THE AGES DIGITAL LIBRARY

REFERENCE

CYCLOPEDIA of BIBLICAL, THEOLOGICAL and ECCLESIASTICAL LITERATURE

Matter, Jacques- Mcvickar, John

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

Matter, Jacques

a noted French historian and philosopher, was born in Alt-Eckendorf, Alsace, May 31, 1791. His parents were Germans, and, though living under French rule, remained true to the fatherland. Jacques, however, was taught French from his childhood, as he was expected to take a position under the French government. He was intended for the legal profession, and, after enjoying the best educational advantages of private instructors, was sent to the gymnasium at Strasburg, and then entered as a student at the University of Gottingen, Germany, where he enjoyed the instruction and association of Heeren, the noted historian, and Eichhorn, the celebrated Orientalist. He removed to Paris with a diplomatic career in view, attended the lectures of the Faculty of Letters, and wrote his *Essai historique sur lecole d'Alexandrie* (published in 1820), which, crowned by the academy in 1816, gave him a reputation among those French scholars who were interested in German erudition. By favor of Royer-Collard and Guizot, he received in 1819 a professorship in the College of Strasburg, which he exchanged two years afterwards for the directorship of the gymnasium and the professorship of ecclesiastical history in the Protestant academy of the same city. Applying himself to the study of ecclesiastical history and philosophy, he wrote *Histoire critique du Gnosticismze* (Paris, 1828, 2 vols. 8vo; 2d ed. 1843-44, 3 vols. 8vo), and *Histoire universelle de l'Eglise Chretienne* (1829-32, 3 vols.; 2d edit. 1838). In 1828 he was appointed inspector of the Academy of Strasburg, and, in 1831, corresponding member of the Academy of Inscriptions. His treatise *De l'influence des sooeurs sur les lois et des lois sur les moeurs* (Paris, 1832) received from the academy the extraordinary prize of 10,000 francs. In 1832 he was appointed by Guizot general inspector of the University of Paris, and removed to that city. Among his later productions are, *Histoire des doctrines morales et politiques des trois derniers siecles* (1836-37, 3 vols.): — *De l'affaiblissement des idees et des etudes morales* (1841): — *Schellig et la philosophie de la nature* (1842): — *De l'etat morale politique et litteraire de l'Allemagne* (1847, 2 vols.): — *listoire de la philosophic dans ses rapports avec la religion* (1854): -*Philosophie de la religion* (1857, 2 vols): — *Morale, philosophie des moeurs* (1860): — *St. Martin, philos. inconnu* (1862): — *Emmnanuel de Swedenborg* (1863): — *Le Mysticisme en France aux temps de Fenelon* (1864). He has also written occasional treatises concerning schools and education, and

numerous articles in the *Dictionnaire de la conversation* and other cyclopaedias. He died at Strasburg June 23, 1864.

Matthai, Christian Friedrich Von

a noted German theologian, was born in Thuringia in 1744; was educated at the University of Leipsic, and immediately upon the completion of his studies became rector of the Gymnasium at Moscow. While here he devoted himself to a critical study of the Greek fathers of the Church, and published editions of the writings of Chrysostom, Basil the Great, and others. He was promoted to a professorship in the university about 1776, but in 1785 gladly accepted the position of rector at Meissen — this affording him an opportunity to return to his fatherland. In 1789 he was called to the University of Wittenberg, whence he again returned to Moscow in 1805. He died in Russia Sept. 26,1811. Matthai, besides patristic studies, devoted himself largely to exegesis. He edited the commentary of Euthymius Zigabenus on the Gospels, with notes, and Nemesius of Emesa on the Nature of Man. But his most celebrated critical labor is his edition of the Greek Testament, for which he made an extensive collation of manuscripts; though, as he chiefly followed the authority of one class, the Byzantine, his edition is less valuable in itself than as a collection of materials for the further labors of the critical editor. A second edition of this Testament appeared in 1803-7, in 3 vols. 8vo. The work is entitled *Novum Test. Graece et Latine: Textum denuo recensuit, varias Lectiones numquam antea vulgatas collegit, scholia Graeca addidit, animadversiones criticas adjecit,* etc. (Rigse, 1782-88, 12 vols. 8vo). The competent judgment of Michaelis pronounces its great value in few words. He says: “He has made his collection of various readings with great labor and diligence; he found in his MSS. a confirmation of many readings, which I should have hardly expected, because they are found in MSS. of a different kind and of a different country from those which he used; nay, even those of the Western edition, of which he speaks with the utmost contempt, he has corroborated by the evidence of his Moscow MSS. This edition is absolutely necessary for every man who is engaged in the criticism of the Greek Testament.” See Doring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands d.* 18ten *u.* 19ten *Jarh.* vol. 2, s.v.; Home, *Introd. to the Crit. Study of the Scriptures;* Kitto, *Cyclop. Bibl. Lit.* vol. 3, s.v.

Matthaeus, Cantacuzenus

co-emperor of Constantinople, was the eldest son of the far-more illustrious John V Cantacuzenus (Johannes VI). At twenty-one, four years before he was of age, he was associated by his father in the supreme government as a means of checking the rebellion of John Palaeologus. This measure of Cantacuzenus. however, owing to the popularity of Palaeologus, failed in its design, and in 1355 the associate emperors, father and son, were compelled to abdicate the throne in favor of their rival. Matthaeus now retired with his father to a monastic life in the convents of Mount Athos. He married Irene Palueologina, and became the father of six children. His death, preceding that of his father, occurred towards the end of the 14th century. He was a man of much learning, and the author of various works, mostly Biblical commentaries, several of which are still extant in MS. The one entitled *Commentarii in Cantica Canticorun* has been published. See Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology, s.v.*

Mat'than

(40115Matthew 1:15). *SEE MATTAN*.

Mat'that

*(*Ματθάτ, prob. some form of the name *Matthan),* the name of two men mentioned only in the New Test. as maternal ancestors of Jesus. *SEE GENEALOGY OF JESUS CHRIST*.

1. The son of Levi and father of Jorim, of the private line between David and Zerubbabel (40329Luke 3:29). B.C. post 623.

2. The son of another Levi, and father of the Eli who was the father of the Virgin Mary (40324Luke 3:24). B.C. considerably ante 22.

Matthe'las

(Μαθήλας v r. Μαηλάς,Vulg. *Mareas),* a corrupt Greek form (1 Esdras 9:19) of the MAASEIAH *SEE MAASEIAH* (q.v.) of the Hebrew text (15103Ezra 10:8). "The reading of the Sept., which is followed in the A.V., might easily arise from a mistake between the uncial Θ and Σ (C)."

Matthes

KARL, a Lutheran minister in the duchy of Altenburg, in Germany, was born Dec. 26, 1811, at Eisenberg. His early studies were pursued at the lyceum of his native town, and in 1830 he entered the University of Jena as a student of theology. After completing his studies in 1833, he spent several years in the capacity of family tutor and as a teacher, and finally, in 1843, became the pastor of Ober-Arnsdorf. In 1864 he was transferred to Bornshain, where he died suddenly July 3, 1865. Matthes possessed in a rare degree the love and esteem of his acquaintances, who applied to him the saying of Luther, "He *lived* what we preach." His ripe culture, theological knowledge, and penetrating judgment find expression in his works, which comprise a *Leben Philip Melancthon's* (of which a second edition appeared in 1846) and a *Vergleichende Symbolik* (published in 1854). In the latter year he assumed the publication of the *Allgemeine kirchliche Chronik,* a brief but comprehensive annual, reviewing important matters in the field of Church and theology.

Mat'thew

(Ματθαῖος v. r. Μαθθαῖος**),** one of the apostles and evangelists. In the following account of him and his Gospel we have endeavored to collect and arrange all that is definitely known on the subject.

