of Protection;" and for some time the French consul at Beirut exercised almost regal sway over them, the Maronites regarding themselves as "the French of the East." In the early part of the 18th century the Druses called the Mohammedan family of the Shehabs to govern Lebanon, and in 1713 the Turks made the first attempt to bring the inhabitants under the direct rule of a pacha. They resisted successfully, defeating the Turks in the battle of Aindara; but in 1756 several emirs became Maronites, and, incited by the Maronites clergy, showed great favor to their new brethren, thereby displeasing the Druses, and provoking a feeling of ill-will between the Druses and the Maronites, which has not yet subsided. The pachas of Acre, since Jezzar, carefully promoted this misunderstanding, for they felt that the tribes of Lebanon, fully united under an enterprising chief, would become dangerous to the Porte. Yet there was no feeling of religious animosity between the two nations at this early date, and, whenever political troubles broke out, Druse and Maronite sided indiscriminately with both parties. Emir Beshir Shehab (1789-1840), although in secret a Maronite, was always surrounded by the most important among the Druses, and, whenever he needed help, asked it of them rather than of the Maronites. Thus the Druses and the Christians were living peaceably side by side until 1831, when Syria passed under the rule of Mohammed Ali, and he commissioned his son, Ibrahim Pacha, to govern the province. Carrying out his father's enlightened views, Ibrahim Pacha applied himself to the improvement of the condition of his Christian subjects, and, in spite of the opposition of the Mohammedans, they were raised to civil and military offices. The Syrians, however, accustomed to the indolent Turkish rule, revolted against this energetic and active Egyptian management, and it was some time before the insurrection was quelled, the Druses being the last to submit. They had asked the Maronites to join them, and the latter, who had held back when there was some chance of success, now rose under the most frivolous pretenses. In the mean time, in 1840, the allied fleet of England, Austria, and Turkey were employed to secure the

restoration of Syria to Turkey. Turkish agents were busy among the Maronites, fanning the flame of rebellion; most of these wretches were Englishmen. Finally, France not upholding Egypt, Syria was returned to Turkish rule. The position of the Christians now became worse than ever, and their merchants were obliged to invoke the protection of the European consuls against the spoliation of the Turks. Lord Stratford of Redcliffe interfered in their behalf at Constantinople, and quiet was for a while restored. The Turkish government wished to appoint a Turkish governor over Lebanon, but the English finally succeeded in obtaining the appointment of emir Beshir Kassim Shehab, a Christian. The Druses, however, took exception to this arrangement, and when subsequently the Maronite patriarch attempted to confiscate all civil authority for the benefit of the Maronites, they became exasperated. Colonel Rose, the English consul-general, wrote on that occasion, "The Maronite clergy show a determination to uphold their supremacy in the mountains at the risk of a civil war." And a civil war was the result of this obstinacy. The patriarch (for his functions among the Maronites, see below, under III. *Religious Status*. — I. *Clergy*) at the same time, by his mismanagement, excited the jealousies of the Turks, and displeased the English, whom the Druses hailed as their friends.

On Sept. 14, 1841, a first affray took place between the Druses and the Christians at Deir el-Kamar; it was repressed by the efforts of colonel Rose. The Druses rose again, however, on Oct. 13, 14, and 15, and the entire destruction of the town was only prevented by the arrival from Beirut of colonel Rose and Ayieb Pacha on the 16th. But the war had commenced, and the Druses, assisted by the Turks, who willfully and purposely promoted the hateful strife, soon got the better of the Christians, and, had it not been for the interference of the English consul, Turkish fanaticism would have extinguished every Christian life on and near Mount Lebanon. Quiet was restored, however, only for a season. See DRUSES. On Aug. 30, 1859, an affray took place at Bate-mirri, three hours from Beirut, originating in a quarrel between a Druse and a Christian boy, in which the Druses were defeated; but the next day, Sunday, they renewed the fight in greater numbers, and were victorious. The Druses now commenced burning the Maronite villages; the Turks fearing the power of European governments, Kurchid Pach put an end to the disturbance, yet without punishing the offenders. The Maronites, perceiving or believing that a secret understanding existed between the Druses and the Turks,

promptly commenced arming. In April, 1860, Kurchid Pacha received despatches from Constantinople; soon afterwards Seid Bev Jumblatt assembled a Druse divan at Muchtara, and great agitation commenced to pervade the Druse districts; Christians were murdered either singly or in small parties, and a great number of them, leaving their villages, fled to the stronger places of Zachle and Deir el-Kamar. On May 4 some Druses broke into the convent of Amik, near Deir el-Kamar, and murdered the superior in his bed. The Maronites still sought to obtain peace, but found that they would be compelled to meet force with force. Three thousand men from Zachle attacked the Druse village of Aindara, but were beaten by a much smaller force, their arrangements, and especially their discipline, being much inferior to that of the Druses. Kurchid Pacha had a Turkish camp in the immediate vicinity of Beiriut, and commanding the plain, but he did not interfere now as he had done on the former occasion. On the contrary, after encouraging the Maronites by promising them his protection against the Druses, he gave the signal of their massacre on May 30. One hundred Turkish soldiers and the irregular Turkish cavalry joined the Druses in cutting down the Maronites. The Druses would have pushed on to Beirat had they not been prevented by the Turks. The European consuls now attempted to interfere; they were met with fine protestations by the Turkish authorities, and nothing was done to repress the outrages. At the end of May the Druses blockaded Deir el-Kamar, and on June 1 it was attacked by 4000 of them. The city surrendered the next day. The pacha, after entering the city, upbraided the Maronites as traitors, rebels, etc., because they had thought it wise to defend themselves against the Druses. At the same time 2000 Druses, commanded by Seleb Bev Jumblatt, took Jezin, and murdered the inhabitants. Roman Catholic convents shared the same fate as those of the Maronites, being sacked, plundered, and burned: in that of Meshmfisy alone thirty monks had their throats cut; the plunder was enormous. Ali Said Bey's district was given up to fire and the sword. Sidon was only saved by the timely arrival of captain Maunsell, with his English ship the Firefly, on June 3. In the Anti-Lebanon, Said Bev's sister followed her brother's example and instructions, causing the Christians of Hasbeya and Rasheva to be inveigled into the serail of the former place, under promise of their being taken safely to Damascus; they were there murdered in cold blood by the Druses, without distinction of age or sex, on June 10. The Turkish soldiers crowded into the serail to enjoy the sight, and some of them even took part in the butchery. On June 14 Zachle was invested and taken and on the 19th Deir el-Kamar met with the same fate.

The entire male population was ruthlessly massacred, and the city given a prey to the flames. The surviving widows and children fled to the coasts. On June 22 a disturbance broke out at Beirut, in which even the Europeans were assailed, but it was repressed with the aid of general Kmety (Ismail Pacha). The purely Maronite districts of Lebanon now became greatly alarmed, the more as Turkish soldiers were quartered there under the pretense of protecting them. The European consuls advised together, and drew up a remonstrance to the Druse chiefs, which a Mr. Graham was sent to deliver to them. Said Bey Jumblatt, however, when appealed to, declared only his respect for England and his willingness to see this struggle end, but added that he had no power over it, and that the Druses would not obey him. Most of the Druse sheiks contrived to avoid Mr. Graham, and those he did meet gave him but evasive answers. Finally, on July 10, the Mohammedans of Damascus rose against the Christians, of whom there were some 25,000 in the city. The Christian quarter was soon a heap of smoldering ruins, beneath which numberless corpses were buried. Women, married and unmarried, were wandering through the streets, and were seen to cry for assistance, with heads uncovered and feet naked, appealing to the murderers for mercy. Many were sold as slaves for a few piastres, or taken away to the desert. The streets were crowded with fanatics, who shouted continually, "Death to the Christians! Let us slaughter the Christians! Let not one remain!" Every church and convent was plundered and afterwards burned. The silver plate, jewelry, and gold coin taken from these sanctuaries "were not allowed to be plundered by the rabble, but were removed by soldiers." These are the words of the British consul, Mr. Brant. The consulates of France, Russia, Austria, Belgium, Holland, and the United States were all burned. Those of England and Prussia escaped, as they were not situated in the Christian quarter, and they became an asylum for as many as were able to reach them. Others were saved in great numbers in the house of Abd-el-Kader, and in the citadel; but the governor, Ahmed Pacha, was an unmoved witness of the devastation, or an accomplice in the lawless deeds of the plundering rabble (*Lond. Rev.* 1860, Oct., p. 160). As has already been stated in the article DRUSES *SEE DRUSES* (q.v.), the French and English governments were obliged to come to the rescue of the Syrian Christians, and the Porte was forced to inflict punishment upon those whom the Turkish officers had made pliant tools for the destruction of the Maronites. On Aug. 3 a conference of the great powers — Britain, Austria, France, Prussia, Russia, and Turkey as well-met, but the meeting was closed without accomplishing

any real good. All that was secured was the promise that the Sublime Porte had endeavored and would continue to do its duty; but what this duty consisted in, it has been hard to determine to this day. Only a few weeks previously the Christian emirs had been compelled by the Turkish pacha to testify that the conduct of the Turks was irreproachable, when the emirs felt constrained afterwards to acknowledge their extorted perjury. In October, finally, the international conference of the plenipotentiaries of European powers convened at Beirut, and crowned their labors successfully, June 9, 1861, by a special treaty concerning the administration of the Lebanon. *SEE DRUSES.*

II. Social Position. — The nation may be considered as divided into two classes, the common people and the *sheiks*, by whom must be understood the most eminent of the inhabitants, who, from the antiquity of their families and the opulence of their fortunes, are superior to the ordinary class. They all live dispersed in the mountains, in villages, hamlets, and even detached houses, which is never the case in the plains. The whole nation consists of cultivators. Every man improves the little domain he possesses, or farms, with his own hands. Even the *sheiks* live in the same manner, and are only distinguished from the rest by a bad pelisse, a horse, and a few slight advantages in food and lodging; they all live frugally, without many enjoyments, but also with few wants, as they are little acquainted with the inventions of luxury. In general, the nation is poor, but no one wants necessaries; and if beggars are sometimes seen, they come rather from the sea-coast than the country itself. Property is as sacred among them as in Europe; nor do we hear of robberies and extortions so frequently committed by the Turks. Travelers may journey there, either by night or by day, with a security unknown in any other part of the empire, and the stranger is received with hospitality, as among the Arabs: it must be owned, however, that the Maronites are less generous, and rather inclined to the vice of parsimony. Conformably to the doctrines of Christianity, they have only one wife, whom they frequently espouse without having seen, and always without having been much in her company. Contrary to the precepts of that same religion, however, they have admitted, or retained, the Arab custom of retaliation, and the nearest relation of a murdered person is bound to avenge him. From a habit founded on distrust, and the political state of the country, every one, whether sheik or peasant, walks continually armed with a musket and poniards. This is, perhaps, an inconvenience; but this advantage results

from it, that they have no novices in the use of arms among them when it is necessary to employ them against the Turks. As the country maintains no regular troops, every man is obliged to join the army in time of war; and if this militia were well conducted, it would be superior to many European armies. From accounts taken in late years, the number of men fit to bear arms amounts to 35,000.

III. Religious Status. — Although the Maronites are united with Rome, and though they are perhaps the most ultramontane people in the world, they nevertheless retain their distinctive national rites and usages.

1. Clergy. — The most peculiar of all their institutions is undoubtedly the clerical. As we have seen above, it is supposed that the founder of the Maronites constituted himself a patriarch, and this position remains the highest dignity among them. It is true they admit the supremacy of Rome, but for the home government of the Church the patriarch is the highest authority. and in his election, as well as in the selection of all the clergy, the Maronite exercises his own private judgment, independent of the papal power at Rome. Here it may not be improper to state that the patriarch is at present expected to furnish every tenth year a report of the state of his patriarchate. Associated with the patriarch in the ecclesiastical government of the Maronites are twelve bishops, but of the latter four are titular, or *inpartibus*. The patriarch himself is chosen by the bishops in secret conclave, and by ballot. “The debates usually last for many days, and even weeks; at last, when the choice is made, the bishops present kneel down and kiss the new patriarch’s hands; the patriarch immediately writes letters to all the chief nobles of the mountain informing them of his nomination. The latter lose no time in assembling to pay him their respects and make their obeisance. A pelisse of honor shortly afterwards arrives for the patriarch from the governor of Lebanon. Fires, and rejoicing, and illumination extend throughout the whole range of the Maronite districts; a petition is now drawn up to be sent to the pope, praying him to confirm the choice which has just been made, and signed by the principal chiefs. It is open, however, to the clergy, or any party, to protest against the nomination. . . . The pope, however, never fails at once to confirm a selection which has the support of the feudal aristocracy and principal clergy of Lebanon” (Churchill 3:78). In true puerile affectation and presumptuous inference, the patriarch of the Maronites, who is styled the Patriarch of Antioch, usually takes the name of *Peter*, intended to denote an official descent from the apostle Peter. “His power,” says Churchill, “is

despotic, and from his decision there is no appeal, either in temporal or spiritual affairs; even the pope's legate, who resides constantly in Lebanon, and is supposed to superintend all the ecclesiastical proceedings of the Maronite Church, has no influence over the patriarch beyond what may be obtained by personal superiority of character.... The income of the patriarch may amount to about £5000 a year, derived principally from lands set apart exclusively for the office. He obtains likewise a sixth of the revenue of the bishops." "The patriarch of the Maronites," says Madden (*Turkish Empire*, 2:160), "formerly exercised very extensive power not only of a religious, but of a civil kind, for the protection of his people, who in those times possessed many important immunities and franchises, which, since 1842, have been either abrogated or assimilated to the privileges enjoyed by the Roman Catholic subjects of the Porte. But the Maronites still, in all great emergencies and dangers at the hands of their old and constant enemies the Druses, are wont to look for counsel and guidance to their patriarch rather than to the emir, their nominal civil protector. The patriarch, in the winter, resides ordinarily at Kesruan, and in the summer at the monastery of Canobin, in the valley of Tripoli, supposed to be, on very insufficient grounds, where the venerated Maron had fixed his abode." The eight regular bishoprics of the Maronite Church are Aleppo, Tripoli, Jebail, Baalbek, Damascus, Cyprus, Beirut, Tyre, and Sidon. The incumbents of this, the second office, are, like the patriarch, possessed of stated revenues, that enable them to live in comparative affluence. Their election takes place as follows: "When a bishop dies, the patriarch writes to the principal people of the village under the jurisdiction of the deceased prelate, requesting them to assemble together and nominate a priest to the vacant see; should there be a unanimity of voices, the patriarch confirms their selection; if, on the contrary, they cannot agree, he desires them to send him the names of three priests, and from this list he selects one for the bishopric." The inferior clergy of the Maronites, who have no fixed sources of income, subsist on the produce of their masses, the bounty of their congregations, and, above all, *on the labor of their hands*, i.e. they exercise trades, or cultivate small plots of ground, and are thus industriously employed *for the maintenance of their families*: it is one of the peculiar characteristics of the Eastern clergy that they are not strangers to the married state. The Maronite priests marry as in the first ages of the Church, but their wives must be maidens, and not widows; nor can they marry a second time.

The poverty to which the Maronite clergy is doomed is, however, recompensed to them by the great respect the people award them. "Their vanity is incessantly flattered; whoever approaches them, whether rich or poor, great or small, is anxious to kiss their hands, which they fail not to present.... It is perhaps to the potent influence of the clergy that we must attribute the mild and simple manners generally prevailing among the Maronites, for violent crimes are extremely rare among them. Retribution immediately follows every offense, however slight, and the clergy are rigorous in preventing every appearance of disorder or scandal among the members of their flocks. Before a young man can marry he must obtain the consent of his pastor and of his bishop. If they disapprove of the marriage they prohibit it, and the Maronite has no remedy. If an unmarried girl become a mother, her seducer is compelled to marry her, whatever be the inequality of their conditions; if he refuses he is reduced to obedience by measures of severity, fasting, imprisonment, and even bastinadoing. This influence of the clergy extends to every detail of civil and domestic life. The Maronite who should appeal from the decision of the clergy to the civil authority of the emirs would not be listened to by them, and the act would be regarded by the appellant's bishop as a transgression to be visited with condign punishment" (Kelly). The number of Maronite priests is said to be 1200, and the number of their churches 400.

2. Monastics. — Of the more than 200 convents scattered through Lebanon, nearly one half belong to the Maronites, and contain from 20,000 to 25,000 inmates, who all wear a distinctive costume, and follow the rule of St. Anthony. They are divided into three different congregations those of St. Isaiah, those of the Alipines, and those of the Libanese or Baladites; besides which there are also a number of nunneries. Their dress, like that of all Greek monastics, consists of a black frockcoat, reaching to the knees, confined round the waist by a leathern girdle, and surmounted by a hood, which can be drawn over the head. This attire is called a "cacooly." The temporal affairs of the convents are directed by a superior monk, called Reis el-Aam, a sort of accountant-general, who regulates all the disbursements of his fraternity. "Lest the monks should form any particular local attachments, they are removed from convent to convent every six months, in a kind of rotation. They are, in general, exceedingly ignorant, but skillful in such trades as are necessary for their own wants and necessities." "The monks, by the rules of their order, are not allowed to smoke or eat meat. The latter, however, is permitted in case of sickness, by

the order of the physician and the consent of the superior. In making long journeys the bishop may give the same permission, provided they shall not indulge in it on the days in which its use is forbidden by the canons of the Church. Much stress is laid on the nunneries being built at a distance from the convents; and no nun or woman is allowed to enter a convent, nor a monk to enter a nunnery, except on occasions of great necessity, and with strict limitation. The monks are employed in their prayers, and in various occupations of industry; the lay-brothers tilling the lands of the convents, making shoes, weaving, begging, etc.; and the priests applying themselves to study, copying books, and other matters befitting the dignity of their office. The nuns are taught to read and sew. Both the monks and nuns vow the three conditions of a monastic life — namely, chastity, poverty, and obedience; and, taken as a whole, both are extremely ignorant and bigoted.”

IV. *Peculiar Religious Usages.* — Like the Bohemians and the (Greek Christians, the Maronites administer the sacraments in both kinds, dipping the bread in wine before its distribution. “The host is a small round loaf, unleavened, of the thickness of a finger, and about the size of a crown-piece. On the top is the impression of a seal, which is eaten by the priest, who cuts the remainder into small pieces, and putting it into the wine in the cup, administers to each person with a spoon, which serves the whole congregation” (Kelly, *Syria and the Holy Land*, as compiled from Burckhardt. etc., p. 92). They also keep up public nightly prayers, which are attended by women as well as by men; have a peculiar commemoration of the dead in the three weeks preceding Lent, and their whole office during Lent is of immense length and peculiar to themselves. Indeed their ritual and liturgy differ in many respects from those of the Latin Church. The mass is recited in the Syriac language, with the exception of the Epistle and Gospel, and some prayers, which are recited in Arabic, the only language understood by the people, the Syriac being simply used in the services of the Church and the offices of the priests.

V. *Educational Status.* — The Maronite clergy had formerly lands at Rome, the revenues of which were appropriated to keeping up a seminary for the education of young Christians from the Lebanon; and from this high school came forth some illustrious Romanists, e.g. Gabriel Sionita, Abr. Echellensis, the Assemani, etc. The resources of this appropriation were confiscated by the French during the first revolutionary war. Since then the

court of Rome has granted them a *hospitium* at Rome, to which they may send several of their youth to receive a gratuitous education. It would seem that this institution might introduce among them the ideas and arts of Europe; but the pupils of this school, limited to an education purely monastic, bring home nothing but the Italian language, which is of no use, and a stock of theological learning from which as little advantage can be derived; they accordingly soon assimilate with the rest. Nor has a greater change been operated by the three or four missionaries maintained by the French Capuchins at Gazir, Tripoli, and Beirat. Their labors consist in preaching in their church, in instructing children in the Catechism, Thomas a Kempis, and the Psalms, and in teaching them to read and write. Formerly the Jesuits had two missionaries at their house at Antura, but the Lazarites have now succeeded them in their mission. The most valuable advantage that has resulted from these labors is that the art of writing has become more common among the Maronites, and rendered them, in that country, what the Copts are in Egypt, that is, they are in possession of all the posts of writers, intendants, and *kaiygas* among the Turks, and especially of those among their neighbors, the Druses. "But, though the ability to read and write be thus general among the Maronites, it must not be inferred that they are a literary people. Far from it; the book-learning of all classes, both clergy and laity, can hardly be rated too low. There are native printing-presses at work in some of the monasteries, but the sheets they issue are all of an ecclesiastical kind—chiefly portions of the Scripture or mass-books in Syriac, which few even of the clergy understand, though they repeat them by rote" (Kelly, p. 97).

The American Protestant churches, so ably represented by the Rev. W. M. Thomson and others, have done already a noble work for Syria. The MaIronite, of course, has not been forgotten, and his educational disadvantages it has been sought to ameliorate by bringing the influence of American schools to his very door. Tristram (*Land of Israel* [Lond. 1865], p. 22), who cites the opinion of the noteli pacha Daid Oghli, writes the following as from the mouth of the illustrious Mussulman ruler of Mount Lebanon: "He spoke with much warmth and interest of the American mission-schools; and it was gratifying to hear his independent testimony to the importance and solid nature of the work they are carrying on, especially among the Maronites, with whom he considered they have met with greater success than with any any other sect."

See Churchill, *Mount Lebanon* (Lond. 1853, 3 vols. 8voa, iii, chap. v-viii; id. *Druse and Maronite* (Lond. 1864, 8vo); Kelly, *Syria, and the Holy Land* (compiled from Burckhardt and others), chap. viii; Guys, *leir-ut et le Liban* (Par. 1860); Madden, *Turkish Empire*, ii, ch. vi; Ritter, *Erdkutnde*, 17:744; Robinson, *Palestine*, 2:572; Comte de Paris, *Dumas et le Liben*, p. 75-78; Neale, *Hist. of East. Ch.* (Introd.), 1:153 sq.; Cowper, *Sects in Syria* (Lond. 1860); Schnurrer, *De eccl. Spurmit.* (Tub. 1810 and 1811); Silbernagl *Verfassung u. gegenwartiger Bestand sammtlicher Kiechen des Orients* (Landshut, 1865); Foulkes, *Christendom's; Divisions. ii*, ch. ix; *New-Englander*, 1861, p. 32; *Westminster Review*, 1862 (July).

Marot, Clement

a French poet, known in the theological world for his translation of the Psalms into French verse, was born at Chalons in 1495. At an early age he commenced writing poetry, and at the recommendation of Francis I became a member of the household of Margaret, duchess of Alençon. He afterwards accompanied Francis I to Italy, and was wounded and taken prisoner at the battle of Pavia. On his return to France he wrote poetry for Diana of Poitiers, the king's mistress, who showed him favor; but, having presumed too much upon his familiarity with her. she discarded him, and he was soon after put in prison, through her agency as some have believed, in 1525. Margaret procured his release; and it appears likely that Marot's intercourse with that princess caused him to incline towards the Reformation, although he is not known to have openly embraced it. When, in 1533, Gerard Roussel preached in Paris, after the dismissal of the fanatic Sorbonnist Beda, satirical verses against the Protestants were posted on the walls; Marot answered in the same tone; and when the persecution broke out, in the spring of 1534, prohibited books being found in his dwelling, Marot was compelled to flee to Beam, whence he afterwards proceeded to Ferrara, the residence of the duchess Renata of Este. In 1536 Francis I recalled him to his court. It is said that he had recanted, but this is not proved. In 1538 he commenced, with the aid of the learned Vatablus, the translation of the Psalms, which was very warmly received; it became the fashion at court to sing them, and Charles V himself gave Marot a reward of two hundred doubloons. The Sorbonne, however, condemned the book, while the pope caused it to be reprinted at Rome in 1542. Marot, in the mean time, was, on account of the condemnation of the Sorbonne, obliged, in 1543, to flee to Geneva, where he was well received by Calvin, and invited to continue his translation of the Psalms, which was first used

in public worship at Granson, Switzerland, Dec. 1, 1540. Geneva, however, did not long please Marot, accustomed to the gayety of the French court; and, after remaining a while at Charnbery, he went to Turin, where he died in 1544. The first known edition of Marot's translation appeared towards the end of the year 1541; it contained thirty psalms, a poetical translation of the Lord's Prayer, etc. A second edition, containing thirty psalms, with the music, and the liturgy of Geneva, was published by Calvin in 1542. The next year another edition appeared, containing twenty more psalms, dedicated "to the ladies of France," and accompanied by the well-known preface of Calvin; this, as well as the subsequent editions, contains the liturgy; the catechism, the reformed confession of faith, and prayers were at sundry times added to others. The remainder of the Psalms was translated by Beza (1550-52), and in 1552 appeared the first complete Psalter, with Beza's eloquent appeal "to the Church of our Lord." The popularity of these Psalms was so great that, after the Colloquy of Poissy, on Oct. 19, 1561, Charles IX gave the Lyons printer, Anton Vincent, the privilege of printing them. In the 17th century the translation was revised by Conrart, first secretary of the French Academy, and the learned Anton Labastide. This revision, approved by the Synod of Charenton in 1679, was admitted in the churches of Geneva, Neufchatel, and Hesse, while the ancient text remained in use in the French villages. In 1701 Beausobre and Lenfant, at Berlin, undertook a revision, which was much opposed, especially by country congregations. *SEE LENFANT*. The modern revision was accepted without difficulty. Originally, the Psalms of Marot were sung to popular tunes; but when they came to be used in the Church it was found necessary to adapt a more solemn music to them. William Frank, however, who is considered the original composer of the tunes, wrote only a few. The Lyons edition of 1561 contains some by Louis Bourgeois; those of 1562 and 1565 have some by Claude Goudimel, the teacher of Palestrina, in four voices. See Anguis, *Vie de Marot*, prefixed to his (*Euvres* (1823, 5 vols. 8vo); Jan Suet, *Leven en Bedriff von C. Marot* (1655); Sainte-Beuve, *Tableau de la Poesie Franaise au siximee siecle*; *Christian Review*, vol. ix; Paleario, *Life and Times*, 2:92 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopeddie*, 9:115; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Gener.* 33:924. (J. N. P.)

Ma'roth

(Heb. *laeroth'*, **twom**; bitter fountains; Sept. **ὀδύνας**, Vulg. *amaritudines*), a place apparently not far from Jerusalem, on the route of

the invading Assyrian army from Lachish (^{<3000>}Micah 1:12; see Henderson, *Comment. ad loc.*). Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 107) conjectures it was identical with *Maarath* (^{<6859>}Joshua 15:59); but this name is very different in the Hebrew.

Marouf

SEE MARÛF.

Marozia

a Roman lady of noble birth, but of infamous reputation in the scandalous chronicles of her age, slaughter of the equally notorious Theodora (q.v.), was born near the close of the 9th century. On the dissolution of all the moral ties of public and private life which the war of factions occasioned in Rome in the 10th century, Marozia, by her beauty and her intrigues, contrived to exercise great influence. She was married three times, and, according to Luitprand, had skill and address enough to procure the deposition and death of the pope, John X, and the elevation of her son, the fruit, it is alleged, of adulterous intercourse with pope Sergius III, to the pontificate, under the name of John XI. This testimony of Luitprand, who wrote some time after the period, is considered doubtful by Muratori and by Dr. Pertz. See, however, our articles JOHN X *SEE JOHN X* and JOHN XI *SEE JOHN XI*. In her latter years Marozia suffered the punishment of her early crimes. She was imprisoned by her own son Alberic, and died in prison at Rome in 938.

Marquesas Isles

frequently applied to the whole Mendania Archipelago, refers strictly only to the southern group of the Mendafia Archipelago, in Polynesia, the northern group bearing the name of the Washington Islands. They are situated in lat. 7° 30' - 109° 30' S., long. 138° - 140° 20' W., have an area of 500 English square miles, and a population of 6011, and were discovered by Mendana de Neyra, a Spanish navigator, in 1596 (the Washington Isles were discovered in 1791 by Ingraham, an American). The isles were named after the viceroy of Peru, Marquesas de Mendoza. They are of volcanic origin, and are in general covered with mountains, rising in some cases to about 3500 feet above the sea-level; the soil is rich and fertile, and the climate hot, but healthy. The coasts are difficult of access, on account of the surrounding reefs and the sudden changes of the wind. Cocoa-nut,

bread-fruit, and papaw trees are grown, and bananas, plantains, and sugar-cane are cultivated.

The inhabitants are of the same race as those of the Society and Sandwich islands. They are well proportioned and handsome, but degraded in their religion and in many of their customs. They exhibit some confused notion of a divine being, whom they call Etooa; but they give the same name to the spirit of a priest, of a king, or any of his relations, and generally to all Europeans, as superior beings. The principal appearance of a religious feeling is found in their reverence for anything pronounced to be “taboo” or sacred, which a priest only can extend to any general object, but which every person may effect upon his own property by merely declaring that the spirit of his father, or of some king, or of any other person, reposes in the spot or article which he wishes to preserve. They have a universal belief in charms (which they name “kaha”) which kill, by imperceptible means and slow degrees, those against whom they are directed, and which the priests chiefly are understood to be able to render effectual. Some reference to a future life appears in their funeral rites. The corpse is washed, and laid upon a platform under a piece of new cloth; and, to obtain a safe passage for the deceased through the lower regions, a great feast is given, by the family to the priests and the relations. The body continues to be rubbed for several months with coconut oil, till it becomes quite hard and incorruptible; and a second feast, exactly twelve months after the first, is then given to thank the gods for having granted to the deceased a safe arrival to the other world. The corpse is then broken in pieces, packed in a box, and, deposited in the morai or burying-place, which no woman is permitted to approach upon the pain of death.

On some of the islands there are missionary stations; but, although cannibalism has been abolished, the efforts; of the missionaries have not otherwise met with much success. The Gospel was introduced in the Marquesas: Isles by the “London Missionary Society” in 1797. The first missionary was William Crook, a man of great zeal and untiring energy. Though greatly discouraged by the ignorance and rudeness of the natives, he pushed the good work, and accomplished much, notwithstanding his failure to secure converts. In 1825, when three teachers came to his aid, it was found that the natives had destroyed many of their idols, and were improving in morals. In 1828 the mission was abandoned; but in 1831 Mr. Darling, then a missionary to Tahiti, visited the isles, and gave the home society such glowing accounts of the improvements that had been wrought

by their earlier efforts, that the mission was re-established in 1833 by Mr. Darling, assisted by Messrs. Rodgerson and Stallworthy, and four natives from Tahiti; but in 1841 the work was again abandoned. The Romanists gained a footing in 1838; and when in 1842 the isles were placed under French protection, the Roman Catholics secured most favorable terms for their missionaries. Their work, however, remains thus far without fruit. See Aikman, *Cyclop. of Christian Missions*, p. 68.

Marquette, Jacques,

a celebrated French Roman Catholic missionary and discoverer, was born in 1637, at Laon, in Picardy; entered the Order of the Jesuits; became a missionary, and traveled and labored several years in Canada and other regions. He was a member of the first exploring party to the Mississippi River, and wrote a narrative of the expedition (Paris, 1681). "He writes," says professor Sparks, "as a scholar, and as a man of careful observation and practical sense. In every point of view, this tract is one of the most interesting among those that illustrate the early history of America." On his return from the Mississippi he resumed his missionary labors among the Miamis on Lake Michigan, and died there, May 18, 1675. — Charlevoix, *Histoire de la Nouvelle France*, s.v.; Moréri, *Dictionnaire Historique*, s.v.; Bacqueville de la Potheric, *Hist. de l'Amérique Septentrionale* (Paris, 1872, 4 vols. 12mo); Sparks. *Amer. Biog.* vol. 10:1st series, s.v.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 33:942.

Marquez, Juan

a Spanish theologian, was born at Madrid in 1564; studied at the University of Salamanca; joined the Augustines of Madrid, and attained to the first dignities of his order. He died at Salamanca Feb. 17, 1621. He has written *El gobernador Christiano, lde ducido de has vidos de Moysen y Josue, principes del pueblo a Dios* (Salamanca, 1612, 1619, 1634, fol.): — *Los dos Estados de la espiritual Gerusalem sobre los Psalmos cxxv y cxxxvi* (Medina. 1603, and Salamanca, 1610, 4to): — *Origen de los Padros Ermitanos de son Augustin, y su verdadera institucion antes del gran concilio Lateranense* (Salamanca, 1618, fol.): — *Vida del V. P. F. Alonso de Horozco* (Madrid, 1648, 8vo). He left in manuscript some comedies and several theological treatises. — Nicholas Antonio, *Bibliotheca Scriptorum Hispanice*, 3:734; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, vol. 33, s.v.

Marquis, James E.

a Presbyterian minister, was born near Cross Creek, Pa., Nov. 20, 1815; was educated in Jefferson College, Canonsburg, Pa.; studied divinity in the Western Theological Seminary, Alleghany, Pa.; was licensed by Washington Presbytery in 1844, and ordained by Sidney Presbytery in 1848. During the first ten years of his ministry he labored successively in the churches of Kenton, Mansfield, Shelby, and Ontario, Ohio. In 1858 he removed to Bloomington, Ill., and commenced to labor as presbyterial missionary for the presbyteries of Peoria and Bloomington. In 1859 he accepted the united charge of the churches of Salem, Brunswick, and Elmawood, which he retained until his death, Feb. 22, 1863. Mr. Marquis was noted for his faithfulness, devotion, and purity of life. He was eminently successful as a pastor; earnest and instructive as a preacher. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1864, p. 171.

Marquis, Thomas

a Presbyterian minister, was born near Winchester, Va., in 1753. His early life was subjected to many deprivations. He received an ordinary common-school education, prosecuted his classical studies, amid painful vicissitudes, at Buffalo and Canonsburg, and in April, 1793, was licensed to preach; labored one year as a licentiate, and in 1794 was ordained and installed pastor of the church at Cross Creek, Pa. In 1796 he became an active missionary to the Indians, traveling down the Alleghany, and the lower waters of the Muskingum and Scioto rivers. In 1802 he became a member of the executive committee of the Missionary Board west of the Alleghany Mountains. The remaining twenty years of his ministry were filled up with multiplied labors and varied but unusual success. He died Sept. 27, 1829. Mr. Marquis was a laborious and faithful pastor, eminently wise in counsel, and apt in introducing and enforcing religious duty. As a preacher he was composed and earnest, extremely logical in style, and entirely perspicuous in the expression of thought. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1864, p. 171, Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 4:83-89.

Marracci

an Italian priest, eminent as an Oriental scholar, was born at Lucca in 1612, and for years held the professorship of Arabic in the Collegia della Sapienza in Rome. He died in 1700. His principal work is an excellent edition of the Koran in Arabic, with a Latin version (1698). "This," says

Hallam, in his Introduction to the Literature of Europe, “is still esteemed the best.”