I. *His Name.* — According to Gesenius, the names *Matthaeus* and *Matthias* are both contractions of *Maittathias (*hy;t]Tam; "gift of Jehovah;" Θεόδωρος, θεόδοτος*),* a common Jewish name after the exile. *SEE MATTITHIAH*. Matthew had also the name of *Levi* (<40214>Mark 2:14; Luke v. 27). In the catalogues — <40318>Mark 3:18; <40615>Luke 6:15-he is coupled with Thomas, which has given rise to the not altogether unfounded conjecture that Matthew was the twin brother of Thomas *(*µwaT]a *twin),* whose real name, according to Eusebius, *H. E.* 1:13, was Judas, and that they were both "brethren of our Lord" (Donaldson, *Jashar,* p. 10; comp. <401355>Matthew 13:55; <41603>Mark 6:3). This last supposition would account for Matthew's immediate obedience to the call of Christ, but is hardly consistent with the indefiniteness of the words with which he is introduced-ἄνθρωπον Ματθ. λεγόμ. (<40909>Matthew 9:9); τελώνην ὀνόματι Λευΐν (Luke v. 27) — or the unbelief of our Lord's brothers (<430705>John 7:5). Heracleon, as quoted by Clem. Alex *(Strom.* 4:11), mentions Levi as well as Matthew among the early teachers who did not suffer martyrdom.

Origen also *(Contr. Cels.* 1, sec. 62 [48]) speaks of ὁ Λεβὴς τελώνης ἀκολουθήσας τῷ Ἰησὸυ, together with "Matthew the publican;" but the names Λεβής and Δευΐς are by no means identical, and there is a hesitation about his language which shows that even then the tradition was hardly trustworthy. The attempt of Theod. Hase *(Bibl. Brem.* v. 475) to identify Levi with the apostle Lebbseus is an example of misapplied ingenuity which deserves little attention (comp. Wolf. *Cur.* ad Marc. 2:14). The distinction between Levi and Matthew has, however, been maintained by Grotius (though he acknowledges that the voice of antiquity is against him, "et sane congruunt circumstantiae"), Michaelis, De Wette, Sieffert, Ewald, etc. But it is in the highest degree improbable that two publicans should have been called by Christ in the same words, at the same place, and with the same attendant circumstances and consequences; and that, while one became an apostle, the other dropped entirely out of memory. Still less can we acquiesce in the hypothesis of Sieffert *(Urspir. d. erst. Kanon. Ev.* p. 59) and Ewald *(Drei Erst. Ev.* p. 344: *Christus,* p. 289, 321) that the name "Matthew" is due to the Greek editor of Matthew's Gospel, who substituted it by an error in the narrative of the call of Levi. On the other hand, their identity was assumed by Eusebius and Jerome, and most ancient writers, and has been accepted by the soundest commentators (Tischendorf, Meyer, Neander, Lardner, Ellicott, etc.). The double name only supplies a difficulty to those who are resolved to find such everywhere in the Gospel narrative. It is analogous to what we find in the case of Simon Peter, John Mark, Paul, Jude, etc., which may all admit of the same explanation, and be regarded as indicating a crisis in the spiritual life of the individual, and his passing into new external relations. He was no longer ywale but yTmi, not *Levi* but *Theodore* — one who might well deem both himself and all his future life a veritable "gift of God" (Ellicott, *Hist. Lect.* p. 172; compare Meyer, *Comment.* 1:2; Winer, *R. W. B.* s.v. Matthiius, Name). See Michaelis. *Einleit.* 2:934; Kraft, *Observ. sacr.* v. 3; Bid, in the *Bibl. Brenl.* 6:1038; Heumann, *Erklar. d.* N.T. 1:538; Frisch, *Diss. de Levi c. Matth. non confundendo* (Leips. 1746); Thiers, *Krit. Comment.* 1:90; Sieffert, *Urspir. d. Kanon. Evang.* p. 54. *SEE NAME*.

II. *Scripture Statements respecting him.* — His father's name was Alphaeus (<410214>Mark 2:14), probably different from the father of James the son of Mary, the wife of Cleophas, who was a "sistef" of the mother of Jesus (<431925>John 19:25). *SEE ALPHAEUS*. His call to be an apostle (A.D. 27) is related by all three evangelists in the same words, except that

Matthew 9:9 gives the usual name, and Mark 2:14 and Luke 5:27 that of Levi. Matthew's special occupation was probably the collection of dues and customs from persons and goods crossing the Lake of Gennesareth. It was while he was actually engaged in his duties, καθημένον ἐπὶ τὸ τελώνιον, that he received the call, which he obeyed without delay. Our Lord was then invited by him to a "great feast" (Luke 5:29), to which perhaps, as Neander has suggested *(Life of Christ,* p. 230, Bohn; comp. Blunt, *Undes. Coincid.* p. 257), by way of farewell, his old associates, ὄχλος τελώνων πολύς, were summoned. The publicans, properly so called *(publicani),* were persons who farmed the Roman taxes, and they were usually, in later times, Roman knights, and persons of wealth and credit. They employed under them inferior officers, natives of the province where the taxes were collected, called properly *portitores,* to which class Matthew no doubt belonged. These latter were notorious for impudent exactions everywhere (Plautus, *Menoech.* 1:2, 5; Cic. *ad Quint. Fir.* 1:1; Plut. *De Curios.* p. 518 e); but to the Jews they were especially odious, for they were the very spot where the Roman chain galled them, the visible proof of the degraded state of their nation. As a rule, none but the lowest would accept such an unpopular office, and thus the class became more worthy of the hatred with which in any case the Jews would have regarded it. The readiness, however, with which Matthew obeyed the call of Jesus seems to show that his heart was still open to religious impressions. We find in Luke 6:13, that when Jesus, before delivering the Sermon on the Mount, selected twelve disciples, who were to form the circle of his more intimate associates, Matthew was one of them. On a subsequent occasion (Luke v. [29]), Matthew gave the parting entertainment to his friends. After this event he is mentioned only in Acts 1:13. A.D. 29.

III. *Traditionary Notices.* — According to a statement in Clemens Alexandrinus *(Paedagog.* 2:1), Matthew abstained from animal food. Hence some writers have rather hastily concluded that he belonged to the sect of the Essenes. It is true that the Essenes practiced abstinence in a high degree, but it is not true that they rejected animal food altogether. Admitting the account in Clemens Alexandrinus to be correct, it proves only a certain ascetic strictness, of which there occur vestiges in the habits of other Jews (comp. Josephus, *Life,* 2 and 3). Some interpreters find also in Romans 14 an allusion to Jews of ascetic principles.

According to another account, which is as old as the first century, and which occurs in the Κήρυγμα Πέτρου in Clemens Alexandrinus *(Stroml.* 6:15), Matthew, after the death of Jesus, remained about fifteen years in Jerusalem. This agrees with the statement in Eusebius *(Hist. Eccles.* 3:24), that Matthew preached to his own nation before he went to foreign countries. Rufinus *(Hist. Eccles.* 10:9) and Socrates *(Hist. Eccles.* 1:19) state that he afterwards went into Ethiopia (Meroe); but Ambrose says that God opened to him the country of the Persians *(In Psalm* 45); Isidore, the Macedonians (Isidore Hisp. *De Sanct.* 77); and others the Parthians, the Medes, the Persians of the Euphrates (comp. Florini *Exercit. hist. phil.* p. 23; Credner, *Einl. ins N.T.* I, 1:58). There also he probably preached specially to the Jews. See Abdiae, *Histor. Apost.* 7, in Fabricii *Cod. apocrs.* 1:636; Perionii *Vit. Apost.* p. 114; comp. *Martyrol. Roma.* Sept. 21. According to Heracleon (about A.D. 150) and Clemens Alexandrinus *(Stronz.* 4:9), Matthew was one of those apostles who did not suffer martyrdom, which Clement, Origen, and Tertullian seem to accept: the tradition that he died a martyr, be it true or false, came in afterwards (Niceph. II.E. 2:41). Tischendorf has published the apocryphal "Acts and Martyrdom of Matthew" *(Acta Apocrypha,* Lips. 1841). *SEE ACTS, SPURIOUS.*

Matthew, Gospel Of,

the first of the four memoirs of our Lord in all the arrangements. *SEE NEW TESTAMENT.*

I. *Author.* — There is no ancient book with regard to the authorship of which we have earlier, fuller, and more unanimous testimony. From Papias, almost if not quite contemporary with the apostles, downwards, we have a stream of unimpeachable witnesses to the fact that Matthew was the author of a gospel; while the quotations which abound in the works of the fathers prove that at least as early as Irenaeus — if we may not also add Justin, whose "Memorabilia of Christ" we cannot but identify with the "Gospels" he speaks of as in public use — the Gospel received by the Church under his name was the same as that which has reached us. As in the case of the other synoptists, a subsidiary argument of no small weight in favor of the correctness of this assignment may be drawn from the comparative insignificance of Matthew among the twelve. Any one desirous of imposing a spurious gospel on the Church would naturally have assumed one of the

principal apostles as its author, instead of one whose name could add but little weight or authority to the composition.