Marriage

This relation is in a general way represented by several Hebrew words, the most distinctive of which are several forms of $\hat{t}j$; *chathan*’, to give in marriage; Gr. $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\mu\omicron\varsigma$, a wedding. It is very remarkable, however, as well as significant, that there is no single word in the whole Hebrew Scriptures for the estate of marriage, or to express the abstract idea of wedlock, matrimony, as the German *Ehe* does. It is only in the post-exilian period, when the laws of marriage had gradually developed themselves, that we meet with the abstract $tw\check{c}ya$ and $gwwz$ — — $\zeta\epsilon\upsilon\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ (*Jebanoth*, 6:5; *Kiddushin*, 1:2); the former denoting the legal, and the latter the natural side of matrimony. But even then no such definition of marriage is to be found in the Hebrew writings as we find in the Roman law, “Nuptiue sunt conjunctio maris et feminae et consortium omnis vite, divini et humani juris communicatio” (*Dig. lib. xxiii, tit. 2, “De ritu nupt.”*). In the present article, which treats of marriage as found among the Hebrew race, we cover the entire field of matrimonial relations and ceremonies, both ancient and modern. *SEE WEDLOCK.*

I. Origin, Primitive Relations, and General View of the Married State. —

1. The institution of marriage is founded on the requirements of man’s nature, and dates from the time of his original creation. It may be said to have been ordained by God, in as far as man’s nature was ordained by him; but its formal appointment was the work of man, and it has ever been in its essence. a natural and civil institution, though admitting of the infusion of a religious element into it. This view of marriage is exhibited in the historical account of its origin in the book of Genesis; the peculiar formation of man’s nature is assigned to the Creator, who, seeing it “not good for man to be alone,” determined to form an “help meet for him” ($\langle\text{GEN}28\rangle$ Genesis 2:18), and accordingly completed the work by the addition of the female to the male ($\langle\text{GEN}27\rangle$ Genesis 1:27). The necessity for this step appears from the words used in the declaration of the divine counsel. Man, as an intellectual and spiritual being, would not have been a worthy representative of the Deity on earth, so long as he lived in solitude, or in communion only with beings either high above him in the scale of creation, as angels, or far beneath him, as the beasts of the field. It was absolutely necessary, not only for his

comfort and happiness, but still more for the perfection of the divine work, that he should have a “help *meet* for him,” or, as the words more properly mean, “the exact counterpart of himself”“ (/DgḥK]rzi[eSeptuag. βοηθός κατ’ αὐτόν; Vulg. *adjutorium simile sibi*, “a help meet for him”) — a being capable of receiving and reflecting his thoughts and affections. No sooner was the formation of woman effected, than Adam recognized in that act the will of the Creator as to man’s social condition, and immediately enunciated the important statement, to which his posterity might refer as the charter of marriage in all succeeding ages, “Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife; and they shall be one flesh” (^{<0024>}Genesis 2:24). From these words, coupled with the circumstances attendant on the formation of the first woman, we may evolve the following principles:

- (1) The unity of man and wife, as implied in her being formed out of man, and as expressed in the words “one flesh;”
- (2) the indissolubleness of the marriage bond, except on the strongest grounds (compare ^{<009>}Matthew 19:9);
- (3) monogamy, as the original law of marriage, resulting from there having been but one original couple, as is forcibly expressed in the subsequent reference to this passage by our Lord (“they *twain*,” ^{<005>}Matthew 19:5) and St. Paul (“*two* shall be one flesh,” ^{<016>}1 Corinthians 6:16);
- (4) the social equality of man and wife, as implied in the terms *ish* and *ishshah*, the one being the exact correlative of the other, as well as in the words “help meet for him;”
- (5) the subordination of the wife to the husband, consequent upon her subsequent formation (^{<018>}1 Corinthians 11:8, 9; ^{<023>}1 Timothy 2:13); and
- (6) the respective duties of man and wife, as implied in the words “help meet for him.”

2. The introduction of sin into the world modified to a certain extent the mutual relations of man and wife. As the blame of seduction to sin lay on the latter, the condition of subordination was turned into subjection, and it was said to her of her husband, “he shall rule over thee” (^{<016>}Genesis 3:16)-a sentence which, regarded as a prediction, has been strikingly fulfilled in

the position assigned to women in Oriental countries; but which, regarded as a rule of life, is fully sustained by the voice of nature and by the teaching of Christianity (~~464B~~ 1 Corinthians 14:34; ~~462~~ Ephesians 5:22, 23; Timothy 2:12). The evil effects of the fall were soon apparent in the corrupt usages of marriage: the unity of the bond was impaired by polygamy, which appears to have originated among the Cainites (~~0049~~ Genesis 4:19); and its purity was deteriorated by the promiscuous intermarriage of the “sons of God” with the “daughters of men,” i.e. of the Sethites With the Cainites, in the days preceding the flood (~~0082~~ Genesis 6:2).

3. For the history of marriage in the later ages. see below. One question may properly be considered here, i.e. *celibacy*. Shortly before the Christian sera an important change took place in the views entertained on the question of marriage as affecting the spiritual and intellectual parts of man’s nature. Throughout the Old Testament period marriage was regarded as the indispensable duty of every man, nor was it surmised that there existed in it any drawback to the attainment of the highest degree of holiness. In the interval that elapsed between the Old and New Testament periods, a spirit of asceticism had been evolved, probably in antagonism to the foreign notions with which the Jews were brought into close and painful contact. The Essenes were the first to propound any doubts as to the propriety of marriage; some of them avoided it altogether, others availed themselves of it under restrictions (Josephus, *War*, 2:8, § 2, 13). Similar views were adopted by the Therapeutae, and at a later period by the Gnostics (Burton’s *Lectures*, 1:214); thence they passed into the Christian Church, forming one of the distinctive tenets of the Encratites (Burton, 2:161), and finally developing into the system of Monachism. The philosophical tenets on which the prohibition of marriage was based are generally condemned in ~~5026~~ Colossians 2:16-23, and specifically in ~~5048~~ 1 Timothy 4:3. The general propriety of marriage is enforced on numerous occasions, and abstinence from it is commended only in cases where it was rendered expedient by the calls of duty (~~4092~~ Matthew 19:12; ~~4078~~ 1 Corinthians 7:8, 26). With regard to remarriage after the death of one of the parties, the Jews, in common with other nations, regarded abstinence from it, particularly in the case of a widow, laudable, and a sign of holiness (~~4076~~ Luke 2:36, 7; Josephus, *Ant.* 17:13, 4; 18:6, 6); but it is clear, from the example of Josephus (*Vit.* 76), that there was no prohibition even in the case of a priest. In the Apostolic Church remarriage was regarded as occasionally undesirable (~~4074~~ 1 Corinthians 7:40), and as an absolute

disqualification for holy functions, whether in a man or woman (^{508D}1 Timothy 3:2,12; 5:9); at the same time it is recommended in the case of young widows (⁵⁰⁵⁴1 Timothy 5:14).

II. *Mode of selecting a Bride, Betrothal, and Marriage price.* — 1.

Imitating the example of the Father of the Universe, who provided the man he made with a wife, fathers from the beginning considered it both their duty and prerogative to find or select wives for their sons (^{024B}Genesis 24:3; 38:6). In the absence of the father, the selection devolved upon the mother (⁰²²¹Genesis 21:21). Even in cases where the wishes of the son were consulted, the proposals were made by the father (⁰³⁰⁴Genesis 34:4, 8); and the violation of this parental prerogative on the part of the son was “a grief of mind” to the father (⁰²⁵⁵Genesis 26:35). The proposals were generally made by the parents of the young man, except when there was a difference of rank; in such a case the negotiations proceeded from the father of the maiden (⁰¹²¹Exodus 2:21), and when accepted by the parents on both sides, sometimes also consulting the opinion of the adult brothers of the maiden (⁰²⁵¹Genesis 24:51; 34:11), the matter was considered as settled without requiring the consent of the bride. The case of Rebekah (⁰²⁵⁸Genesis 24:58) forms no exception to this general practice, inasmuch as the alliance had already been concluded between Eleazar and Laban, and the question put to her afterwards was to consult her opinion, not about it, but about the time of her departure. Before, however, the marriage contract was finally concluded, a price (^{rhm}) was stipulated for, which the young man had to pay to the father of the maiden (⁰³¹⁵Genesis 31:15; 34:12), besides giving presents (tm) to her relations (⁰²⁵³Genesis 24:53; 34:12). This marriage-price was regarded as a compensation due to the parents for the loss of service which they sustained by the departure of their daughter, as well as for the trouble and expense which they incurred in her education. Hence, if the proffered young man had not the requisite compensation, he was obliged to make it up in service (⁰²²¹Genesis 29:20; ⁰¹²¹Exodus 2:21; 3:1). Some, indeed, deny that a price had to be paid down to the father for parting with his daughter, and appeal for support to ⁰³¹⁵Genesis 31:15, where, according to them, “the daughters of Laban make it a matter of complaint, that their father bargained for the services of Jacob in exchange for their hands, just as if they *were strangers*;” thus showing that the sale of daughters was regarded as an unjust act and a matter of complaint (Saalschutz, *Das Mosaische Recht*. p. 733). But, on a closer inspection of the passage in question, it will be seen that Rachel and

Leah do not at all complain of any indignity heaped on them by being sold just as if they were strangers, but, on the contrary, mention the sale to corroborate their statement that they are no longer their father's property, have no more any portion in his possession, and are *now* regarded by him as strangers, since, according to the usual custom, they have been duly sold to their husband, and hence agree with the latter that it is time for them to depart. Besides, the marriage-price is distinctly mentioned in other passages of Scripture (^{<0225>}Exodus 22:15, 16; ^{<0823>}1 Samuel 18:23, 25; ^{<0840>}Ruth 4:10; ^{<2082>}Hosea 3:2), and was commonly demanded by the nations of antiquity; as the Babylonians (Herod. 1:196); Assyrians (Elian, *V. H.* 4:1; Strabo, 16:745); the ancient Greeks (*Odys.* 8:318 sq.; Arist. *Polit.* 2:8; Pausan. 3:12, 2); the Germans (Tacitus, *Germ.* 18), and still obtains in the East to the present day. In fact, it could not be otherwise where polygamy was practiced. As the number of maidens was under such circumstances less than that of wooers, it called forth competition, and it was but natural that he who offered the highest marriage-price obtained the damsel. There was therefore no fixed marriage-price; it varied according to circumstances. We meet with no dowry given with the bride by her father during the patriarchal age, except a maid-servant (^{<0243>}Genesis 24:61; 29:24,29).

2. The Mosaic enactments introduced no changes into these usages. The father's power over the child in matters of marriage continued paramount, and he could give his children to any one he pleased without asking their consent. Thus Caleb offers his daughter Achsah (^{<0556>}Joshua 15:16,17) as wife to any one who will conquer Kirjath-sepher (^{<0012>}Judges 1:12). Saul promises his daughter to him who shall kill the Philistine, and barter his daughter Michal for the prepuces of a hundred slain Philistines (^{<0973>}1 Samuel 17:26, 27; 18:25-27); and Ibzan takes thirty wives for his thirty sons (^{<0713>}Judges 12:9). The imaginary case of women soliciting husbands (^{<2340>}Isaiah 4:1) was designed to convey to the mind a picture of the ravages of war, by which the greater part of the males had fallen. A judicial marriage-price (**rhm hl wtbh**) was now introduced, which was fixed at fifty silver shekels (^{<0216>}Exodus 12:16, with ^{<0523>}Deuteronomy 22:29), being the highest rate of a servant (^{<0273>}Leviticus 27:3), so that one had to pay as much for a wife as for a bondwoman. When the father of the maiden was rich and *did not want the marriage-price* (**rhmb /pj `ya**), he expected some service by way of compensation for giving away his daughter (^{<0825>}1 Samuel 18:25). As soon as the bargain was concluded, and the marriage-

price paid, or the required service rendered, the maiden was regarded as betrothed to her wooer, and as sacredly belonging to him. In fact, she was legally treated as *a married wontan* (*çya tça*); she could not be separated from her intended husband without a bill of divorce, and the same law was applicable to her as to married people. If she was *persuaded* to criminal conduct between the espousals and the bringing her home to her husband's house, both she and her seducer were publicly stoned to death; and if she was violated, the culprit suffered capital punishment (⁽⁴²²³⁾Deuteronomy 22:23-27, with ver. 22; and ⁽⁴³¹⁰⁾Leviticus 20:10). With such sacredness was betrothal regarded, that even if a bondmaid who was bought with the intention of ultimately becoming a secondary wife (⁽⁴²⁰⁷⁾Exodus 21:7-11), was guilty of unchastity prior to her entering into that state, both she and her seducer were scourged, while the latter was also obliged to bring a sin-offering, and the priest had to pray for the forgiveness of his sin (⁽⁴³¹⁰⁾Leviticus 19:20-22). Every betrothed man was by the Mosaic law exempt from military service (⁽⁴³¹⁰⁾Deuteronomy 20:7).

3. In the post-exilian period, as long as the children were minors-which in the case of a son was up to thirteen, and a daughter to twelve years of age-the parents could betroth them to any one they chose; but when they became of age their consent was required (Maimonides, *Hilchoth Ishuth*, 3:11, 12). Occasionally the whole business of selecting the wife was left in the hands of a friend, and hence the case might arise which is supposed by the Talmudists (*Yebam.* 2, § 6, 7), that a man might not be aware to which of two sisters he was betrothed. So in Egypt at the present day the choice of a wife is sometimes entrusted to a professional woman styled a *khat'beh*; and it is seldom that the bridegroom sees the features of his bride before the marriage has taken place (Lane, 1:209-211). It not unfrequently happened, however, that the selection of partners for life was made by the young people themselves. For this, the ceremonies connected with the celebration of the festivals in the Temple afforded an excellent opportunity, as may be gathered from the following remark in the Mishna: "R. Simeon ben-Gamaliel says. There were never more joyous festivals in Israel than the 15th of Ab and the Day of Atonement. On these the maidens of Jerusalem used to come out dressed in white garments, which they borrowed, in order not to shame those who had none of their own, and which they had immersed [for fear of being polluted]. Thus arrayed, these maidens of Jerusalem went out and danced in the vineyards, singing, Young man, lift up thine eyes, and see whom thou art about to choose; fix

not thine eye upon beauty, but look rather to a pious family; for gracefulness is deceit, and beauty is vanity, but the woman that fears the Lord, she is worthy of praise” (*Megilla*, 4:8). Having made his choice, the young man or his father informed the maiden’s father of it, whereupon the young people were legally betrothed. The betrothal was celebrated by a feast made in the house of the bride (*Jebammoth*, 43 a; *Taanith*, 26 b; *Pessachil*, 49 a; *Kiddushin*, 45 b), and is called $\hat{\text{y}}\text{çw}\text{dyq}$, *made sacred*, for by it the bride was made sacred to her bridegroom, and was not to be touched by any one else. It is also called $\hat{\text{y}}\text{srya}$, which may be from *sya çra*, *to betroth*. For a betrothal to be legal, it has to be effected in one of the following three modes:

(1.) By *money*, or *money’s worth*, which, according to the school of Shammai, must be a *denar* (ynyd) = 90 grains of pure gold, or, according to the school of Hillel, a *perutah* ($\text{h}\text{f}\text{w}\text{r}\text{p}$) = half a grain of pure silver, and which is to be given to the maiden, or, if she is a minor, to her father, as betrothal price ($\hat{\text{y}}\text{çw}\text{dyq} \text{ãsk}$);

(2.) By *letter or contract* ($\hat{\text{y}}\text{swrya} \text{r}\text{f}\text{ç}$), which the young man, either in person or through a proxy, has to give to the maiden, or to her father when she is a minor; or,

(3.) By *cohabitations* (hayb , *usus*), when the young man and maiden, having pronounced the betrothal formula in the presence of two witnesses, retire into a separate room. This, however, is considered immodest, and the man is scourged (*Kiddushin*, 12 b). The legal formula to be pronounced is, “Behold, thou art betrothed or sanctified to me ($\text{hnh} \text{I} \text{ar}\text{çyw} \text{hçm} \text{tdk} \text{yl} \text{tçdwqm} \text{ta}$), according to the law of Moses and Israel” (*Kiddushin*, 1:1; 4:9; *Tosiftha Kethuboth*, 4; *Kethuboth*, 4:8; Maimonides, *Hilchoth Ishuth*, 3; *Eben in Ezer*, 32). Though betrothment, as we have seen before, was the beginning of marriage itself, and, like it, could only be broken off by a regular *bill of divorcement* (fg), yet twelve months were generally allowed to intervene between it and actual marriage ($\text{h}\text{p}\text{w}\text{j}$) in the case of a maiden, to prepare her outfit, and thirty days in the case of a widow (*Kethuboth*, 57 a). The intercourse of the betrothed during this period was regulated by the customs of the different towns (*Mishna, Kethuboth*, v. 2). When this more solemn betrothment ($\hat{\text{y}}\text{çw}\text{dyq}$) was afterwards united with the marriage ceremony ($\text{h}\text{p}\text{w}\text{j}$), *engagements* ($\hat{\text{y}}\text{k}\text{wd}\text{ç}$) more in our sense

of the word took its place. Its nature and obligation will best be understood by perusing the contents of the contract (**μyant**) which is made and signed by the parties, and which is as follows: “May he who declares the end from the beginning give stability to the words of this contract, and to the covenant made between these two parties: namely, between A, bachelor, with the consent of his father B, and C, who is proxy for his daughter D, spinster. The said A, bachelor, engages, under happy auspices, to take the afore-mentioned D, spinster, by marriage and betrothal (**γϙwdyqw hpwj**), according to the law of Moses and Israel. These henceforth are not to conceal anything from each other appertaining to money or goods, but to have equal power over their property. Moreover, B, the said father of the bridegroom, is to dress his son in goodly apparel before the marriage, and to give the sum of... . in cash; whilst C, father of the said bride, is to give his daughter before the marriage a dowry in cash to the amount of... as well as jewelery to the amount of . . . to dress her in goodly apparel corresponding to the dowry, to give her an outfit, and the bridegroom *the Talith* (**tyl** []), i.e. the fringed wrapper used at prayer, *SEE FRINGE*, and *Kittel* (**l fyq**), i.e. the white burial garment, in harmony with his position and in proportion to the dowry. The marriage is to be (D.V.) on the... in the place... at the expense of the said C, the bride’s father, and, if agreed to by both parties, may take place within the specified period. Now the two parties have pledged themselves to all this, and have taken upon themselves by an oath to abide by it, oil the penalty of the great anathema, and at the peril of forfeiting half the dowry; but the forfeit is not to absolve from the anathema, nor is the anathema to absolve from the forfeit. The said father of the bride also undertakes to board at his table the newly-married couple for the space of... and furnish them with lodgings for the space of... The surety on the part of the bridegroom is E, sol of F; and on the part of the bride, G, sol of H. The two bridal parties, however, guarantee that these sureties shall not suffer thereby. Further, C, the said father of the bride, is to give his daughter an assurance letter, that, in the event of his death, she is to get half the inheritance of a son (**rkz yxj rfϙ**); whilst the bridegroom pledges himself to get his brothers, in the event of his dying without issue, to give her *a Chalizuh document* [for which see below], without any compensation. But if there should be dispute or delay on the subject, which God forbid, the decision is to be left to the Jewish congregation. We have taken all this in possession from the party and sureties, for the benefit of the other parties, so that everything

aforementioned may be observed, with the usual witness which qualified us to take care of it. Done this day... Everything must be observed and kept. (Signed)... (Comp. *Nachlas Shiva*, 9 b). This contract, which is written in Rabbinic Hebrew, is used by all orthodox Jews to the present day.

III. Marriage Ceremonies. —

1. In the pre-Mosaic period, when the proposals were accepted, and the marriage-price (rhm), as well as the sundry other gifts (tm), were duly distributed, the bridegroom (tj) could at once remove the bride (hl k) from her father's house to his own house, and this removal of the maiden, under the benedictions of her family, but without any definite religious ceremony whatever, and cohabitation, consummated and expressed marriage (hca j ql). Thus we are told that Isaac, when meeting Eleazar and Rebekah in the field, as soon as he was informed by the former of what had transpired, took Rebekah to the tent of his departed mother, and this without further ceremony constituted the marriage, and she *thereby* became his wife (hcal wl yj tw , ^{<0243>}Genesis 24:63-67). Under more ordinary circumstances, however, when the bride had not at once to quit her parental roof under the protection of a friend, as in the case just mentioned, but where the marriage took place in the house of the bride's parents, it was celebrated by a feast, to which all the friends and neighbors were invited, and which lasted seven days (^{<0227>}Genesis 29:22,27). On the day of the marriage, the bride was conducted to her future husband veiled, or, more properly, in an outdoor wrapper or shawl (ay[x]), which nearly enveloped her whole form, so that it was impossible to recognize the person, thus accounting for the deception practiced on Jacob (^{<0246>}Genesis 24:65; 29:23) and on Judah (^{<0384>}Genesis 38:14).

2. With regard to age, no restriction is pronounced in the Bible. Early marriage is spoken of with approval in several passages: (^{<0177>}Proverbs 2:17; 5:18; ^{<2615>}Isaiah 62:5), and in reducing this general statement to the more definite one of years, we must take into account the very early age at which persons arrive at puberty in Oriental countries. In modern Egypt marriage takes place in general before the bride has attained the age of sixteen frequently when she is twelve or thirteen, and occasionally when she is only ten (Lane, 1:208). The Mosaic law prescribes no civil or religious forms for the celebration of marriage. The contract or promise made at the payment of the marriage-price, or when the service which was

required in its stead was rendered, constituted the solemn bond which henceforth united the espoused parties, as is evident from the fact pointed out in the preceding sections, that a betrothed maiden was both called *a married woman*, and was legally treated as such. There can, however, be no doubt that the ancient custom of celebrating the consummation of the marriage by a feast, which lasted seven days (^{<0222>}Genesis 29:22, 27), must have become pretty general by this time. Thus we are told that when Samson went to Timnath to take his wife, he made there a feast, which continued for seven days, according to the usage of young men on such occasions (μυρῶν βῆ ἠμέρῃ ἕκ ἑκατόν), that the parents of the bride invited thirty young men (ἑνὸς τοῦ νυμφῶνος, ^{<0195>}Matthew 9:15) to honor his nuptials, and that to relieve their entertainment, Samson, in harmony with the prevailing custom among the nations of antiquity, proposed enigmas (^{<0740>}Judges 14:10-18). We afterwards find that the bridal pair were adorned with nuptial crowns (^{<2181>}Song of Solomon 3:11; ^{<2310>}Isaiah 61:10) made of various materials — gold, silver, myrtle, or olive — varying in costliness according to the circumstances of the parties (Mishna, *Sota*, 9:14; *Gesmara*, 49 a and b; Selden, *Ux. Ebr.* 2:15), and that the bride especially wore gorgeous apparel, and a peculiar girdle (^{<0953>}Psalms 45:13, 14; ^{<3018>}Isaiah 49:18; ^{<012>}Jeremiah 2:12), whence in fact she derived her name *Kallah* (ἡ κ), which signifies *the ornamented, the adorned*. Thus attired, the bridegroom and bride were led in joyous procession through the streets, accompanied by bands of singers and musicians (^{<0734>}Jeremiah 7:34; 25:10; 33:11), and saluted by the greetings of the maidens of the place, who manifested the liveliest interest in the nuptial train (^{<2181>}Song of Solomon 3:11), to the house of the bridegroom or that of his father. Here the feast was prepared, to which all the friends and the neighbors were invited, and at which most probably that sacred covenant was concluded which came into vogue during the post-Mosaic period (^{<0127>}Proverbs 2:17; ^{<3018>}Ezekiel 16:8; ^{<0124>}Malachi 2:14). The bride, thickly veiled, was then conducted to the (rdj) bridal chamber (^{<0223>}Genesis 29:23; ^{<0751>}Judges 15:11; ^{<0116>}Joel 2:6), where a nuptial couch (hpj) was prepared (^{<0953>}Psalms 19:5; ^{<0126>}Joel 2:16) in such a manner as to afford facility for ascertaining the following morning whether she had preserved her maiden purity; for in the absence of the *signa virginitatis* she was stoned to death before her father's house (^{<0213>}Deuteronomy 22:13-21).

3. In the period after the exile the proper age for marriage is fixed in the Mishna at eighteen (*Aboth*, v. 31), and though, for the sake of preserving

morality, puberty was regarded as the desirable age, yet men generally married when they were *seventeen* (*Jebaumoth*, 62; *Kiddushin*, 29). The Talmudists forbade marriage in the case of a man under thirteen years and a day, and in the case of a woman under twelve years and a day (Buxtorf, *Syznagog.* cap. 7, p. 143). The day originally fixed for marriage was Wednesday for maidens and Friday for widows (Mishna, *Kethuboth*, 1:1). But the Talmud already partially discarded this arrangement (Gemara, *ibid.* 3 a), and in the Middle Ages it became quite obsolete (*Eben Ha-Ezar*, lxxv). The primitive practice of the sages, however, has been resumed among the orthodox Jews in Russia, Poland, etc. The wedding-feast was celebrated in the house of the bridegroom (*Kethuboth*, 8 a, 10 a), and in the evening, for the bridal pair fasted all day, since on it, as on the day of atonement, they confessed their sins, and their transgressions were forgiven. On the day of the wedding, the bride, with her hair flowing, and a myrtle wreath on her head (if she was a maiden, Mishna, *Kethuboth*, 2:1), was conducted, with music, singing, and dancing, to the house of the bridegroom by her relations and friends, who were adorned with chaplets of myrtle, and carried palm branches in their hands (*Kethuboth*, 16,17; *Sabbath*, 110 a; *Sota*, 49 b). The streets through which the nuptial procession passed were lined with the daughters of Israel, who greeted the joyous train, and scattered before them cakes and roasted ears of wheat, while fountains freely poured forth wine (*Kethuboth*, 15 b; *Berachoth*, 50 b). Having reached the house, the bridegroom, accompanied by the groomsmen, met the bride, took her by the hand, and led her to the threshold. The *Kethubah* (**hbwtk**) — *donatio propter* or *ante nuptias*, or the marriage-settlement, alluded to in the book of Tobit (7:15), was then written, which in the case of a maiden always promises 200, and in the case of a widow 100 *denar* (each denar being equal to 90 grains of pure gold), whether the parties are rich or poor (Mishna, *Kethuboth*, 1:2), though it may be enlarged by a special covenant (**hbwtk twpswt**). The dowry could not be claimed until the termination of the marriage by the death of the husband or by divorce (*ibid.* v. 1), though advances might be made to the wife previously (9:8). Subsequently to betrothal a woman lost all power over her property, and it became vested in the husband, unless he had previously to marriage renounced his right to it (8:1; 9:1). The marriage must not be celebrated before this settlement is written (*Balbs Kama*, 89). The wording of this instrument has undergone various changes in the course of time (*Kethuboth*, 82 b). The form in which it is given in the Talmud, by Maimonides, etc., is as follows: “Upon the fourth day of the week, on the...

of the month, in the year... of the creation of the world, according to the computation adopted in this place, A, son of B, said to C, spinster, daughter of E, 'Be thou my wife according to the law of Moses and Israel, and I will work for thee, honor thee, maintain thee, and provide for thee according to the custom of Jewish husbands, who work for their wives, honor them, maintain them, and provide for them honestly; I also give thee the dowry of thy virginity, 200 silver *Sus*, which belong to thee by the law, as well as thy food, thy apparel, and whatsoever is required for thy maintenance, and I will go in to thee according to the custom of the whole earth.' And C, the spinster, consented. and became his wife. The dowry which she brought him from the house of her father, in silver, gold, and ornaments, as well as in apparel, domestic utensils, and bedding, amounts to... pure silver, and A, the bridegroom, has consented to add to it from his own property the same sum; and the bridegroom said thus: 'I undertake for myself and my heirs after me the security for this *Kethiubah*, this dowry and this addition, so that the same shall be paid from the best and most choice of my possessions which I have under the whole heaven, which I have acquired or shall acquire in real or personal property. All this property is to be mortgaged and pledged, yea, even the coat which I have on is to go in order to pay this *Kethubah*, this down and this addition, from this day to all eternity.' And the surety of this *Kethubah*, this dowry and this addition, A, the bridegroom, has undertaken in the strictness of all the *Kethubahs* and supplement instruments usual among the daughters of Israel, and which are written according to the order of our sages of blessed memory, not after the manner of a mere visionary promise or empty formula. We have taken possession of it from A, the bridegroom, and given it to C, spinster, daughter of E, according to all that is written and explained above, by means of such a garment as is legal in the taking of possession. All this yea and amen. (Signed) . . ."Comp. Maimonides, *Jud Ha-Chazaka Hilchoth Jebum Ve-Cheliza*, 4:33. Among the more modern Jews it is the custom in some parts for the bridegroom to place a ring on the bride's finger (Picart, 1:239)-a custom which also prevailed among the Romans (Smith, *Dict. of Ant.* p. 604). Some writers have endeavored to prove that the rings noticed in the O.T. (^{Q152}Exodus 35:22; ^{Q181}Isaiah 3:21) were nuptial rings, but there is not the slightest evidence of this. The ring was nevertheless regarded among the Hebrews as a token of fidelity (^{Q44E}Genesis 41:42), and of adoption into a family (^{Q152}Luke 15:22). According to Selden it was originally given as an equivalent for dowry-money (Uxor *Ebraic.* 2:14). After the document was handed over to the

bride, crowns, varying in expense according to the circumstances of the parties, were placed upon the heads of the bridal pair (*Sota*, 49 a, b), and they, with their relations and friends, sat down to a sumptuous repast; the marriage-feast was enlivened by the guests, who sang various songs and asked each other amusing riddles (*Berachoth*, 31 a; *Nedarinim*, 51 a), parched corn was distributed among the guests if the bride was a virgin (*Keth.* ii), and when the meal was concluded with customary prayer of thanksgiving, the bridegroom supplemented it with pronouncing over a cup of wine the seven nuptial benedictions (*twkrb* [bç) in the presence of at least ten persons (*Kethuboth*, 7 b), which gave the last religious consecration to the marriage-covenant, and which are as follows:

1. “Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, king of the universe, who hast created everything for thy glory.”
2. “Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, king of the universe, who hast created man.”
3. “Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, king of the universe, who hast created man in thine image, in the image of the likeness of thy own form, and hast prepared for him, in himself, a building for the perpetuity of the species. Blessed art thou, O Lord, the creator of man.”
4. “The barren woman shall rejoice exceedingly, and shout for joy when her children are gathered around her in delight. Blessed art thou, O Lord, “who rejoicest Zion in her children.”
5. “Make this loving pair to rejoice exceedingly, as thou hast made thy creature rejoice in the Garden of Eden in the beginning. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who rejoicest the bridegroom and the bride.”
6. “Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, king of the universe. who hast ordained joy and gladness, bride and bridegroom, delight and song, pleasure and intimacy, love and friendship, peace and concord; speedily, O Lord our God, let there be heard in the cities of Judah and in the streets of Jerusalem the voice of joy and the voice of gladness, the voice of the bridegroom and the voice of the bride, the voice of jubilant bridegrooms under their canopies, and of the young men at the nuptial feast playing music. Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, who makest the bridegroom rejoice with his bride.”

7. “Remove all suffering and anger; then will the dumb be heard in song; lead us in the paths of righteousness, listen to the benedictions of the children of Jeshurun! With the permission of our seniors and rabbins, and my masters, let us bless our God in whose dwelling is joy, and of whose bounties we have partaken!” to which the guests respond, “Blessed be our God, in whose dwelling is joy, of whose bounties we have partaken, and by whose goodness we live;” and he then answers, “Then let us bless our God, in whose dwelling is joy, of whose bounties we have partaken, and by whose goodness we live” (*Kethuboth*, 7 b, 8). The married couple were then conducted to an elaborately-ornamented nuptial chamber (**הַפּוֹרְטָל**), where the bridal couch (*thalamus*) was carefully prepared; and at the production of the *linteum vilrinitatis* the following morning (⁽⁻⁶²¹³⁾Deuteronomy 22:13-21), which was anxiously awaited, the following benediction was pronounced by the bridegroom: “Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, king of the universe, who hast placed a nut in paradise, the rose of the valleys—a stranger must not rule over this sealed fountain; this is why the hind of love has preserved the holy seed in purity, and has not broken the compact. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who hast chosen Abraham and his seed after him!” (see *Halachoth Gedoloth*, ed. Vienna, 51 [comp. Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* 15:24], where an explanation will be found of the use of **זַמְגָּא** nut, in this connection). Festivities continued for seven days (*Kethuboth*, 7 a).

As important religious questions had to be put to the bridal pair which required a learned man to do (*Gitrit*, 6; *Kiddushin*, 6, 13), it was afterwards resolved that the marriage-ceremony should be performed by a rabbi, and it is celebrated in the following manner: A beautifully-embroidered silk or velvet canopy, about three or four yards square, supported by four long poles, is held by four men out of doors on the day of the wedding. Under this *chupash* (**הַפּוֹרְטָל**), which represents the ancient bridal chamber, the bridegroom is led by his male friends, preceded by a band of music, and welcomed by the joyous spectators with the exclamation, *Blessed is he who is now come!* (**אַבְחַרְב**); the bride, with her face veiled (*nuptiae*), is then brought to him by her female friends and led three times round the bridegroom, in accordance, as they say, with the remark of Jeremiah, “The woman shall compass the man” (⁽⁻²⁸¹²⁾Jeremiah 31:22), when he takes her round once amid the congratulations of the bystanders, and then places her at his right hand (⁽⁻⁹⁵¹⁰⁾Psalm 45:10), both

standing with their faces to the south and their backs to the north. The rabbi then covers the bridal pair with the *Talith*, or fringed wrapper, which the bridegroom has on (comp. ^{<QRI>}Ruth 3:19; ^{<QRI>}Ezekiel 16:8), joins their hands together, and pronounces over a cup of wine the benediction of affiance (^{<QRI>}*yswra tkrb*), which is as follows: “Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, king of the universe, who hast created the fruit of the vine. Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, king of the universe, who hast sanctified us with thy commandments, and hast forbidden to us consanguinity, and hast prohibited us the betrothed, but hast permitted us those whom we take by marriage and betrothal. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who hast sanctified thy people Israel by betrothal and marriage” (*Kethuboth*, 7 a). Whereupon the bridegroom and bride taste of the cup of blessing, and the former produces a plain gold ring, and, in the presence of all the party, puts it on the bride’s finger, saying, “Behold, thou art consecrated unto me with this ring according to the rites of Moses and Israel!” The rabbi then reads aloud, in the presence of appointed witnesses, the *Kethubah*, or the marriage-settlement, which is written in Syro-Chaldaic, and concludes by pronouncing over another cup of wine the seven benedictions (^{<QRI>}*twkrb [bç]*), which the bridegroom in ancient times, before the ceremony of marriage became a public act and was delegated to the spiritual head, used to pronounce himself at the end of the meal. The bridegroom and bride taste again of this cup of blessing, and when the glass is emptied it is put on the ground, and the bridegroom breaks it with his foot, as a symbol to remind them in the midst of their joys that just as this glass is destroyed, so Jerusalem is destroyed and trodden down under the foot of the Gentiles. With this the ceremony is concluded, amid the shouts, *May you be happy!* (^{<QRI>}*bwf l zm*). **SEE WEDDING.**

IV. Polygamy and Concubinage. — Though the history of the protoplasts — in which we are told that God in the beginning created a single pair, one of each sex — seems to exhibit a standard for monogamy, yet the Scriptures record that from the remotest periods men had simultaneously several wives, occupying either coordinate or subordinate positions. Against the opinion that Lamech, sixth in descent from Adam through Cain, introduced polygamy-based on the circumstance that he is the first who is recorded as having married two wives (^{<QRI>}Genesis 4:19) — is to be urged that

- (1.) Lamech is the first whose marriage or taking of a wife is recorded, and consequently it is impossible to say how many wives his five progenitors had;
- (2.) The mention of Lamech's two wives is incidental, and is entirely owing to the fact that the sacred historian had to notice the useful inventions made by their respective sons Jabal, Jubal, and Tubal-Cain, as well as to give the oldest piece of rhythmical composition which was addressed to the wives, celebrating one of these inventions; and
- (3.) If polygamy had been for the first time introduced by Lamech, the sacred writer would have as distinctly mentioned it as he mentions the things which were first introduced by Lamech's sons. The manner in which Sarah urges Abraham to take her servant Hagar, and the fact that Sarah herself gives the maiden to her own husband (**hçal**) to be his wife, the readiness with which the patriarch accepts the proposal (^{<0101>}Genesis 16:1-4), unquestionably show that it was a common custom to have one or more secondary wives. In fact, it is distinctly mentioned that Nahor, Abraham's own brother, who had eight sons by Milcah, his principal wife, and consequently did not require another wife for the purpose of securing progeny, had nevertheless a secondary wife (**çgl p**), by whom he had four sons (^{<0221>}Genesis 22:21-24). Besides, it is now pretty generally admitted that ^{<0201>}Genesis 25:1 describes Abraham himself to have taken another or secondary wife in the lifetime of Sarah, in addition to Hagar, who was given to him by his principal wife, as is evident from ^{<0216>}Genesis 25:6; ^{<1012>}1 Chronicles 1:32, and that he could not have taken her for the sake of obtaining an heir. If any more proof be wanted for the prevalence of polygamy in the patriarchal age, we refer to Esau, who, to please his father, married his cousin Mahalath in addition to the several wives whom he had (^{<0208>}Genesis 28:8,9); and to Jacob, who had not the slightest scruple to marry two sisters, and take two half-wives at the same time (^{<0223>}Genesis 29:23-30; 30:4, 9), which would be unaccountable on the supposition that polygamy was something strange. Though sacred history is silent about the number of wives of the twelve patriarchs, yet there can be little doubt that the large number of children and grandchildren which Benjamin had at so early an age (^{<0462>}Genesis 46:21; ^{<0438>}Numbers 26:38-41; ^{<1016>}1 Chronicles 7:6-12; 8:1), must have been the result of polygamy; and that Simeon, at all events, had more than one wife (^{<0165>}Exodus 6:15). The extraordinary rate at which the Jews increased in Egypt implies that they practiced polygamy

during their bondage. This is, moreover, corroborated by the incidental notice that Asher, Judah's grandson, had two wives (^{<1304>}1 Chronicles 4:5 with 2:24); that Caleb, Judah's great-grandson, had three principal and two subordinate wives (^{<1309>}1 Chronicles 2:9, 18, 42, 46, 48); that Aharaim, probably Benjamin's great-grandson, had three wives (^{<1308>}1 Chronicles 8:8-11); and that Moses had two wives (^{<1021>}Exodus 2:21; ^{<0403>}Numbers 12:1); as well as by the fact that the Mosaic legislation assumes the existence of polygamy (^{<0834>}Leviticus 13:14; ^{<0204>}Deuteronomy 25:47). Still, the theory of monogamy seems to be exhibited in the case of Noah and his three sons (^{<0068>}Genesis 6:18; 7:7, 13; 8:16), of Aaron, and of Eleazar.

In judging of this period we must take into regard the following considerations:

(1.) The *principle* of monogamy was retained, even in the practice of polygamy, by the distinction made between the chief or original wife and the secondary wives, or, as the A.V. terms them, "concubines"-a term which is objectionable, inasmuch as it conveys to us the notion of an illicit and unrecognised position, whereas the secondary wife was regarded by the Hebrews as a wife, and her rights were secured by law. The position of the Hebrew concubine may be compared with that of the concubine of the early Christian Church, the sole distinction between her and the wife consisting in this, that the marriage was not in accordance with the *civil* law: in the eye of the Church the marriage was perfectly valid (Bingham, *Ant.* 11:5, §11). It is worthy of notice that the term *pillegesh* (^{vgl}^{<1304>}^{<1304>}A.V. "concubine") nowhere occurs in the Mosaic law. The terms used are either "wife" (^{<0215>}Deuteronomy 21:15) or "maid-servant" (^{<0207>}Exodus 21:7); the latter applying to a purchased wife.

(2.) The motive which led to polygamy was that absorbing desire of progeny which is prevalent throughout Eastern countries, and was especially powerful among the Hebrews.

(3.) The power of a parent over his child, and of a master over his slave (*the postestas patsiea and domestica* of the Romans), was paramount even in matters of marriage, and led in many cases to phases of polygamy that are otherwise quite unintelligible, as, for instance, to the cases where it was adopted by the husband *at the request of his wife*, under the idea that children born to a slave were in the eye of the law the children of the mistress (^{<0148>}Genesis 16:3; 30:4, 9); or, again, to cases where it was

adopted at the instance of the father (^{<012923>}Genesis 29:23, 28; ^{<02109>}Exodus 21:9, 10). It must be allowed that polygamy, thus legalized and systematized, justified to a certain extent by the motive, and entered into, not only without offense to, but actually at the suggestion of those who, according to our notions, would feel most deeply injured by it, is a very different thing from what polygamy would be in our own state of society.

2. In the case of polygamy, as in that of other national customs, the Mosaic law adheres to the established usage. Hence there is not only no express statute to prohibit polygamy, which was previously held lawful, but the Mosaic law presupposes its existence and practice, bases its legislation thereupon, and thus authorizes it, as is evident from the following enactments:

- 1.** It is ordained that a king “shall not multiply wives unto himself” (^{<051717>}Deuteronomy 17:17), which, as bishop Patrick rightly remarks, “is not a prohibition to take more wives than one, but not to have an excessive number, after the manner of Eastern kings, whom Solomon seems to have imitated;” thus, in fact, legalizing a moderate number. The Mishna (*Sanhedrin*, 2:4), the Talmud (*Babylon Sanhedrin*, 21 a), Rashi (on ^{<051717>}Deuteronomy 17:17), etc., in harmony with ancient tradition, regard eighteen wives, including half” wives, as a moderate number, and as not violating the injunction contained in the expression “multiply.”
- 2.** The law enacts that a man is not to marry his wife’s sister to vex her while she lives (^{<093818>}Leviticus 18:18), which, as the same prelate justly urges, manifestly means “that though two wives at a time, or more, were permitted in those days, no man should take two sisters (as Jacob had formerly done) begotten of the same father or born of the same mother;” or, in other words, a man is at liberty to take another wife besides the first, and during her lifetime, provided only they are not sisters.
- 3.** The law of primogeniture (^{<02115>}Deuteronomy 21:15-17) actually presupposes the case of a man having *two* wives, one beloved and the other not, as it was with Jacob and his two wives, and ordains that if the one less beloved is the mother of his first-born, the husband is not to transfer the right of primogeniture to the son of his favorite wife, but is to acknowledge him as first-born who is actually so.

4. ^{<1210>}Exodus 21:9, 10, permits a father who had given his son a bondwoman for a wife, to give him a second wife of *freer birth*, and prescribes how the first is then to be treated — that she is to have alimony, clothes, and the conjugal duty; and
5. ^{<6204>}Deuteronomy 25:47 expressly enjoins that a man, though having a wife already, is to marry his deceased brother's widow.

Having existed before the Mosaic law, and being acknowledged and made the basis of legislation by it, polygamy continued in full force during the whole of this period. Thus, during the government of the judges, we find Gideon, the celebrated judge of Israel, “had many wives, and three score and ten sons” (^{<0783>}Judges 8:30); Jair the Gileadite, also a judge of Israel, had thirty grown-up sons (^{<0704>}Judges 10:4) and a proportionate number of daughters. Ibzan, another judge of Israel, had thirty full-grown sons and thirty full-grown daughters (^{<0713>}Judges 12:9); and Abdon, also a judge of Israel, had forty adult sons and thirty adult daughters—which was utterly impossible without polygamy; the pious Elkanah, father of Samuel the illustrious judge and prophet, had two wives (^{<0902>}1 Samuel 1:2). During the monarchy, we find Saul, the first king of Israel, had many wives and half wives (^{<1017>}2 Samuel 3:7; 12:8); David, the royal singer of Israel, “their best king,” as bishop Patrick remarks in his comment on ^{<0818>}Leviticus 18:18, “who read God’s law day and night, and could not but understand it, took many wives without any reproof; nay, God gave him more than he had before, by delivering his master’s wives to him” (^{<1018>}2 Samuel 12:8); Solomon, the wise monarch, had no less than a thousand wives and half wives (^{<1113>}1 Kings 11:3); Rehoboam, his son and successor, had eighteen wives and three score half wives (^{<1412>}2 Chronicles 11:21); Abijah, his son and successor to the throne of Judah, married fourteen wives (^{<1442>}2 Chronicles 14:21); and Joash, the tenth king, including David, who reigned from B.C. 378 to 338, had two wives given to him by the godly high-priest Jehoiada, who restored both the throne of David and the worship of the true God according to the law of Moses (^{<1443>}2 Chronicles 24:3). A very remarkable illustration of the prevalence of polygamy in private life is given in ^{<1304>}1 Chronicles 7:4, where we are told that not only did the five fathers, all of them chief men of the tribe of Issachar, live in polygamy, but that their descendants, numbering 36,000 men, “had many wives.” De Wette, indeed, affirms that “the Hebrew moral teachers speak decidedly for monogamy, as is evident from their always speaking of one wife, and from the high notion which they have of a good wedded wife — ‘A virtuous

woman is the diadem of her husband, but a bad wife is like rottenness in the bones' (^{<2124>}Proverbs 12:4); 'Whoso findeth a wife findeth happiness' (^{<2182>}Proverbs 18:22); 'A house and wealth are an inheritance from parents, but a discreet wife is from the Lord' (^{<2194>}Proverbs 19:14). ^{<2110>}Proverbs 31:10-31 describes an industrious and managing wife in such a manner as one only could be it" (*Christl. Sittenlehre*, vol. 3, sec. 472). Similarly Ewald: "Wherever a prophet alludes to matrimonial matters, he always assumes faithful and sacred monogamy contracted for the whole life as the legal one" (*Die Alterthumer Israels*, p. 177 sq.). But we have exactly analogous passages where parental felicity is described: "A wise son is happiness to the father, but a foolish son is the grief of his mother" (^{<2101>}Proverbs 10:1; 15:20); "A wise son heareth his father's instruction" (^{<2103>}Proverbs 13:1); and upon the same parity of reasoning it might be said that the theory of having only one son is assumed by the sacred moralist, because, when speaking of happiness or misery, which parents derive from their offspring, only one son is alluded to. Besides, the facts which we have enumerated cannot be set aside by arguments.

3. As nothing is said in the post-exilian portions of the Bible to discourage polygamy, this ancient practice also continued among the Jews during this period. During the second Temple, we find that Herod the Great had nine wives (Josephus, *Ant.* 17:1, 3); his two sons, Archelaus the Ethnarch, and Antipas the Tetrarch of Galilee, had each two wives (Josephus, *Ant.* 17:13, 2; 18:5, 1); and John the Baptist and other Jews, who censured the one for violating the Mosaic law by the marriage of his deceased brother's wife who had children (Josephus, *Ant.* 18:13, 2), and the other for marrying Herodias, the wife of his half-brother Herod-Philip (^{<2143>}Matthew 14:3, 4; ^{<2167>}Mark 6:17,18; ^{<2189>}Luke 3:19), raised no cry against their practicing polygamy; because, as Josephus tells us, "the Jews of those days adhered to their ancient practice to have many wives at the same time" (Josephus, *Ant.* 17:1; 2). In harmony with this ancestral custom, the post-exilian legislation enacted various statutes to regulate polygamy and protect the rights and settlement of each wife (Mishna, *Jebamoth*, 4:11; *Kethuboth*, 10:1-6; *Kiddushin*, 2:7). As a striking illustration of the prevalence and legality of polygamy during this period may be mentioned the following circumstance which is recorded in the Talmud: Twelve widows appealed to their brother-in-law to perform the duty of *Levir*, which he refused to do, because he saw no prospect how to maintain such an additional number of wives and possibly a large increase of children. The case was then brought

before Jehudah the Holy, who promised that if the man would do the duty enjoined on him by the Mosaic law, he himself would maintain the family and their children, in case there should be any, every sabbatical year, when no produce was to be got from the land which was at rest. The offer was accepted by the *Levir*, and he accordingly married his twelve sisters-in-law; and after three years these twelve wives appeared with thirty-six children before Jehudah the Holy to claim the promised alimony, as it was then the sabbatical year, and they actually obtained it (*Jerusalem Jebamoth*, 4:12). Rabba ben-Joseph, founder and president of the college at Machuza (A.D. 338-352), taught that a man may take as many wives as he pleases, provided only that he can maintain them all (*Jebamoth*, 65 a). From the remark in the Mishna, that a *Levir* may marry his deceased brother's *fur* widows (*Jebamoth*, 4:11), the Babylonian Gemara concluded that it recommends a man to have no more than this number (*Babyl. Jebamoth*, 44 a); and from this most probably Mohammed's injunction is derived (Koran, 4:3). It was Rabanu Gershom ben-Jehudah of France (born cir. 960, died 1028), who, in the 11th century, prohibited polygamy under pains of excommunication, saving in exceptional cases (Graitz, *Geschichte der Juden*, v. 405-507). His motive for doing so is a matter of dispute; the older Occidental rabbins say that the prohibition originated in a desire to preserve the peace of the family, while the Oriental rabbins will have it that it was dictated by the governments of Christian countries. His interdict, however, made but slow progress, even in Germany and France, for which it was chiefly designed. Thus Simon ben-Abraham of Sens, one of the most celebrated French Tossaphists, tells us (cir. 1200): "The institution of R. Gershom has made no progress either in our neighborhood or in the provinces of France. On the contrary, it happens that pious and learned men and many other people marry a second wife in the lifetime of the first" (*B. Joseph, Eben Ha-Ezar*, 1). The practice of marrying a second wife in the event of the first having no issue within ten years also obtained in Italy till about the 15th century-the pope giving a special dispensation for it. The Spanish Jews never recognized R. Gershom's interdict; bigamy was practiced in Castile till the 14th century, while the Christian government of Navarre declared polygamy among the Jews legal, and the law of king Theobald allowed them to marry as many wives as they could maintain and govern, but they were not permitted to divorce ally one of them without sending all away (Kayserling, *Geschichte der Juden in Spanien*, 1:71). Nor was the said interdict acknowledged by the Jews in the East; and monogamy is there practiced simply because the bride makes a special

agreement, and has a clause inserted in the *Kethubah* (hbwtk), or *marriage-settlement*, that her husband is not to marry another as long as she lives. An exception, however, is made in case there is no issue. As to the opinion of the Karaites on monogamy and polygamy, the celebrated Jehudah ben-Elia Hadassi. (flourished 1149) remarks, in his famous work against rabbinic Judaism, “The Pentateuch prohibits one to marry two wives with a view to vex one of them ([Ⓜ]hm tj a rwrxl , [Ⓜ]Leviticus 18:18); but he may take them provided he loves them and does not grieve either of them, and treats them both affectionately. If he does not diminish their food, raiment, and conjugal rights ([Ⓜ]Exodus 21:11), he is allowed to take two wives or more, just as Elkanah married Hannah and Peninnah, and as David, peace be upon him, and other kings and judges did” (*Eshkol Hacopher*, ed. Eupatoria, 1836, p. 129). From this it is evident that polygamy was not prohibited by the Jewish law, nor was it regarded as a sin, and that the monogamy of the Jews in the present day is simply in obedience to the laws of the countries in which they live. There were, however, always some rabbins who discouraged polygamy (*A both*, 2:7; *Jebamoth*, 65 a, al.); and the elevated notion which they had of monogamy is seen in the statutes which they enacted that the high-priest is to be the husband of one wife and to keep to her (*Jebamoth*, 58 a; Maimonides, *Hilchoth Issure Bia*, 18:13; Josephus, *Ant.* 3:12, 2); and which the apostle Paul also urges on Christian bishops ([Ⓜ]1 Timothy 3:2; [Ⓜ]Titus 1:16).

Picture for Marriage 1

V. Proscribed Degrees and Laws of Intermarriage.

1. There were no proscribed degrees within which a man was forbidden to marry in the pre-Mosaic period. On the contrary, the fact that Adam married “bone of his bone and flesh of his flesh,” and that his sons married their own sisters, rather engendered an aversion to marry out of one’s own kindred. Hence we find that Abraham married his half-sister ([Ⓜ]Genesis 20:12); Nahor, Abraham’s brother, married the daughter of his brother Haran, or his niece ([Ⓜ]Genesis 11:29); Jacob married two sisters at the same time, who were the daughters of his mother’s brother ([Ⓜ]Genesis 28:2; 29:26); Esau married his cousin Mahalath, the daughter of Ishmael ([Ⓜ]Genesis 28:8, 9); Amram married his aunt Jochebed, his father’s sister ([Ⓜ]Exodus 6:20); and Judah married his daughter-in-law, Tamar, the widow of his own son ([Ⓜ]Genesis 38:26-30). This aversion to intermarriage with strangers and other tribes, which made Abraham pledge

his faithful steward by the most sacred oath not to take for his son a wife from the daughters of the Canaanites (^{<0124D>}Genesis 24:2-4); which occasioned such “a grief of mind” to Isaac, because his son Esau married Hittite women (^{<01264>}Genesis 26:34, 35); and which was the cause of great dissatisfaction in the family of Moses when he married a Midianitish woman (^{<01271>}Exodus 2:21); was afterwards greatly increased on the ground of difference of creed. The same feeling of aversion against intermarriage (**ἐπιγαμία**) with foreigners prevailed among other nations of antiquity, and may also have been the cause why marriages with the nearest of kin were practiced among them. Thus the Athenians were allowed to marry half-sisters by the father’s side (Corn. Nepos, *Praef: Cimon*, i; Plutarch, *Cimon*, iv; *Themistocl.* xxxii); the Spartans married half-sisters by the same mother (Philo, *De spec. leg.* p. 779); and the Assyrians and Egyptians full sisters (Lucian, *Sacrif:* 5; *Died.* 1:27; Philo, *De spec. leg.* p. 779; Selden, *De jure naturali et gentium*, v. 11). In later times, when the desire to preserve purity of blood, which was the primary cause for not intermarrying with alien tribes, was superseded by religious motives, the patriarchal instances of epigamy recorded without censure during this period became very inconvenient. Hence means were adopted to explain them away. Thus the marriage of Judah with a heathen woman, the daughter of Shuah, a Canaanite (^{<01302>}Genesis 38:2). is made orthodox by the Chaldee Paraphrase, the Midrash (*Bereshith Rabba.* c. lxxxv), the Talmud (*Pesachim*, 50 a), Rashi (ad loc.), etc., by explaining **yn[nk]** to mean **argt**, *merchant*, as in ^{<01318>}Job 40:30; ^{<01324>}Proverbs 31:24; and the Jerusalem Targum finds it necessary to add that Judah converted her to Judaism (**hryyqw**). The marriage of Simeon with a Canaanitess (^{<01450>}Genesis 46:10) is explained away in a similar manner (comp. *Bereshith Rabba*, c. 80; Rashi on ^{<01450>}Genesis 46:10).

2. The regulations next introduced in this respect are of a twofold nature:

a. The most important change in the Biblical gamology is the Mosaic law about the prohibited degrees among the Israelites themselves. While in the pre-Mosaic period no prohibition whatever existed against marrying one’s nearest and dearest relatives, the Mosaic law (^{<01807>}Leviticus 18:7-17; 20:11, etc.) proscribes no less than fifteen marriages within specified degrees of both consanguinity and affinity. In neither consanguinity nor affinity, however, does the law extend beyond two degrees, viz. the mother, her daughter, aunt, father’s wife, father’s sister, sister on the father’s side. wife

of the father's brother, brother's wife (excepting in the case of a Levirate marriage), daughter-in-law, granddaughter, either from a son or daughter, a woman and her daughter, or her granddaughter either from a son or daughter, and two sisters together. The preceding table exhibits these degrees. We must only remark that the squares stand for *males*, the circles for *females*, the triangles within the squares for *deceased*, the numbers refer to the order in which they are enumerated in ^(~~CRIB~~)Leviticus 18:17, and that the husband and wife, who form the starting-point, are represented by a double square and double circle.

It will be seen from the foregoing table that, while some kindred are proscribed, others are allowed, e.g. a father's sister is forbidden while a brother's daughter is not. This has occasioned great difficulty in tracing the principle which underlies these prohibitions. Philipppson is of opinion that it may be deduced from the remarks which accompany the respective vetoes. The stepmother is proscribed because "it is thy father's nakedness" (^(~~CRIB~~)Leviticus 18:8); the son's or daughter's daughter because it "is thine own nakedness" (ver. 10); the father's or mother's sister because she is the "father's or mother's flesh" (vers. 12, 13); and the brother's wife because "it is the nakedness of thy brother" (ver. 16). "From this it is evident," this erudite rabbi submits, "that, on the one side, son, daughter, and grandchild are identified with the father, while, on the other side, brothers and sisters are identified with each other, *because they have one and the same source of life*. Accordingly, we obtain the following data. All members proceeding from a common father or mother constitute one issue, because they possess *together* the same source of life; while the ascendants and the descendants in a straight line form *one line*, because they have *one aifer the other and from each other* the same source of life; and hence the law —

(1.) Two members of the same issue, or two members of the same line, are *not* to intermarry, because they have the same source of life. But inasmuch as the ascending is the primary to each descending issue, and the descending the derived to every ascending, an ascending issue may press forward out of the straight line, or step down into the following, i.e. the primary into the one derived from it; while the succeeding cannot go backwards into the foregoing, i.e. the derived into the primary. Now, as the man is the moving cause in carnal intercourse, hence the law —

(2.) A male member of the succeeding issue must not marry a female member of the preceding issue, while, on the contrary, a male member of

the preceding may marry a female of the succeeding issue, provided they are not both of a direct line. Half-blood and step-relations make no difference in this respect, since they are identified, both in the issue and in the line, because husband and wife become identified. It is for this reason, also, that the relationship, which the wife always assumes in marriage with regard to her husband, is such as a blood relation bears to her; hence it is, for instance, that a brother's wife is proscribed, while the wife's sister is allowed. Thus the principle of the Mosaic proscriptions is a profound one, and is fully borne out by nature. Connubial intercourse has for its object to produce a third by the connection of two opposites; but that which proceeds from the same source of life is merely of the same kind. Hence, when two, originally of the same kind, unite, it is contrary to the true design of copulation, and can only proceed from an overpowering and excess of rude and animal passions. It is a desecration of the nature and morality of man. and the highest defilement" (*Israelitische Bibel*, 1:588 sq.; 3d. ed. Leipz. 1863).

Different penalties are attached to the infringement of these prohibitions. The punishment of death is to be inflicted for marrying a father's wife (^{<CR18>}Leviticus 18:8; 20:11), or a daughter-in-law (^{<CR15>}Leviticus 18:15; 20:12); of death by fire for marrying a woman and her daughter at the same time (^{<CR17>}Leviticus 18:17; 20:14); of being cut off or excommunicated for marrying a sister on the father's side or on the mother's side (^{<CR19>}Leviticus 18:9; 20:17); of not being pardoned for marrying a father's or mother's sister (^{<CR12>}Leviticus 18:12, 13; 20:19); of not being pardoned and childlessness for marrying a father's brother's wife (^{<CR14>}Leviticus 18:14; 20:20); and of childlessness alone for marrying a brother's wife (^{<CR16>}Leviticus 18:16; 20:21), excepting the case of a Levirate marriage (^{<CR15>}Deuteronomy 25:5-10). No penalty is mentioned for marrying one's mother (^{<CR7>}Leviticus 18:7), granddaughter (^{<CR10>}Leviticus 18:10), or two sisters together (^{<CR18>}Leviticus 18:18). From this enumeration it will be seen that it only specifies *three instances* in which capital punishment is to be inflicted.

The grounds on which these prohibitions were enacted are reducible to the following three heads:

- (1) moral propriety;
- (2) the practices of heathen nations; and
- (3) social convenience.

The first of these grounds comes prominently forward in the expressions by which the various offenses are characterized, as well as in the general prohibition against approaching “the flesh of his flesh.” The use of such expressions undoubtedly contains an appeal to the *horror naturalis*, or that repugnance with which man instinctively shrinks from matrimonial union with one with whom he is connected by the closest ties both of blood and of family affection. On this subject we need say no more than that there is a difference in kind between the affection that binds the members of a family together, and that which lies at the bottom of the matrimonial bond, and that the amalgamation of these affections cannot take place without a serious shock to one or the other of the two; hence the desirableness of drawing a distinct line between the provinces of each, by stating definitely where the matrimonial affection may legitimately take root. The second motive to laying down these prohibitions was that the Hebrews might be preserved as a peculiar people, with institutions distinct from those of the Egyptians and Canaanites (^{<BIB>}Leviticus 18:3), as well as of other heathen nations with whom they might come in contact. Marriages within the proscribed degrees prevailed in many civilized countries in historical times, and were not unusual among the Hebrews themselves in the pre-Mosaic age. For instance, marriages with half-sisters by the same father were allowed at Athens (Plutarch, *Cim.* 4; *Themistocl.* 32), with half-sisters by the same mother at Sparta (Philo, *De spec. leg.* p. 779), and with full sisters in Egypt (Diod. 1:27) and Persia, as illustrated in the well-known instances of Ptolemy Philadelphus in the former (Paus. 1:7, 1), and Cambyses in the latter country (Herod. 3:31). It was even believed that in some nations marriages between a son and his mother were not unusual (Ovid, *het.* 10:331; Eurip. *Androm.* 174). Among the Hebrews we have instances of marriage with a half-sister in the case of Abraham (^{<BIB>}Genesis 20:12), with an aunt in the case of Amran (^{<BIB>}Exodus 6:20), and with two sisters at the same time in the case of Jacob (^{<BIB>}Genesis 29:26). Such cases were justifiable previous to the enactments of Moses: subsequently to them we have no case in the O.T. of actual marriage within the degrees, though the language of Tamar towards her half-brother Amnon (^{<BIB>}2 Samuel 13:13) implies the possibility of their union with the consent of their father. The Herods committed some violent breaches of the marriage law. Herod the Great married his half-sister (*Ant.* 17:1, 3); Archelaus his brother’s widow, who had children (17:13,1); Herod Antipas his brother’s wife (18:5, 1; ^{<BIB>}Matthew 14:3). In the Christian Church we have an instance of marriage with a father’s wife (^{<BIB>}1 Corinthians 5:1), which St. Paul

characterizes as “fornication” (πορνεία), and visits with the severest condemnation. The third ground of the prohibitions, social convenience, comes forward solely in the case of marriage with two sisters simultaneously, the effect of which would be to “vex” or *irritate* the first wife, and produce domestic wars.

Besides the proscribed degrees, the Mosaic law also forbids the following intermarriages: 1. No Israelite is to marry the progeny of incestuous and unlawful copulations, or *a manner* (רזמם, ^{<R21D>}Deuteronomy 23:2). In the absence of any Biblical definition of this much-disputed expression, we must accept the ancient traditional explanation contained in the Mishna, which is as follows: ‘When there is betrothal without transgression of the law about forbidden marriages — e.g. if the daughters of priests, Levites, or Israelites are married to priests, Levites, or Israelites — the child goes after the father; where there is betrothal, and this law has been transgressed — e.g. if a widow is married to a high-priest, a divorced woman or one who performed the ceremony of *chralitsah* to an ordinary priest, or a bastardess or a female *nethin* to an Israelite; or, vice versa, if a Jewess is married to a bastard or *nethin*— the child goes after the inferior party; where the woman cannot be betrothed to the man, but might legally be betrothed to another person — e.g.,

1. if a man married within any one of the degrees proscribed by the law — the child is *a bastard or manner*” (*Kiddushin*, 3:12).
2. Any person who is hkd [wxp, *cujus testiculi vulnerati sunt, vel certe unus eorum*, or hkpc twrk), *cujus membruns virile precissum est*, as the Mishna (*Jebanoth*, 8:2) explains it, is not allowed to marry (^{<R21D>}Deuteronomy 23:1).
3. A man is not to remarry a woman whom he had divorced, and who, after marrying another husband, had become a widow, or been divorced again (^{<R21D>}Deuteronomy 24:2-4).
4. Heiresses are not allowed to intermarry with persons of another tribe (^{<R21D>}Numbers 36:5-9).
5. A high-priest is forbidden to marry a widow, a divorced woman, a profane woman, or a harlot, and restricted to a pure Jewish maiden (^{<R21D>}Leviticus 21:13,14).

6. Ordinary priests are prohibited from marrying prostitutes and divorced women (^{<R207>}Leviticus 21:7).

b. The proscription of epigamy with non-Israelites is absolute with regard to some nations, and conditional with regard to others. The Mosaic law absolutely forbids intermarriage with the seven Canaanitish nations, on the ground that it would lead the Israelites into idolatry (^{<R345>}Exodus 34:15,16; ^{<R008>}Deuteronomy 7:3, 4); and with the Ammonites and Moabites, on account of national antipathy (^{<R204>}Deuteronomy 23:4-8); while the prohibition against marriage with the Egyptians and Edomites only extends to the third generation (^{<R207>}Deuteronomy 23:7, 8). The Talmud, which rightly expounds the prohibition to “*enter into the congregation of the Lord*” as necessarily extending to epigamy (comp. ^{<H102>}1 Kings 11:2; *Kiddushin*, 4:3), takes the third generation to mean *of those who became proselytes*, i.e. the grandchildren of an Ammonite or Moabite who professes Judaism (Mishna, *Jebamoth*, 8:3; Maimonides, *lad Ha-Chazaka, Issure Biah*, 12:19, 20). This view is confirmed by the fact that the Bible only mentions *three* intermarriages with Egyptians, and records at least two out of the three to show the evil effects of it. One occurred after the Exodus and in the wilderness, and we are told that the son of this intermarriage, while quarreling with a brother Jew, blasphemed the name of God, and suffered capital punishment (^{<R240>}Leviticus 24:10-14); the second occurred towards the end of the rulership of the judges, and tradition endeavors to show that Ishmael, the murderer of Gedaliah (^{<H401>}Jeremiah 41:1, 2), was a descendant of Jarha, the Egyptian son-in-law of Sheshan (^{<R234>}1 Chronicles 2:34,35; and, Rashi, *ad loc.*); and the third is the intermarriage of Solomon, which, however, is excepted from the censure in the book of Kings (^{<H001>}1 Kings 3:1 sq.; 11:1, 2). Of intermarriages with Edomites not a single instance is recorded in the O.T.; the Jewish antipathy against them was transmitted down to a very late period, as we find in the declaration of Jesus, son of Sirach, that his soul hates the inhabitants of Seir (Ecclesiasticus 4:25, 26), and in the fact that Judas Maccabaeus carried on a deadly war with them (1 Maccabees 5:3; 2 Maccabees 20:15-23).

An exception is made in the case of female captives of war (^{<R210>}Deuteronomy 21:10-14), which is evidently designed to obviate as far as possible the outrages committed after the evil passions have been stirred up in the conflict. The law, however, most humanely ordains that the captor, before making her his wife, should first allow her to indulge herself

for a full month in mourning for her parents, from whom she is snatched away, and to practice the following customary rites expressive of grief:

1. Cut off the hair of her head, which was the usual sign of mourning both among the Jews and other nations of antiquity (^{<4508>}Ezra 9:3; ^{<802>}Job 1:20; ^{<2352>}Isaiah 15:2; ^{<4072>}Jeremiah 7:29; 16:6; ^{<4078>}Ezekiel 7:18; 27:31; ^{<3080>}Amos 8:10; ^{<3001>}Micah 1:16);
2. Cut off her nails, which were stained to form a part of personal adornment; and,
3. Put off the raiment in which she was taken captive, since the women who followed their fathers and husbands to the war put on their finest dresses and ornaments previous to an engagement, in the hope of finding favor in the eyes of their captors in case of a defeat (Ovid, *Remied. Amor.* 343; Rosenmüller, *as alte u. neue Morgenland*, 2:308).

The first complaint of epigamy with aliens is, strange to say, made against Moses, the lawgiver himself (^{<0421>}Numbers 12:1). In the days of the Judges the law against intermarriage was commonly transgressed (^{<0086>}Judges 3:6), and from the earlier portions of the book of Proverbs, which ring with repeated denunciations of foreign women (^{<3026>}Proverbs 2:16, 17; 5:8-11; 15:17), as well as from the warnings of ^{<2116>}Isaiah 2:6, it is evident that intermarriages with foreign women were generally practiced in private life in after times. Of the twenty kings of Israel who reigned from the division of the kingdom to the Babylonian captivity, Ahab is the only one mentioned who married a foreign wife (^{<1165>}1 Kings 16:31); while of the nineteen kings of Judah after the division none intermarried with aliens. Marriages between Israelitish women and proselyted foreigners were at all times of rare occurrence, and are noticed in the Bible as if they were of an exceptional nature, such as that of an Egyptian and an Israelitish woman (^{<0240>}Leviticus 24:10); of Abigail and Jether, the Ishmaelite, contracted probably when Jesse's family was sojourning in Moab (^{<1327>}1 Chronicles 2:17); of Sheshan's daughter and an Egyptian, who was staying in his house (^{<1325>}1 Chronicles 2:35); and of a Naphthalite woman and a Tyrian, living in adjacent districts (^{<1074>}1 Kings 7:14). In the reverse case, viz. the marriage of Israelites with foreign women, it is, of course, highly probable that the wives became proselytes after their marriage, as instanced in the case of ^{<8016>}Ruth 1:16, and probably in that of Solomon's Egyptian wife (^{<1940>}Psalms 40:10); but this was by no means invariably the case. On the contrary, we find that the Canaanitish wives of Solomon (^{<1104>}1 Kings 11:4),

and the Phoenician wife of Ahab (^{<1165>}1 Kings 16:31), retained their idolatrous practices, and introduced them into their adopted countries. Proselytism does not, therefore, appear to have been a *sine qua non* in the case of a wife, though it was so in the case of a husband: the total silence of the law as to any such condition in regard to a captive, whom an Israelite might wish to marry, must be regarded as evidence of the reverse (^{<1210>}Deuteronomy 21:10-14), nor have the refinements of rabbinical writers on that passage succeeded in establishing the necessity of proselytism. The opposition of Samson's parents to his marriage with a Philistine woman (^{<1743>}Judges 14:3) leads to the same conclusion.

3. In the post-exilic period, besides the fifteen proscribed degrees enumerated in ^{<1887>}Leviticus 18:7-17; 20:11, etc., the *Sopherlim*, or scribes (B.C. 322-221), prohibited marriage with other relations (Mishna, *Jebcamoth*, 2:4), and those prohibitions were afterwards extended still further by R.Chija ben-Abba the Babylonian (A.D. 163-193), and friend of Jehudah I the Holy (*Jebamoth*, 22. a). 'The prohibited degrees of the scribes are denominated *twynç*, i.e. *twyr* [I the *second* or *subordinate in rank* with respect to those forbidden in the Bible, and may be seen in the following list given by Maimonides:

- “**1.** The mother's mother, and this is infinite, for the mother's mother's mother's mother, and so upwards. are proscribed.
- 2.** The mother of his father's mother, and no further.
- 3.** His father's mother, and this is infinite, for even the father's mother's mother's mother, and so upwards, are proscribed.
- 4.** The mother of his father's father only.
- 5.** The wife of his father's father, and this is infinite, for even if she were the wife of our father Jacob, she is forbidden to every one of us.
- 6.** The wife of his mother's father only.
- 7.** The wife of his father's brother by the mother.
- 8.** The wife of his mother's brother, whether by the mother or by the father.
- 9.** His son's daughter-in-law, i.e. his son's son's wife, and this is infinite, for even if she were the son's son's son's son's wife,

descending to the end of the world, she is forbidden, so that, as long as the wife of one of us lives, she is secondary or forbidden to our father Jacob

10. His daughter's daughter-in-law, i.e. her son's wife only.
11. The daughter of his son's daughter only.
12. The daughter of his son's son only.
13. The daughter of his daughter's daughter only.
14. The daughter of his daughter's son only.
15. The daughter of his wife's son only.
16. The daughter of his wife's daughter's daughter only.
17. The mother of his wife's father's mother only.
18. The mother of his wife's mother's father only.
19. The mother of his wife's mother's mother only.
20. The mother of his wife's father's father only.

Thus, of these secondary prohibitions, there are four which are infinite:

- a, the mother's mother and all upwards;
- b, the father's mother and all upwards;
- c, the grandfather's wife and all upwards; and,
- d, the son's son's wife and all downwards" (*Hilchoth Ishuth*, 1:6).

The principle by which the scribes were guided was to extend the prohibition to the whole line wherever the Mosaic law refers to lineal ascendants or descendants, as well as to those who might easily be mistaken by having a common appellation. Thus mother's mother's mother's mother, *ad infinitum*, is forbidden, because the Mosaic law proscribes the mother, so also the wife of the grandfather, because the wife's father is forbidden in the Mosaic law; while the mother of the father is proscribed, because the appellation grandmother is used without distinction for both the mother's and father's mother. From Maimonides's list, however, it will be seen that he, like Alfasi, restricts prohibition 2 to

the mother of the grandfather, and prohibitions 12-16, 20, to the son's grandchildren, great-grandmother, and great-grandchildren, but does not extend it to any further ascendants or descendants. The whole subject is extensively discussed in the Talmud (*Jebamoth*, 21, 22; *Jerusalem Jebamoth*, 2:4), and by Maimonides (*Istel Ha-Chazaka, Hilchoth Ishuth*, 1:6, etc.), to which we must refer. It must, however, be remarked that Philo's list of proscribed degrees is much shorter. After explaining why Moses prohibited marriage with one's own mother or sister, he says, "For this reason he has also forbidden other matrimonial connections, inasmuch as he ordained that a man shall not marry his granddaughter ($\mu\eta$ $\theta\upsilon\gamma\alpha\tau\rho\iota\delta\eta\eta\nu$, $\mu\eta$ $\upsilon\iota\delta\eta\eta\nu$), nor his aunt on the father's or mother's side, nor the wife of an uncle, son, or brother; nor a step-daughter while in the lifetime of her mother or after her death, because a stepfather takes the place of a father, and a step-daughter is to be looked upon as his own daughter. Neither does he allow the same man to marry two sisters, either at the same time or at different times, even in case one of them had been married to another and is divorced; for he did not consider it pious that one sister should succeed to the place of her unfortunate sister, whether the latter is still cohabiting with him, or is divorced and has no husband. or is married to another husband" (*De special. legibus*, 780). Still shorter is the list of Josephus, who says, "The law prohibits it as a heavy sin and an abomination to have carnal intercourse with one's mother, step-mother, father's or mother's sister, one's own sister, or a son's wife" (*Ant.* 3:12, 1). Marriage with a wife's step-mother is allowed by the Babylonian and forbidden by the Jerusalem Talmud; the Spanish Jews follow the former, while the Germano-French communities adopt the latter. Inter marriages between cousins, uncle and niece, entire step-brother and step-sister, are quite legitimate. Indeed, for an uncle to marry a niece, which the English law forbids, has been considered by the Jews from time immemorial as something specially meritorious. The Talmud says that the promise given in Isaiah, "Then shalt thou call and the Lord shall answer" (58:9), refers to that man especially "who loves his neighbors, befriends his relations, marries his brother's daughter, and lends money to the poor in the hour of need" (*Jebamoth*, 62 b. 63 a).