Nevertheless a number of alleged circumstances have led Strauss and others to consider the Gospel of Matthew as an unapostolical composition, originating perhaps at the conclusion of the first century; while some consider it a production of the Aramsean Matthew, augmented by some additions; others call it a historical commentary of a later period, made to illustrate the collection of the sayings of Christ which Matthew had furnished (comp. Sieffert, *Ueber die Aechtheit und den Ursprung des ersten Evalgelii.* 1832; Schneckenburger, *Ueber den Ursprung des ersten Evangelii.* 1834; Schott, *Ueber die Authenticitat des Ev. Matt.* 1837).

(1st.) The representations of Matthew (it is said) have not that vivid clearness which characterizes the narration of an eye-witness, and which we find, for instance, in the Gospel of John. Even Mark and Luke surpass Matthew in this respect. Compare, for example, <4004>Matthew 4:18 with <4201>Luke 5:1 sq.; <4008>Matthew 8:5 sq, with <4207>Luke 7:1 sq. This is most striking in the history of his own call, where we should expect a clearer representation. To this it may be replied that the gift of narrating luminously is a personal qualification of which even an apostle might be destitute, and which is rarely found among the lower orders of people; this argument, therefore, has recently been given up altogether, In the history of his call to be an apostle, Matthew has this advantage over Mark and Luke, that he relates the discourse of Christ (<4013>Matthew 9:13) with greater completeness than these evangelists. Luke relates that Matthew prepared a great banquet in his house, while Matthew simply mentions that an entertainment took place, because the apostle could not well write that he himself prepared a great banquet.

(2d.) He omits some facts which every apostle certainly knew. For instance, he mentions only one journey of Christ to the Passover at Jerusalem, namely, the last; and seems to be acquainted only with one sphere of Christ's activity, namely, Galilee. He even relates the instances of Christ's appearing after his resurrection in such a manner that it might be understood as if he showed himself only to the women in Jerusalem, and to his disciples nowhere but in Galilee (<4032>Matthew 26:32, and 28:7). But an *argumentum a silentio* must not be urged against the evangelists. The raising of Lazarus is narrated only by John, and the raising of the youth at Nain only by Luke; the appearance of five hundred brethren after the

resurrection, which, according to the testimony of Paul (<46516>1 Corinthians 15:6), was a fact generally known, is not recorded by any of the evangelists. The apparent restriction of Christ's sphere of activity to Galilee, we find also in Mark and Luke. This peculiarity arose perhaps from the circumstance that the apostles first taught in Jerusalem, where it was unnecessary to relate what had happened there, but where the events which had taken place in Galilee were unknown, and required to be narrated: thus the sphere of narration may have gradually become fixed. At least it is generally granted that hitherto no satisfactory explanation of this fact has been discovered. The expressions in <40262>Matthew 26:32, and 28:7, perhaps only indicate that the Lord appeared more frequently and for a longer period in Galilee than elsewhere. In <40216>Matthew 28:16, we are told that the disciples in Galilee went up to a mountain, whither Christ had appointed them to come; and, since it is not previously mentioned that any such appointment had been made, the narrative of Matthew himself here leads us to conclude that Christ appeared to his disciples in Jerusalem after his resurrection.

(3d.) He relates unchronologically, and transposes events to times in which they did not happen; for instance, the rejection at Nazareth, mentioned in <42414>Luke 4:14-30, must have happened at the commencement of Christ's public career, but Matthew relates it as late as <40153>Matthew 13:53 sq. But, on the other hand, there is no reason to suppose that the evangelists intended to write a chronological biography. On the contrary, we learn from <42104>Luke 1:4, and <43031>John 20:31, that their object was of a more practical and apologetic tendency. With the exception of John, the evangelists have grouped their communications more according to subjects than according to chronological succession. This fact is now generally admitted. As to the particular event above referred to, namely, the rejection of Christ at Nazareth, it appears to have occurred twice; Luke (<42414>Luke 4:14-31) giving the earlier, and Matthew (<40153>Matthew 13:53-58) the later instance. See Strong's *Harmony of the Gospels, §* 32, 60, and notes.

(4th.) He embodies in one discourse several sayings of Christ which, according to Luke, were pronounced at different times (comp. Matthew 5-7, and 23). But if the evangelist arranges his statements according to subjects, and not chronologically, we must not be surprised that he connects similar sayings of Christ, inserting them in the longer discourses after analogous topics had been mentioned. These discourses are not, in fact, compiled by the evangelist, but always form the fundamental

framework to which sometimes analogous subjects are attached. Moreover, it can be proved that several sayings are more correctly placed by Matthew than by Luke (compare especially <42337>Matthew 23:37-39 with <42134>Luke 13:34, 35).

(5th.) He falls, it is asserted, into positive errors. In ch. i and ii he seems not to know that the real dwellingplace of the parents of Jesus was at Nazareth, and that their abode at Bethlehem was only temporary (compare <40201>Matthew 2:1, 22, 23 with <42204>Luke 2:4, 39). According to <41120>Mark 11:20, [2]1, the fig-tree withered on the day after it was cursed; but according to <40219>Matthew 21:19, it withered immediately. According to <40212>Matthew 21:12, Christ purified the Temple immediately after his entrance into Jerusalem; but according to Mark he on that day went out to Bethany, and purified the Temple on the day following (<41111>Mark 11:11-15). <40207>Matthew 21:7 says that Christ rode on a she-ass and on a colt, which is impossible; the other Gospels speak only of a she-ass. But it depends entirely upon the mode of interpretation whether such positive errors as are alleged to exist are really chargeable on the evangelist. The difference, for instance, between the narrative of the birth of Christ, as severally recorded by Matthew and Luke, may easily be solved without questioning the correctness of either, if we suppose that each of them narrates what he knows from his individual sources of information. The history of Christ's childhood given in Luke leads us to conclude that it was derived from the acquaintances of Mary, while the statements in Matthew seem to be derived from the friends of Joseph. As to the transaction recorded in <40218>Matthew 21:18-22, and <41111>Mark 11:11, 15, 20, 21, it appears that Mark describes what occurred most accurately; and yet there is nothing in Matthew's account really inconsistent with the true order of events.

On the other hand, some of the most beautiful and most important sayings of our Lord, the historical credibility of which no skeptic call attack, have been preserved by Matthew alone (<40128>Matthew 11:28-30; 16:16-19; 28:20; compare also <40102>Matthew 11:2-21; 12:3-6, 25-29; <40172>Matthew 17:12, 25, 26; 26:13). Above all, the Sermon on the Mount, although containing some things apparently not coincident in time (for instance, the Lord's prayer), is yet far more complete and systematic than the comparatively meager report of Luke. It may also be proved . that in many particulars the reports of several discourses in Matthew are more exact than in the other evangelists, as may be seen by comparing Matthew 23 with the various parallel

passages in Luke. See, generally, Kern, *Ueber den Ursprung des Evanyelii Matthaei* (Tubingen, 1834); Olshausen, *Drei Programme*, 1835; and the two *Lucubrations* of Harles, 1840 and 1843.

II. *Time and Place of its Composition.* — There is little in the Gospel itself to throw any light on the date of its composition. In Matthew 27:7, 8; 28:15, we have evidences of a date some years subsequent to the resurrection; but these may well be additions of a later hand, and prove nothing as to the age of the substance of the Gospel. Little trust can be placed in the dates given by. some late writers — e.g. Theophylact, Euthymius Zigabenus, Eusebius's *Chron.*, eight years after the Ascension; Niceph., Callist., and the *Chron. Pasch.*, A.D. 45. The only early testimony is that of Irenmeus *(Haer.* 3:1, p. 174), that it was written "when Peter and Paul were preaching in Rome, and founding the Church." This would bring it down to about A.D. 63 — probably somewhat earlier, as this is the latest date assigned for Luke's Gospel; and we have the authority of a tradition, accepted by Origen, for the priority of that of Matthew *(*ἐν παραδόσει μαθὼν.... ὅτι πρῶτον μὲν γέγραπται τὸ κατὰ τόν ποτε τελώνην ὕστερον δὲ ἀπόστ. I. Χρ. Ματθαῖον, Eusebius, *H. E.* 6:25). On the supposition of a Hebrew original, we may presume that that would have been written the first of all the Gospels, or soon after the Ascension-i.e. about A.D. 31; and then the present Greek edition may have been issued not much later, or shortly before Matthew's removal from Juduea, i.e. about A.D. 47. Tillemont maintains A.D. 33; Townson, A.D. 37; Owen and Tomline, A.D. 38; Davidson, *Introd. N. Test.*, inclines to A.D. 41-43; while Hug, Eichhorn, Credner, Bertholdt, etc., identifying "Zacharias the son of Barachias" (Matthew 23:35) with Zacharias the son of Baruch, whose murder is recorded by Josephus *(War,* 4:6, 4), place its composition shortly after the fall of Jerusalem, a theory which is rejected by De Wette and Meyer, and may safely be dismissed as untenable.