As to the *ethical* cause of the proscribed marriages, or the cases specified, including parallels by affinity. the ancient Jews, to whom the oracles of God were committed, and who had to explain and administer the law in practical life, knew nothing about it. The Palestinian doctors regarded the

proscribed degrees as a *positive* law, the cause of which cannot be divined by human reason (*Sifra Kedoshim*, 9:12; Talmud, *Sabbath*, 130 a; *Joma*, 75 a). The only attempt to rationalize on the subject is on the apparent inconsistency of the Mosaic law in prohibiting marriage with the wife of the father's brother, in case she is divorced or left a widow, and not forbidding the wife of the mother's brother. Upon this the Talmud remarks that a man visits his father's relations more than his mother's (*Jebamoth*, 21 a; and Rashi on this passage); and it is submitted, and we believe with perfect reason, and based on ^{<400B>}Numbers 1:2, that it is the father's relations who constitute the family, and not the mother's. We thus see that up to the time of the Ptolemies, when the Greek loose barriers of consanguinity threatened to fall among the Jewish families, the ancient Hebrews were bound only by the specific proscriptions in the Mosaic law, and that even after the prohibitions were extended by the scribes, the proscription of a male relative by blood did not imply the wife's relatives of the like degree, because of the strong distinction made by them between consanguinity and affinity by marriage; the former being permanent and sacred, and the latter uncertain and vague, as a man might any moment divorce his wife, or take as many as he pleased, and because the husband's family were regarded as the relations, while the wife's were not esteemed beyond those who are especially mentioned.

The proscribed degrees were sacredly avoided by the Jews during this period, and no dispensation could be obtained by any one, no matter how high his position, as Judaism never invested any spiritual functionary with power to absolve, even in extraordinary cases, from the obligations of the law. Hence the outcry against Herod the Great, who married his half-sister (Josephus, *Ant.* 17:1, 3); against Archelaus, who took his deceased brother's widow when she was the mother of children (*ibid.* 17:13, 1); and against Herod Antipas, for which John the Baptist had to atone with his life (Josephus, *Ant.* 18:5, 1; ^{<404B>}Matthew 14:3). So long as foreign epigamy was of merely occasional occurrence no veto was placed upon it by public authority; but when, after the return from the Babylonian captivity, the Jews contracted marriages with the heathen inhabitants of Palestine in so wholesale a manner as to endanger their national existence, the practice was severely condemned (^{<150B>}Ezra 9:2; 10:2), and the law of positive prohibition, originally pronounced only against the Canaanites, was extended to the Moabites, Ammonites, and Philistines (^{<1613B>}Nehemiah 13:23-25). Public feeling was thenceforth strongly opposed to foreign

marriages, and the union of Manasseh with a Cuthaeen led to such animosity as to produce the great national schism, which had its focus in the temple on Mount Gerizim (Josephus, *Ant.* 11:8, 2) A no less signal instance of the same feeling is exhibited in the cases of Joseph (*Ant.* 12:4, 6) and Anilaets (*Ant.* 18:9, 5), and is noticed by Tacitus (*Hist.* v. 5) as one of the characteristics of the Jewish nation in his day. In the N.T. no special directions are given on this head. but the general precepts of separation between believers and unbelievers (~~4064~~ 2 Corinthians 6:14,17) would apply with special force to the case of marriage; and the permission to dissolve mixed marriages, contracted previously to the conversion of one party, at the instance of the unconverted one, cannot but be regarded as implying the impropriety of such unions subsequently to conversion (~~4072~~ 1 Corinthians 7:12).

Besides the proscribed degrees, the rabbinic law also enacted —

1. A man must not marry a divorced woman with whom he has committed adultery prior to her divorcement (*Sotet*, 27), or even if he is only suspected of it (*Jebamoth*, 24; Maimonides, *Sofa*, i 12).
2. A man who attested the death of the husband is not allowed to marry the widow, nor is the bearer of a divorce permitted to marry the divorced woman, to avoid suspicion (*Jebamoth*, 2:9, 10).
3. If a man's wife dies, he must not marry again till three festivals after his wife's death (*Moed Katon*, 23).
4. A man is not to marry a woman who has lost two husbands (*Jebamoth*, 64).
5. A father is not to give a young daughter in marriage to an old man, nor is a young man to marry an old woman (*Jebamoth*, 101; Maimonides, *Isure Bia*, 21:26).
6. A man is not to marry within thirty days of the death of a near relation (*Voed Katon*, 23).
7. Widows are not to marry within ninety days of the loss of their husbands. nor are divorced women to marry within ninety days of their being divorced, in order that the paternity of the newly-born child might be distinguished (*Jebamoth*, 41 a).

8. If a widow or a divorced woman is nursing an infant, she must not marry within twenty-four months of the birth of the baby (*Jebamoth*, 41; *Kethuboth*, 60; and *Tossafoth*, on these passages).

VI. Sanctity of Marriage, and Mutual Rights of Husband and Wife. —

1. Though at the creation the wife occupied an equal position with the husband, being a part of him, yet, as she became the cause of his sin, God ordained it as part of her punishment that the wife should be in subjection to the will of her husband, and that he should be her master, and “rule over her” (^{<01816>}Genesis 3:16). This dependence of the wife on her husband is henceforth declared by the very Hebrew appellation (**I ab**) for husband (^{<02103>}Exodus 21:3, 22), which literally denotes *lord, master, owner*, and is seen in the conduct of Sarah, who speaks of her husband Abraham as (**ynda**) *my lord* (^{<01812>}Genesis 18:12), which is commended by Peter as illustrating the proper position of a wife (^{<01816>}1 Peter 3:6). From this mastery of the husband over the wife arose the different standard of virtue which obtained in married life. The wife, as subject to her husband, her lord and master, was not allowed to practice polyandry; she was obliged to regard the sanctity of marriage as absolute, and any unchastity on her part was visited with capital punishment; while the husband could take any unmarried woman he liked and violate the laws of chastity, as we should view it, with impunity (^{<01824>}Genesis 38:24). This absolute sanctity of marriage on the part of the wife was also acknowledged by other nations of antiquity, as is gathered from the narratives of the patriarchs. Thus Abraham knew that Pharaoh would not take Sarah from her husband, and we are told that as soon as the Egyptian monarch discovered that she was a married woman, he immediately restored her to her husband (^{<01215>}Genesis 12:15-19); and this is confirmed by Egyptology, which, based on ancient writers and monuments, shows that he who seduced a married woman received a thousand rods, and that the woman had her nose cut off (Uhlemann, *AEgypt. Alterthumsk.* 11, sec. 25, 65). The same sanctity was attached to a married woman in Philistia (^{<01211>}Genesis 20:1-18; 26:9-11).

2. Recognizing the previously-existing inequality of husband and wife, and basing its laws upon the then prevailing notion that the husband is lord over his wife, that he can take as many wives as he likes, and send them away whenever he dislikes them, the Mosaic gamology, as a matter of course, could neither impose the same obligation of nuptial fidelity nor confer the same rights on both. This is evident from the following facts:

1. The husband had a right to expect from his wife connubial chastity, and in case of infidelity could demand her death as well as that of her seducer (^{<0300>}Leviticus 20:10; ^{<0220>}Deuteronomy 22:20-22; ^{<0360>}Ezekiel 16:40; ^{<0085>}John 8:5).
2. If he became jealous and suspicious of her, *even when she had not been unfaithful*, he could bring her before the priest and have administered to her the water of jealousy (^{<0452>}Numbers 5:12-31). But if the husband was suspected, or was actually guilty of carnal intercourse with an unmarried woman, no statute was enacted to enable the wife or wives to arraign him for a breach of marriage or infringement of her or their rights. Even when he was discovered with another man's wife, it was the injured husband that had the power to demand the death of the seducer, but not the wife of the criminal.
3. If the wife vowed anything to the Lord, or imposed upon herself voluntary obligations to the Deity, her husband could nullify it (^{<0306>}Numbers 30:6-8).
4. He could send her away or divorce her when she displeased him (^{<0244>}Deuteronomy 24:14).

The woman, again, is protected by the following laws:

1. When a Hebrew maiden is sold by her father to a man, with the understanding that she is to be his half-wife (*h^{ma} = çgl yp*, ^{<0217>}Exodus 21:7; ^{<0018>}Judges 9:18 with ^{<0081>}Judges 8:31), the law enacts that, in case her master and intended husband is displeased with her, and he refuses to redeem his promise —
 - i**, he is not to keep her till the sabbatic year, and then give her her liberty like ordinary servants;
 - ii**, he is not to sell her to any one else as a wife;
 - iii**, he may give her to his son as a wife, and in that case must treat her as a daughter-in-law;
 - iv**, if he gives his son an additional wife, she is to retain — a, her food, b, raiment, and, c, conjugal right as heretofore; and,
 - v**, if these three last-mentioned points are refused to her, she is forthwith to be set at liberty (^{<0217>}Exodus 21:7-11).

2. If he maliciously impugns her chastity, he is to be scourged, and loses his right over her to divorce her (^{<B213>}Deuteronomy 22:13-19)
3. If she has children, they must render equal obedience to her as to the father (^{<B212>}Exodus 20:12; ^{<B216>}Deuteronomy 27:16).
4. The husband must not vex her by marrying two sisters simultaneously (^{<B188>}Leviticus 18:18).
5. He is not allowed to annoy his less-beloved wife by transferring the primogeniture from her son to the child of his favorite wife (^{<B215>}Deuteronomy 21:15-17).
6. If her husband dislikes her, he is not arbitrarily to dismiss her, but give her a “bill of divorcement” (^{<B241>}Deuteronomy 24:1), which requires the interposition of legal advisers.
7. When a woman is divorced, or her husband dies, she is free, and at liberty to marry any one she likes, as is evident from the enactments in ^{<B217>}Leviticus 21:7, 8, 13; ^{<B242>}Deuteronomy 24:2-4; 25:5, which are based upon this fact.

3. The notions about sanctity of marriage were loftier during the post-exilic period than in the preceding epochs, as may be judged from the fact that unfaithfulness to a wife is denounced by the prophet Malachi as violating a sacred covenant, to the transaction of which God himself was a witness (^{<B214>}Malachi 2:14). And though it may be questioned whether the prophet’s appeal to God as having been witness to the marriage-contract refers to the above-named seven benedictions (**twkrb [bç]**) which the bridegroom had to pronounce at the marriage-feast, and in which he invoked God’s presence and blessing to the compact, as Abrabanel will have it. yet there can be no doubt that marriage is here for the first time expressly described as *a covenant* (**tyrb**) *made in the presence of God*. With such a view of the sanctity of marriage, the notion that a wife is a plaything for a leisure hour rapidly disappeared, and the sages who had to expound the law to the people in the time of Christ taught that the declaration “Peace shall be in thy house” (^{<B134>}Job 5:24) will be realized by him “who loves his wife as himself, and honors her more than himself, and trains his sons and daughters up in the way of righteousness” (*Jebamoth*, 62 b). Moreover, marriage was regarded as illegal if the man had not given to his wife the instrument (**hbwtk**), in which he promises his wife, “I will

work for thee, honor thee. maintain thee, and provide for thee, according to the custom of Jewish husbands.” The rabbinic laws both define this promise and insist upon its being fulfilled, as may be seen from the following enactments:

1. A wife is to be kept in proportion to the circumstances of her husband, and have her meals with him at the table; if he ill-treats her and she removes from him, he is obliged to send her maintenance (*Jebamoth*, 64 b).
2. If the husband goes on a three months' journey without making provision for his wife, the legal authorities of the place are to maintain her from his property (*Kethuboth*, 48 a, 107).
3. He is obliged to perform the duties of a husband within a stated period (Mishna, *Kethuboth*, v. 6).
4. If her husband dies, she is to be maintained from his property, or by the children, in the same manner as she was in his lifetime, till she is betrothed to another man, and her rights must be attended to before the claims of any one else (*Kethuboth*, 43, 51, 52, 68, 103; *Jerusalem Kethuboth*, 4:14).
5. If a woman marries a man of higher rank than herself, she rises with him; but if he is inferior to her. she does not descend to him (*tdrwy wmw[hl w[hnyaw* [*Kethuboth*, 48 a, 61 a]). For other rights which the wife possesses we must refer to the *Kethubah*, or the marriage-instrument given in section 2 of this period. The husband, on the other hand, has a right to expect from his wife chastity which is beyond the reach of suspicion, unreserved obedience, and to do the work of a housewife. Other rights are given in the following section on *divorce*.

VII. *Divorce*. —

1. The arbitrary power of the husband over his wife in the patriarchal age is also seen in the fact that he could divorce her at his pleasure. There is but one instance of it recorded, but it is a very significant one. Abraham, though he has a child by Hagar, sends away his half-wife, not requiring any legal or religious intervention (⁰²¹⁴Genesis 21:14), but, as in the case of marriage, effecting it by a mere verbal declaration. Wherever marriages are effected by the violent, exercise of the *patria. potestas*, or without any bon

of affection between the parties concerned, ill-assorted matches must be of frequent occurrence; and without the remedy of divorce, in such a state of society, we can understand the truth of the apostles' remark that "it is not good to marry" (^{<090>}Matthew 19:10). Hence divorce prevails to a great extent in all countries where marriage is the result of arbitrary appointment or of purchase: we may instance the Arabians (Burckhardt's *Notes*, 1:111; Layard, *Nineveh*, 1:357) and the Egyptians (Lane, 1:235 sq.).

2. It must be remarked that the Mosaic law does not *institute* divorce, but, as in other matters, recognizes and most humanely regulates the prevailing patriarchal practice (^{<090>}Deuteronomy 24:1-4). The ground on which the law allows a divorce is termed **rbd twr** [, *any shameful thing*. What the precise meaning of this ambiguous phrase is, and what, according to the Mosaic gamology, gives a husband the right to divorce his wife, has been greatly disputed in the schools of Shammai and Hillel, which were founded before the advent of Christ, and these discussions are given below. It is, however, certain that the phrase does not *denote fornication or adultery*, for in that case the woman was not divorced, but *stoned* (^{<090>}Leviticus 20:10; ^{<090>}Deuteronomy 22:20-22; ^{<090>}Ezekiel 16:40; ^{<090>}John 8:5). Moreover, the phrase **ynl p yny** [**b j axm**, with which this statute begins, when used of opposite sexes, as in the case before us, generally denotes *favorable i impression which one produces on the other*, by *graceful manners*, or *beautiful appearance* (^{<090>}Genesis 39:4; ^{<090>}Ruth 2:2, 10, 13; ^{<090>}Ezekiel 5:2 with 8). That it has this sense here seems to be warranted by ver. 3, where it is supposed that, the divorced woman marries again, and her second husband also divorces her, and that not on account of immorality, but because *he does not like her*. The humane regulations which the Mosaic gamology introduced in order to render a divorce legal were as follows:

- 1.** If a man dislikes his wife, or finds that he cannot live happily with her, he is not summarily to send her away by word of mouth as heretofore, but is to give her a formal and judicial *bill of divorcement* (**t tyrk rps**), which required the intervention of a legal adviser, and caused delay, thus affording time for reflection, and preventing many a divorce resolved on under the influence of passion.
- 2.** Allowing the parties, even after the dissolution of the marriage, to renew the connection if they wished it, provided the divorced wife had not in the meantime married another husband, and become a widow, or

been again divorced. Not only are bishop Patrick (on ^{<1820>}Deuteronomy 24:4), Michaelis (*Law's of Moses*, 2:137, English translation), and many other Christian expositors, of this opinion, but it has been so understood and acted upon by those who were charged with the administration of the law from time immemorial. The only exception which the sages made was when a man divorced his wife because of an evil report which he maliciously circulated about her; then he was not allowed to remarry her (Mishna, *Gittin*, 4:7).

3. If the divorced woman marries again, and the second husband either dies or divorces her, she is not allowed to remarry her first husband: this was to preclude the possibility of procuring the death of, or a divorce from, the second husband, in case the parties wished to be reunited.

4. If a man seduces a maiden, and on this account is legally obliged to marry her, "he may not put her away all his life" (^{<1828>}Deuteronomy 22:28, 29). Or,

5. If he groundlessly impugns her chastity, he also loses the power of ever divorcing her (^{<1823>}Deuteronomy 22:13-19). This, as well as the preceding benign law, was evidently designed to make men care for those women whom they had either virtually or actually deprived of their moral character, and who, if these men were allowed to desert them, might never be able to get husbands. Thus these laws, while checking seduction, inasmuch as the man knew that he would have all his lifetime to be wedded to and care for the injured woman, also prevented those females who had momentarily fallen from being branded for life, and compelled to give themselves up to prostitution.

6. Though the Mosaic law has no express statute that the wife, under certain circumstances, may demand a divorce from her husband, yet it is undoubtedly implied in the enactment contained in ^{<1210>}Exodus 21:10. For if a bondwoman who became the wife of her master could quit him if he did not fulfill the conditions of a husband, it is but natural to conclude that a *free* wife would, under similar circumstances, be able to claim the protection of the same law. A few instances of the violation of the divorce law, between the period of its enactment and the Babylonian captivity, are incidentally recorded without any censure whatever. Thus we are told that Saul took away Michal, his daughter, David's wife, without David's formally divorcing her, and gave her to

Phalti (¹⁰²⁵⁴1 Samuel 25:44), and that David took back again Michal, who had been united to another husband (¹⁰¹⁸⁴2 Samuel 3:14-16). Still the laws of divorce and of prohibiting reunion after the divorced woman had been married to another husband are alluded to by Jeremiah as well known and commonly observed (²⁴⁰⁰Jeremiah 3:1:8).

3. The rather uncertain grounds on which the Mosaic law permits divorce (¹⁰³⁰⁰Deuteronomy 24:1-4) were minutely defined during the period after the exile. Though the school of Shammai restricts the phrase *rbd twr* [to *unchastity*, and the Sadducees too insisted that divorce is not to be tolerated except when the woman is guilty of *adultery* (*Eschol Ba-Copher, Alphab. xcix; Ben-Chonanja, 4:276*), yet the Jews as a nation, as well as most Christian expositors, agree with the school of Hillel, (*Mishna, Gittin, 9:10*) that it *denotes faults or deformities*, as the context plainly shows. Now, in stating the grounds on which the Jewish expositors of the law, in the time of Christ and after, regarded dissolution of marriage as justifiable, we must distinguish the cases in which the legal authorities themselves took up the matter, from those in which the married parties asked for divorce.

a. *Dissolution of marriage occasioned by the lawful authorities* took place

1. When the woman is guilty of adultery.
2. When the woman carries on secret intercourse with a man after her husband has warned her against it (*Sota, 27; Jebamoth, 24*).
3. Where, though betrothal had taken place, yet a matrimonial law (*matrimonium injustum*) is violated, either referring to the proscribed degrees or to other matters enacted by the rabbins.
4. When the husband is infected with leprosy (*Kethuboth, 77*).

b. *It was granted on the demand of the married parties.* Thus the husband could effect a dissolution of marriage —

1. When his wife, by violating the Mosaic law, caused him, without knowing it, to be guilty of transgression (*Mishna, Kethuboth, 7:6*).
2. If the wife violates the bounds of modesty — e.g. by going into the street with uncovered hair, flirting with young men, etc. (*ibid.*).

3. If the wife is suspected of adultery.
4. If the woman curses her father-in-law in the presence of her husband (*Kethuboth*, 72).
5. If the wife will not follow her husband to another place (*Kethuboth*. 110).
6. If the wife refuses her husband the conjugal rights for twelve months.

The wife can demand a divorce —

1. If after marriage the husband contracts a loathsome disease (Mishna, *Kethuboth*, 7:9, 10).
2. If after marriage he betakes himself to a disgusting business (*ibid.* the Gemara thereon, 75).
3. If he treats her cruelly (*Eben Ha-Ezar*, 154).
4. If her husband changes his religion (*ibid.*).
5. If the husband commits an offense which makes him flee from his country (*Eben Ha-Ezar*, 9).
6. If he leads a dissolute and immoral life (*Eben Ha-Ezar*, Gloss on Sects, 11).
7. If he wastes his property and neglects to maintain her (Mishna, *Kethuboth*, 7:1).
8. If he refuses her connubial rights (Mishna, *Kethuboth*, v. 6).

There are other grounds on which divorce can be obtained, but for these we must refer to the Mishna, *Gittin*, as they are too numerous to be detailed. The bill of divorcement must be handed over, either by the husband or a messenger, to the wife or one deputed by her, with the words, "This is thy divorce; thou art henceforth divorced from me, and canst marry whomsoever thou likest" (Mishna, *Gittin*, 9). It must, however, be remarked that divorce was greatly discouraged by the Talmudists, and it is declared that The who divorces his wife is hated of God. The altar sheds tears over him who divorces the wife and companion of his youth" (*Gittin*, 90 a).

During the post-exilian period the abuse of divorce continued unabated (Josephus, *Life*, 76); and under the Asmonaeon dynasty the right was assumed by the wife as against her husband, an innovation which is attributed to Salome by Josephus (*Ant.* 15:7, 10), but which appears to have been prevalent in the apostolic age, if we may judge from passages where the language implies that the act emanated from the wife (^{<4102>}Mark 10:12; ^{<4071>}1 Corinthians 7:11), as well as from some of the comments of the early writers on ^{<5489>}1 Timothy 5:9. Our Lord and his apostles re-established the integrity and sanctity of the marriage-bond by the following measures:

(1) by the confirmation of the original charter of marriage as the basis on which all regulations are to be framed (^{<4094>}Matthew 19:4, 5);

(2) by the restriction of divorce to the case of fornication, and the prohibition of remarriage in all persons divorced on improper grounds (^{<4162>}Matthew 5:32; 19:9; ^{<4103>}Romans 7:3; ^{<4070>}1 Corinthians 7:10, 11); and

(3) by the enforcement of moral purity generally (^{<3804>}Hebrews 13:4, etc.), and especially by the formal condemnation of fornication, which appears to have been classed among acts morally indifferent (*ἁδιόφορα*) by a certain party in the Church (^{<4151>}Acts 15:20).

VIII. *Levirate Law.* —

1. The only power which a woman had over the man during the pre-Mosaic period, in matrimonial matters, was when her husband died without issue. The widow could then claim his next brother to marry her; if the second also died without progeny, she could ask the third, and so on. The object of this Levirate marriage, as it is called, from the Latin, *levir*, brother-in-law (Hebrew, *μby*; Greek, *ἐπιγαμβρέω*), is “to raise up seed to the departed brother,” which should preserve his name upon his inheritance, and prevent it from being erased from among his brethren, and from the gate of his town (^{<0138>}Genesis 38:8; ^{<6216>}Deuteronomy 25:6; ^{<8910>}Ruth 4:10); since the Hebrews regarded childlessness as a great evil (^{<0164>}Genesis 16:4; 19:31), and entire excision as a most dire calamity and awful punishment from God (^{<8914>}Deuteronomy 9:14; ^{<9107>}Psalms 9:7; 109:15). To remove this reproach from the departed, it was regarded as the sacred duty of the eldest surviving brother to marry the widow, and the first-born son resulting from such an alliance was to all intents and

purposes considered as the representative and heir of the deceased. Thus we are told that when Er, Judah's eldest son, who was married to Tamar, died without issue, the second son was called upon to marry his deceased brother's widow, and that when he again died, leaving no children, Tamar, the widow, had still a claim upon the only surviving son, for whom she had to wait, as he was not as yet marriageable (^{<0130>}Genesis 38:6-12. 14, 26). Ultimately Judah himself had to marry his daughter-in-law, for she inveigled him into it as a punishment for neglecting to give her his third son (^{<0130>}Genesis 38:26-30); and Pharez, the issue of this Levirate marriage, not only became the founder of a numerous and illustrious family, but was the direct line from which the royal family of David descended, and the channel through which the Messiah was born (^{<0130>}Genesis 38:29, with ^{<0130>}Matthew 1:3). This Levirate marriage was not peculiar to the Hebrews. It also obtained among the Moabites (^{<0111>}Ruth 1:11-13), Persians (Kleuker, *Zendavesta*, 3:226), Indians (*Asiatic Researches*, 3:35), and still exists in Arabia (Burckhardt, *Notes*, 1:112; Niebuhr, *Voyage*, p. 61), among the tribes of the Caucasus (Hanthausen, *Trans-caucasia*, p. 403), and other nations (comp. Leyser, in Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 8:358, s.v. Leviratsehe).

2. This law, which, as we have seen, existed from time immemorial both among the patriarchs and other nations of antiquity, was at length formally enacted as part of the Biblical gamology. In adopting this law, however, as in the case of other primitive practices incorporated in the Mosaic code, the sacred legislator both prescribes for it definite limits, and most humanely deprives it of the irksome and odious features which it possessed in ancient times. This is evident from the enactment itself, which is as follows: "If brothers dwell together, and one of them die and have no child, the wife of the deceased shall not marry out of the family a stranger; her husband's brother shall go in unto her. and take her as his wife, and perform the duty of a brother-in-law. Her first-born shall then succeed in the name of the deceased brother, so that his name be not blotted out of Israel" (^{<0130>}Deuteronomy 25:5, 6). Accordingly —

1. This law is restricted to brothers who *dwell together*, i.e. in contiguous properties, as the rabbinical law explains it according to the meaning of the phrase **wydy j thç** in ^{<0130>}Genesis 13:6; 36:7, and elsewhere. If the brothers lived far away, or if the deceased had no brothers at all, it was an understood thing that it devolved upon the nearest of kin to marry the widow, or care for her if she was too old,

when, of course, it passed over from the domain of Leviration into that of *Goel* or *redeemer* (⁽⁻⁸¹²¹⁾Ruth 2:20; 3:9; 4:15, 16).

2. To cases where no issue whatever is left, as *ḥb* is here used in its general sense of *offspring* and not specifically for *son*. This is not only confirmed by the Sept. (σπέρμα), Matthew (μὴ ἔχων σπέρμα, 22:5), Mark (⁽⁻⁴¹²⁹⁾Mark 12:19). Luke (ἄτεκνος, 20:28), Josephus (*Ant.* 4:8, 23), and the Talmud (*Jebamoth*, 22 b), but is evident from the law of inheritance (⁽⁻⁰²⁷⁸⁾Numbers 27:8-11), in which it is declared that if a man dies without leaving a son, his daughter is to inherit the property. For if his widow could claim the surviving brother to marry her in order to raise up a son to the deceased, the daughter who legally came to the inheritance would either have to lose her possessions, or the son born of the Levirate marriage would have to be without patrimony.

In fulfilling the duty of the *Levir* in the patriarchal age the surviving brother had to make great sacrifices. He had not only to renounce the perpetuating of his own name through the first-born son (⁽⁻⁰³⁹⁾Genesis 38:9), and mar his own inheritance (⁽⁻⁰⁴⁶⁾Ruth 4:6), but, what was most galling, he was obliged to take the widow whether he had an inclination for any such marriage or not, as the *Levir* in the patriarchal age had no alternative. Now the Mosaic law removed this hardship by opening to the man a door of escape: 'But if the man like not to take his brother's wife, then let his brother's wife go up to the gate of the elders and say, My husband's brother refuseth to raise up unto his brother a name in Israel; he will not perform the Levirate duty. And the elders of the city shall call him, and speak unto him. But if he still persist and say, I like not to take her then shall his brother's wife come in to him in the presence of the elders. and loose his shoe from off his foot, and spit in his face and say, So shall it be done unto that man that will not build up his brother's house; and his house shall be called in Israel the house of the barefoot' (⁽⁻⁰⁵⁷⁾Deuteronomy 25:7-10). Thus the Mosaic gamology does not impose it as an inexorable law, but simply enjoins it as a duty of love, which the *Levir* might escape by submitting to censure and reproach. Of this he could not complain, for he not only neglected to perform towards his deceased brother the most sacred offices of love, but, by refusing to do so, he openly declared his dislike to the widow, and thus publicly insulted her. The symbolic manner in which she took away in the public court his right to her and his deceased brother's possession, has its origin in the fact that the possession of property was claimed by planting the foot on it. Hence, when the transfer of property was effected by an

amicable transaction, the original owner signified the renunciation of his rights by taking off his shoe and giving it to the new possessor (^{<8347>}Ruth 4:7, 8). A similar custom obtained among the Indians (Benary, *de Hebraeorum Leviratu*, Berol. 1835, p. 14) and the ancient Germans (Grimm, *Deutsche Rechtsalterthümer*, p. 156). In the case before us, however, where the privilege of possession was not renounced by a mutual understanding, but involved insult both to the deceased brother and the surviving widow, the outraged sister-in-law snatched the right from him by pulling off his shoe.

3. That this patriarchal law—which, as we have seen, was incorporated in the Mosaic gamology — continued in its full force after the Captivity, is evident from ^{<1225>}Matthew 22:25-27, ^{<1129>}Mark 12:19-23, and ^{<278>}Luke 20:28-33. From the question put to our Savior in these passages, it will be seen that it was incumbent upon each surviving brother in succession to perform the duty of the *Levir*. There were, however, cases where this duty could not be performed, about which the Mosaic law gives no directions whatever — e.g. when the deceased brother's widow was a near relation of the *Levir* and came within the proscribed degrees, of which the Mishna (*Jebeemoth*, 1:1) gives fifteen cases; or when the latter was a child when his brother died and left a widow without issue (2:3); and if he were on this or any other account exempt from the obligation to marry one of the widows, he was also from the obligation to marry any of them (1:1); it is also implied that it was only necessary for one brother to marry one of the widows in cases where there were several widows left. The marriage was not to take place within three months of the husband's death (4:10). The eldest brother ought to perform the duty of marriage; but, on his declining it, a younger brother might do it (2:8; 4:5). The *chalitstah* was regarded as involving future relationship, so that a man who had received it could not marry the widow's relations within the prohibited degrees (4:7). Special rules are laid down for cases where a woman married under a false impression as to her husband's death (10:1), or where a mistake took place as to whether her son or her husband died first (10:3), for in the latter case the Levirate law would not apply; and, again, as to the evidence of the husband's death to be produced in certain cases (cap. 15, 16). There can, therefore, be no question that the administrators of the law in the time of the prophets and at the advent of our Savior had to define and supplement the Levirate law. As the space of this article does not permit us to enumerate these important definitions and enactments. we must refer to the

Mishna, Tract *Jebamoth*, which derives its name (תּוּמְבֵי) from the fact that it embodies these laws. These descend into trivial distinctions — e.g. that the shoe was to be of leather, or a sandal furnished with a heel-strap; a felt shoe, or a sandal without a strap, would not do (*Yebam.* 12:1, 2). The *chalitsah* was not valid when the person performing it was deaf and dumb (12:4), as he could not learn the precise formula which accompanied the act. The custom is retained by the modern Jews, and is minutely described by Picart (*Ceremonies Religieuses*, 1:243). It receives illustration from the expression used by the modern Arabs in speaking of a repudiated wife: ‘She was my slipper. I have cast her off’ (Burckhardt, *Notes*, 1:113). It only remains to be remarked that the fear lest the performance of the duty of *Levir* should come into collision with the law of consanguinity, made the ancient rabbins declare that (מְבִיל מְדַוֵּק חֲסֵיל י) the ceremony of taking off the shoe is preferable to marrying the widow, and thus virtually set aside Levirate marriages. As this ceremony, which is called *Chalitsah* (חֲסֵיל י from /ל י, to draw out, to pull off), supersedes the ancient law, the rabbins gave very minute orders about the manner in which it is to be performed. The ceremony is performed in the synagogues after morning prayer, in the presence of three rabbis and two witnesses, attended by others of the congregation as auditors and spectators. The *Levir* and widow are called forward, and after being questioned by the principal rabbi, and avowing his determination not to marry her, the man puts on a shoe of a peculiar form and made for this purpose, and the woman repeats, ‘My husband’s brother refuseth to raise up unto his brother a name in Israel; he will not perform the duty of my husband’s brother.’ To which the *Levir* replies, ‘I like not to take her.’ Upon this declaration the widow unties the shoe with her right hand, takes it off, throws it on the ground, and spits before him, saying in Hebrew, ‘So shall it be done unto that man that will not build up his brother’s house: and his name shall be called in Israel, The house of him that hath his shoe loosed;’ when the persons present exclaim three times, ‘His shoe is loosed!’ This concludes the ceremony, and the rabbi tells the widow that she is now at liberty to marry whom she pleases.

IX. In considering the *social and domestic conditions of married life* among the Hebrews, we must, in the first place, take into account the position assigned to women generally in their social scale. The seclusion of the *harem*, and the habits consequent upon it, were utterly unknown in early times, and the condition of the Oriental woman, as pictured to us in

the Bible, contrasts most favorably with that of her modern representative. There is abundant evidence that women, whether married or unmarried, went about with their faces unveiled (^{<0124>}Genesis 12:14; 24:16, 65; 29:11; ^{<0013>}1 Samuel 1:13). An unmarried woman might meet and converse with men, even strangers, in a public place (^{<0204>}Genesis 24:24, 45-7; 29:9-12; ^{<0012>}1 Samuel 9:2); she might be found alone in the country without any reflection on her character (^{<0225>}Deuteronomy 22:25-27); or she might appear in a court of justice (^{<0270>}Numbers 27:2). Women not unfrequently held important offices: some were prophetesses, as Miriam, Deborah, Huldah, Noadiah, and Anna; of others advice was sought in emergencies (^{<0412>}2 Samuel 14:2; 20:16-22). They took their part in matters of public interest (^{<0150>}Exodus 15:20; ^{<0816>}1 Samuel 18:6, 7); in short., they enjoyed as much freedom in ordinary life as the women of our own country.

If such was her general position, it is certain that the wife must have exercised an important influence in her own home. She appears to have taken her part in family affairs, and even to have enjoyed a considerable amount of independence. For instance, she entertains guests at her own desire (^{<1048>}2 Kings 4:8) in the absence of her husband (^{<0708>}Judges 4:18), and sometimes even in defiance of his wishes (^{<0254>}1 Samuel 25:14, etc.); she disposes of her child by a vow without any reference to her husband (^{<0012>}1 Samuel 1:24); she consults with him as to the marriage of her children (^{<0246>}Genesis 27:46); her suggestions as to any domestic arrangements meet with due attention (^{<1049>}2 Kings 4:9); and occasionally she criticizes the conduct of her husband in terms of great severity (^{<0255>}1 Samuel 25:25; ^{<0160>}2 Samuel 6:20).

The relations of husband and wife appear to have been characterized by affection and tenderness. He is occasionally described as the "friend" of his wife (^{<2400>}Jeremiah 3:20; ^{<3001>}Hosea 3:1), and his love for her is frequently noticed (^{<0245>}Genesis 24:67; 29:18). On the other hand, the wife was the consolation of the husband in time of trouble (^{<0245>}Genesis 24:67), and her grief at his loss presented a picture of the most abject woe (^{<2008>}Joel 1:8). No stronger testimony, however, can be afforded as to the ardent affection of husband and wife than that which we derive from the general tenor of the book of Canticles. At the same time we cannot but think that the exceptions to this state of affairs were more numerous than is consistent with our ideas of matrimonial happiness. One of the evils inseparable from polygamy is the discomfort arising from the jealousies and quarrels of the several wives, as instanced in the households of Abraham and Elkanaah

(^{<0211>}Genesis 21:11; ^{<0106>}1 Samuel 1:6). The purchase of wives, and the small amount of liberty allowed to daughters in the choice of husbands, must inevitably have led to unhappy unions. The allusions to the misery of a contentious and brawling wife in the Proverbs (^{<0193>}Proverbs 19:13; 21:9,19; 27:15) convey the impression that the infliction was of frequent occurrence in Hebrew households, and in the Mishna (*Ketub.* 7:6) the fact of a woman being noisy is laid down as an adequate ground for divorce. In the N.T. the mutual relations of husband and wife are a subject of frequent exhortation (^{<0122>}Ephesians 5:22-33; ^{<0138>}Colossians 3:18, 19; ^{<0104>}Titus 2:4, 5; ^{<0101>}1 Peter 3:1-7): it is certainly a noticeable coincidence that these exhortations should be found exclusively in the epistles addressed to Asiatics, nor is it improbable that they were more particularly needed for them than for Europeans.

The duties of the wife in the Hebrew household were multifarious. In addition to the general superintendence of the domestic arrangements, such as cooking, from which even women of rank were not exempted (^{<0186>}Genesis 18:6; ^{<0138>}2 Samuel 13:8), and the distribution of food at meal-times (^{<0115>}Proverbs 31:15), the manufacture of the clothing and the various textures required in an Eastern establishment devolved upon her (^{<0113>}Proverbs 31:13, 21,22); and if she were a model of activity and skill, she produced a surplus of fine linen shirts and girdles, which she sold, and so, like a well-freighted merchant-ship, brought in wealth to her husband from afar (^{<0114>}Proverbs 31:14, 24). The poetical description of a good housewife drawn in the last chapter of the Proverbs is both filled up and in some measure illustrated by the following minute description of a wife's duties towards her husband, as laid down in the Mishna: "She must grind corn, and bake, and wash, and cook, and suckle his child, make his bed, and work in wool. If she brought her husband one bondwoman, she need not grind, bake, or wash; if two, she need not cook nor suckle his child; if three, she need not make his bed nor work in wool; if four, she may sit in her chair of state" (*Ketub.* v. 5). Whatever money she earned by her labor belonged to her husband (6:1). The qualification not only of working, but of working *at home* (^{<0105>}Titus 2:5, where οἰκουργούς is preferable to οἰκουρούς), was insisted on in the wife, and to spin in the street was regarded as a violation of Jewish customs (*Ketub.* 7:6).

The legal rights of the wife are noticed in ^{<0210>}Exodus 21:10, under the three heads of food, raiment, and duty of marriage or conjugal right. These were defined with great precision by the Jewish doctors, for thus only

could one of the most cruel effects of polygamy be averted, viz. the sacrifice of the rights of the many in favor of the one whom the lord of the modern *harem* selects for his special attention. The regulations of the Talmudists, founded on ^{<1210>}Exodus 21:10, may be found in the Mishna (*Ketub. av.* 6-9).

X. The *allegorical and typical* allusions to marriage have exclusive reference to one subject, viz. to exhibit the spiritual relationship between God and his people. The earliest form, in which the image is implied, is in the expressions “to go a whoring,” and “whoredom,” as descriptive of the rupture of that relationship by acts of idolatry. These expressions have by some writers been taken in their primary and literal sense, as pointing to the licentious practices of idolaters. But this destroys the whole point of the comparison, and is opposed to the plain language of Scripture: for

(1) Israel is described as the false wife “playing the harlot” (^{<2021>}Isaiah 1:21; ^{<2401>}Jeremiah 3:1,6, 8);

(2) Jehovah is the injured husband, who therefore divorces her (^{<4937>}Psalm 73:27; ^{<2421>}Jeremiah 2:20; ^{<2012>}Hosea 4:12; 9:1); and

(3) the other party in the adultery is specified, sometimes generally, as idols or false gods (^{<6316>}Deuteronomy 31:16; ^{<1017>}Judges 2:17; ^{<1325>}1 Chronicles 5:25; ^{<2310>}Ezekiel 20:30; 23:30), and sometimes particularly, as in the case of the worship of goats (A.V. “devils,” ^{<1810>}Leviticus 17:7), Molech (^{<1215>}Leviticus 20:5), wizards (^{<1216>}Leviticus 20:6), an ephod (^{<1027>}Judges 8:27), Baalim (^{<1023>}Judges 8:33), and even the heart and eyes (^{<1459>}Numbers 15:39)-the last of these objects being such as wholly to exclude the idea of actual adultery. The image is drawn out more at length by Ezekiel (chap. 23), who compares the kingdoms of Samaria and Judah to the harlots Aholah and Aholibah; and again by Hosea (chap. 1, 3), whose marriage with an adulterous wife, his separation from her, and subsequent reunion with her, were designed to be a visible lesson to the Israelites of their dealings with Jehovah.

The direct comparison with marriage is confined in the O.T. to the prophetic writings, including the Canticles as an allegorical work. *SEE CANTICLES*. The actual relation between Jehovah and his people is generally the point of comparison (^{<2545>}Isaiah 54:5; 62:4; ^{<2414>}Jeremiah 3:14; ^{<2019>}Hosea 2:19; ^{<3111>}Malachi 2:11); but sometimes the graces consequent thereon are described under the image of bridal attire (^{<2308>}Isaiah 49:18;

61:10), and the joy of Jehovah in his Church under that of the joy of a bridegroom (^{<2315>}Isaiah 62:5).

In the N.T. the image of the bridegroom is transferred from Jehovah to Christ (^{<4095>}Matthew 9:15; ^{<4123>}John 3:29), and that of the bride to the Church (^{<4710>}2 Corinthians 11:2; ^{<6607>}Revelation 19:7; 21:2, 9; 22:17), and the comparison thus established is converted by St. Paul into an illustration of the position and mutual duties of man and wife (^{<4023>}Ephesians 5:23-32). The suddenness of the Messiah's appearing, particularly at the last day, and the necessity of watchfulness, are inculcated in the parable of the Ten Virgins, the imagery of which is borrowed from the customs of the marriage-ceremony (^{<4151>}Matthew 25:1-13). The Father prepares the marriage-feast for his Son, the joys that result from the union being thus represented (^{<4121>}Matthew 22:1-14; 25:10; ^{<6609>}Revelation 19:9; comp. ^{<4081>}Matthew 8:11), while the qualifications requisite for admission into that union are prefigured by the marriage-garment (^{<4121>}Matthew 22:11). The breach of the union is, as before, described as fornication or whoredom in reference to the mystical Babylon (^{<6170>}Revelation 17:1, 2, 5).

XI. Literature. — The most important ancient literature on all the marriage questions is contained in the third order (**dds**) of the *Mishna*, five tractates of which treat respectively —

1. On the Levirate law;
2. On the marriage-instrument;
3. On suspicion of having violated the marriage-bond;
4. On divorce; and,
5. On betrothal.

To these must be added the Gemaras or Talmuds on these tractates. Maimonides devotes six tractates of the second volume of his *Jad Ha-Chazaka* to Biblical and Talmudic gamology, giving an abridgment of the traditional enactments. Jacob ben-Asher occupies the entire third volume of his *Tur*, called *Eben Ha-Ezar*, with marriage in its various ramifications, and gives a lucid epitome of the ancient code. Of modern writers are to be mentioned Michaelis, *Commentaries on the Laws of Moses*, 1:450 sq.; 2:1 sq.; Saalschütz, *Das Mosaische Recht*, 2:735 sq.; by the same author, *Archæologie der Iudeer*, 2:173 sq.; Ewald, *Die Alterthümer der Volkes Israel*, p. 218 sq.; Geiger, *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift* (Frankfort-on-the-Main), 4:36 sq., 345 sq.; *Jüdische Zeitschrift* (Breslau, 1862), 1:19 sq.,

253 sq.; Stein and Susskind's *Israelitische Volkslehrer*, 1:192; 4:282, 301, 315; v. 323; vi,'74; 7:264; 8:73; 9:171; Frankel, *Grundlinien des Mosaisch-talmudischen Eherechts* (Breslau, 1860); Leopold Law, *Ben Chananja*, vol. iii-vi. Among the writers on special points we may notice Benary, *De Hebr. Leviratu* (Berlin, 1835); Redslob's *Leiratsche* (Leipz. 1836); and Kurtz's *Ehe des Hosea* (Dorpat, 1859). **SEE WOMAN.**

Marriage, Christian.

The word is derived through the French *mnari*, from the Latin *maritus*, "a husband." *Matrimonoy*, a synonyme, comes from the Latin *mater*, "a mother," as *testimoniumz* from *testis*, "a witness." *Wedlock*, a beautiful word, is of Anglo-Saxon origin, from *weddian*, "to pledge," "to covenant;" or *wedd*, "a pledge," and *lac*, "a gift." The definition of marriage given by Modestinus, the Roman lawyer and scholar of Ulpian, is as follows: "Nuptiae sunt conjunctio maris et feminae et consortium omnis vitse, divini et humani juris communicatio" (*Digest*, 18:2, 1). In the Institutes of Justinian we have "nuptiae sive matrimonium est viri et mulieris conjunctio individuum vitse consuetudinemr continens," that is, a union of a man and a woman which contains in itself an inseparable life-intercourse. These definitions are not entirely definite, nor free from objection; nor is it easy for the *law* to give a definition of that which transcends the sphere of human rights, and has most important relations to morality and religion.

According to Paley, the public use of the marriage institution consists in its promoting the following beneficial effects:

1. The private comfort of individuals.
2. The production of the greatest number of healthy children, their better education, and the making of due provision for their settlement in life.
3. The peace of human society, in cutting off a principal source of contention, by assigning one or more women to one man, and protecting his exclusive right by sanctions of morality and law.
4. The better government of society, by distributing the community into separate families, and appointing over each the authority of a master of a family, which has more actual influence than all civil authority put together.

5. The additional security which the state receives for the good behavior of its citizens, from the solicitude they feel for the welfare of their children, and from their being confined to permanent habitations.
6. The encouragement of industry. (See also Dwight's *Theology* on this topic, and Anderson, *On the Domestic Constitution*.)

I. The idea of marriage is beautifully expressed in those words of the earliest book of the Bible: "Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife; and they twain shall be one flesh." Here we have (1) marriage conceived of as a union so close that it separates a man from the union of the family—the closest but this one that can exist; (2) two persons cleave to one another, the word *cleave* in the original denoting to be glued to, to stick to; (3) the result is that they become one flesh, they unite their personalities together. A text like this points to monogamy as alone answering to the trite conception of marriage; for how can two be one flesh, and one of them be also united to a third person, so as to be one flesh with that one also. Accordingly the union of one man and one woman in the married state, as opposed to polygamy, must be regarded as the state pointed out by our nature for us. This alone preserves the unity, the undivided love and peace of the household. Polygamy is an institution growing out of the servile subjection of the woman to the man, and tout of the indulgence of lewd desire. It is also apparently contrary to the order of things in this. that the sexes, so obviously made for one another. divide between them about equally the numbers of those who are born into the world, there being a slight excess in the number of male children, which is counterbalanced before manhood is reached by the greater risks incurred by that sex. The conditions which secure the interests of morality are thus pointed out by the laws of our physical nature.

The conception of marriage which appears in the writings of Paul has sometimes been said to be a low one, as having respect to the gratification of bodily desires rather than to the true, spiritual, and heart communion of the wedded pair. This charge is founded on such passages as ^{<HTD>}1 Corinthians 7:9: "It is better to marry than to burn;" and on those verses in the same chapter where there appears to be a certain preference in the apostle's mind of the single to the married life (ver. 33, 38, etc.). It must be confessed that if such a passage as ver. 9 were the apostle's *only* expression of opinion, it would seem as if he saw nothing in marriage but

the prevention of sexual excesses and the satisfaction of sexual longings. It ought, however, to be considered, *first*, that in such words he gives us but one side of a manifold subject. Christian, like all true moralists, must take into account the desires which are implanted in our nature for the purpose of securing certain great ends, among which the introduction of new beings into the world is most prominent. If, as men showed themselves to the apostle, the sexual desires needed a certain control, and a certain satisfaction also, it was good sense to say that a reason for marrying lay in the temperament of the particular person, and that he was bound to consider his power of continence when he inquired what his duty was in this respect. But, *secondly*, the apostle gives us another picture of marriage, from another point of view. The relation (⁴¹²Ephesians 5:22-33) is like that of Christ to his Church. The husband is to love the wife as if she actually formed one body with him, and with that pure, self-sacrificing affection which Christ had when he “loved his Church, and gave himself for it.” Here marriage is ennobled and glorified by a comparison with the most spiritual of all relations. But, *thirdly*, neither in the writings of the apostle nor in any other part of the New Testament is there any peculiar sanctity attached to the married life placing it above the single, nor to the single life making it more excellent than the married. The apostle condemns the false teachings of those who forbid men to marry, and command to abstain from meats, “which God has created to be received with thanksgiving” (^{504B}1 Timothy 4:3). His principle would include marriage — for which multitudes give thanks — under this last remark. At the same time the New Testament regards celibacy as equally honorable with marriage (^{414B}Matthew 14:13). Nay more, if a person, for the kingdom of heaven’s sake, can lead a life of pure thoughts, undisturbed by any sensual longings, absorbed in spiritual employments and pursuits; he may be said to have a rare nature, or a rare gift to rise above nature; and so he will stand higher in the kingdom of heaven than another, in proportion to the greatness of his self-sacrifice and his consecration. All men are not bound to “forsake houses, or brethren, or sisters,” etc., for Christ’s name’s sake, but those who have the call to do so and obey “shall receive a hundred-fold.” So those who lead a single life under the same high motive shall have the greater praise from the Master: and, as they show by their self-denial the strength of Christian virtue, they stand higher in the Christian scale than others. But so do they also who show a readiness to undergo, or actually undergo, any great sacrifice with the same spirit. (Comp. Harless, *Christl. Ethik*, § 44, and especially § 52.)

If the Christian Church had stopped at admiring the continence and rare self-restraint of men who for Christ's sake led unmarried lives, much evil would have been avoided. As it was, the Christian mind passed on from such admiration to an undervaluation of the married life; celibacy was a sign of greater virtue; second marriages were looked on with disfavor; and marriages of clergymen became unlawful. The heretics Marcion and Tatian went even so far as to rail against marriage; as Simon Magus is said, on the other hand, to have taught in his day a plurality of wives, and the Gnostics and Manichaeans rejected marriage altogether. But what was really the view of the early Church is best seen in the canons of the Gangran Synod, held about A.D. 370, where it is decreed: "1. If any one reproach marriage, or have in abomination the religious woman that is a communicant and sleeps with her husband, as one that cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven, let him be anathema. 4. If any one condemn a married presbyter, as if he ought not to partake of the oblation when he performs the liturgy, let him be anathema. 9. If any one live a virgin, or in chastity, as abominating marriage (while he lives ill a retired state), and not for the beauty and sanctity of a virgin life, let him be anathema. 10. If one of those who live a virgin life for the Lord's sake insult those who are married, let him be anathema. 14. If any woman, abominating marriage, desert her husband, and will become a recluse, let her be anathema." (See also Isaac Taylor's *Ancient Christianity*.) At this very same time, however, marriage became a sacrament. One may ask how it came to pass that a kind of life which was looked on as being not the best one, and which had to be renounced in the Western Church if a married man would receive ordination, could come into the category of baptism, the eucharist, and the other acts which, in process of time, took the name of sacraments. Without going into an extended answer to this question, it may be said that the passage of Paul already cited (⁴⁰⁵Ephesians 5:32) calls it a *mystery*, which Jerome's Vulgate renders by *sacramentum*. It was, in fact, peculiarly holy, as symbolizing Christ's union with the Church. But the word *sacramentum* had for a long time no definite sense, and marriage was not so called until the time of Augustine. Nay, that great writer had so vague an idea of its religious meaning that he does not hesitate to call the polygamous marriage of the patriarchs in the Old Testament a "*sacramentum pluralium nuptiarum*" (*De boano conjugii*, cap. 18), which, he says, "signified a future multitude subject to God in all the nations of the earth, and so the sacrament of a single marriage [i.e. between one pair] in our time signifies the unity of all ours [our Christian Church], which is to be subject to God

in the one celestial city.” The passage itself, however, in the Ephesians, which we have referred to, does not, in a fair interpretation of it, call marriage a mystery, but gives that name only to Christ’s leaving the Father and becoming one with his Church. As for the rest, the Catholic theologians have held widely diverse opinions about the *matter* and *form* of marriage. One opinion has been that the *consent* of the parties expressed in words constitute both the *matter* and *the form*; another that the bodies or persons of the contracting parties are the *matter*, and the words expressing consent *the form*. *SEE MATRIMONY.*

Marriage being a peculiarly sacred transaction, and having the religious impress put on it, questions relating to its celebration, the persons capable of contracting it, its dissolution, its renewal after the death of one of the parties, and the like, came under the control of the clergy. Accordingly we find in use in the early Church a special ecclesiastical form for the celebration of matrimony. The fathers, Tertullian, e.g., considered marriage contracted without the participation of the Church, as tolerated by the law of Rome, as almost a sin. Later it was sought to make marriage — an *exclusively* religious institution, and this it finally became, and so continued until the days of the Reformation. The civil law gradually restricted itself to the regulation of the material interests connected with marriage, leaving the Church to regulate the conditions under which it could be contracted. As gradually the religious impress put on it brought to the door of the clergy the settlement of questions relating not only to its celebration, but also to the propriety of its dissolution, its renewal after the death of one of the parties, and the like, the State was content to lend the Church the secular arm for the enforcement of the decisions of the ecclesiastical courts. “The principles of the law concerning marriage thus became a part of canon law in the Romish Church, and received final settlement by the Council of Trent, which not only established marriage as a sacrament in the most solemn manner (*Conc. Trid.* sess. 24, Mat. can. 1 “*Si quis dixerit, matrimonium non esse vere et proprie unum ex septem legis evangelicæ sacramentis a Christo institutum, sed ab hominibus in ecclesia inventum neque gratiam conferre: anath. sit;*” see also I, can. 7, *Cat. Rom.* 2, 8, 3, 23, 20 sq.; *Conf. orthod.* p. 183), but referred the question of its validity exclusively to the Church. The remains of these and similar laws have almost disappeared in Protestant England in our own times; the act of 1857 (cited as 20 and 21 Vict. cap. 85), with its amendments, destroys all jurisdiction of courts ecclesiastical in matters pertaining to marriage, except

so far as marriage licenses are concerned, and constitutes a new court, which is called the court for divorce and matrimonial causes. See Woolsey, *Divorce and Divorce Legislation* (New York, 1869), p. 174-178.

The Continental Reformers from the first denied the sacramental character of marriage. They acknowledged, indeed, matrimony as holy and instituted of God, yet considered it as partaking more of a civil than of an ecclesiastical character — as an institution which received only a higher consecration by the blessing of the Church. They even required the Protestant civil authorities to legislate on the subject, and thus it passed entirely into the hands of the latter. The new laws were promulgated in the 16th and 17th centuries, yet all still referred to Scripture, the symbolic books, and canon law as their basis; and, being generally drawn up with the assistance of the clergy, the Church still retained the higher authority over all questions pertaining to matrimony. In all Protestant countries at present, as far as we are informed, marriage is essentially controlled by the law of the state, although the solemnization of it may be put into the hands of clerical persons. In Catholic countries there is a tendency to establish two kinds of marriage celebrations — one a *civil*, the other an *ecclesiastical* one; but all the civil consequences of marriage, in relation to property, legitimation of children, bigamy, etc., grow out of the civil marriage, and the, other (or ecclesiastical) is left to the option of the parties. The Catholic Church endures this with great unwillingness; and in this feeling the Concordat between Austria and the pope did away with the civil contract, which was restored to its former place in the laws in 1869 (comp. Richter, *Kirchenr.* § 263, 6th ed.). We thus are brought to the question of the relations of the state in right reason to the marriage-contracts of its citizens. Here, before touching the particulars that are within the province of state-law, we wish to make two points in regard to the office of the state:

1. Marriage is a contract, because it is an agreement between two persons to live together in the condition of life called matrimony. But, while in most other cases the contract *creates* or *specifies* the transaction, in the contract of marriage the matter of the contract is *presupposed*, and the contract has nothing to do except to introduce two persons into a definite specific state. Out of this grows the peculiar state of *parentage*. This, it seems to us, is one of the greatest points in hand against the institution of “Freelove.” The *resultant* of the marital relation is of a character that does not admit of the dissolution of the contract when once it has been entered into. The

offspring requires the care of *both* the contractors, as is clearly seen in the case of second marriages with children from the first contract. Thus there can be no contract to enter into a marriage state which is terminable by the consent of the parties, or dependent on the pleasure of either. There may be partnerships of this kind, as contracts of service or of agency, for the performance of specific acts for a specific time, but there are no such contracts of marriage. This institution is unlike the passing business relations of life, and resembles the Church and State unions more closely, although not entirely. The reason for all this is the moral nature of the institution, and its immense importance as the foundation of the family as well as the origin of the state. In this sense the Roman law correctly proclaimed marriage a, 'viri et mulieris conjunctio individuum vitae consuetudinem continens' (to which canon law adds, "i.e. talem se in omnibus exhibere viro, qualis ipsa sibi est, et e converso"), or a "consortium omnis vite, divini et humani juris communicatio." Quite a different tendency, however, is found in the attempts of some modern philosophers to *establish free-marriage*, as e.g. the St. Simonites (q.v.), who would overthrow all these laws, and make marriage a mere human convention subject to all the whims of the contracting parties and who have failed hitherto from this very cause, as has also the pretended emancipation of woman which has gone hand in hand with it. The higher nature of marriage over any other human institution at once manifests itself not only in the fact that it has at all times been connected with religion, both as to its contracting and dissolving, but that this view has been in no wise confined to Christendom, but in a great degree has taken a like hold upon heathen communities also.

2. Our other point is that on account of the moral and religious bearings of marriage, State and Church have concurrent power over it; that is, they both may act and lay down principles in regard to matrimonial questions. How are their provinces to be distinguished? In this way, as it seems to us: The State can require nothing which the Word of God forbids in a Christian country, although it may forbid what the Word of God does not forbid. The Church can allow nothing, permitted by the law, which the Word of God forbids. For illustration, we may suppose the State to have very loose divorce laws, or to have no penalty for concubinage during regular marriage; it is evident that the Church must keep its members pure in such respects, until its protest, loud or silent, shall change the current of legislation.

II. These things being premised, we proceed to a brief discussion of some of those points relating to marriage which may be reasonably made the subjects of legislation without violating the feelings of Christians or opposing the authority of the Scriptures.

1. The State may decide who shall be capable of contracting marriage. Thus (a) the age at which, or the state of the will or reason with which a matrimonial engagement may be legally made, is as much within the control of the law as the similar conditions necessary for making business contracts or for exercising political rights. If minors are allowed to enter into this condition, the law ought to provide that their free consent is ascertained beforehand. Thus, too, incapacity to give consent, by reason of immaturity, force on the will, insanity, idiocy, and the like, may be obstacles. But (b) far more important is the control of state-law over the degrees of relationship and affinity which shall incapacitate parties from entering into this close connection. Here we find that, although the children of the first pair must have united in wedlock, it became the very decided feeling of a large part of the human race that such a union is unlawful for brothers with sisters, or for a parent with a child. H. W. J. Thiersch (*Das Verbot der Ehe* [Nordlingen, 1869], p. 4) remarks that wild heathen tribes in Asia and Africa consider incest a crime. Exceptions to this occurred in Persia and Egypt, where incest was practiced within the reigning families—in the latter country after the example of His and Osiris. At Athens a brother might marry a sister who had not the same mother. and adoption was no obstacle to the union of an adopted brother and sister. The Romans were more strict, but allowed this relation to commence between an adopted brother and his adopted sister, after the adoption was dissolved by emancipation. By Roman law a man could not marry his *sister's* daughter, but when the emperor Claudius took Agrippina, his *brother's* daughter, to wife, that relation became permissible (see Gail *Instit.* i, § 61, 62). By Levitical law the prohibited degrees embraced the direct relatives in the ascending and descending line, whether of full or of half blood, the children who had the same parents or parent, the brothers or sisters of fathers or mothers, brothers' wives, daughters-in-law, a woman and her daughter, or other descendant in the third generation, and the sister of a wife during her lifetime. It would seem that in Leviticus xviii, where these rules are given, the analogy derived from relations there mentioned may be applied to others equally close, of which nothing is said (comp. Saalschiitz, *Mos. Recht*, cap. 105, § 5). In the Christian Church a stricter system of

prohibited degrees was a part of canonical law, and a sign of the new feeling was that the emperor Theodosius I forbade by law the marriage of first cousins, which was formerly by Roman law permitted. The Roman Catholic and the Greek churches went far beyond this. The Latin Church carried the prohibition of marriage to the seventh degree, that is, to the sixth cousins — counting brothers and sisters as of the first degree, and first cousins as of the second — until Innocent III, in 1216, gave a new rule, that the “*prohibitio copulae conjugalis quartun consanguinitatis et affinitatis gradum non excedat*” — that is, third cousins might marry; but a little while after Gregory IX so modified Innocent’s rule that a marriage between a third and a fourth cousin was allowable. Where pressing reasons demanded, these rules might be suspended. More severe and worthless were the rules prohibiting marriage, on the ground of affinity, which reached to the same degrees with the rules affecting blood-relatives, and were altered together with them. Other restrictions touching spiritual affinities, betrothal, etc., were mitigated by the Council of Trent. According to the canons of the Greek Church, a man may not marry

His second cousin’s daughter.

His deceased wife’s first cousin.

His deceased wife’s first cousin’s daughter.

His deceased wife’s second cousin.

Two brothers may not marry

Two sisters.

An aunt and a niece.

Two first cousins.

A man may not marry

His wife’s brother’s wife’s sister, i.e. his brother-in-law’s sister-in-law.

His brother-in-law’s wife: nor can his own brother marry her.

Godparentage and *Adoption* constitute impediments to marriage up to the seventh degree. **SEE AFFINITY**. What was the feeling lying at the bottom of all these prohibitions? It must have been that which led the Roman lawyer Gaius (*I. c.* § 59) to say that if such persons as parents and children marry one another *nefarias atque incestas nuptias contraxisse dicuntur*. Incest is the greatest unchastity, from which its Latin name comes, and men early felt this. If the children of the first parent did not partake of this sentiment, there is a parallel in the feelings of little children, whose modesty is developed just at the time of life when it is needed for a moral protection. Besides this moral principle, it might be urged that to marry out of one’s near relationship binds families together, and diffuses the feeling of

brotherhood through neighborhoods and tribes. This is urged by Augustine (*Civit. Dei*, xv, cap. 16). Another consideration is, that the marriage of near relations promotes neither the health nor the multitude of offspring. In a letter imputed to Gregory the Great (A.D. 601), written to his missionary in England, Augustine, he is made to say, while speaking of the marriages of own cousins, “We have learned from experience that from such a marriage offspring cannot grow” (Gratian’s *Decr. caus. xxxv, quaest. 5, c. 2*). This is in conformity with a physical law which governs the issue of animals. Nay, plants themselves, it is now known, are benefited by the pollen of one flower being conveyed to another, and it is the office of insects, such as bees and flies, to mediate in this keeping up the “breeds” of the vegetable kingdom. (c) Besides enacting laws against the marriage of blood-relations, states have sometimes prohibited men from connecting themselves with women who sustain towards them the closest degrees of affinity. Some Protestant countries make it unlawful to marry a wife’s sister. There are no valid arguments against such unions from Scripture, but rather, when it is said (~~LEVITICUS~~ Leviticus 18:18) that a man shall not have two sisters together as his wives, the fair inference is that Jewish law allowed marriage to one of them after the death of the other and preceding wife. Marriage to a brother’s widow or deceased husband’s brother is more doubtful. Yet in the canonical law, where such unions are forbidden, the pope can probably give a dispensation from the rule. Such was the case of Henry VIII of England, and a canon of the Council of Trent (sess. xxiv, *De sacr. matrim. can. iii*) ordains that if any one shall say that the Church cannot give a dispensation in the case of some of the prohibitions in ~~LEVITICUS~~ Leviticus, ch. 18, “anathema sit” — evidently referring to that very case which blew up such a flame in England.

On the whole, there are no *certifies* within which the moral feeling and the law — which in this case is more or less controlled by such feeling — can be confined. We have a parallel to this in the definitions of certain rights, where the law has to make the positive and exact metes and bounds. Thus there is a time in the life of a child when he ought to acquire a jural capacity, and so become legally independent of his father; but whether this shall be reached at the age of eighteen or twenty-one, or shall be reached by degrees or all at once, the reason of a state must determine. So the moral feeling of a state must determine within what limits of consanguinity or of affinity parties may contract marriage; and if the Church has another

prevailing sentiment, it must have its own rules prohibiting for its members what the state does not prohibit.

We will just mention, with little or no remark, several other hinderances which either State or Church law have put in the way of wedlock. Such are fraudulent representations of either party, which were leading causes of the contract of marriage; mistakes affecting the identity of the person; and previous crime of one party unknown to the other, especially previous adultery; to which is to be added difference of religious confessions, especially when so great as that between a Jew and a Christian, or a Protestant and a Roman Catholic. Indeed, in the case of *mixed marriages* (see below), there is still much conflict between the legislation of Church and State. Civil law in countries where slavery was allowed made all marriage unions between freemen and slaves unlawful. In some countries marriage between a noble and an ordinary citizen or peasant has been either forbidden or attended with civil disabilities, such as degradation of rank to the offspring. Here it may not be out of place to allude also to the regulations of the Romish Church in the case of persons who may have taken the vow of celibacy. If any such party have not yet entered the convent, pope Boniface VIII decided that marriage may be contracted; after having once entered the convent, the contract becomes illegal. Among Protestants, however, the taking of the vow of celibacy remains a question of conscience only. Another objection to marriage in the Roman Catholic Church is spiritual relationship, *cognatio spiritualis*, which prevents marriage between persons who have held one another at the baptismal font. In the 13th century this was made to include both the infant baptized and the children of the sponsors, as well as the sponsors themselves; but it has since been restricted. The Continental Reformers as early as the Smalcald articles declared against this impediment of the sponsors. In the Greek Church, as we have seen above, *Godparentage* and *adoption* constitute impediments up to the seventh degree.

2. In order to preserve the purity and peace of married life, the State has often passed rules making all sexual union of either the husband or the wife with a third party penal, and the Church will of course visit such offenses of its members with severe discipline. Some states in their laws have punished the concubinage or illicit intercourse of a husband with an unmarried woman less severely than similar offenses of a wife or, it may be, has let them go unpunished. According to Roman law, adultery was a crime committed only with a married woman; but a wife, displeased with

her husband's morals, could without difficulty obtain a divorce. Under English law adultery has not been treated as a public crime, the dealing with it being left to the ecclesiastical law, and "the temporal courts take no cognizance of it otherwise than as a private injury" (Blackstone's *Comment.* bk. 4, chap. 4). In our country it is visited with punishment according to law in almost all the states — New York, which has followed English law, and one or two other states, being exceptions: but it is safe to say that prosecutions for the crime of adultery are very rare indeed. The protection afforded by such laws is very small, except so far as they testify that society regards crimes against marriage as deserving of civil penalties.

3. The State, as the guardian of the family, as the protector of the wife's and the children's rights even against the husband and father, is bound, and has in no civilized country refused, to make laws touching the *patria postestas* — the husband's rights over and obligations towards the wife; his obligations especially to support his wife and children, and the amount of freedom he ought to have in transmitting his property. We do not intend to enter into this large subject, except so far as to say that there lies a feeling of the unity of family life at the foundation of all righteous law on these subjects, whatever may be the specific rules of this or that code. The family being one, the wife ought to be deprived no more than the children of a portion of a deceased husband's effects; so that the *right of testament* in his case, even if he acquired all his property himself, ought not to be absolutely free.

4. The moral feeling of the importance and sanctity of marriage lies also, in a measure, at the foundation of laws and usages regulating its commencement. Such are betrothal, the formal declaration before a registrar or other officer of an intention of marriage, the publication of the banns, the celebration or solemnization before witnesses and with appropriate formalities. Marriage having a religious side, it has been natural that the ministers of religion should have a part in its initial solemnities. But it is a great grievance that they are obliged — as the law of Prussia, we believe, requires of them to unite in wedlock any persons who may by law be lawfully united, whether the minister's own views touching the lawfulness of marriage after divorce agree with those of the government or not; and it is another grievance when only the ministers of an establishment can solemnize nuptials. Civil marriage, on the other hand, as it exists in some Catholic countries, and marriage before a magistrate or justice of the peace, which is lawful to a great extent through the United States, have

this great evil attending on them: that they look on the civil side of marriage exclusively. Surely that institution which is the foundation of the state, the guardian of children against evil influences until they can act their part in the state; in which, and in which alone love presides over the formation of character; from which, through the sympathies of kindred, chords run in all directions, binding and weaving society together, and where the seeds of religion are sown in the impressible heart — such an institution surely, which pagans feel to have a sacred quality, and place under the protection of their gods, ought to have a solemn beginning, so that the parties to be united in “holy matrimony,” and the witnesses, may feel that it is a deeply serious transaction — a relation not to be lightly assumed without forethought and preparation, and solemn consecration to one another, and earnest prayer to that God — who has said that “they twain shall be one flesh.”

III. When the Church takes a view of divorce different from that taken by the State. it cannot sanction the remarriage of a person whom it regards as bound by Christ’s law to a former wife or husband. *SEE DIVORCE.*

1. Some of these obstacles to marriage are of such a nature that a marriage actually commenced in disregard of or in ignorance of the law ruling in such cases is a nullity. There is, however, a need of some formal proceeding by which the nullity is made manifest. There are others in which the innocent party may continue the marriage, and condone or consent to live with the offender; nor can such consent be afterwards withdrawn in order to make good a claim which has been once waived. Near relationship or affinity, the existence of a previous wife or husband, are instances of the first kind; impotence, mistake, previous misconduct, even fraudulent statements procuring marriage, are instances of the second. In the first case the marriage is void, in the second it is voidable. We are apt to call separations for either reason divorces, and our statutes in many state-codes group them with divorces properly so called; but there is a wide difference between separations on the ground that there had been no lawful marriage, and divorce proper on the ground of some event occurring after actual marriage. In the first case there was a form without the reality of marriage, and the court civil or ecclesiastical — pronounced a decree of nullity, which did not affect the children nor the parties up to the time of the sentence. Being decided to have never been united in wedlock, they were free to enter into this union with third parties. See Woolsey, *On Divorce*,

etc., p. 123,124, and especially Richter's *Kirchenr.* § 266-284, 6th ed.; Goschen, in Herzog's *Real-Encyclopädie*, vol. iii, s.v. Ehe.

2. In regard to the lawfulness of remarriage in general, we must refer to the article on DIVORCE *SEE DIVORCE* (*Christian Law of*) in this *Cyclopaedia*. On the particular point of marrying again after a first wife's or husband's decease, we have room for a few remarks. That this is lawful in itself, and must be left to the conscience and the circumstances of individuals, there can be no question, after what the apostle Paul has said in ~~800~~ Romans 7:1-3, and in ~~804~~ 1 Timothy 5:14, in which latter passage "the younger women" evidently refers to the young widows just before spoken of. The apologist Athenagoras (§ 33, p. 172, edit. Otto) is both unscriptural and weak where he says that a second marriage is "decorous adultery," and applies the words of Christ (~~809~~ Matthew 19:9) to such remarriages, adding that he who deprives himself of [or separates himself from] a former wife, even if she be dead, is a covert adulterer who transgresses the direction of God, since in the beginning God made one man and one woman. Similar views are entertained by Tertullian in his treatise *De monogamia*, which was written after he became a Montanist (comp. esp. cap. 10); while in the treatise *Ad uxorem*, written before he left the Catholic Church, he does not condemn remarriage, although he praises widowhood. Most of the fathers, while, from the times of Hermas and of Clement of Alexandria, they regard remarriage as no sin, look on widowhood and the state of a widower as capable of higher virtue. Augustine thus expresses both opinions in his little work *De bono viduitatis*, written at the request of a widow named Juliana, whose daughter had chosen a virgin's life. "As the good thing of virginity which your daughter has chosen does not condemn your one marriage, so your widowhood does not condemn the second marriage of some one else.... Do not so extol your good thing as to accuse that which is not evil belonging to another, as if it were evil, but so much the more rejoice in your good, the more you perceive that not only evils are prevented by it, but that it surpasses some good things in excellence. The evil things are adultery and fornication. Now from these illicit things she is far removed who by a free vow has bound herself, and thus has brought to pass not by the power of law, but by the purpose of love, that for her not even lawful things should be lawful." *SEE DIGAMISTS; SEE CELIBACY.*

3. But if the apostle Paul could even advise young widows to marry again, must not this be understood as if he thought this the less of two evils, and

only necessary to save the persons in question from crime? How otherwise can we explain his directions that a bishop, and so also a deacon, must be the husband of one wife? (^{<SAB>}1 Timothy 3:2, 12; ^{<SAB>}Titus 1:6). Some have explained these directions as forbidding polygamy — that is, simultaneous polygamy, to speak technically — which would seem to imply that among the private members of the Church at Ephesus and in Crete such plurality of wives was allowed. But the words in ^{<SAB>}1 Timothy 5:9, where the qualification occurs that the aged *widow* in question must have been *the wife of one man*, forbid such an interpretation, for ‘otherwise we should have to suppose that *polyandry* was practiced. The phrases are exactly of the same form in all the four cases, since in the last-mentioned verse the participle *Eyovvia* is to be joined to “sixty years” (comp. ^{<SAB>}Luke 2:42). The sense, then, must be that the bishop, or deacon, or widow had not been married but once. Now this was a special precept suited to the state of life of the times, for in marrying more than once they might have obtained divorce — in their heathenish condition — or have married divorced persons contrary to the law of Christ. Of these irregularities, if they had married but once, there would be less probability.