With regard to the place, there is no difference of opinion. All ancient authorities agree that Matthew wrote his Gospel in Palestine, and this has been as unanimously received by modern critics.

III. *For what Readers was it Written*? — The concurrent testimony of the early Church that Matthew drew up his Gospel for the benefit of the Jewish Christians of Palestine *(*τοῖς ἀπὸ Ἰουδαϊσμοῦ πιστεύσασι**,** Orig. ap. Eusebius, *H. E.* 6:25), has been accepted without question, and may be regarded as a settled point. The statement of Eusebius is that, "having

previously preached to the Hebrews, when he was about to go to others also, he committed to writing in his native tongue his Gospel *(τὸ καὶ αὐτὸν εὐαγγέλιον)*, and so filled up by his writing that which was lacking of his presence to those whom he was departing from" (Eusebius, *H. E.* 3:24). The testimony of Jerome, frequently repeated, is to the same effect *(Proef. ad Matt.; De Vir. III.; Comm. in Hosea 11)*. The passages quoted and referred to above, it is true, have reference to the supposed Aramaic original, and not to the present Greek Gospel. But whatever conclusion may be arrived at on the perplexed question of the origin of the existing Gospel, Mr. Westcott has shown *(Introd. to Gospels,* p. 208) that "there is no sufficient reason to depart from the unhesitating habit of the earliest writers who notice the subject, in practically identifying the revised version with the original text," so that whatever has been stated of the purpose or characteristics of the one may unhesitatingly be regarded as applicable to the other also.

Looking, therefore, to our present Gospel for proofs of its original destination, we find internal evidence tending to confirm the traditional statement. The great object. of the evangelist is evidently to prove to his countrymen that Jesus of Nazareth was the promised Messiah, the antitype of the figures of the old covenant, and the fulfillment of all prophecy. The opening words of his Gospel declare his purpose. Jesus Christ is set forth as "the son of David" and "the son of Abraham," fulfilling "the promises made to the fathers," and reviving the faded glories of the nation in the heir of David's royal line, Abraham's promised seed (comp. Iren. *Fragm.* 29; *Hear.* 3:9, 1; Orig. *in Johann.* 4:4). In the symmetrical arrangement of the genealogy also" its divisions," as dean Goodwin has remarked *(Comm. in St. Matt.*, Introd.), "corresponding to the two great crises in their national life, the maximum and minimum points of Hebrew prosperity" — we have an accommodation to Jewish prejudices and Jewish habits of thought, in marked contrast with the continuous order of the universalistic Luke. As we advance, we find that the accomplishment of the promises, the proof that Jesus Christ is he of whom "Moses in the law and the prophets did write," is the object nearest to his heart. Thus he is continually speaking of the necessity of this or that event happening, in order that a particular prophecy might be fulfilled *(ἵνα πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου θεοῦ) διὰ τοῦ προφήτου*, <4001022>Matthew 1:22; 2:15; 21:4; 26:56; comp. <4001217>Matthew 2:17; 3:3; 4:14; 8:17, etc.), while his whole Gospel is full of allusions to those passages and sayings of the O. Test. in which Christ was

predicted and foreshadowed. As Da Costa has remarked *(Four Witnesses,* p. 20), he regards the events he narrates as “realized prophecy,” and everything is recorded with this view, that he may lead his countrymen to recognize in Jesus their promised Deliverer and King.

It is in keeping with the destination of his Gospel that we find in Matthew less frequent explanations of Jewish customs, laws, and localities than in the other Gospels. Knowledge of these is presupposed in the readers (<4015>Matthew 15:1, 2 with <4107>Mark 7:1-4: <4276>Matthew 27:62 with <4142>Mark 15:42; <4254>Luke 23:54; <3914>John 19:14, 31, 42, and other places). Jerusalem is the holy city (see below, *Style anud Diction).* Jesus is of the elect line (<4001>Matthew 1:1; 9:27; 12:23; 15:22; 20:30; 21:9, 15); is to be born of a virgin in David’s place, Bethlehem (<4002>Matthew 1:22; 2:6); must flee into Egypt and be recalled thence (<4015>Matthew 2:15, 19); must have a forerunner, John the Baptist (<4003>Matthew 3:3; 11:10); was to labor in the outcast Galilee that sat in darkness (<4004>Matthew 4:14-16); his healing was a promised mark of his office (<4017>Matthew 8:17; 12:17), and so was his mode of teaching by parables (<4034>Matthew 13:14); he entered the holy city as Messiah (<4205>Matthew 21:5-16); was rejected by the people, in fulfillment of a prophecy (<4242>Matthew 21:42), and deserted by his disciples in the same way (<4031>Matthew 26:31, 56). The Gospel is pervaded by one principle, the fulfillment of the law and of the Messianic prophecies in the person of Jesus. This at once sets it in opposition to the Judaism of the time, for it rebuked the Pharisaic interpretations of the law (<4005>Matthew 5:23), and proclaimed Jesus as the Son of God, and the Savior of the world through his blood, ideas which were strange to the cramped and limited Judaism of the Christian aera. In the Sermon on the Mount Christ is introduced declaring himself not as the destroyer but the fulfiller of the Mosaic law. When the twelve are sent forth they are forbidden to go “into the way of the Gentiles” (<4005>Matthew 10:5; comp. <4015>Matthew 15:24). In the same passage — the only one in which the Samaritans are mentioned — that abhorred race is put on a level with the heathen, not at once to be gladdened with the Gospel message.

But while we keep this in view, as the evangelist’s first object, we must not strain it too narrowly, as if he had no other purpose than to combat the objections and to satisfy the prepossessions of the Jews. No evangelist expresses with greater distinctness the universality of Christ’s mission, or does more to break down the narrow notion of a Messiah for Israel who was not one also for the whole world; none delivers stronger warnings

against trusting to an Abrahamic descent for acceptance with God. It is in Matthew that we read of the visit of the magi (<40201>Matthew 2:1 sq.), symbolizing the manifestation of Christ to the Gentiles; it is he that speaks of the fulfillment of Isaiah's prophecy, when "the nations that sat in darkness saw a great light" (<40415>Matthew 4:15, 16), and adds to the narrative of the cure of the centurion's servant what is wanting to the universalistic Luke, that "many should come from the East and West," etc. (<40811>Matthew 8:11). The narrative of the Syro-Phoenician woman, omitted by Luke, is given by Matthew, in whom alone we also find the command to "make disciples of all nations" (<402819>Matthew 28:19), and the unrestricted invitation to "*all* that labor and are heavy laden" (<401128>Matthew 11:28). Nowhere are we made more conscious of the deep contrast between the spiritual teaching of Christ and the formal teaching of the rulers of the Jewish Church. We see also that others besides Jewish readers were contemplated, from the interpretations and explanations occasionally added, e.g. Immanuel, <40123>Matthew 1:23; Golgotha, <402733>Matthew 27:33; Eli, lama sabachthani, ver. 46.

IV. *Original Language.* — *While* there is absolutely nothing in the Gospel itself to lead us to imagine that it is a translation, and, on the contrary, everything favors the view that in the present Greek text, with its perpetual *verbal* correspondence with the other synoptists, we have the original composition of the author himself; yet the unanimous testimony of all antiquity affirms that Matthew wrote his Gospel in *Hebrew* i.e. the Aramaic or Syro-Chaldee dialect. which was the vernacular tongue of the then inhabitants of Palestine. The internal evidence, therefore, is at variance with the external, and it is by no means easy to adjust the claims of the two.

1. *External Evidence.* — The unanimity of all ancient authorities as to the Hebrew origin of this Gospel is complete. In the words of the late canon Cureton *(Syriac Recension,* p. 83), "no fact relating to the history of the Gospels is more fully and satisfactorily established. From the days of the apostles down to the end of the 4th century, every writer who had occasion to refer to this matter has testified the same thing. Papias, Irenaeus, Pantsenus, Origen, Cyril of Jerusalem, Athanasius, Epiphanius, Jerome, all with one consent affirm this. Such a chain of historical evidence appears to be amply sufficient to establish the fact that Matthew wrote his Gospel originally in the Hebrew dialect of that time, for the benefit of Jews who understood and spoke the language." To look at the evidence more particularly —

(1.) The earliest witness is Papias, bishop of Hierapolis, in Phrygia, in the beginning of the 2d century; a hearer of the apostle, or more probably of the presbyter John, and a companion of Polycarp (Irenaeus, *leur. v.* 33, 4). Eusebius describes him *(H.E.* 3:36) as "a man of the widest general information, and well acquainted with the Scriptures" *(ἀνὴρ τὰ πάντα ὅτι μάλιστα λογιώτατος καὶ γραφῆς εἰδήμων);* and,though in another place he depreciates his intellectual power *(σφόδρα συικρὸς β τὶν νοῦν, H. E.* 3:39), this unfavorable view seems chiefly to have reference to his millennarian views (comp. Irenaeus, *Haer. v.* 33, 3), and can hardly invalidate his testimony on a matter of fact. Papias says, it would seem on the authority of John the Presbyter, "Matthew compiled his Gospel (or 'the oracles') in the Hebrew dialect; while each interpreted them according to his ability" *(*Ματθαῖος μὲν ουν ῾Εβραΐδι διαλέκτῳ τὰ λόγια συνεγράψατο; ἡρμήνευσε δ αὐτὰ ὡς ην δυνατὸς ἕκαστος). In estimating the value of this testimony, two important points have to be considered-the meaning of the term λόγια, and whether Papias is speaking of the present or the past. On the latter point there can be little doubt. His use of the aorist, ἡρμήνευσε, not ἑρμηνεύει, evidently shows that the state of things to which he or his original authority referred had passed away, and that individual translation was no longer necessary. It would seem, therefore, to follow, that "an authorized Greek representative of the Hebrew Matthew" had come into use "in the generation after the apostles" (Westcott, *Introd.* p. 207, note). The signification of λόγια has been much controverted. Schleiermacher *(Stud. u. Krit.* 1832, p. 735) was the first to explain the term of a supposed "collection of discourses" which is held to have been the basis that, by gradual modification and interpolation, was transformed into the existing Gospel (Meyer, *Comm.* 1:13). This view has found wide acceptance, and has been strenuously maintained by Lachmann *(Stud. u. Krit.* 1835), Meyer, De Wette, Credner, Wieseler, B. Crusius, Ewald, Renan, etc., but has been controverted by Lucke *(Stud. u. Krit.* 1833), Itug, Ebrard, Bauer, Delitzsch, Hilgenfeld, Thiersch, Alford, Westcott, etc. But λόγια, in the N.T., signifies the *whole revelation* made by God, rather than the mere *words* in which that revelation is contained (<440738>Acts 7:38; <450302>Romans 3:2; <580512>Hebrews 5:12; <600411>1 Peter 4:11); and, as has been convincingly shown by Hug and Ebrard, the patristic use of the word confirms the opinion that, as used by Papias, both in this passage and in the title of his own work *(λογίων κυριακῶν ἐξήγησις),* it implies a combined record of facts and discourses corresponding to the later use of the word *gospel.*

(2.) The next witness is Irenaeus, who, as quoted by Eusebius *(II. F.* v. 8), says that "Matthew among the Hebrews published also a written Gospel in their own language" *(*τῇ ἰδίᾳ αὐτῶν διαλέκτῳ*)*. Hug and others have attempted to invalidate this testimony, as a mere repetition of that of Papias, whose disciple, according to Jerome, Irenaeus was; but we may safely accept it as independent evidence.

(3.) Pantaenus, the next witness, cannot be considered as strengthening the case for the Hebrew original much; though, as far as it gods, his evidence is definite enough. His story, as reported by Eusebius, is that "he is said to have gone to the Indians (probably in the south of Arabia), where it is reported that the Gospel of Matthew had preceded him among some who had there acknowledged Christ, to whom it is said the apostle Bartholomew had preached, and had left with them the writing of Matthew in Hebrew letters *(*Ἑβραίων γράμμασι τὴν τοῦ Ματθαίου καταλεῖψαι γραφήν*)*, and that it was preserved to the time mentioned." Jerome tells the same tale, with the addition that Pantaenus brought back this Hebrew Gospel with him *(De Vir. Ill.* 36). No works of *Pantaenus* have been preserved, and we have no means of confirming or refuting the tale, which has somewhat of a mythical air, and is related as a mere story *(*λέγεται, λόγος εὑρεῖν αὐτόν*)*, even by Eusebius.

(4.) The testimony of Origen has already been referred to. It is equally definite with those quoted above on the fact that the Gospel was "published for Jewish believers, and composed in Hebrew letters" *(*ἐκδεδωκότα αὐτὸ τοῖς ἀπὸ Ἰουδαϊσμοῦ πιστεύσασι, γράμμασιν Ἑβραικοῖς συντεταγμένον, Eusebius, 1 *H. E.* 6:25). There is no reason for questioning the independence of Origen's evidence, or for tracing it back to Papias. He clearly states what was the belief of the Church at that time, and without a doubt as to its correctness. (For a refutation of the objections brought against it by Masch and Hug, etc., see Marsh's *Michaelis*, 4:128, 135 sq.)

(5.) We have already given the testimony of Eusebius *(H. E.* 3:24), to which may be added a passage *(ad Marin. quaest.* ii, p. 941) in which he ascribes the words ὀψὲ τοῦ σαββάτου to the *translator (*παρὰ τοῦ ἑρμηνεύσαντος τὴνγραφήν*)*, adding, "For the evangelist Matthew delivered his Gospel in the Hebrew tongue." This is very important evidence as to the belief of Eusebius, which was clearly that of the Church generally, that the Gospel was originally composed in Hebrew.

(6.) Epiphanius *(Haer.* 29:9, p. 124) states the same fact without the shadow of a doubt, adding that Matthew was the only evangelist who wrote ῾Εβραϊστί καὶ ῾Εβραϊκοῖς γράμμασιν. The value of his evidence, however, is impaired by his identification of the Hebrew original with that employed by the Nazarenes and Ebionites, by whom he asserts it was still preserved *(*ἐτὶ σώζεται*).*

(7.) The same observation may also be made concerning the testimony of Jerome, whose references to this subject are very frequent, and who is the only one of the fathers that appears to have actually seen the supposed Hebrew archetype *(Proef ad Matt.; De Vir. Ill.* 3 and 36; in *Quat. Ev. ad Dam. praef.; Ep. Dam. de Osanna; Ep. ad Hedib.* quaest. viii; *Comm. in Hosea 11).* A perusal of these passages shows that there was a book preserved in the library collected by Pamphilus at Caesarea, which was supposed to be the Hebrew original (*"ipsum Hebraicum"),* and was as such transcribed and translated into Greek and Latin by Jerome, about A.D. 392, from a copy obtained from the Nazarenes at the Syrian city of Bercea. Afterwards, about A.D. 398 *(Comm. in Matt.* 12:13), he speaks more doubtfully of it, "quod vocatur a plerisque Matthew authenticum." Later on, A.D. 415 *(Confr. Pelay.* 3:1), he modifies his opinion still further, and describes the book used by the Nazarenes, and preserved in the library at Cuesarea, as "Ev. juxta Hebraeos... secundum Apostolos, sive *ut plerique autumant* juxta Matthueum" (comp. *Edinb. Rev.* July, 1851, p. 39; De Wette, *Einl.* p. 100). While, then, we may safely accept Jerome as an additional witness to the belief of the early Church that Matthew's Gospel was originally composed in Hebrew (Aramaic), which he mentions as something universally recognised without a hint of a doubt, we may reasonably question whether the book he translated had any sound claims to be considered the genuine work of Matthew, and whether Jerome himself did not ultimately discover his mistake, though he shrunk from openly confessing it. We may remark, in confirmation of this, that unless the Aramaic book had differed considerably from the Greek Gospel, Jerome would hardly have taken the trouble to translate it: and that while, whenever he refers to Matthew, he cites it according to the present text, he never quotes the Nazarene Gospel as a work of canonical authority, but only in such terms as "quo utuntur Nazareni," "quod lectitant Nazaruei," "quod juxta Heb. Nazar. legere consueverunt," and still more doubtingly, *"qui crediderit evangelio,* quod secundum Hebrueos editum nuper

transtulimus;" language inconsistent with his having regarded it as canonical Scripture.