IV. Many one-sided and erroneous opinions must arise when marriage is looked at only in one of its aspects or relations. Thus it may be said to exist *liberorum quaerendorum causa*; but if that is the only side on which we view it, we shall have to say that no marriages ought to be contracted when the woman is past the age of child-bearing. It may be put on the foundation of restraining and moderating those sexual desires which might otherwise irbrute men. But if this were the only reason for marriage, it would be at the best but a necessary evil. It may be said to be instituted for the happiness of the partners in the union; but if this were all, every disappointed man or woman ought to have an opportunity to place his or her affections on a new object. It may be said to be in idea the highest religious union, but a Christian wife has never felt it to be right for this reason to leave a husband merely because he is unconverted. We must, then, look at marriage on every side; on its jural, moral, and religious aspects; on its relations to sexual differences; to the birth and education of children; to its use in cementing the State together through the ties of kindred; to the love that will almost of course subsist between the married couple; to the field which it affords for the highest social and spiritual well-being of husband, wife, and family. It ought to be added also, as a point of no small importance, that the jural relations of marriage are determined by

the moral convictions of men, and that thus Christianity, by purifying the moral sense, and by giving forth a nobler idea of marriage, has ennobled and strengthened civil law. Those nations have had the best moral habits where the sentiments regarding matrimony and the family were the most pure. Witness the Romans of the earlier ages, to whom divorce was unknown, and among whom the matron was chaste and frugal. The corruption of Roman morals first appeared, according to Horace, in the defilement of married life and the family:

*“Fecunda culpa saecula nuptias
Primum inquinavere et genus et domos.”*

And so, if our Christianity is destined to decay, the loss will be soon shown in the family relations. Even now a race of women is springing up who seem to have caught their inspiration from some of the high dames — the Fulvias and Julias — of the expiring Roman republic,

The neglect to look at the religious and moral side of marriage is also doing great evil in this country. In fact, a state of things now exists which our fathers hardly dreamed of, and which makes reflecting men tremble for the future. Rash and ill-sorted marriages have always existed; but where divorce laws, so loose as to be opposed to the very idea of marriage, open an easy door to get out of an uncomfortable relation, the tendency is that parties will marry with divorce before their eyes, and that, instead of forbearance and patience, they will magnify their present evils, and give to one another only half a heart. In the old times there were few who did not look upon large families as a blessing; at present it is established beyond doubt that a multitude of women, in one part of the country, regard children as an evil to be prevented or avoided, and do actually use the means for such flagitious ends. *SEE INFANTICIDE*. Some of these women are communicants in Christian churches, as physicians assert who profess to know. This shows that the very notion of marriage in many minds is a degraded and a corrupting one — that this union is entered into as an honest way of gratifying the lowest desires of human beings, and for no higher purpose. Nor are there wanting representatives of these base views, who practice upon them in their communities and defend them before the world. Who will question that the extreme of ancient asceticism, which gave to the word chastity the sense of rigid abstinence, as we give to the word temperance the same perverted meaning, was infinitely nearer to the Christian standard, in fact to any respectable pagan standard of morals,

than feelings which can tolerate such practices? That they can exist and even be common is an alarming sign for the future of our country. The conscience of men and women needs to be enlightened on a point of morals which can hardly be referred to from the pulpit. We ought not to hear Catholics twit the Protestantism of the country with winking at methods of preventing the increase of families. We ought to strike at that extravagance of living and showiness of dress which tempt the less wealthy to such things. We ought to hear from every quarter where the subject can be mentioned that "they who do such things cannot inherit the kingdom of God." (T. D. W.)

See Grove, *Mor.* ~~3:104~~ *Philippians* 2:470; Paley, *Mor. Phil.* vol. i, chap. viii, p. 339; Leslie, *Sermons on Marriage* (1702, 8vo); Fordyce, *Moral Philos.* (1769, 8vo); Delany, *Relative Duties* (1750, 8vo); Beattie, *Elem. Moral Science*, vol. ii; Bean, *Christian Minister's Advice to a Newmarried Couple* (Lond. 1793); *Guide to Domestic Happiness; Advantages and Disadvantages of the Married State*; Stennett, *On Domestic Duties*; Jay, *Essay on Marriage*; Doddridge, *Lect.* (8vo edit.) 1:225, 234, 265; Ryan, *Philosophy of Marriage, in its Social, Moral, and Physical Relations* (Lond. 1839, 12mo); Evans, *Christian Doctrine of Marriage* (Balt., Md., 1860, 8vo); Klee, *Die Ehe: eine dogmat. — archceol. Abhandl.; Tradition, ou histoire de l'église sur le sacrement de mariage; tiree des monumens les plus authentiques de chaque siecle tant l'orient que de l'occident* (Paris, 1725, 3 vols. 4to); Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* 1:325 sq.; 2:111 sq., 242 sq.; Lea, *Sacerdotal Celibacy* (see Index); Fry (John), *Marriage between Kindred* (1773, 8vo); *Marriage Rites, Customs, and Ceremonies of the Nations of the Universe* (Lond. 1824, 8vo); Wuttke, *Ethics* (transl. by Prof. Lacroix, N. Y. 1873, 2 vols. 12mo), 2:310 sq.; *Brit. and For. Rev.* 1844, p. 95 sq.; *Engl. Rev.* 3:129; *Biblical Repository*, 2:70 sq.; *Biblioth. Sacra*, 1:283 sq.; *Fraser's Magazine*, 41:112 sq.; (*Lond.*) *Quart. Rev.* lxxxv. 84 sq.; *Lond. Qu. Rev.* 10:545; *Princet. Rev.* 15:182, 420; *Meth. Qu. Rev.* 1866, p. 137; *Christian Remembr.* 1, 130; *Evangel. Qu. Rev.* 1870, p. 482 sq.; *North Brit. Review*, 12:286, 532; 1870, p. 267 sq.; *New Engl.* 1870 (July), p. 540; *Am. Qu. Congreg. Rev.* 1871, p. 627; *South. Rev.* 1871 (Jan.), art. v. See also Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 19:458; 3:666, art. Ehe; and for early literature, Walch, *Bibl.*; and for English writers, especially sermons on this subject, Malcolm, *Theol. Index*, s.v. For modern half or left-hand matrimony in Christendom, **SEE MORGANATIC MARRIAGE**. For marriage as a sacrament, **SEE MATRIMONY**.

V. *Marriage with Believers.* — The importance of regulating the conjugal alliance on religious principles was, according to the record of the Old Testament, practically recognized at a very early period. Indeed, the corruption of manners which rendered the Flood necessary is directly traced to such mixed marriages (^{<0001>}Genesis 6:1-4). The intermixture, by marriage, of the professed servants and worshippers of God, with those by whom his authority was disowned, was first branded, and afterwards positively forbidden by divine authority; being denounced as an evil, the results of which were most injurious to the interests of religion, and which exposed those who fell into it to the condign and awful displeasure of the Most High (^{<0346>}Exodus 34:16). Now, although there were *some* circumstances attending the marriages in this manner denounced which do not directly apply to the state of society in our own country (especially the circumstance that the people with whom such intercourse was forbidden were idolaters), yet there is much, as must be evident to every pious observer, that illustrates the sin and danger of forming so intimate and permanent a union in life with the ungodly. The general fact is hence clearly deducible that there is an influence in marriage strongly affecting the character, which demands from those who are anxious for moral rectitude and improvement much of caution as to the manner in which their affections are fixed; and that unequal alliances — alliances where the parties are actuated by different spiritual habits and desires, and where good is made to meet and combine with bad, encountering most imminently the danger of seduction and pollution — are guilty, unnatural, and monstrous. The expression of the divine authority, in application to the Jews, is to be regarded as comprehending the principle of his people in all ages, that *here* they ought not to walk in the counsel of the ungodly, nor to stand in the way of sinners.

What we thus are enabled to conclude from the Old Testament, will be still more distinctly exemplified from the New. The evangelical writings do not, indeed, frequently offer directions expressly on the subject of marriage, the point appearing rather to be assumed than argued, that in Christian marriage the husband and wife ought both, in the emphatic terms of the apostle Peter, to be and walk as being “heirs together of the grace of life.” In the first Epistle to the Corinthians, the apostle Paul applies himself to a question which seems at that time to have been agitated — whether Christians who, previous to their conversion, had contracted marriages with unbelievers, ought not to be actually divorced from the wives or

husbands remaining in unbelief, because of the evil and peril attending the continuance of the alliance. Such an extreme, advocated by some, he considers as uncalled for (~~4173~~ 1 Corinthians 7:10-17). But, respecting the formation of a new matrimonial connection by a believer (the case taken being that of a believing widow, though the rule, of course, extends to all), this is the direction: “She is at liberty to be married to whom she will, only in the Lord” (~~4173~~ 1 Corinthians 7:39). Here is a simple proclamation, the force of which is permanent, and in submission to which Christians in every period should act. They are to marry “only in the Lord.” They, being themselves “in the Lord” — united to the Lord Jesus by the divine Spirit, and possessing an interest in the redeeming blessings he has purchased are to marry only on Christian principles, and, of course, only such as are thus also “in the Lord” — believer with believer, and with none else. This is the obvious meaning of the passage, which no sophism can evade or fritter away.

It would be easy to employ the attention further, on the general statements contained in the Word of God, respecting the character of separation from the world which ought to be sustained by his Church, the ends for which it is called, and the objects it is bound to perform; statements which all bear on the principle as to marriage, operating to enforce and to confirm it (see especially ~~4164~~ 2 Corinthians 6:14-18; 7:1). But, without amplifying here, and satisfied that this principle receives, from the testimony already quoted, a convincing and solemn establishment, the reader is requested to ponder a truth, which is as indubitable as it ought to be impressive, namely, that marriages formed by Christians in violation of the religious design of the institute, and of the express principles of their religion, are connected with evils many and calamitous, most earnestly to be deprecated, and most cautiously to be avoided. Is it, indeed, to be expected, on the ground of religion, that an act can be committed against the expressed will of the Most High God without exposing the transgressor to the scourge of his chastisement? Is it to be expected, on the ground of reason, that an alliance can be formed between individuals whose moral attributes and desires are essentially incompatible without creating the elements of uneasiness, discord, and disappointment? Excited imagination and passion may delude with the belief of innocence and hope of escape, but religion and reason speak the language of unchangeable veracity, and are ever justified in the fulfillments of experience and of fact.

The operation of the evil results whose origin is thus deduced, is of course susceptible of modifications from several circumstances in domestic and social life; and, for many reasons, the degrees of public exhibition and of personal pressure may vary.

1. Yet it may be remarked uniformly, respecting these results—they *are such as deeply affect the character*. A reference has already been made to the moral influence of marriage, and as the marriages stigmatized under the patriarchal, and forbidden and punished under the Jewish dispensation, were obnoxious on account of the contamination into which they led the professed people of God, so are the marriages of Christians with worldlings in this age, *a worldly spirit being still the essence of idolatry* (~~3044~~ James 4:4; ~~5076~~ Colossians 3:5; ~~6125~~ 1 John 2:15-17; ~~4102~~ Matthew 6:24), the objects of censure and deprecation, because of the baneful effect they exert on those who are numbered among the redeemed of the Lord. Such marriages as these present constant and insinuating temptations to seduce Christians to worldly dispositions and pursuits; they enfeeble their spiritual energies; interfere with their communion with God; hinder their growth in the attainments of divine life; check and oppose their performance of duty and their pursuit of usefulness, in the family, the Church, and the world. There has probably never been known a forbidden marriage which, if its original character were continued, did not pollute and injure. Some instances have been most palpable and painful; nor can it be considered other than a truth, unquestionable and notorious, that whoever will so transgress invokes a very blighting of the soul.

2. It may be remarked respecting these results, again, *they are such as deeply effect happiness*. Christian character and Christian happiness are closely connected if the one be hurt the other will not remain untouched. And who sees not in the unhallowed alliance a gathering of the elements of sorrow? Are there not ample materials for secret and pungent accusations of conscience, that agitate the heart with the untold pangs of self-condemnation and remorse? Is there not reason for the bitterness of disappointment, and the sadness of foreboding fear, because the *best* intercourse is unknown — the *purest* affection is impossible — the *noblest* union is wanting — and the being on whom the spirit would repose is, to all that is the sweetest and most sublime in human sympathies, human joys, and human prospects, an alien and a stranger? And what must be the horror of that anticipation which sets forth the event of a final separation at the bar of God, when, while the hope of personal salvation may be

preserved, the partner of the bosom is seen as one to be condemned by the Judge, and banished with everlasting destruction from his presence and the glory of his power! Oh the infatuation of the folly which leads to unite, where evils like these are created, rather than where God will sanction, and where time and eternity will both combine to bless!

3. Its effects upon what may be regarded as the supreme end of the marriage relation, *the religious education of children*, is another most distressing consideration. What *must* it be! What *has* it ever been! That much injury, therefore, has arisen to the *public* interests of the Church of Christ from this transgression cannot be doubted. Injury done to individual character is injury done to the community to which the individual is attached. It has always been a fact, that whoever sins in the household of faith, sills not only against himself, but against others; and that *this* transgression is one peculiarly extended in its influence, operating more than, perhaps, any one else which can be named to bring religion from its vantage ground, to clog its progress, and to retard its triumph. See *Cong. Mag.* May, 1831; *Malcolm on the Christian Rule of Marriage*; H. More's *Caeleb's in Search of a Wife*.

VI. Marriage Ceremonies. — In the early Christian Church marriages were to be notified to the bishop or society, and in the first centuries were solemnized by the clergy, but with very many exceptions. Much was borrowed from the customs of the Roman law. Banns were required about the 12th century. **SEE BANNS.** No prescribed form for the solemnization of marriage seems to have existed in early times. Witnesses were required, and the dowry was settled in writing. The sponsalia or betrothal preceded, and tokens or pledges were given or exchanged. The ceremonies were to all appearances not regarded as essential by the early Christians, but were merely considered appropriate and becoming, and when celebrated were observed as follows: “The use of the ring, in the rites both of espousal and of marriage, is very ancient. It is mentioned both by Tertullian and Clement of Alexandria, the latter of whom says, ‘It was given her, not as an ornament; but as a seal, to signify the woman’s duty in preserving the goods of her husband, because the care of the house belongs to her.’” The crowning of the married pair with garlands was a marriage-rite peculiar to many nations professing different forms of religion. Tertullian inveighs against it with all the zeal of a Montanist, but it is spoken of with approbation by the fathers of the 4th and 5th centuries, from whom it appears that the friends and attendants of the bridal pair were adorned in

the same manner. These chaplets were usually made of myrtle, olive, amaranth, rosemary, and evergreens, intermingled with cypress and vervain. The *crown*, appropriately so called, was made of olive, myrtle, and rosemary, variegated with flowers, and sometimes with gold and silver, pearls, precious stones, etc. These crowns were constructed in the form of a pyramid or tower. Both the bride and the bridegroom were crowned in this manner, together with the groomsman and the bridesmaid. The bride frequently appeared in church thus attired on the day when proclamation of the banns was made. Chaplets were not worn by the parties in case of second marriage, nor by those who had been guilty of impropriety before marriage. In the Greek Church the chaplets were imposed by the officiating minister at the altar. In the Western Church it was customary for the parties to present themselves thus attired. The wearing of a veil by the bride was borrowed from the Romans. It was also conformable to the example of Rebecca (~~(1241)~~Genesis 24). From this marriage-rite arose the custom of taking the veil in the Church of Rome. By this act the nun devotes herself to perpetual virginity as the spouse of Christ, the bridegroom of the Church. It appears to have been customary also to spread a robe over the bridegroom and bride, called *vitta nuptialis*, *pallium jugale*, etc., and made of a mixture of white and red colors. Torches and lamps were in use on such occasions, as among the Jews and pagan nations. The festivities were celebrated by nuptial processions going out to meet the bridegroom and conducting him home, by nuptial songs and music, and marriage feasts. These festivals were frequently the subject of bitter animadversion by the fathers, especially by Chrysostom, and often called for the interposition of the authority of the Church. At marriage festivals it was customary to distribute alms to the poor. The groomsman had various duties to perform — to accompany the parties to the church at their marriage; to act as sponsor for them in their vows; to assist in the marriage ceremonies; to accompany them to the house of the bridegroom; to preside over and direct the festivities of the occasion.

For a considerable time the observance of a marriage ceremony fell into desuetude among the Christians, to remedy which certain laws enforcing it were enacted in the 8th century. The ceremony now differs in different places. In Scotland, like all other religious services of that country, it is extremely simple, and is performed in the session-house, the residence of the minister, or the private house of some friend of one of the parties. In Lutheran countries it is generally celebrated in private houses. In England,

by the ancient common law, a like custom prevailed as in Scotland until 1757, when, by lord Hardwicke's Act, a ceremony in a church of the state establishment was made necessary, and this continued till 1836, when the Dissenters succeeded in removing this exclusiveness. Persons have now the option of two forms of contracting marriage: it may be with or without a religious ceremony; and, if with a religious ceremony, it may be either in the established church or in a dissenting chapel. If the marriage is to take place in an established church, then there must be either publication of banns of marriage for three preceding successive Sundays, or a license or certificate obtained, which dispenses with such publication; and, in either case, seven or fifteen days' previous residence in the parish by one of the parties is necessary, according as it is a certificate or license respectively which is applied for. The marriage must take place in the church, the marriage-service of the Church of England being read over, and this must be done in canonical hours, i.e. between 8 and 12 A.M., in presence of two witnesses at the altar, before which, in the body of the church, the parties are placed, after having mutually joined hands, and pledged their mutual troth, according to a set form of words, which they say after the minister; the mall gives a ring to the woman, then lays it on the book, with the accustomed duty to the priest and clerk. The priest then takes the ring and delivers it to the man, whom he instructs to put it on the *fourth* finger of the woman's *left* hand, and, holding it there, to repeat the words, "With this ring I thee wed, with my body I thee worship, and with all my worldly goods I thee endow. In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen." The minister next joins their right hands together, and, after prayers and blessings, during certain parts of which the man and woman kneel before the altar, they are dismissed with the reading of a part of the Prayer-book, which points out the duties of the marriage state. If the marriage is celebrated in a dissenting chapel (and for that purpose such chapel must be duly licensed and registered), there must be present the superintendent-registrar of the district as one of the witnesses, but the dissenting clergyman may use his own or any kind of form of service. If the marriage is not to be with any religious ceremony, then it must take place in the office of the superintendent-registrar, and in presence of witnesses, the essential thing being that both parties should in the presence of witnesses there exchange a declaration that they take each other for man and wife. The canonical hours must be attended to in all cases, and the condition of previous residence by one of the parties in the district; but the condition of residence is often evaded. In all cases the fact of the marriage

must be entered in a register, which register is kept by a public officer, and ultimately filed and kept in Somerset House, London, where a copy of the certificate of registration of every marriage in England can at all times be had for a small sum.

In the United States of America the customs of the Church of Scotland are followed by the Presbyterian and Congregational churches, and measurably also by the Baptists. The Protestant Episcopal Church adheres closely to the practices of the Church of England, and from the latter the Methodists also, in a somewhat modified form, have copied in this particular. Minor ecclesiastical bodies of the Christian Church follow the practices of one or the other of the churches mentioned. The laws of the several states differ somewhat as to the matter of marriage ceremonies, but they are adapted to the usages of all acknowledged Christian denominations, and recognize the validity of the act whether performed by a clergyman or magistrate, or by a simple contract before witnesses.

Peculiar usages are found in some of the Eastern churches of to-day. In Russia the bride and bridegroom hold a lighted taper in their hands in front of a small altar placed in the center of the church. Rings are placed on their fingers, and, their hands being joined, they are led by the priest three times round the altar. Two highly-ornamented gilt crowns are placed on their heads, and held over them by the groomsman during a part of the service. They drink wine out of a cup three times, and, kissing one another, the ceremony is finished. The married couple then make the tour of the church, crossing themselves at and saluting each saintly image on their way. Weddings generally take place towards evening, so that immediately after the ceremony dinner commences at the house of the bride's father. At a marriage-feast lighted candles are placed in every position and corner possible. No other wine but champagne is drunk, and the quantity of this beverage consumed is remarkable. The dinner is followed by a ball, and the feasting is usually kept up for twenty-four hours. The custom of honeymoon does not exist in Russia. The married couple spend the first few days of their wedded life with the bride's father. Shortly after the marriage the bride and bridegroom must call upon every one of their relations, friends, and acquaintances, and after this ceremony is finished they sink back into their ordinary life (*Ivan at Home*). For the Roman Catholic view of marriage, *SEE MATRIMONY*.

Marriage, Heathen.

Under this head, as being most akin to the ancient Hebrew, and perhaps best representing the general type of Oriental matrimony, we begin with

I. Mohammedan. — The following description of this (condensed from Lane's *Modern Egyptians*) applies especially to Cairo, but will serve for a general illustration in most Moslem countries. To abstain from marrying when a man has attained a sufficient age, and when there is no just impediment, is esteemed by the Egyptians improper, and even disreputable. Oriental females arrive at puberty much earlier than the natives of colder climates. Many marry at the age of twelve or thirteen years; few remain unmarried after sixteen years of age. An Egyptian girl at the age of thirteen, or even earlier, may be a mother. It is very common among the Arabs of Egypt and of other countries, but less so in Cairo than in other parts of Egypt, for a man to marry his first cousin. In this case the husband and wife continue to call each other "cousin;" because the tie of blood is indissoluble, but that of matrimony very precarious. Most commonly the mother, or some other near female relation of the youth or man who is desirous of obtaining a wife, describes to him the personal and other qualifications of the young women with whom she is acquainted, and directs his choice; or he employs a woman whose regular business it is to assist men in such cases. The parents may betroth their daughter to whom they please, and marry her to him without her consent if she be not arrived at the age of puberty, but after she has attained that age she may choose a husband for herself, and appoint any man to arrange and effect her marriage. In the former case, however, the relations of a girl sought in marriage usually endeavor to obtain her consent to the proposed union. The bridegroom can scarcely ever obtain even a surreptitious glance at the features of his bride until he finds her in his absolute possession, unless she belong to the lower classes of society; in which case it is easy enough for him to see her face. When a female is about to marry, she should have a deputy to settle the compact and conclude the contract for her with her proposed husband. If she be under the age of puberty this is absolutely necessary; and in this case her father, if living, or (if he be dead) her nearest adult male relation, or a guardian appointed by will or by the magistrate, performs the office of deputy; but if she be of age she appoints her own deputy, or may even make the contract herself, though this is seldom done. After a youth or man has made choice of a female to demand in marriage,

on the report of his female relations, and, by proxy, made the preliminary arrangements before described with her and her relations, he repairs, with two or three of his friends, to her deputy. Having obtained consent to the union, if the intended bride be under age, he asks what is the amount of the required dowry. The giving of a dowry is indispensable. It is generally stipulated that two thirds of the dowry shall be paid immediately before the marriage-contract is made, and the remaining third held in reserve, to be paid to the wife in case of divorcing her against her own consent, or in case of the husband's death. This affair being settled, and confirmed by all persons present reciting the opening chapter of the Koran, an early day (perhaps the day next following) is appointed for paying the money, and performing the ceremony of the marriage-contract; but it is very seldom the case that any document is written to confirm the marriage, unless the bridegroom is about to travel to another place, and fears that he may have occasion to prove his marriage where witnesses of the contract cannot be procured. Sometimes the marriage-contract is concluded immediately after the arrangement respecting the dowry, but more generally a day or two after. On the day appointed for this ceremony the bridegroom, again accompanied by two or three of his friends, goes to the house of the bride, usually about noon, taking with him that portion of the dowry which he has promised to pay on this occasion. It is necessary that there be two witnesses (and those must be Moslems) to the marriage-contract, unless in a situation where witnesses cannot be procured. All persons present recite the same chapter of the Koran, and the bridegroom then pays the money. After this the marriage-contract is performed. It is very simple. The bridegroom and the bride's deputy sit upon the ground face to face, with one knee upon the ground, and grasp each other's right hand, raising the thumbs, and pressing them against each other. A schoolmaster is generally employed to instruct them what they are to say. Having placed a handkerchief over their closed hands, he usually prefaces the words of the contract with a few words of exhortation and prayer, with quotations from the Koran and Traditions, on the excellency and advantages of marriage. He then desires the bride's deputy to say, "I betroth [or marry] to thee my daughter [or the female who has appointed me her deputy], such a one [naming the bride], the virgin [or the adult virgin], for a dowry of such an amount." (The words "for a dowry." etc., are sometimes omitted.) The bridegroom says, "I accept from thee her betrothal [or marriage] to myself, and take her under my care, and bind myself to afford her my protection; and ye who are present bear witness of this." The deputy addresses the

bridegroom in the same manner a second and a third time, and each time the latter replies as before. They then generally add, "And blessing be on the apostles, and praise be to God, the Lord of all creatures; amen" after which all present repeat the same chapter. It is not always the same form that is recited on these occasions: any form may be used, and it may be repeated by any person; it is not even necessary, and is often altogether omitted. The contract concluded, the bridegroom sometimes (but seldom unless he be a person of the lower orders) kisses the hands of his friends and others there present; and they are presented with sherbet, and generally remain to dinner. Each of them receives an embroidered handkerchief, provided by the family of the bride. Before the persons assembled on this occasion disperse, they settle upon the night when the bride is to be brought to the house of the bridegroom, and the latter, for the first time, is to visit her.

Picture for Marriage 2

In general, the bridegroom waits for his bride about eight or ten days after the conclusion of the contract. Meanwhile he sends to her, two or three or more times, some fruit, sweetmeats, etc.; and perhaps makes her a present of a shawl, or some other article of value. The bride's family are at the same time occupied in preparing for her a stock of household furniture and dress. The portion of the dowry which has been paid by the bridegroom, and generally a much larger sum (the additional money, which is often more than the dowry itself, being supplied by the bride's family), is expended in purchasing the articles of furniture, dress, and ornaments for the bride. These articles are the property of the bride, and, if she be divorced, she takes them away with her. She cannot, therefore, with truth be said to be *purchased*. The furniture is sent, commonly borne by a train of camels, to the bridegroom's house. Often among the articles is a chair for the turban or headdress. There are sometimes sent two of these chairs, one for the husband and the other for the wife. The bridegroom should receive his bride on the eve of Friday, or that of Monday; but the former is generally esteemed the more fortunate period. During two or three or more preceding nights the street or quarter in which the bridegroom lives is illuminated with chandeliers and lanterns (q.v.). An entertainment is also given on each of these nights, particularly on the *last* night before that on which the wedding is concluded, at the bridegroom's house. On these occasions it is customary for the persons invited, and for all intimate friends, to send presents to his house a day or two before the feast which

they purpose or expect to attend: they generally send sugar, coffee, rice, wax candles, or a lamb; the former articles are usually placed upon a tray of copper or wood, and covered with a silk or embroidered kerchief. The guests are entertained on these occasions by musicians and male or female singers, by dancing girls, or by some other performance.

On the preceding Wednesday (or on the Saturday if the wedding is to conclude on the eve of Monday), at about the hour of noon, or a little later, the bride goes in state to the bath. In general the first persons among the bride's party are several of her married female relations and friends, walking in pairs, and next a number of young virgins. The former are dressed in the usual manner, covered with the black silk shawl; the latter have white silk shawls. Then follows the bride, walking under a canopy of silk, of some gay color, as pink, rose-color, or yellow, or of two colors composing wide stripes, often rose-color and yellow. It is carried by four men, by means of a pole at each corner, and is open only in front: and at the top of each of the four poles is attached an embroidered handkerchief. The dress of the bride during this procession entirely conceals her person. She is generally covered from head to foot with a red shawl, or with a white or yellow shawl though rarely. Upon her head is placed a small pasteboard cap or crown. The shawl is placed over this, and conceals from the view of the public the richer articles of her dress, her face, and her jewels, etc., excepting one or two ornaments, generally of diamonds and emeralds, attached to that part of the shawl which covers her forehead. She is accompanied by two or three of her female relations within the canopy; and often, when in hot weather, a woman, walking backwards before her, is constantly employed in fanning her with a large fan of black ostrich feathers, the lower part of the front of which is usually ornamented with a piece of looking-glass. Sometimes one procession, with a single canopy, serves for two brides, who walk side by side. The procession moves very slowly, and generally pursues a circuitous route, for the sake of greater display. On leaving the house it turns to the right. It is closed by a second party of musicians, similar to the first, or -by two or three drummers. The whole bath is sometimes hired for the bride and her party -exclusively. They pass several hours, seldom less than two, occupied in washing, sporting, and feasting; and frequently female singers are hired to amuse them in the bath: they then return in the same order in which they came. Having returned from the bath to the house of her family, the bride and her companions sup together. If singers have contributed to the festivity in the

bath, they also return with the bride to renew their concert. Their songs are always on the subject of love, and of the joyous event which occasions their presence. It is on this night, and sometimes also during the latter half of the preceding day, that the bridegroom gives his chief entertainment. Low farce-players often perform on this occasion before the house, or, if it be large enough, in the court. The other and more common performances by which the guests are amused have been before mentioned.

On the following day the bride goes in procession to the house of the bridegroom. The ceremony usually occupies three or more hours. Sometimes, before bridal processions of this kind, two swordsmen, clad in nothing but their drawers, engage each other in a mock combat; or two peasants cudgel each other with long staves. The bride and her party, having arrived at the bridegroom's house, sit down to a repast. Her friends shortly after take their departure, leaving with her only her mother and sister, or other near female relations, and one or two other women. The bridegroom sits below. Before sunset he goes to the bath, and there changes his clothes; or he merely does the latter at home, and, after having supped with a party of his friends, waits till a little before the time of the night-prayer, or until the third or fourth hour of the night, when, according to general custom, he should repair to some celebrated mosque, such as that of the Hasaneyn, and there say his prayers. The party usually proceeds to the mosque with a quick pace, and without much order. A second group of musicians, with the same instruments, or with drums only, closes the procession. The prayers are commonly performed merely as a matter of ceremony; and it is frequently the case that the bridegroom does not pray at all. The procession returns from the mosque with more order and display, and very slowly; perhaps because it would be considered unbecoming in the bridegroom to hasten home to take possession of his bride. Soon after his return from the mosque, the bridegroom leaves his friends in a lower apartment, enjoying their pipes, and coffee, and sherbet. The bride's mother and sister, or whatever other female relations were left with her, are above, and the bride herself and her companion in a separate apartment. If the bridegroom be a youth or young man, it is considered proper that he, as well as the bride, should exhibit some degree of bashfulness: one of his friends therefore carries him a part of the way up to the room. On entering the bride's apartment he gives a present to her companion, who then retires. The bride has a shawl thrown over her head, and the bridegroom must give her a present of money, which is called the

price of the uncovering of the face," before he attempts to remove this, which she does not allow him to do without some apparent reluctance, if not violent resistance, in order to show her maiden modesty. The bridegroom now sees the face of his bride for the first time, and generally finds her nearly what he has been led to expect. He remains with her but a few minutes: having satisfied his curiosity respecting her personal charms, he calls to the women (who generally collect at the door, where they wait in anxious suspense) to raise their cries of joy, and the shrill sounds acquaint the persons below and in the neighborhood, and often, responded by other women, spread still further the news that he has acknowledged himself satisfied with his bride: he soon after descends to rejoin his friends, and remains with them an hour or more before he returns to his wife. It very seldom happens that the husband, if disappointed in his bride, immediately disgraces and divorces her; in general he retains her a week or more, even if dissatisfied With her.

Marriages are sometimes conducted without any pomp or ceremony, even in the case of virgins, by mutual consent of the bridegroom and the bride's family, or the bride herself; and widows or divorced women are never honored with a procession on marrying again. The mere sentence, "I give myself up to thee," uttered by a female to a man who proposes to become her husband (even without the presence of witnesses, if none can easily be procured), renders her his legal wife, if arrived at puberty; and marriages with widows and divorced women, among the Moslems of Egypt, and other Arabs, are sometimes concluded in this simple manner. The dowry of such women is generally one quarter, or third, or half the amount of that of a virgin. Among persons not of the lowest order, though in very humble life, the marriage ceremonies are conducted in the same manner as among the middle orders. But when the expenses cannot by any means be paid, the bride is paraded in a very simple manner, covered with a shawl (generally red), and surrounded by a group of her female relations and friends, dressed in their best, or in borrowed clothes, and enlivened by no other sounds of joy than their shrill cry, which they repeat at frequent intervals. The general mode of processions among the inhabitants of the villages is different from those above described. The bride, usually covered with a shawl, is seated on a camel, and so conveyed to the bridegroom's dwelling. Sometimes four or five women or girls sit with her on the same camel, one on either side of her, and two or three others behind, the seat being made very wide, and usually covered with carpets or other drapery. She is

followed by a group of women singing. In the evening of the wedding, and often during several previous evenings, in a village, the male and female friends of the two parties meet at the bridegroom's house, and pass several hours of the night in the open air, amusing themselves with songs and a rude kind of dance, accompanied by the sounds of a tambourine, or some kind of drum: both sexes sing, but only the women dance.

II. *Ancient Pagan, i.e.*

1. Greek. — The ancient Greek legislators considered the relation of marriage as a matter not merely of private, but also of public or general interest. This was particularly the case at Sparta, where proceedings might be taken against those who married too late or unsuitably, as well as against those who did not marry at all. But, independent of public considerations, there were also private or personal reasons, peculiar to the ancients, which made marriage an obligation. One of these was the duty incumbent upon every individual to provide for a continuance of representatives to succeed himself as ministers of the divinity: and another was the desire felt by almost every one, not merely to perpetuate his own name, but to leave some one who might make the customary offerings at his grave. We are told that with this view childless persons sometimes adopted children. The choice of a wife among the ancients was but rarely grounded upon affection, and scarcely ever could have been the result of previous acquaintance or familiarity. In many cases a father chose for his son a bride whom the latter had never seen, or compelled him to marry for the sake of checking his extravagances.

By the Athenian laws a citizen was not allowed to marry a foreign woman, nor conversely, under very severe penalties; but proximity by blood (*ἀγγιστεία*) or consanguinity (*συγγένεια*) was not, with some few exceptions, a bar to marriage in any part of Greece: direct lineal descent was. At Athens the most important preliminary to marriage was the betrothal (*ἐγγύησις*), which was in fact indispensable to the complete validity of a marriage-contract. It was made by the natural or legal guardian (*ὁ κύριος*) of the bride elect, and attended by the relatives of both parties as witnesses. The wife's dowry was settled at the betrothal. On the day before the *gamos*, or marriage, or sometimes on the day itself, certain sacrifices or offerings (*προτέλεια γάμων* or *προγάμεια*) were made to the gods who presided over marriage. Another ceremony of almost general observance on the wedding-day was the bathing of both the

bride and bridegroom in water fetched from some particular fountain, whence, as some think, the custom of placing the figure of a **λουτροφόρος**, or “water carrier,” over the tombs of those who died unmarried. After these preliminaries, the bride was generally conducted from her father’s to the house of the bridegroom at nightfall, in a chariot (**ἐφ’ ἀμάξης**) drawn by a pair of mules or oxen, and furnished with a kind of couch (**κλινίς**) as a seat. On either side of her sat the bridegroom and one of his most intimate friends or relations, who from his office was called the *pcaranymph* (**παράνυμφος** or **νυμφευτής**); but, as he rode in the carriage (**ὄχημα**) with the bride and bridegroom, he was sometimes called the **πάροχος**. The nuptial procession was probably accompanied, according to circumstances, by a number of persons, some of whom carried the nuptial torches. Both bride and bridegroom (the former veiled) were decked out in their best attire, with chaplets on their heads, and the doors of their houses were hung with festoons of ivy and bay. As the bridal procession moved along, the hymenaeal song was sung to the accompaniment of Lydian flutes, even in olden times, as beautifully described by Homer, and the married pair received the greetings and congratulations of those who met them. After entering the bridegroom’s house, into which the bride was probably conducted by his mother, bearing a lighted torch, it was customary to shower sweetmeats upon them (**καταχύσματα**), as emblems of plenty and prosperity. After this came the nuptial feast, to which the name *gamos* was particularly applied; it was generally given in the house of the bridegroom or his parents, and, besides being a festive meeting, served other and more important purposes. There was no public rite, whether civil or religious, connected with the celebration of marriage among the ancient Greeks, and therefore no public record of its solemnization. This deficiency then was supplied by the marriage-feast, for the guests were of course competent to prove the fact of a marriage having taken place. To this feast, contrary to the usual practice among the Greeks, women were invited as well as men; but they seem to have sat at a separate table, with the bride, still veiled, among them. At the conclusion of this feast she was conducted by her husband into the bridal chamber; and a law of Solon required that, on entering it, they should eat a quince together. as if to indicate that their conversation ought to be sweet and agreeable. The song called the *Epithalamium* was then sung before the doors of the bridal chamber. The day after the marriage, the first of the bride’s residence in her new abode, was called the *epaulia* (**ἐπαύλια**), on which their friends sent the customary presents to

the newly-married couple. On another day, the *spatulia* (ἄπαύλια), perhaps the second after marriage, the bridegroom left his house to lodge apart from his wife at his father's-in-law. Some of the presents made to the bride by her husband and friends were called *anacalypteria*.