(8.) The statements of later writers, Cyril of Jerusalem, Athanasius, Chrysostom, Augustine, Gregory Nazianzen, etc., merely echo the same testimony, and need not be more particularly referred to.

An impartial survey of the above evidence leads to the conclusion that, in the face of so many independent witnesses, we should be violating the first principles of historical criticism if we refused to accept the fact that Matthew wrote his Gospel originally in Hebrew. But whether this original was ever seen by Jerome or Epiphanius is more than questionable.

2. *Internal Evidence.* — What, then, is the origin of our present Gospel? To whom are we to ascribe its existing form and language? What is its authority? These are the questions which now meet us. and to which it must be confessed it is not easy to give a satisfactory answer. We may at the outset lay down as indisputable, in opposition to Cureton (who asserts, *ut sup.*, that "a careful critical examination of the Greek text will afford very strong confirmation of the Hebrew original), that the phenomena of the Gospel as we have it-its language, its coincidences with and divergences from the other synoptists, the quotations from the Old Test. it contains, and the citations made from it by ancient writers, all oppose the notion of the present Greek text being a translation, and support its canonical authority.

(1.) An important argument may be drawn from the use made of the existing Gospel by all ancient writers. As Olshausen remarks (Clark's ed., 1, 28), while all the fathers of the Church assert the Hebrew origin of the Gospel, they without exception make use of the existing Greek text as canonical Scripture, and that without doubt or question, or anything that would lead to the belief that they regarded it as of less authority than the original Hebrew, or possessed it in any other form than that in which we now have it.

(2.) Another argument in favor of the authoritative character of our present Gospel arises from its universal diffusion and general acceptance, both in the Church and among her adversaries. Had the Hebrew Gospel been really clothed with the authority of the sole apostolic archetype, and our Greek Gospel been a mere translation, executed, as Jerome asserts, by some unknown individual ("quis postea in Grecum transtulerit non satis certum

est," *De Vir. Ill. 3*), would not, as Olshausen remarks, *ut sup.*, objections to it have been urged in some quarter or other, particularly in the country where Matthew himself labored, and for whose inhabitants the Hebrew was written? Would its statements have been accepted without a cavil by the opponents of the Church? No trace of such opposition is, however, to be met with. Not a doubt is ever breathed of its canonical authority.

(3.) Again, the text itself bears no marks of a translation. This is especially evident in the mode of dealing with the citations from the Old Test. These are of two kinds: (*a*) those standing in the discourses of our Lord himself, and the interlocutors; and *(b)* those introduced by the evangelist as proofs of our Lord's Messiahship. Now if we assume, as is certainly most probable (though the contrary has been maintained by Hug, the late duke of Manchester, and more recently by the Rev. Alexander Roberts, whose learned and able "*Discussions* on the Gospels" demand attentive consideration from every Biblical student), that Aramaic, not Greek, was the language ordinarily used by our Lord and his Jewish contemporaries, we should certainly expect that any citations from the Old Test., made by them in ordinary discourse, would be from the original Hebrew or its Aramaic counterpart, not from the Septuagint version, and would stand as such in the Aramaic record; while it would argue more than the ordinary license of a mere translator to substitute the Sept. renderings, even when at variance with the Hebrew before him. Yet what is the case? While in the class (*b*), due to the evangelist himself, which may be supposed to have had no representative in the current Greek oral tradition which we assume as the basis of the synoptical Gospels, we find original renderings of the Hebrew text; in the class *(a),* on the other hand, where we might, *a priori,* have looked for an even closer correspondence, the citations are usually from the Sept., even where it deviates from the Hebrew. In (*a*) we may reckon 3:3; 4:4, 6, 7, 10; 15:4, 8, 9; 19:5, 18; 21:13, 42; 22:39, 44; 23:39; 24:15; 26:31; 27:46. In *(b),* called by Westcott *(Introd.* p. 208, note 1) "*Cyclic* quotations," 1:23; 2:6,15, 18; 4:15, 16; 8:17; 12:18 sq.; 13:35; 21:5; 27:9, 10). In two cases Matthew's citations agree with the synoptic parallels in a deviation from the Sept., all being drawn from the same oral groundwork. Matthew's quotations have been examined by Credner, one of the soundest of modern scholars, who pronounces decidedly for their derivation from the Greek *(Einzleit.* p. 94; comp. De Wette, *Einzl.* p. 198). We may therefore not unwarrantably find here additional evidence that in

the existing Greek text we have the work, not of a mere translator, but of an independent and authoritative writer.

(4.) The verbal correspondences between Matthew and the other synoptists in their narratives, and especially in the report of the speeches of our Lord and others, are difficult to account for if we regard it as a translation. As Alford remarks *(Gr. Test.* Proleg. 1:28), "The translator must have been either acquainted with the other two Gospels, in which case it is inconceivable that, in the midst of the present coincidences in many passages, such divergences should have occurred, or unacquainted with them, in which case the identity itself would be altogether inexplicable." Indeed, in the words of Credner *(Einzleit.* p. 94, 95), "the Greek original of this Gospel is affirmed by its continual correspondence with those of Mark and Luke, and that not only in generals and important facts, but in particulars and minute details, in the general plan, in entire clauses, and in separate words-a phenomenon which admits of no explanation under the hypothesis of a translation from the Hebrew."

(5.) This inference in favor of an original Greek Gospel is strongly confirmed by the fact that all versions, even the Peshito Syriac, the language in which the Gospel is said to have been originally written, are taken from the present Greek text. It is true that canon Cureton *(Syriac Recens.* p. 75 sq.) argues with much ability against this, and expends much learning and skill in proof of his hypothesis that the Syriac version of Matthew published by him is more ancient than the Peshito, and may be regarded as, in the main, identical with the Aramaic Gospel of Matthew; which he also considers to have been identical with the *Gospel according to the Hebrews,* used by the Nazarenes and Ebionites, "modified by some additions, interpolations, and perhaps some omissions." His statement (p. 42) that "there is a marked difference between the recension of Matthew and that of the other Gospels, proving that they are by different hands — the former showing no signs, as the others do, of translation from the Greek" — demands the respect due to so careful a scholar; but he fails entirely to explain the extraordinary fact that, in the very country where Matthew published his Gospel, and within a comparatively short period, a version from the Greek was substituted for the authentic original; nor have his views met with general acceptance among scholars.

3. Having thus stated the arguments in favor of a Hebrew and Greek original respectively, it remains for us to inquire whether there is any way

of adjusting the claims of the two. Were there no explanation of this inconsistency between the external assertions and the internal facts, it would be hard to doubt the concurrent testimony of so many old writers, whose belief in it is shown by the tenacity with which they held it in spite of their own experience.

(1.) But it is certain that a Gospel, not the same as our canonical Matthew, sometimes usurped the apostle's name; and some of the witnesses we have quoted appear to have referred to this in one or other of its various forms or names. The Christians in Palestine still held that the Mosaic ritual was binding on them, even after the destruction of Jerusalem. At the close of the first century one party existed who held that the Mosaic law was only binding on Jewish converts; this was the Nazarenes. Another, the Ebionites, held that it was of universal obligation on Christians, and rejected Paul's Epistles as teaching the opposite doctrine. These two sects, who differed also in the most important tenets as to our Lord's person, possessed each a modification of the same Gospel, which no doubt each altered more and more, as their tenets diverged, and which bore various names-the Gospel of the twelve Apostles, the Gospel according to the Hebrews, the Gospel of Peter, or the Gospel according to Matthew. Enough is known to decide that the Gospel according to the Hebrews was not identical with our Gospel of Matthew; but it had many points of resemblance to the synoptical Gospels, and especially to Matthew. What was its origin it is impossible to say: it may have been a description of the oral teaching of the apostles, corrupted by degrees; it may have come in its early and pure form from the hand of Matthew, or it may have been a version of the Greek Gospel of Matthew, as the evangelist who wrote especially for Hebrews. Now this Gospel, "the Proteus of criticism" (Thiersch), did exist; is it impossible that when the Hebrew Matthew is spoken of, this questionable document, the Gospel of the Hebrews, was really referred to? Observe that all accounts of it are at second hand (with a notable exception); no one quotes it; in cases of doubt about the text, Origen even does not appeal from the Greek to the Hebrew. All that is certain is, that Nazarenes or Ebionites, or both, boasted that they possessed the original Gospel of Matthew. Jerome is the exception, and him we can convict of the very mistake of confounding the two, and almost on his own confession. "At first he thought," says an anonymous writer *(Edinburgh Review,* 1851, July, p. 39), "that it was the authentic Matthew, and translated it into both Greek and Latin from a copy which he obtained

at Bercea, in Syria. This appears from his *De Vir. Ill.*, written in the year 392. Six years later, in his Commentary on Matthew, he spoke more doubtfully about it — 'Quod vocatur *a plerisque* Matthaei authenticum.' Later still, in his book on the Pelagian heresy, written in the year 415, he modifies his account still further, describing the work as the 'Evangelium juxta Hebraeos, quod Chaldaico quidem Syroque sermone, sed *Hebraicis literis* conscriptum est, quo utuntur usque hodie Nazareni secundum Apostolos, sive *ut plerique autumant* juxta Matthaeum, quod et in Caesariensi habetur Bibliotheca.' "There have pronounced for a Greek original — Erasmus, Calvin, Leclerc, Fabricius, Lightfoot, Wetstein, Paulus, Lardner, Hey, Hales, Hlug, Schott, De Wette, Moses Stuart, Fritzsche, Credner, Thiersch, and many others. Great names are ranged also on the other side, as Simon, Mill, Michaelis, Marsh, Eichhorn, Storr, Olshausen, and others. May not the truth be that Papias, knowing of more than one Aramaic Gospel in use among the Judaic sects, may have assumed the existence of a Hebrew original from which these were supposed to be taken, and knowing also the genuine Greek Gospel, may have looked on all these, in the loose, uncritical way which earned for him Eusebius's description, as the various "interpretations" to which he alludes? It is by no means improbable that after several inaccurate and imperfect translations of the Aramaean original came into circulation, Matthew himself was prompted by this circumstance to publish a Greek translation, or to have his Gospel translated under his own supervision. It is very likely that this Greek translation did not soon come into general circulation, so that it is even possible that Papias may have remained ignorant of its existence. See Stuart, in the *Amer. Bib. Repos.* 1838, p. 130-179, 315-356.

(2.) We think that Mr. Westcott — to whom the study of the Gospels owes so much-has pointed out the road to a still better solution. Not that the difficulties which beset this matter can be regarded as cleared up, or the question finally and satisfactorily settled, but a mode of reconciling the inconsistency between testimony and fact has been indicated, which, if pursued, may, we think, lead to a decision. "It has been shown," says Mr. Westcott *(Introd.* p. 208, note), "that the oral Gospel probably existed from the first both in Aramaic and in Greek, and in this way a preparation for a fresh representative of the Hebrew Gospel was at once found. The parts of the Aramaic oral Gospels which were adopted by Matthew already existed in the Greek counterpart. The change was not so much a version as a substitution; and frequent coincidence with common parts of Mark and

Luke, which were derived from the same oral Greek Gospel, was a necessary consequence. Yet it may have happened that, as long as the Hebrew and Greek churches were in close connection, perhaps till the destruction of Jerusalem, no authoritative Greek Gospel of Matthew — i.e. such a version of the Greek oral Gospel as would exactly answer to Matthew's version of the Aramaic-was committed to writing. When, however, the separation between the two sections grew more marked, the Greek Gospel was written, not indeed as a translation, but as a representation of the original, as a Greek oral counterpart was already current." This theory of the origin of the Greek Gospel, it appears to us, meets the facts of the case, and satisfies its requirements more fully than any other. We have seen above that the language of Papias indicates that, even in his day, the Gospel of Matthew existed substantially in Greek, and its universal diffusion and general authority in the earliest ages of the Church prove that its composition cannot be placed much after the times of the apostles. May it not have been then that the two — the Aramaic and the Greek Gospel — existed for some time in their most important portions as an old tradition side by side — that the Aramaic was the first to be committed to writing, and gained a wide though temporary circulation among the Hebrew Christians of Syria and Palestine? that when, as would soon be the case, the want of a Greek Gospel for the use of the Hellenistic Jews was felt, this also was published in its written form, either by Matthew himself (as is maintained by Thiersch, Olshausen, and Lee), or by those to whom, from constant repetition, the main portions were familiar; perhaps under the apostle's eye, and with the virtual, if not the formal sanction of the Church at Jerusalem? As it supplied a need widely felt by the Gentile Christians, it would at once obtain currency, and as the Gentile Church rapidly extended her borders, while that of the Jewish believers was continually becoming confined within narrower limits, this Greek Gospel would speedily supplant its Hebrew predecessor, and thus furnish a fresh and most striking example of what Mr. Westcott, in his excellent work on *The Bible in the Church* (Introd. p. 8), calls "that doctrine of a divine providence separating (as it were) and preserving special books for the perpetual instruction of the Church, which is the true correlative and complement of every sound and reverend theory of inspiration." No other hypothesis, as Dr. Lee has satisfactorily shown *(Inspir. of H. Sc.* Appendix M), than the Greek Gospel being either actually or substantially the production of Matthew himself, "accounts for the profound silence of ancient writers respecting the translation... or for the absence of the least

trace of any other Greek translation of the Hebrew original." The hypotheses which assign the translation to Barnabas (Isid. Hispal., *Chron.* p. 272), John (Theophyl., Euthym. Zigab.), Mark (Greswell), Luke and Paul conjointly (Anastas. Sinaita), or James the brother of our Lord *(Syn. Sacr. Scr.* apud Athanas. 2:202), are mere arbitrary assertions without any foundation in early tradition. The last named is the most ingenious, as we may reasonably suppose that the bishop of Jerusalem would feel solicitude for the spiritual wants of the Hellenistic Christians of that city.

Those who desire to pursue the investigation of this subject will find ample materials for doing so in the *Introductions* of Hug, De Wette, Credner, etc.; Marsh's *Michaelis,* vol. iii, pt. i, where the patristic authorities are fully discussed; and they will be found, for the most part, in Kirchhofer, *Quellensammlung,* where will also be found the passages referring to the Gospel of the Hebrews, p. 448; also in most of the commentaries. The following have written monographs on this point: Sonntag (Altorf, 1696), Schroder (Viteb. 1699, 1702), Masch (Halle, 1755),Williams (Lond. 1790), Elsner (F. ad V. 1791), Buslaw (Vratisl. 1826), Stuart *(Bibl. Repos.* 1838), Harless (Erlang. 1841, also 1842, the latter tr. in *Bibl. Repos.* 1844), Tregelles (Kitto's *Journ.* 1850, and separately), Alexander *(ibid.* 1850), Roberts (Lond. 1864). More general discussions may be found in Lardner's *Credibility,* vol. v; Reuss's *Gesch. d. Kanonl;* Tregelles on *The Original Language of St. Matthew;* Rev. A. Roberts's *Discussions on the Gospels;* the commentaries of Olshausen, Meyer, Alford, Wetstein, Kuinol, Fritzsche, Lange, etc.; and the works on the Gospels of Norton *(Credibility),* Westcott, Baur, Gieseler *(Entstehung),* Hilgenfeld, etc.; Cureton's *Syriac Recension,* Preface; and Dr. W. Lee on *Inspiration,* Appendix M; Jeremiah Jones's *Vindication of St. Matthew; Ewald, Die drei Erst. Ev.;* and *Jahrbuch d. Bibl. Wissensch.* 1848-49.