(ἀνακαλυπτήρια), as being given on the occasion of the bride first appearing unveiled; they were probably given on the *epaulia*, or day after the marriage. Another ceremony observed after marriage was the sacrifice which the husband offered up on the occasion of his bride being registered among his own phratores.

The above account refers to Athenian customs. At Sparta the betrothal of the bride by her father or guardian (κύριος) was requisite as a preliminary of marriage, as well as at Athens. Another custom peculiar to the Spartans, and a relic of ancient times, was the seizure of the bride by her intended husband, but of course with the sanction of her parents or guardians. She was not, however, immediately domiciled in her husband's house, but cohabited with him for some time clandestinely, till he brought her, and frequently her mother also, to his home.

The Greeks, generally speaking, entertained little regard for the female character. They considered women in fact, as decidedly inferior to men, qualified to discharge only the subordinate functions in life, and rather necessary as helpmates than agreeable as companions. To these notions female education for the most part corresponded, and, in fact, it confirmed them; it did not supply the elegant accomplishment and refinement of manners which permanently engage the affections when other attractions have passed away. Aristotle states that the relation of man to woman is that of the governor to the subject; and Plato, that a woman's virtue may be summed up in a few words, for she has only to manage the house well, keeping what there is in it, and obeying her husband. Among the Dorians, however, and especially at Sparta, women enjoyed much more estimation than in the rest of Greece.

2. Roman. — A legal Roman marriage was called *justiæ nuptiæ, justum matrimonium*, as being conformable to *jus (civile)* or to law. A legal marriage was either *cum conventione uxoris in manum viri*, or it was without this conventio. But both forms of marriage agreed in this: there must be connubium between the parties, and consent. The legal consequences as to the power of the father over his children were the same in both.

Connubium is merely a term which comprehends all the conditions of a legal marriage. Generally it may be stated that there was only connubium between Roman citizens; the cases in which it at any time existed between parties not both Roman citizens, were exceptions to the general rule. Originally, or at least at one period of the republic, there was no connubium between the patricians and the plebeians; but this was altered by the Lex Canuleia (B.C. 445), which allowed connubium between persons of those two classes. There were various degrees of consanguinity and affinity within which there was no connubium. An illegal union of a male and female, though affecting to be, was not a marriage: the man had no legal wife, and the children had no legal father; consequently they were not in the power of their reputed father. The marriage *cum conventione* differed from that *sine conventione* in the relationship which it effected between the husband and the wife; the marriage *cum conventione* was a necessary condition to make a woman a *nmotetjiamilias*. By the marriage *cum conventione* the wife passed into the familia of her husband, and was to him in the relation of a daughter, or, as it was expressed, *in manum covenit*. In the marriage *sine conventione* the wife's relation to her own familia remained as before, and she was merely *uxor*. "*Uxor*," says Cicero, "is a genus of which there are two species: one is *materfamilias, quae in manum convei it*; the other is *uxor* only." Accordingly a *materfamilias* is a wife who is in manu, and in the familia of her husband. A wife not in manu was not a member of her husband's familia, and therefore the term could not apply to her. *Matrona* was properly a wife not in manu, and equivalent to *uxor*; and she was called *matrona* before she had any children. But these words are not always used in these their original and proper meanings.

It does not appear that any forms were requisite in the marriage *sine conventione*; and apparently the evidence of such marriage was cohabitation *matrimonii causa*. The *matrimoni causa* might be proved by various kinds of evidence. In the case of a marriage *cum conventione*, there were three forms:

- (1) *Usus*,
- (2) *Farreunm*, and
- (3) *Coemptio*.

(1.) Marriage was effected by *usus* if a woman lived with a man for a whole year as his wife; and this was by analogy to usucaption of movables generally, in which *usus* for one year gave ownership. The law of the

Twelve Tables provided that if a woman did not wish to come into the manus of her husband in this manner, she should absent herself from him annually for three nights (*trinoctium*), and so break the *usus* of the year.

(2.) *Farreum* was a form of marriage in which certain words were used in the presence of ten witnesses, and were accompanied by a certain religious ceremony, in which panis farreus was employed; and hence this form of marriage was also called *confarreatio*. It appears that certain priestly offices, such as that of Flamen Dialis, could only be held by those who were born of parents who had been married by this ceremony (*confuarreati parentes*).

(3.) *Coemptio* was effected by *mancipatio*, and consequently the wife was in *mancipio*. A woman who was cohabiting with a man as *uxor*, might come into his manus by this ceremony, in which case the *coemptio* was said to be *matrimonii causa*, and she who was formerly *uxor* became *apud maritum filiae loco*.

Sponsalia were not an unusual preliminary of marriage, but they were not necessary. The *sponsalia* were an agreement to marry, made in such form as to give each party a right of action in case of non-performance, and the offending party was condemned in such damages as to the *judex* seemed just. The woman who was promised in marriage was accordingly called *sponsca*, which is equivalent to *promisa*; the man who was engaged to marry was called *sponsus*. The *sponsalia* were of course not binding if the parties consented to waive the contract. Sometimes a present was made by the future husband to the future wife by way of earnest (*arrha*, *arrha sponsalia*), or, as it was called, *propter nuptias donatio*.

The consequences of marriage were:

1. The power of the father over the children of the marriage, which was a completely new relation — an effect indeed of marriage, but one which had no influence over the relation of the husband and wife.
2. The liabilities of either of the parties to the punishments affixed to the violation of the marriage union.
3. The relation of husband and wife with respect to property.

When marriage was dissolved, the parties to it might marry again; but opinion considered it more decent for a woman not to marry again. A

woman was required by usage (*mos*) to wait a year before she contracted a second marriage, on the pain of *infamia*.

It remains to describe the customs and rites which were observed by the Romans at marriages. After the parties had agreed to marry, and the persons in whose potestas they were had consented, a meeting of friends was sometimes held at the house of the maiden for the purpose of settling the marriage-contract, which was written on tablets, and signed by both parties. The woman, after she had promised to become the wife of a man, was called *sponsa, pacta, dicta, or sperata*. It appears that — at least during the imperial period — the man put a ring on the finger of his betrothed as a pledge of his fidelity. This ring was probably, like all rings at this time, worn on the left hand, and on the finger nearest to the smallest. The last point to be fixed was the day on which the marriage was to take place. The Romans believed that certain days were unfortunate for the performance of the marriage rites, either on account of the religious character of those days themselves, or on account of the days by which they were followed, as the woman had to perform certain religious rites on the day after her wedding, which could not take place on a *dies ater*. Days not suitable for entering upon matrimony were the *calends, nones, andoides* of every month, all *dies atri*, the whole months of May and February, and a great number of festivals. On the wedding-day, which in the early times was never fixed upon without consulting the auspices, the bride was dressed in a long white robe with a purple fringe, or adorned with ribbons. This dress was called *tunica recta*, and was bound round the waist with a girdle (*corona, cingulum, or zona*), which the husband had to untie in the evening. The bride's veil, called *flammeum*, was of a bright yellow color, and her shoes likewise. Her hair was divided on this occasion with the point of a spear. The bride was conducted to the house of her husband in the evening. She was taken with apparent violence from the arms of her mother, or of the person who had to give her away. On her way she was accompanied by three boys dressed in the *pretexta*, and whose fathers and mothers were still alive (*patimni iet matrinsi*). One of them carried before her a torch of white thorn (*spina*), or, according to others, of pine wood; the two others walked by her side, supporting her by the arm. The bride herself carried a distaff and a spindle, with wool. A boy called *camillus* carried in a covered vase (*cumera, cumerum, or casmillum*) the so-called utensils of the bride and playthings for children (*crepundia*). Besides these persons who officiated on the occasion, the procession was

attended by a numerous train of friends, both of the bride and the bridegroom. When the procession arrived at the house of the bridegroom, the door of which was adorned with garlands and flowers, the bride was carried across the threshold by *pronubi*. i.e. men who had been married to only one woman, that she might not knock against it with her foot, which would have been an evil omen. Before she entered the house, she wound wool around the door-posts of her new residence, and anointed them with lard (*adeps suillus*) or wolf's fat (*adeps lupinus*). The husband received her with fire and water, which the woman had to touch. This was either a symbolic purification, or a symbolic expression of welcome, as the *interdicere aqua et igni* was the formula for banishment. The bride saluted her husband with the words, *Ubi tu Caius, ego Caia*. After she had entered the house with distaff and spindle, she was placed upon a sheep-skin, and here the keys of the house were delivered into her hands. A repast (*coena nuptialis*), given by the husband to the whole train of relatives and friends who accompanied the bride, generally concluded the solemnity of the day. Many ancient writers mention a very popular song, *Taladius* or *Talassio*, which was sung at weddings; but whether it was sung during the repast or during the procession is not quite clear, though we may infer from the story respecting the origin of the song that it was sung while the procession was advancing towards the house of the husband. It may be easily imagined that a solemnity like that of marriage did not take place among the merry and humorous Italians without a variety of jests and railleries; and Ovid mentions obscene songs which were sung before the door of the bridal apartment by girls, after the company had left. These songs were probably the old *Fescennina*, and are frequently called *Epithalamia*. At the end of the repast, the bride was conducted by matrons who had not had more than one husband (*pronubae*) to the *lectus genialis* in the atrium, which was on this occasion magnificently adorned and strewn with flowers. On the following day the husband sometimes gave another entertainment to his friends, which was called *reposita*, and the woman, who on this day undertook the management of the house of her husband, had to perform certain religious rites; on which account, as was observed above, it was necessary to select a day for the marriage which was not followed by a *dies ater*. These rites probably consisted of sacrifices to the *Dii Penates*.

The position of a Roman woman after marriage was very different from that of a Greek woman. The Roman presided over the whole household; she educated her children, watched over and preserved the honor of the

house, and, as the *materfamilias*, she shared the honors and respect shown to her husband. Far from being confined, like the Greek women, to a distinct apartment, the Roman matron (at least during the better centuries of the republic) occupied the most important part of the house, the atrium. — Smith, *Dict. of Class. Ant.* s.v.

III. *Among the Hindus.* — There are writers, perhaps we had better call them “fact gatherers” (comp. Miller. *Chips*, 2:262), who, not contenting themselves with the accomplishment of the task for which they are fitted, frequently go out of their way to cast a slur upon the Christian’s belief and to ridicule him for entertaining the thought that the Bible is the educator of the human race. Yet the deeper the researches into the “primitive” condition of man, and the more intimate our relation with those nations who can claim a civilization outside of the pale of Christian teachings, the more stubborn appears the fact that Christianity alone assigns to woman a position of equality with man. The N.T. teaches “there is neither Jew nor Greek; there is neither bond nor free; there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus.” The Hindu’s *sacred* writings, however, not only fail to make woman the equal of man, but they even put a stigma upon her from her very birth. A woman, it is affirmed by the *Institutes* of Manu (q.v.), whose inspiration is as unquestioned as his legislative supremacy is universal among the Hindus, “is never fit for independence, or to be trusted with liberty; for she may be compared to a heifer on the plain, which still longeth for grass.” “They exhaust,” says Massie (*Continental India*, 2:153), “the catalogue of vice to affix its epithets to woman’s nature — infidelity, violence, deceit, envy, extreme avariciousness, an entire want of good qualities, with impurity, they affirm, are the innate faults of womankind.” “Why,” says Butler (*Land of the Veda*, p. 470), “if my native friend had six children, three boys and as many girls, and I happened to inquire, ‘Lalla, how many children have you?’ the probability is he would reply, ‘Sir, I have three children;’ for he would not think it worth while to count in the daughters.” Indeed, the Brahmin is taught that perfection is to be attained only, freed from the contamination of woman, in a purely ascetic state (Wuttke, *Christian Ethics*, 1:51). But let us not be misunderstood as conveying the impression that the lay Hindfi favors asceticism. Far from it. Among the laity celibacy is a reproach in either sex. As among the Chinese (see below), “girls are not desired, not welcome;” and, when they come, they are either quickly done away with, where the English law does not interfere [see INFANTICIDE], or, if they must live, are

ignored, if not despised. Arrived at the age of only seven, the age at which the Shasters pronounce the girl marriageable, the unhappy parents begin to look about for an early opportunity to free themselves from the burden that is upon them by betrothal of the child. As all through the East, so also here the whole matter is held by the parents in their own hands. The poor girl has no choice or voice in her own destiny — all is arranged without consulting her views or affections in any way whatever. “Courtship, in our Christian sense,” says Butler, “the maiden in India can never know. She is not allowed to see or converse with him to whose control she will ere long be handed over. She cannot write to him, for she can neither read nor write; all she is able to do is to follow the instructions to ‘worship the gods for a good husband.’ She is taught to commence as soon as she is four years old. Her prayers are addressed chiefly to Kama-deva (q.v.), the Hindû Cupid ... the maiden prays, and father and mother manage the business of selection. Each caste, *SEE INDIAN CASTE*, has its professional match-makers, whose aid is indispensable. When the negotiations have reached a certain definiteness, the Pundits are consulted to avoid mistakes of consanguinity, and then the astrologers, who pronounce upon the carefully-preserved horoscopes of the boy and girl, whether they can be united with safety. These preliminaries all found satisfactory, the aid of the Brahmin is sought to ascertain if the family god favors the union. The stars, the gods, and men being a unit, negotiations are opened between the parents and relations as to the amount of gift and dowry, and, when conclusions are reached here to their mutual satisfaction, the astrologer is again called in to ascertain and name a lucky day when the agreement may be registered, and a bond for the dowry executed. This is done with due solemnity, and then the astrologer has again to ascertain and name a lucky day for the ceremony, which is accepted by the parents under their bond to see to the consummation of the engagement. This is the usual method, slightly varied in different localities” (p. 479, 480). No female child is expected to have gone beyond the age of twelve without the consummation of an engagement. Woe be unto that family wherein a girl is past the age of twelve and yet unbetrothed (Butler, p. 497). And yet what is the fate of the poor girl after she has actually found her mate? Marriage to the Hindû female means slavery in its most abject form. “The Hindû,” says Massie (2:154), “does not marry to secure a companion who will aid him in enduring the ills of life, or in obtaining the means of rational employment, he seeks only a slave who shall nourish (he thinks not of training) children, and abide in abject subjection to his rule.”

Betrothal with the Hindûs being as binding as marriage (indeed, the word “marriage” is used to include both betrothal and our conception of the matrimonial alliance), the female child enters into a new state of existence immediately after the ceremony of betrothal. “Henceforth she is no more free to roam the fields and enjoy the lovely face of nature. Reserved for her husband, she can no longer be seen with propriety by any man save her father and brothers. She is from that day ‘*a plurdah-sashlzi*’ — one who sits behind the curtains within the enclosure which surrounds her mother’s home;” and now commences her education, which, lasting for five or six years, may be epitomized in its entire curriculum under these four heads: cooking, domestic service, religion, and their peculiar female literature, to enter at last a state of dependence more strict, contemptuous, and humiliating, ordained for the weaker sex among the Hindus, than which there cannot easily be conceived another. Look into the house which the bride has entered, and see her as she begins the duties for which she has been trained. She rises to prepare her husband’s food, and, when all is ready and laid out upon the mat — for they ignore such aids as chairs and tables, knives or forks, and take their meals with the hand, sitting on the floor — she now announces to her lord that his meal is ready. He enters and sits down, and finds all duly prepared by her care. Why does she still stand? Why not sit down too, and share with her husband the good things which she has made ready. She dares not. He would not allow it — the law of her religion forbids it. She must stand and wait upon him, for do not the Shasters render it her duty? “When in the presence of her husband,” they teach her, “a woman must keep her eyes upon her master, and be ready to receive his commands. When he speaks she must be quiet, and listen to nothing else, and attend upon him alone. A woman has no other god on earth but her husband.” Therefore she waits upon her husband so patiently. But not only is she prohibited from enjoying the blessings of the family table, even when her lord has fully satisfied himself, but she is obliged to remove what remains to another apartment — “for her religion not only forbids her eating with him, but also prohibits her from eating even what he leaves ‘in the same room where he dines’ — and not till then can she and her children eat their food” (Butler, p. 492). If the state we have portrayed be sad and low enough, what shall be said of the helpless condition in which the poor woman of India is placed if her husband be cruel, aye, brutal? “Woman,” says Butler (p. 492), “is absolutely without redress, in the power of her husband, and no one can interfere when it stops short of actual murder.” Such is woman’s history in a married life, as guided and

controlled by the sacred writings of a people who enjoy a non-Biblical civilization. "If ever woman had an opportunity of showing what she might become under the teachings and influence of a civilization where Christianity or the Bible did not interfere with her state, the women of India have had that opportunity, and now, after forty centuries of such experiment, what is woman there to-day?" (Butler, p. 469). Surely here is a question worthy the attention of those "fact gatherers" who so eagerly thrust aside the benighted influences of a Christian civilization.

Polygamy exists among the Hindûs, as it is allowable. It is a luxury, however, that few poor men can afford, and hence the practice of "successional polygamy:" Hindûs often forsake their wives, and then take others. Where polygamy has invaded the household, the woman who has had the good fortune to be the first wife takes precedence in rank; she remaining the mistress of the *zenana* — the Hindû *harem*.

Polyandry, strangely enough, has also established itself here. "This singular and amazing relation existed in India twenty-five centuries ago, and lingers today in some localities to such an extent as to call for the legislative action of the English government." *SEE POLYANDRY*.

The marriage-rites are numerous, tedious, and in many parts far from delicate. All, however, being expressed in Sanscrit, and recited by the officiating Brahmin with the utmost rapidity, no one understands what is said. The principal rites among the Brahmins are walking three times round a fire, and tying the garments of the parties together. The bride has also to make *seven steps*, at the last of which the marriage is complete.

The marriage is usually solemnized in the house of the bride's father. Thither the bridegroom proceeds, attended by his friends, and from thence conducts the bride to his home in a grand procession, usually by night, with torches and great rejoicings. On both occasions considerable expenditure is incurred in feasting the friends and relatives, and in providing ornaments, music, processions, and illuminations. The wealthy spend freely on these objects, and the poorer classes often incur debts which burden them for many years. The costs incurred by the fathers, on both sides, in celebrating a marriage, form a heavy item of Hindû expenditure, and one of the motives to female infanticide is doubtless laid in the desire to avoid this charge (Trevor, *Its Natives and Missions*, p. 214).

The marriage procession is thus described by Butler (p. 485). “Often when traveling at night in my palanquin, I have been roused from my sleep by my bearers catching sight of an approaching marriage procession, with its torches, music, and shouting; falling in with the enthusiasm of each event, they would cry out that ‘the bridegroom cometh.’ First the bridegroom would make his appearance, mounted on a fine horse splendidly caparisoned — his own or borrowed for the occasion — and wearing a grand coat, decked out in tinsel and gold thread, with the matrimonial crown on his head, and his richly-embroidered slippers, all very fine, his friends shouting and dancing alongside of him, and, of course, as he passes, we make our salaam and wish him joy. Right behind the bridegroom’s horse comes the palanquin of the bride, but she is veiled, and the venetians are closely shut, and on the little lady is borne to a home which she never saw before, to surrender herself into the hands of one who has neither wooed nor won her; a bride without a choice, with no voice in her own destiny; married without preference; handed over, by those assumed to do all the thinking for her, to a fate where the feelings of her heart were never consulted in the most important transaction of her existence; beginning her married life under circumstances which preclude the possibility of her being sustained by the affection which is founded upon esteem. When the procession has come within hailing distance of his home, the watching friends go forth to meet the bridegroom, the bride enters her apartments, the door is shut, and the guests are entertained in other parts of the establishment.”

IV. *Among the Chinese and Japanese.* — The Chinese are divided into a number of clans, each distinguished by a clan name. Of these clans there are from a hundred to a thousand, according to different authors. The law is that no man shall marry a woman of his own clan name. Thus relationship by the male line, however distant, prevents marriage. This rule is very ancient, its origin being referred by the Chinese to the mythic times of their empire. The legendary emperor Fu-Hi, who reigned before the Hea dynasty, which, according to the Chinese annals, began in B.C. 2207, is said to have divided the people into clans, and established this rule regarding marriage (Tyler, *Researches*, p. 278). We give the Chinese marriage customs at considerable length, as they are highly illustrative of Oriental usages in general.

As in all Eastern countries, the girl to be given in wedlock is not consulted in the choice of her future husband, the parents deciding in her stead. The

Chinese are firm believers in the sentiment to which the Western mind has given expression in the proverb that "Matches are made in heaven." To secure an alliance, a person is employed as a go-between or match-maker. The negotiation is generally opened by the family of the male person. Not unfrequently the girl has to be paid for — a relic of the patriarchal custom. Occasionally, when a female child is born to persons in humble circumstances, it is given away to a family having a male child only; is reared by the latter, and, when the girl and boy have reached a marriageable age, they are joined in matrimony. Not unfrequently it occurs among wealthy families having a daughter that the custom of purchase is reversed, and a husband secured for a pecuniary consideration. The wealthy look with special favor upon the literary class, and not unfrequently great sacrifices are made to secure a scholarly husband. "It not unfrequently occurs," says Doolittle (*China*, 1:99), "that a rich family, having only one daughter and no boys, desires to obtain a son-in-law who shall be willing to marry the girl and live in the family as a son. Sometimes a notice is seen posted up, stating the desire of a certain man to find a son-in-law and heir who will come and live with him, perhaps stating the age and qualifications of an acceptable person. In such a case, the parents of those who have a son whose qualifications might warrant such an application, and whom they would be willing to allow to marry on such terms, are expected to make application by a go-between, when the matter would be considered by the rich man. Sometimes the rich man makes application by a go-between to the parents of a young man whose reputation he is pleased with, and who perhaps may be a recent graduate, his name standing near the head of the list of successful competitors of the first or second literary degree."

Betrothal. — This among the Chinese is considered as binding as marriage, if the rites and observances have been carefully looked after. The final act in betrothment is the exchange of cards (for description, see Doolittle, 1:67). The time intervening between betrothal and marriage varies from a month or two to eighteen or twenty years, depending much on the age of the parties. "From one to three months before the marriage a fortunate day is selected for its celebration. Generally a member of the family of the bridegroom, or a trusty friend, takes the eight horary characters which denote the birth-time for each of the affianced parties, and for each of their parents, if living, to a fortune-teller, who selects lucky days and times for the marriage, for the cutting of the wedding garments, for the placing of

the bridal bed in position, for the finishing of the curtains of the bridal bed, for the embroidering of the bridal pillows, and for the entering of the sedan, on the part of the bride, on the day of her marriage. These items are written out on a sheet of red paper, which is sent to the family of the girl by the hands of the go-between. If accepted, the periods specified become the fixed times for the performance of the particulars indicated, and both parties proceed to make the necessary arrangements for the approaching wedding. Presenting the wedding-cakes and material for the bridal dress to the family of the bride by the other party is next in order. The relative time usually adopted for the performance of this custom is about one month before the day fixed for the marriage. The number of these '*cakes of ceremony,*' or wedding-cakes, varies from several score to several hundreds. They are round, and about an inch thick, weighing generally about one pound and ten or twelve ounces each, and measure nearly a foot in diameter. They are made out of wheat flour, and contain in the middle some sugar, lard, and small pieces of fat pork, mixed together in a kind of batter, and then cooked: they are, in fact, a sort of mince-pies. There is also sent a sum of money, of greater or less amount, according to previous agreement; a quantity of red cloth or silk, usually not less than five kinds, for the use of the bride; five kinds of dried fruits, several kinds of small cakes, a cock and a hen, and a gander and a goose. The family of the girl, on receiving these wedding-cakes, proceeds to distribute them among their relatives and intimate friends. The small cakes are also distributed in a similar manner. The money sent is generally spent in outfitting the bride.

“A few days before the day fixed for the wedding, the family of the bridegroom again makes a present of various articles of food and other things to the family of the bride, as a cock and a hen, a leg and foot of a pig and of a goat, eight small cakes of bread, eight torches, three pairs of large red candles, a quantity of vermicelli, and several bunches of fire-crackers. There are also sent a girdle, a head-dress, a silken covering for the head and face, and several articles of ready-made clothing, which are usually borrowed or rented for the occasion. These are to be worn by the bride on her entering the bridal sedan to be carried to the home of her husband on the morning of her marriage. The food, or a part of it, including the cock, is to be eaten by her on that morning. The fire-crackers are for explosion on the road, and the torches are for burning during the time occupied *en route* to her new home. On each of the eight bread-cakes is made a large red character in an ancient form of writing, of an auspicious meaning, as

'longevity,' 'happiness,' official emolument,' and 'joy;' or certain four of them have four characters, meaning 'the phoenixes are singing in concert,' or 'the ducks are seeking their mates.' Four of these bread-loaves are accepted; the remaining four and the hen, according to strict custom, are returned to the party which proffers them. The bread-cakes and the vermicelli are omens significant of good, owing to a play on the local sound of the characters which denote them, or in consequence of the shape of the article. The vermicelli is significant of longevity,' because of its length; and the four bread-cakes reserved by the family of the bride are kept for a singular use on the morning of the girl's entering her bridal chair. *Placing the bridal bedstead in the position where it is to stand* is an important ceremony. When the day selected arrives, which is generally only a few days before the wedding, the bedstead is arranged in some convenient place in the bride's chamber, and then for a considerable time it must not be moved, for fear of ill luck. This placing of the bedstead in position is attended with various superstitious acts."

Worship of Ancestors by the Bridal Party. — "Usually the day before the wedding, the bride has her hair done up in the style of married women of her class in society, and tries on the clothes she is to wear in the sedan, and for a time after she arrives at her future home on the morrow. This is an occasion of great interest to her family. Her parents invite their female relatives and friends to a feast at their house. The professed object of trying on the clothing is to see how the articles provided will fit, and to ascertain that everything is ready, so that there may be no delay or confusion on the arrival of the hour when she is to take her seat in her sedan. While thus dressed (the thick veil designed to conceal her features on arrival at her husband's residence not now being worn), she proceeds to light incense before the ancestral tablets belonging to her father's family, and to worship them for the last time before her marriage. She also kneels down before her parents, her grandparents (if living), her uncles and aunts (if present), and worships them in much the same manner as she and her husband will on the morrow worship his parents and grandparents, and the ancestral tablets belonging to his family. On the occasion of the girl's trying on these clothes and worshipping the tablet and her parents, it is considered unpropitious that those of her female relatives and friends who are in mourning should be present.

"The bridal chair is selected by the family of the bridegroom, and sent to the residence of the bride generally on the afternoon preceding the

wedding-day, attended by a band of music, some men carrying lighted torches, two carrying a pair of large red lanterns, containing candles also lighted, and one having a large red umbrella, and one or two friends or other attendants. The bridal chair is always red, and is generally covered with broadcloth, or some rich, expensive material. It is borne by four men, who wear caps having red tassels. The musicians and all the persons employed in the procession have similar caps. Very early on the morning of her marriage the bride or the 'new woman' arises, bathes, and dresses. While she is bathing the musicians are required to play. Her breakfast consists theoretically of the fowl, the vermicelli, etc., sent by the family of her affianced husband. In fact, however, she eats and drinks very little of anything on the morning or during the day of her wedding. When the precise time approaches for taking her seat in her sedan, usually between five and eight o'clock in the morning, previously fixed by the fortune-teller, her toilet is completed by one of her parents taking a thick veil and placing it over her head, completely covering her features from view. She is now led out of her room by one of her female assistants, and takes her seat in the sedan, which has been brought into the reception-room of the house. The floor from her room to the sedan is covered for the occasion with a kind of red carpeting, so; that her feet may not touch the ground. She takes her place in the sedan amid the sound of fire-crackers and, music by the band. The bride, her mother, and the various members of the family, are required by custom to, indulge during this morning in hearty and protracted. crying — oftentimes, no doubt, sincere and unaffected. While seated in the sedan, but before she starts for her future home, her parents, or some members of her family, take a bed-quilt by its four corners, and, while holding it thus before the bridal chair, one of the bride's assistants tosses into the air, one by one, four bread-cakes, in such a manner that they will fall into the bed-quilt. These bread-cakes were received from the family of her husband at the same time as the cock and vermicelli were received. The woman during this ceremony is constantly repeating felicitous sentences, which are assented to by some others of the company. The quilt containing these cakes is gathered up and carried immediately to an adjoining room. The object of this ceremony is explained to be to profit the family of the: bride's parents, being an omen of good, which is in some, manner indicated to the Chinese apprehension by the. quilt and the cakes being retained in the house — the local sound of the common word for 'bread,' and a certain word meaning 'to warrant,' 'to secure,' being identical."

Bridal Procession. — After these performances “the, bridal procession starts *en route* for the residence of the other party, amid explosions of fire-crackers and the music of the band. In the front of the procession go, two men carrying two large lighted lanterns, having the ancestral or family name of the groom cut in a large form out of red paper pasted upon them. Then, come two men carrying similar lanterns, having the, family name of the bride in a similar manner pasted on them. These belong to her family, and accompany her only a part of the way. Then comes a large red umbrella, followed by men carrying lighted torches, and by the band of music. Near the bridal chair are several brothers of the bride or friends of her family, and several friends or brothers of the groom. These latter are dispatched from the house of the groom early in the morning, for the purpose of meeting the bridal procession and escorting the bride to her home. This deputation sometimes arrives at the house of the bride before she sets out on her journey, and, if so, it accompanies the procession all the way. About midway between the homes of the bride and the groom the procession stops in the street, while the important ceremony of *receiving the bride* is formally transacted. The friends of the bride stand near each other, and at a little distance stand the friends of the groom. The former produce a large red card, having the ancestral name of the bride’s family written on it; the latter produce a similar card bearing the ancestral name of the groom. These they exchange, and each, seizing his own hands *a la Chinois*, bows towards the members of the other party. The two men in the front of the procession who carry the lanterns having the ancestral name of the groom now turn about, and, going between the sedan chair and the two men who carry the lanterns having the ancestral name of the bride, come back to their former position in the procession, having gone around the party which has the lanterns with the bride’s ancestral name attached. This latter party, while the other is thus encircling it, turns round in an opposite direction, and starts for the residence of the family of the bride, accompanied by that part of the escort which consisted of her brothers or the friends of her family. The rest of the procession now proceeds on its way to the residence of the bridegroom, the band playing a lively air. At intervals along the street fire-crackers are exploded. It is said that, from the precise time when the two parties carrying lanterns having the ancestral names of the two families attached separate from each other in the street, the name of the bride is changed into the name of her betrothed; the lanterns having his name attached remaining in the procession, while those which have her (former) name are taken back to the residence of her

father's family. From this time during the day she generally is in the midst of entire personal strangers, excepting her female assistants, who accompany the procession and keep with her wherever she goes. On arriving at the door of the bridegroom's house fire-crackers are let off in large quantities, and the band plays very vigorously. The torch-bearers, lantern-bearers, and the musicians stop near the door. The sedan is carried into the reception-room. The floor, from the place where the sedan stops to the door of the bride's room, is covered with red carpeting, lest her feet should touch the floor. A woman who has borne both male and female children, or at least male children, and who lives in harmonious subjection to her husband, approaches the door of the sedan and utters various felicitous sentences. If she is in good pecuniary circumstances, and if her parents are living and of a learned family, so much the more fortunate. A boy six or eight years old, holding in his hands a brass mirror, with the reflecting surface turned from him and towards the chair, also comes near and invites the bride to alight. At the same time the married woman who has uttered propitious words advances as if to open the door of the sedan, when one of the female assistants of the bride, who accompanied the procession, steps forward and opens it. The married woman referred to and the boy are employed by the family of the groom, and receive a small present for their services, which are considered quite important and ominous of good. The mirror held by the lad is expected to ward off all deadly or pernicious influences which may emanate from the sedan. The bride is now aided by her female assistants to alight. While being led towards the door of her room, the sieve which had been placed over the door of the bridal chair on its arrival is sometimes held over her head, and sometimes it is placed directly in front of the door of the sedan, so that, on stepping out, she will step into it.

“The groom, on the approach of the bridal procession, disappears from the crowd of friends and relatives who have assembled at his residence on the happy occasion, and takes his position standing by the side of the bedstead, having his face turned towards the bed. When the bride enters the room, guided by her assistants, he turns around, and remains standing with his face turned from the bed. As soon as she has reached his side, both bridegroom and bride simultaneously seat themselves side by side on the edge of the bedstead. Oftentimes the groom manages to have a portion' of the skirt of her dress come under him as he sits down by her, such a thing being considered as a kind of omen that she will be submissive. Sometimes

the bride is very careful, by a proper adjustment of her clothing at the moment of sitting down, not only to prevent the accomplishment of such an intention on his part, but also to sit down, if possible, in such a manner that some of his dress will come under her, thus manifesting her determination to preserve a proper independence, if not to bring him actually to yield obedience to her will. After sitting thus in profound silence together for a few moments, the groom arises and leaves the room. He waits in the reception-room for the reappearance of his bride, to perform the ceremony called 'worshipping the temple' (q.v.). Until this time the bride has worn the heavy embroidered outside garment, head-dress, etc., which she had on when she entered her sedan. These are now removed. She has her hair carefully combed in the style of her class in society, and she is arrayed in her own wedding garments. Sometimes her hair is gorgeously decked out with pearls and gems, true or false, according to the ability of the family to purchase, rent, or borrow. When her toilet has been completed, and everything has been made ready, the bride and bridegroom sit down in her room to their wedding dinner. He now, oftentimes for the first time in his life, and always for the first time on his marriage day, beholds the features of his wife. He may eat to his fill of the good things provided on the occasion, but she, according to established custom, may not take a particle. She must sit in silence, dignified and composed.

"The wedding festivities generally last at least two days. 'The first day the male friends and relatives of the groom are invited to *'shed their light'* on the occasion. On the second day the female friends and relatives of the family of the groom are invited to the wedding feast; this is often called the 'women's day.' Not long after the family and guests have breakfasted on the morning of the second day, the newly-married couple, amid the noise of fire-crackers, come out of their room together for the purpose of worshipping the ancestral tablets belonging to the household, the grandparents, and parents of the groom. This custom is known by the name of *'coming out of the room.'* In the case of those families who devote only one day to the marriage festivities and ceremonies, this custom is observed on the afternoon of the first day. Not long subsequent to the ceremony of 'coming out of the room,' the couple proceed to the kitchen for the purpose of worshipping the god and goddess of the kitchen. This is performed with great decorum, and is regarded as an important and essential part of marriage solemnities. Incense and candles are lighted, and arranged on a table placed before the picture or the writing which

represents these divinities, plastered upon the wall of the kitchen. Before this table the bridegroom and his bride kneel down side by side, and bow in worship of the god and goddess of the kitchen. It is believed that they will thus propitiate their good-will, and especially that the bride, in attempting culinary operations, will succeed better in consequence of paying early and respectful attentions to these divinities. On the third day the parents of the bride send an invitation to their son-in-law and his wife to visit them. With this invitation they send sedans for them. The card is usually brought by her brothers, if she has any of the proper age, or by relatives having her own ancestral name. Until this morning, since she left her former home two days previous, the bride has seen none of her own family, and generally none of her own relatives or acquaintances. She and her husband now receive the congratulations and compliments of her brothers or other relatives, and prepare to visit her parents. The bride enters her sedan first, and proceeds a short distance in front of her husband. They do not start together, nor is it proper that they should arrive at the house of her parents at the same time. The chair provided for the bride on this occasion is a common black sedan in all respects, except that its screen in front has a certain charm painted upon the outside. This charm is the picture of a grim-looking man, sitting on a tiger, with one of his hands raised up, holding a sword, as if in the act of striking, representing a certain ruler of elves, hobgoblins, etc. The object of its use on the occasion of a bride's returning to her parents' house, on the third day after her marriage, is to keep off evil and unpropitious influences from her. On arrival at her paternal home the bride's sedan is carried into the reception-room, and she alights amid the noise of fire-crackers. The sedan which contains the son-in-law stops a few rods from his father-in-law's residence, where he is met by one of his brothers-in-law, or some relative or friend deputed to meet and conduct him into the house. The two parties, standing in the street, respectfully shake their own hands towards each other on meeting, according to the approved fashion. The newly-arrived is now invited to enter the house. He is seated in the reception-room, where he is treated successively to three cups of tea and three pipes of tobacco. Afterwards he is invited to go and see his mother-in-law in her room, where he finds his wife. There he sits awhile, and visits after a stereotyped manner, being careful to use only good or propitious words, avoiding every subject and phrase which, according to the notions of this people, are unlucky. He is soon invited into the reception-room, where he is joined by his wife. Everything being arranged, the husband and wife proceed to worship the ancestral tablets of her family. At the

conclusion of this ceremony the bride retires to her mother's apartments. or to some back room, where she and the female relatives present are feasted. Her husband invited to partake of some refreshments in the reception-room, in doing which he is joined by his bride's brothers, or some others of her family relatives. According to the rules of etiquette, he must eat but very little, however hungry he may be. The usual phrase employed in speaking of it is that he eats part of 'three bowls of vegetables,' after which he declines to receive anything more, under the plea that he has eaten enough. He soon takes his departure in his sedan, leaving his bride to follow by herself by-and-by, accompanied usually only by a servant or female friend. Husbands are never seen with their wives in public."

The marriage customs of the Japanese are so very like those of the Chinese that we have grouped them together. The custom of purchasing the wife is still more general among the Japanese than other Asiatic nations. Polygamy is strictly forbidden. Though the harem is tolerated, only one lawful wife is recognised. "It appears, however," says MacFarlane (*Japan*, p. 268), "to be very easy for a man to put away his wife and take another — at least so far as any law exists to the contrary." The condition of woman is far better than in any other Asiatic country.

V. Among Savages. — Perhaps in no other way can the great advantages of Christian civilization be more conclusively shown than by the improvement which it has effected in the relations between the two sexes. The best students of the primitive condition of man have come to the conclusion that where divine revelation does not extend the institution of marriages if it exists at all, it is by no means the outgrowth of affection and a desire for companionship, but is entered into by the male savages "as a mere animal and convenient connection" as the "means of getting their dinner cooked." There is "no idea of tenderness nor of chivalrous devotion" (Hill, *Tracts of Chittagong*, p. 116; comp. Pallas, *Voyages*, 4:94). Indeed, according to Lubbock (*Origin of Civilization, and Primitive Condition of Man*), the lowest races have no such institution as the marriage rite, because "true love is almost unknown among them" (p. 50). Kolben (*Hist. Cape of Good Hope*, 1:1.62) tells us that "the Hottentots are so cold and indifferent to one another that you would think there was no such thing as love between them. There are even some savages, as the North American Indian tribe, the Tinnes, who have no word for "dear" or "beloved;" and it is said of the Algonquins that when

the Bible was translated into their language a word had to be coined to give expression to our verb "to love." There are other uncivilized races of men that lack greatly in words to express social relations, as, e.g., the Sandwich Islanders, who, according to Lubbock (p. 61-63), possess no words answering to "son," "daughter," "wife," or "husband," due not to poverty of language, but to the fact that "the idea of marriage does not enter into the Hawaiian system of relationship."

Among savages, the peculiar ideas attached to the bond of matrimony make the marriage-ceremony rather an institution peculiar to them. As we have seen above, there are many rude people who do not recognize the symbol of marriage, and, naturally enough, no ceremony is known to them; and then there are many cases in which the marriage bond is recognized, but no ceremony of marriage is observed. "Yet," says Lubbock (p. 58), "we must not assume that marriage is necessarily and always lightly regarded where it is unaccompanied by ceremonial." In Tahiti, says Cook (*Voyage around the World*), "marriage, as appeared to us, is nothing more than an agreement between the man and the woman, with which the priest has no concern. Where it is contracted it appears to be pretty well kept, though sometimes the parties separate by mutual consent" (comp. Klemm, *Cultur der Menschen*, 4:299).

1. Ceremonies. — There cannot be said to exist any marriage ceremonies among the Badagas (Hindostan); the Kurumbas, a tribe of the Neilgherry Hills (*Transact. Ethnol. Soc.* 7:276); the Indians of California (*Smithsoniani Rep.* 1863, p. 368); the Kutchin Indians, further north (*Smith. Rep.* 1866, p. 326); the Arawaks of South America (Brett, *Guiana*, p. 101), and the Brazilian tribes generally (Martins, *Rechtszustand unter den Ureinwohnern Brasiliens*, p. 51); and the same is the case with the Australian tribes (Eyre's *Discoveries*, 2:319). Speke (*Journ.* p. 361) says "there are no such things as marriages in Uganda;" and of the Mandingoes (West Africa), Caille (*Trav. to Timbuctoo*, 1:350) says that husband and wife are not united by any ceremony; and Hutton (in Klemm, *Cultur*, 3:280) makes the same statement as regards the Ashantees. In Congo and Angola (Astley, *Coll. of Voyages*, 3:221, 227) "they use no peculiar ceremonies in marriage, nor scarce trouble themselves for consent of friends." Neither do we find that the Hottentots know anything about marriage ceremonies, if we may follow La Vaillant (*Voy.* 2:58); nor do the Bushmen, according to Mr. Wood (*Nat. Hist. Man*, 1:269), have in their language any means of distinguishing an unmarried from a married girl.

According to Dalton (*Trans. Ethn. Soc.* 6:25), the Keriahs of Central India have no word for marriage in their own language, and the only ceremony used appears to be little more than a sort of public recognition of the fact. “The marital rite among our tribes” (i.e. the Redskins of the United States), says Schoolcraft (*Ind. Tribes*, p. 132, 248), “is nothing more than the personal consent of the parties, without requiring any concurrent act of a priesthood, magistracy, or witnesses; the act is assumed by the parties without the necessity of any extraneous sanction.” “There is,” says Bruce (*Travels*, 4:487), “no such thing as marriage in Abyssinia, unless that which is contracted by mutual consent, without other form, subsisting only till dissolved by dissent of one or the other, and to be renewed or repeated as often as it is agreeable to both parties, who, when they please, live together again as man and wife, after having been divorced, had children by others, or whether they have been married or had children with others or not.” Among the Bedouin Arabs there is a marriage ceremony in the case of a girl, but the remarriage of a widow is not thought sufficiently important to deserve one.

2. Communal Marriage. — Bachofen and M'Lennan, two of the most devoted students of marriage among the savages, will have it that the primitive condition of man was one of pure *Hetairism*, or, as it might perhaps be conveniently Englished, “communal marriage,” where every man and woman in a small community were regarded as equally married to one another. Of course none of our readers will be misled by the use of the word “primitive.” It is not our province here to enter into a discussion on primeval man [see PRE-ADAMITES]; we use the word with reference to the lowest condition of *unchristianized* man, satisfied, as we stated at the beginning of our subject, that the marriage relation, as it exists among civilized men, is due solely to the influence of divine revelation—man’s noblest educator. The most extravagant form of communism we find related of the Techurs of Oude. “They live together almost indiscriminately in large communities, and even when the people are regarded as married the tie is but nominal” (Watson and Kaye, *People of India*, 1:85). In the Andaman Islands, we are told by Sir Edward Belcher (*Trans. Ethn. Soc.* 5. 45), it is the custom for man and woman to remain together until the child is weaned, when they separate as a matter of course, and each seeks a new partner. Among the Southals, one of the aboriginal tribes of India, marriages take place once a year, mostly in January. “For six days all the candidates for matrimony live together in promiscuous concubinage, the

introductory rite to the marital relation; for only after this are the separate couples regarded as having established their right to marry” (Watson and Kaye, 1:2). Among the Todas, of the Hawaiian race, when a man marries a girl, she becomes the wife of all his brothers as they successively reach manhood; and they also become the husbands of all her sisters, as they become old enough to marry. (Comp. here *Ethn. Journ.* 1867, p. 286, on a practice among the Sioux and other North American Indians.) Among the Greenland Esquimaux it is related that “those are reputed the best and noblest tempered who, without any pain or reluctance, will lend their friends their wives” (Egede, *Hist. Greenland*, p. 142). This custom of wife-lending is, however, by no means confined to the inhabitants of Greenland, but prevails among North and South American Indians, Polynesians, Eastern and Western negroes, Arabs, Abyssinians, Kaffirs, Mongols, Tutsi, etc. (see Lubbock, p. 89), and is practiced especially as an act of hospitality. Plutarch will have it that the custom of lending wives existed also among the Romans. Nor must it be forgotten that it was held one of the essentials of the model Platonic republic that “among the guardians, at least, the sexual arrangements should be under public regulation, and the monopoly of one woman by one man forbidden” (Bain, *Mental and Moral Science*; comp. Kames, *Hist. of Man*, 2:50). **SEE PROSTITUTE.** A very peculiar custom is found among the Nassaniyeh Arabs. They practice what might be appropriately termed three-quarter marriage; i.e. the woman is legally married for three days out of four, remaining perfectly free for the fourth (Lubbock, p. 54). In Ceylon, according to Davy (*Ceylon*, p. 286), marriages are provisional for the first fortnight, at the expiration of which they are either annulled or confirmed. Among the Reddies of Southern India a still more singular custom prevails. “A young woman of sixteen or twenty years of age may be married to a boy of five or six years. She, however, lives with some other adult male — perhaps a maternal uncle or cousin—but is not allowed to form a connection with the father’s relatives; occasionally it may be the boy — husband’s father himself—that is, the woman’s father-in-law. Should there be children from these liaisons, they are fathered on the boy-husband. When the boy grows up the wife is either old or past child-bearing, when he, in his turn, takes up with some other boy’s wife in a manner precisely similar to his own, and procreates children for the boy-husband” (Shortt, *Trans. Ethnol. Soc.*, New Series, 7:194).

3. Marriage by Purchase. — Those who believe, like Tyler, M’Lennan, Bachofen, and Lubbock, that the communal system of the marital relation

existed in the primeval state, hold that out of it arose the system of individual marriage. We who depend upon the guidance of a written revelation are rather of the opinion that it is the influence of Christian civilization upon savage life that has led some of them to prefer individual to communal marriage. It is true that the marriage by capture has done much to bring about individual marriage, but it is by no means clear to us that even then the practice was not borrowed from Christianized people directly or indirectly. We certainly do not believe, with Lessing, that nations develop without external influences, that civilization is the possession of every people, and that it is constantly progressive. The condition of the American savage, and the remnants of an early and high civilization, bear witness to the contrary. Yet we believe, with Brinton (*Myths of the New World*, p. 5), that “religious rites are living commentaries on religious beliefs;” and that, while the idea of God does not and cannot proceed from the external world, it nevertheless finds its *historical* origin, also, in the desperate struggle for life, in the satisfaction of the animal wants and passions, in those vulgar aims and motives which possessed the mind of the primitive man to the exclusion of everything else. It is pretty clear that with all pre-Christian nations the modes of getting a wife were the same with those of acquiring any other species of property — capture, gift, sale. The contract of sale may be said to be at the foundation of the marriage relation in every system of ancient law. When daughters belonged to parents as goods, they were parted with only on the principles of fair exchange. Usually the contract was between the heads of families, the intending bride and bridegroom not being consulted. As to the marriage ceremonies, they then were those and no other which were necessary to complete and evidence a sale-delivery, on the price being paid, and “the taking home.” It was never thought of that the children should be consulted, and allowed to act on their likings. Just so the savage has been in a measure addicted to the purchase of his wife, with only this difference, however, that the property is secured by the buyer for himself. In Sumatra, e.g., there were formerly three perfectly distinct kinds of marriage: the “Jugur,” in which the man purchased the woman; the “Ambel-anak,” in which the woman purchased the man (see below, *Polyandry*); and the “Semando,” in which they joined on terms of equality (comp. Marsden, *Hist. of Sumatra*, p. 262 sq.). “Among low races,” says Lubbock (p. 68), ‘the wife is indeed literally the property of the husband, as Petruccio says of Catharine:

*'I will be master of what is mine own.
She is my goods, my chattels; she is my house,
My household stuff, my field, my barn,
My horse, my ox, my ass, my anything.'* “

Still more peculiar and odd are the ceremonies of courtship and marriage in the mountainous districts of Eastern Hungary. In the fall of the year a fair is held there of marriageable young men and women. From all quarters long trains of chariots wind their way to the plain of Kalinosa. They are laden with household furniture, and followed by the cattle of the family. In the midst of these goods may be seen the young lady whom her family has brought to seek a husband at the fair. She is dressed in her best, with brilliant silk scarf and scarlet petticoat. These caravans take up their position one after the other on one side of the plain, while on the other side a cavalcade of young men approaches and deploys along the whole line. The men — young Wallachians, for the most part — are dressed in their best goat-skins, and make what show of horsemanship they can. After both parties have taken up their respective quarters opposite each other, the fathers step forward and begin to negotiate marriages for their children. The questions asked on these occasions are, we fear, of a somewhat sordid character. “How many bullocks?” “How much money?” “Your daughter’s furniture looks rather old; that chest of drawers does not shut properly. I must find something better than that for my son.” Such would doubtless be a correct report of the conversations held in this primitive, if not poetical Arcadia, previous to clinching the matrimonial bargain. The business is, however, carried out with a promptitude equal to its frankness. As soon as the parents are agreed, a priest, who is always ready at hand, is summoned. He chants a hymn and gives his benediction, the bride then kisses her parents, mounts the chariot, and starts for some unknown village with a husband whom she has never seen before, the furniture and cattle which her parents have allowed her as a marriage-portion following in the rear.

5. Marriage by Capture. — Marriage by purchase, however, is by no means the most usual way of the savage to secure a help-meet for himself. Perhaps the general mode by which rude nations enter into the marital relation is that of *capture*. In the opinion of Lubbock, the first state of individual marriage was brought about by capture, and, if he chose to treat of this practice as confined to rude nations, we can see no reason to disagree with him that man came to claim for his sole personal benefit the female he secured from the conquered. Indeed, such a practice finds a

counterpart not only among the pagan nations, but is related of even in the O.-T. Scriptures (~~Exodus~~ Deuteronomy 20:10-14). Our readers must not, however, be led to believe that among savage races marriage by capture means the procuring of a wife by hostility. Many savages, indeed, never secure their female companions except by capture, though they be of the same tribe to which they themselves belong. Indeed, while there are many rude nations that do not tolerate anything else but *endogamy*, i.e. inter-tribal marriage, many others, perhaps the majority, permit only *exogamy*, i.e. marriage without the tribe. (See this head below.) Nor does it at all follow that all exogamous marriages do away with communism. It is simply a step in the right direction, and in many instances has perhaps been instrumental in bringing about individual marriage relations. There is certainly no symbol more widespread, nor more varied in its forms, than that of capture in marriage ceremonies. In many cases feigned theft is necessary to the validity of the marriage. For the Hindu such a marriage form is prescribed in the Sudras (Lassen, *Indische Studien*, p. 325), and in the *Institutes* of Manu marriage by capture is enumerated among “the eight forms of the nuptial ceremony used by the four classes” (chap. 3:33, Jones v. Houghton). “In the description of this marriage, called Racshasa, we have the exact prototype of the Roman and Spartan forms, in a code of laws a thousand years older than our aera” (*Nat. Qu. Rev.* June, 1872, p. 89).

The practice of capture is found in great perfection among the American Indians, existing everywhere throughout the savage races of South America, but more particularly in the regions of the Orinoco and the Amazon. The Fuegians have the practice as well as the fiction of capture. The Horse Indians of Patagonia are commonly at war with each other, or with the Canoe Indians, victory on either side resulting in the capture of women and slaughter of men. The Oens, or Coin men, are more systematic, for every year, at the time of *red leaf*, they are said to make excursions from the mountains in the north to plunder from the Fuegians their women, dogs, and arms (M'Lennan, *Prim. Marriage*, p. 61). The tribes of the Amazon and the Orinoco are in a state of constant warfare, and alternately rich and poor in women. Mr. Bates found the Manaos on the Rio Negro to resemble the Oens in habits. The Caribbees were found by Humboldt to form family groups, often numbering only forty or fifty, which were at constant enmity with each other. Capture prevailed among them to such an extent that the women of any tribe belonged so much to distinct tribes that

in no group were the men and women found to speak the same language (*Personal Narrative of Travels*, v. 210). Among the wild Indians of the North the same account is applicable in varying degrees. Hearne tells us that among the Hudson's Bay Indians "it has ever been the custom for the men to wrestle for any woman to whom they are attached, and, of course, the strongest party always carries off the prize; a weak man, unless he be a good hunter and well-beloved, is seldom permitted to keep a wife that a stronger man thinks worth his notice ... This custom prevails throughout all their tribes, and causes a great spirit of emulation among their youth, who are, upon all occasions, from their childhood, trying their strength and skill in wrestling" (*Voyage to the Northern Ocean*, p. 104). Franklin also says that the Copper Indians hold women in the same low estimation as the Chippewayans do, "looking upon them as a kind of property, which the stronger may take from the weaker" (*Journey to the Shores of the Polar Sea*, 8:43), and Richardson (*Boat Journey*, 2:24) "more than once saw a stronger man assert his right to take the wife of a weaker countryman. Any one may challenge another to wrestle, and, if he overcomes, may carry off the wife as the prize." Yet the women never dream of protesting against this, which, indeed, seems to them perfectly natural.

The capture of women for wives prevails also among the aborigines of the Deccan, and in Afghanistan (Latham, *Descript. Ethinol.* 2:215). It formerly prevailed, according to Olaus Malignus, in Muscovy, Lithuania, and Livonia (*Historiat de gentibus Septentrionalibus*, bk. 14, ch. 9, p. 48). There is ample reason to believe that the practice was general among the nations in the north of Europe and Asia. Olaus Magnus, indeed, represents the tribes of the north as having been continually at war with one another, either on account of stolen women, or with the object of stealing women, "propter raptas virgines aut arripiendas" (*ut sup.* p. 328). In numerous cases the plunderers were of the royal houses of Denmark and Sweden. Among the Scandinavians, before they became Christians, wives were almost invariably fought for and wedded at the sword-point. Among the Kalmucks, Kirghis, Nogais, and Circassians, where the price cannot be agreed upon, nothing is more common than to carry off the lady by force. This capture constitutes a marriage, even before the parties come to terms (M'Lennan, p. 73). The Australians, while having a general system of betrothals, yet employ the practice of capturing wives to a great extent. According to Turnbull, when a man sees a woman whom he likes, he tells her to follow him. If she refuses, he forces her to accompany him by blows,

ending by knocking her down and carrying her off (*Voyage round the World*, 1:81 sq.). Sir George Grey says that many plots are laid to carry off the women, and in the encounters which result they receive usually very harsh treatment.

Many other less barbarous nations keep up the show of force only. The following are among the most marked examples. Among the Khonds the marriage-ceremony begins with a feast at the dwelling of the bride. This is followed by dancing and song. When the night is far spent in these amusements, the principals are lifted by an uncle of each on his shoulders and carried through the dance. Suddenly they exchange burdens, and the uncle of the youth disappears with the bride. The friends of the bride now seek to arrest his flight, those of the groom to cover it, the mock contest that ensues being often carried to great lengths (M'Pherson, *Report upon Khonds*, p. 55). Among the noble class of the Kalmucks a similar form appears. The price to be paid being fixed, the bridegroom and his noble friends go on horseback to her house to carry her off. Her friends make a sham resistance, but she is always carried off, on a richly-caparisoned horse, with loud shouts *and feux de joie* (Xavier de Hell, *Travels in Steppes of Caspian Sea.*, p. 259). Dr. Clarke (*Travels, etc.*, 1:433) describes a different ceremony, probably appertaining to a different clan of the Kalmucks. In this the girl is first mounted on horseback and rides off at full speed pursued by her lover. If he overtakes her, she becomes his wife; but it sometimes happens that the fugitive does not favorably incline towards her pursuer, in which case she will not stiffer him to overtake her. The author was assured that no instance was known of a Kalmuck girl being thus caught unless she had a partiality for her pursuer. In many cases this form of capture has become a mere pretense, as in lifting the bride by force on horseback; or, as in North Friesland, where a young fellow, called the bride-lifter, lifts the bride and the two bridesmaids on a wagon in which the married couple are to travel home (*Weinhold*, p. 50). Among the Bedouins the groom must force the bride to enter his tent. A similar custom existed in some provinces in France in the 17th century (*Marriage Ceremonies, etc.* [Gaya, Lond. 1698], p. 30). Among the Circassians the form is like that in ancient Rome. In the midst of noisy feasting and revelry, the groom must rush in, and, with the help of a few daring young men, carry off the lady by force. By this proceeding she becomes his lawful wife (Louis Moser, *The Caucasuzs and its People*, p. 31). Lord Kames gives a vivid picture of the custom existing in his day, or shortly previous, among

the Welsh. On the morning of the wedding day the groom appeared, with his friends, on horseback, and demanded the bride. Her friends, also mounted, refused. There ensued a mock contest, the bride being carried off mounted behind her nearest kinsman, and pursued with loud shouts. "It is not uncommon to see two or three hundred sturdy Cambro-Britons riding at full speed, crossing and jostling, to the no small amusement of the spectators." When they all were tired, the groom was allowed to overtake the bride and lead her off in triumph (*Sketches of the History of Man* [1807], bk. 1, sec. 6, p. 449). In Africa the same custom exists, as observed by Speke and others. Also throughout America. It is observed in its perfection among the people of Terra del Fuego. As soon as a youthful Fuegian has shown his ability to support a wife by exploits in fishing and bird-catching, *he obtains her parents' consent*, builds or steals a canoe, and watches his chance to carry her off. If she is opposed, she hides in the woods till he is tired of looking for her; but this seldom happens (Fitzroy and King, *Voyage of the Beagle*, 2:182). Sir Henry Piers, in 1682, describes a custom of like nature among the ancient Irish. The ceremony commenced with the drinking of a bottle of good *usquebaugh*, called the agreement bottle. Next the payment of the portion was agreed upon, generally a fixed number of cows. On the day of bringing home, the two parties rode out to meet each other. "Being come near to each other, the custom was of old to cast short darts at the company that attended the bride, but at such distance that seldom any hurt ensued" (*Collectanea de Rebus Hibernicis*, 1:122). The Turcoman youth elopes with his lady-love to some neighboring village, where they live five or six weeks. In the mean time his friends obtain the consent of the parents. Afterwards the bride returns to her own home, where she is retained for six months or a year, sometimes two years, and is not allowed to see her husband except by stealth (Fraser, *Journey*, 2:372). This custom of spending the honey-moon away from home is observed by various other tribes, and has its counterpart in the civilized custom of a wedding journey.

Among the Bedouins of Sinai, the maiden, when coming home in the evening with the cattle, is attacked by the groom and two of his friends. She often defends herself fiercely with stones. The more she struggles, bites, and cries, the more her own companions applaud her. She is taken to her father's tent, where follows the ceremony of throwing over her the abba, or man's cloak, and the name of the groom is formally announced. In the Mezeyvne tribe, the girl, after being captured as above, is permitted to

escape from her tent and fly to the neighboring mountains. The groom goes in search of her, and is often many days in finding her. Her female companions know her hiding-place, and keep her supplied with provisions. The length of time she remains hidden from the groom depends greatly upon the impression he has made upon her heart. After being found she returns home, but runs away again in the evening. These flights are several times repeated before she finally returns to her tent. It is sometimes a year before she goes to live in her husband's tent (Burckhardt, *Notes*, 1:269).

6. Exogamy and Endogamy. — Marriage by capture, it is held by Lubbock and others of his class, led to the practice of exogamous marriages. We are, however, of the opinion that the great prevalence of infanticide (q.v.) among savages, especially the destruction of female infants, caused a paucity of women, and made it necessary to secure wives from hostile tribes. On this ground we can easily explain the predominance of exogamy over endogamy. Among the Khonds, intermarriage between members of the same tribe, we are told by M'Pherson (*Account of the Religion of the Khonds*, p. 57), is considered incestuous, and punishable with death. Many savage races have even established something of a caste distinction for this purpose. Thus, e.g., the Kalmucks are divided into four great nations or tribes, subdivided again into many smaller clans. The common people do not marry within three or four degrees of relationship. But no member of the noble class can marry within his own tribe; his wife must be a noble, and of a different stock (Bergmann, *Streifereien*, 3:155). The Circassians are forbidden to marry within their own fraternities, though these sometimes comprise several thousand members. Formerly such a marriage was considered as incest, and punished by drowning; now a fine of two hundred oxen, and the restitution of the wife to her parents, are exacted (Bell, *Journal of a Residence in Circassia*, 1:347). The Yurak Samoyedes of Siberia consider all the members of the tribe as relations, however large the tribe, and forbid marriage within the tribe limits (Latham, *Descriptive Ethnology*, 2:455). The system among the North American Indians is very similar. The tribal affiliation of each person is distinguished by his *tolem*, generally some animal sacred to the tribe. Marriage is forbidden between persons of the same tolem." Lalitau considers each nation as divided into clans, whose members are spread indiscriminately through the nation, and says that no clansman could marry a member of his own clan. Every child was considered as belonging to the clan of its mother (1:558). The Indians of Guiana have similar customs. The Brazilian Indians vary, some being

exogamous, others endogamous in their customs. Among the Tinne Indians of the North the same rule holds. A man who marries a woman of his own tribe is laughed to scorn, and considered as marrying his own sister, even if she belong to a separate division of the tribe (*Notes on Tinneh, Smithsonian Report, 1866*). In India the custom prevails to a considerable extent, and is of very ancient origin, the *Institutes* of Manu prescribing that a “twice-born” man shall not marry a woman related to him within the sixth degree, or one bearing his family name (ch. 3, § 5). The Battas of Sumatra enforce this custom of exogamy by a mode of punishment which we should imagine would effectually secure its observance. They punish those who impiously marry within the tribe by cutting them up alive, and eating them, grilled or raw, with salt and red pepper. They claim that marriage between a man and woman who had common ancestors is highly criminal (Taylor, *Nat. Hist. of Society, 1:122*). The principle of exogamy is strictly enforced among the Australian tribes. These savages are divided into small tribes, named after the districts which they inhabit. The tribe inhabiting a particular district considers itself the owner thereof, and vigorously resents any intrusion. Yet there are many tribes often found inhabiting the same area quite differently disposed. Thus on the subHimalayan ranges are certain tribes which forbid intermarriage of clansmen, and others which forbid marriage outside of the tribe limits. In some districts, as in the hills on the north-eastern frontier of India, in the Caucasus, and the hill-ranges of Syria. are found a variety of tribes undoubtedly of the same original stock, yet in this particular utterly differing — some forbidding marriage within the tribe, and some proscribing marriage without it (M'Lennan, p. 147)

7. Polyandry and Polygyny. — The paucity of women not only reveals to us the reason why exogamy became so generally established among rude nations, but also easily explains the practice of *polyandry*, which we are told by best authorities exists to a moderate extent among savage races. Lubbock, however, will have it that “polyandry, or the marriage of one woman to several men at once, is more common than is generally supposed, though much less so than polygamy” (p. 55; compare p. 100). It prevails in its most striking form throughout Thibet and in the Himalayan regions. It is also met with in Ceylon, among tribes of the north of Asia, and in parts of Africa and America. In former times it seems to have prevailed still more widely. Tacitus found traces of it among the Germans; and Strabo tells us that in certain cantons of Media a woman was looked

upon with contempt who had less than five husbands (lib. 2, p. 794). Caesar tells us that in his time polyandry prevailed among the Britons (*De Bello Gallico*, lib. 5, ch. 14); and other traces of its former existence remain. It occurs in two distinct forms: the ruder, that in which the husbands are not brothers; the less rude, that in which they are brothers. The latter form only prevails in Thibet. In several other places, as in Ceylon, the two forms coexist. In Thibet the choice of the wife is the privilege of the elder brother. The number of husbands does not appear to be defined or restricted within fixed limits. The same system prevails throughout the Himalayan regions, and generally in Ceylon. Humboldt found this form among the South American savages, and Caesar among the ancient Britons. In connection with the polyandry of Ceylon are two distinct forms of marriage the Diga and the Bina. The first occurs when the wife goes to live in the house or village of her husband; the second, when the husband or husbands come to Live with her. Among the Kandyans, the right of inheritance of a woman and her children depends on whether she is a dîga or a bîna wife (Forbes, *Ceylon*, 1:333). Among the Kochs, though their marriage is now monogamous, a like system prevails, seeming to point to former polyandry (compare, on the prevalence of polyandry, M'Lennan, p. 180 sq.; Lubbock, p. 100 sq.).

8. Family Relations among Savages. — That the marriage system in such imperfect stages of development as we find it to be among savage races cannot furnish any of the advantages guaranteed by the Biblical marriage system, will appear to all a matter hardly necessary to be dwelt upon. Yet there are some faint ideas of the family relation, as we conceive it, prevailing among rude nations also. That polyandry, polygamy, and communism cannot establish the relationship of father and mother, is clearly apparent. Exogamy, however, will do this measurably, especially where it approaches the monogamous system. In communal marriage no man can identify his father; the child is raised by the mother as a sort of tribal property, and naturally enough assumes her name, and only considers parentage as existing in the female line. This gave rise to the wide-spread system of *kinship through the mother* only, continuing to exist in many cases, though the cause which provoked it has disappeared. There is good reason to believe that this system formerly existed among the Celts, and Max Muller (*Chips from a German Workshop*) has traced it to the ancient Brahmins. It also appears to have been in existence in the Shemitic races, and is traceable in the Grecian systems. Its effect is visible in the habits of

many modern tribes, and shows itself evidently in the wide-spread habit, of which we have already given several instances, of naming the child after the clan of its mother, and considering it as belonging especially to her family. Another cause of this lack of knowledge of the paternal relation might be habits similar to those attributed by Lafitau to the North American Indians, who, he says, visited their wives, as it were, by stealth: "Ils n'osent aller dans les cabanes particuliers ou habitent leurs spouses, que durent l'obscurité de la nuit... ce serait un action extraordinaire de s'y présenter le jour" (1:576). Herodotus says that the Lycians named the children from the mother. On the Etruscan tombs descent is traced in the female line. Many modern instances exist besides those we have already mentioned. We may instance the Nairs, and other peoples of India; the Saporogian Cossacks, certain Chinese communities, the Berberts of Sahara, and various other African tribes. Among the Buntar — the highest rank of Sudras in Tulava — a man's children are not his heirs. During his lifetime he may give them money, but all of which he dies possessed goes to his sisters and to their children. When a rich man died in Guinea, his property descended to his sister's son. Battel says the town of Loango was governed by four chiefs, the sons of the king's sister; for king's sons never became kings. Quatremere relates that, "Chez les Nubiens, dit Abon Selah, lorsqu'un roi vient à mourir et qu'il laisse un fils et un neveu du côté de sa sœur, celui-ci monte sur le trône de préférence à l'héritier naturel" (*Geograph. sur l'Égypte*, etc.). I'Lennan (*Primit. Marriage*, p. 247) thus traces the development of the family relation to our present status; and though we have said from the outset that we cannot sanction the position taken by him and others of his class, we will not refuse them an introduction to our readers: "The polyandry, in which all the husbands were brothers, would establish the certainty of the children being of their own blood. In time the eldest brother became considered, by a species of fiction, the father of all the children; the mother was deposed from the headship of the family, and kinship became established in the paternal line. The elder brother became a sort of paterfamilias; the right of succession being in the younger brothers in their order, and, after them, in the eldest son. Thus the idea of fatherhood grew up through the Thibetan system of polyandry. In most races, though, as the sexes became more evenly balanced, *through progress towards civilization*, the system of monogamy or of polygamy would arise. Paternity thus becoming certain, the practice of sons succeeding as heirs direct to their father's estates would ensue, and, as this idea of paternal kinship arose, that of maternal relationship would die

away.” “Our family system, in which the child is equally related to both its parents,” says Lubbock (p. 110), “appears at first sight the only natural one, but it is merely so in connection with our marriage system, there being sufficient reason to conclude as we have seen, that the child is first related to the family group only; then to the mother, and not to the father; afterwards to the father, and not to the mother; and, only as a final result of *civilization*, becomes related to both.” Maine (*Ancient Law*) and other writers of his class, however, hold to a theory that considers man’s history, in the light of divine revelation, to open with perfect recognition of such kinship. In their view the family, under the father’s government, was considered the primary unit, containing the germs of the state and of royalty. The family gathers other families about it, becoming the center of a group; and these groups, tracing back their descent to a common origin, aggregate into tribes and nations. Tribes are numerous which make this claim to common descent. But, upon inquiry, the ancestor of the race is always a legendary hero or god — a being invented to explain the origin of the tribe. In some cases the time of the invention is known, as with the Greek tribes which traced their descent to the sons of Helen.

There are several other peculiar customs widely in vogue relating to marriage, some of which are so curious that it will be well to give a brief description of them also. The strangest of these is the general avoidance of intercourse between children and parents-in-law, in which the one is often forbidden to look at; or mention the name of the other. The reason or the origin of these customs, or of the many strange forms which these assume, is not clear to us, and we can only give some instances of their general character. Under the peculiar Fijian system known as the *tabu*, the husband and wife are forbidden to eat from the same dish. (Compare the above custom among the Hindus.) In other places the father is not permitted to speak to the son after the latter is fifteen years old (Williamms, *Fiji*, 1:136). Among many races the woman is absolutely forbidden to speak to her son-in-law. This system prevails generally among the American Indians (*Origin of Civilizations*, p. 7). Among the Omahaws neither the father nor mother in-law will hold direct communication with their son-in-law (James, *Exp. to Rocky Mountains*, 1:232). Under the social system of the Mongols and Kalmucks a similar restriction appears, the wife being forbidden to speak to her father-in-law, or to sit in his presence. With the Ostiaks of Siberia a similar rule holds (“Un fille mariee dvite autant qu’il lui est possible la prisence du pere de son mari, tant qu’elle n’a pas d’enfant; et le

mari, pendant ce temps, n'ose pas paraitre devant la mere de sa femme. S'ils se rencontrent par hasard, le mari lui tourne le dos, et la femme se couvre le visage" [Pallas, 4:71]). In China customs of a like nature exist, and also in some of the Pacific islands. In some cases this peculiar system assumes the strangest and most decided form. In Central Africa the lover carefully avoids seeing either the father or mother of his future bride, taking great precautions to avoid an encounter. If he is of a different camp, this prohibition extends to all the members of the lady's camp, except a few special friends with whom he is permitted to have intercourse. He avoids passing through the camp, and, if obliged to do so, carefully covers his face (Caille, *Travels to Timbuctoo*, 1:94). This appears to be a relic of the old system of capture, in which the captor would approach with the greatest stealth, and carefully avoid being observed by the inmates of the opposite camp, as in the case of the Australians above described.

Another custom widely prevalent, and of a yet stranger character, is that known in Bearl as *La Couvade*. It consists in putting the husband to bed on the birth of a child, and nursing him with the greatest care, while the mother goes to her usual duties. In some cases the poor fellow is put on such a strict regimen that he really becomes sick. There are, in fact, cases in which his peculiar sufferings are continued for several months, and he is so hardly dealt with that a real sickness would be far more endurable. Cases of this description occur in various parts of America, and in many regions of Europe and Asia, taking often the strangest forms. The idea thus symbolized is that the child is affected by anything happening to its nearest parent, and that any intemperance in eating, drinking, or otherwise, seriously affects the health of the child. Under the idea of male kinship, the father was considered the nearest parent; hence, was obliged to perform this peculiar penance. Max Müller says that the poor husband was first tyrannized over by his female relatives, and afterwards frightened into superstitiously making a martyr of himself, until he became really ill, or took to his bed in self-defense (*Chips from a German Workshop*, 2:281). Lafitau regards it as arising from a dim recollection of original sin, rejecting the Carib explanation that if the father engaged in rough labor, or was careless in his diet, "cela feroit mal h l'enfant, et que cet enfant participeroit b tous les defauts naturels des animaux dont le pere auroit mange" (1:259). For additional illustrations, *SEE WEDLOCK*. (J. H. W.)