V. *Characteristics.* — Matthew's is emphatically the Gospel of the Kingdom. The main object of the evangelist is to portray the kingly character of Christ, and to show that in him the ideal of the King reigning in righteousness, the true Heir of David's throne, was fulfilled (comp. Augustine, *De Consens. Ev.* passim). Thus the tone throughout is majestic and kingly. He views things in the grand general aspect, and, indifferent to the details in which Mark loves so much to dwell, he gathers up all in the great result. His narrative proceeds with a majestic simplicity, regardless of time and place, according to another and deeper order, ready to sacrifice mere chronology or locality to the development of this idea. Thus he brings

together events separated sometimes by considerable intervals, according to the unity of their nature or purpose, and with a grand but simple power accumulates in groups the discourses, parables, and miracles of our Lord (I. Williams, *Study of Gospels,* p. 28). From the formation and objects of the Gospels, we should expect that their prevailing characteristics would be indicated rather by a general tone and spirit than by minute peculiarities. Not, however, that these latter are wanting. It has already been remarked how the genealogy with which Matthew's Gospel opens sets our Lord forth in his kingly character, as the heir of the throne of David, the representative of the royal line of which he was the true successor and fulfillment. As we advance we find his birth hailed, not by lowly shepherds as in Luke, but by wise men coming to wait on him with royal gifts, inquiring, "Where is he that is born king of the Jews." In the Sermon on the Mount the same majesty and authority appear. We hear the Judge himself delivering his sentence; the King laying down the laws of his kingdom, "I say unto you," and astonishing his hearers with the "authority" with which he speaks. The awful majesty of our Lord's reproofs in his teaching in the Temple, and his denunciations of the Scribes and Pharisees, also evidence the authority of a king and lawgiver-" one who knew the mind of God and could reveal it;" which may also be noticed in the lengthened discourses that mark the close of his ministry, in which "the king" and "the kingdom of heaven" come forward with so much frequency (<40213>Matthew 21:31, 43; 22:2 sq.; <40234>Matthew 23:14; 24:14; 25:1, 34:40). Nor can we overlook the remarkable circumstance that, in the parable of the marriage-feast, so similar in its general circumstances with that in Luke (<42146>Luke 14:16), instead of "a certain man," it is "a king" making a marriage for his son, and in kingly guise sending forth his armies and binding the unworthy guest. The addition of the doxology also to the Lord's Prayer, with its ascription of "the kingdom, the power, and the glory," is in such true harmony with the same prevailing tone as to lead many to see in this fact alone the strongest argument for its genuineness.

But we must not in this, or in any of the Gospels, direct our attention too exclusively to any one side of our Lord's character. "The King is one and the same in all, and so is the Son of Man and the Priest. . .. He who is the King is also the Sacrifice" (Williams, *ut sup.* p. 32). The Gospel is that of the King, but it is the King "meek" (<40205>Matthew 21:5), "meek and lowly of heart" (<40129>Matthew 11:29); the kingdom is that of "the poor in spirit," "the persecuted for righteousness' sake" (ver. 3, 10), into which "the weary and

heavy laden" are invited, and which they enter by submitting to the "yoke" of its king. He, it tells us, was to be one of ourselves, "whose brotherhood with man answered all the anticipations the Jewish prophets had formed of their king, and whose power to relieve the woes of humanity could not be separated from his participation in them, who 'himself took our infirmities and bare our sicknesses'" (Matthew 8:17) (Maurice, *Unity of N.T.* p. 190). As the son of David and the son of Abraham, he was the partaker of the sorrows as well as the glories of the throne — the heir of the curse as well as the blessing. The source of all blessings to mankind, fulfilling the original promise to Abraham, the curse due to man's sin meets and centers in him, and is transformed into a blessing when the cross becomes his kingly throne; and from the lowest point of his degradation he reappears, in his resurrection, as the Lord and King to whom "all power is given in heaven and earth." He fulfills the promise, "In thy seed shall all families of the earth be blessed;" in the command to "go and make disciples of all nations," he "expands the I AM, which was the ground of the national polity, into the name of 'the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost' (Maurice, *ut sup.* p. 221).

Once more, the kingdom he came to establish was to be a fatherly kingdom. The King he made known was one reigning in God's name, and as his representative. That God was the father of his people, as of him, in and through whom human beings were to be adopted as the children of God. This characteristic of the Gospel is perpetually meeting us. At every turn Matthew represents our Lord bringing out the mind of God and showing it to be the mind of a Father. The fatherly relation is the ground of all his words of counsel, command warning, comfort. Especially is this the casein the Sermon on the Mount. Every command, as to good works (v. 16, 45, 48), almsgiving (Matthew 6:1, 2), prayer (Matthew 6:6, 8), forgiveness (Matthew 6:14,15), fasting (Matthew 6:18), trust and faith (Matthew 6:26; 7:11), is based on the revelation of a Father. The twelve are sent forth in the same name and strength (Matthew 10:20, 29). The kingdom Christ came to establish is not so much a kingdom as a family — the *Ecclesia,* a word found only in Matthew (Matthew 16:18; 18:17) — "held together by the law of forgiveness and mutual sacrifice, with their elder Brother in the midst of them, and their will so identified with that which rules heaven and earth, that whatever they shall agree to ask shall be done by their Father." This characteristic of Matthew is remarkably evidenced by a comparative survey of the usage of the

evangelists. In Mark we find our Lord speaking of or to God, as his Father, three times, in Luke twelve times, in Matthew twenty-two times; as the Father of his people, in Mark twice, in Luke five times, in Matthew twenty-two times.

Another minor characteristic which deserves remark, is Matthew's use of the plural, where the other evangelists have the singular. Thus, in the temptation, we have "stones" and "loaves" (<4043>Matthew 4:3), two daemoniacs (<4028>Matthew 8:28), τούς χόρτους (<4019>Matthew 14:19), two blind men (<4030>Matthew 20:30; comp. 9:27), the ass and her colt (<4102>Matthew 21:2), servants (<4034>Matthew 21:34, 36), both thieves blaspheming (<4044>Matthew 27:44). This is ingeniously accounted for by Da Costa *(Four Witnesses,* p. 322), though this is not universally applicable, on the idea that "his point of view — regarding the events he narrates as fulfilled prophecies — leads him to regard the species rather than the individual; the entire plenitude of the prophecy rather than the isolated fulfillment."

VI. *Relation to Mark and Luke.* — In the article on Mark we have expressed our opinion that, while his Gospel is probably *in essence* the oldest, there is nothing seriously to invalidate the traditional statement that Matthew's was the earliest in composition — the first committed to writing. Neither does a careful review of the text of the Gospel allow us to accept the view put forth by Ewald with his usual dogmatism, and defended with his wonted acuteness, that, as we have it, it is a fusion of four different elements —

(1.) An original Greek Gospel of the simplest and briefest form;

(2.) An Aramaic "collection of sayings" (τὰ λόγια);

(3.) the narrative of Mark; and

(4.) "a book of higher history." That our Gospel is no such curious mosaic is evident from the unity of plan and unity of language which pervades the whole, and to an unprejudiced reader Ewald's theory refutes itself.

Comparing Matthew's Gospel with those of Mark and Luke, we find the following passages peculiar to him: chap. 1 (with the exception of the great central fact), and chap. 2 entirely. The genealogy, the suspicions of Joseph, the visit of the magi, the flight into Egypt and return thence, the massacre

of the innocents, and the reason of the settlement at Nazareth, are given by Matthew alone. To him we owe the notice that "the Pharisees and Sadducees" came to John's baptism (<40307>Matthew 3:7); that John was unwilling to baptize our Lord, and the words in which Jesus satisfied his scruples (ver. 13-15); the Sermon on the Mount in its fullest form (ch. 5, 6, 7); the prediction of the call of the Gentiles, appended to the miracle of the centurion's servant (<40811>Matthew 8:11, 12); the cure of the two blind men (<40927>Matthew 9:27-30); and that memorable passage by which, if by nothing else, Matthew will forever be remembered with thankfulness which, as perhaps the fullest exposition of the spirit of the Gospel anywhere to be found in Holy Scripture, taught Augustine the difference between the teaching of Christ and that of the best philosophers (<401128>Matthew 11:28-30); the solemn passage about "idle words" (<401236>Matthew 12:36, 37); four of the parables in ch. 13, the tares, the hid treasure, the pearl, and the draw-net; several incidents relating to Peter, his walking on the water (<401428>Matthew 14:28-31), the blessing pronounced upon him (<401617>Matthew 16:17-19), the tribute-money (<401724>Matthew 17:24-27); nearly the whole of ch. 18, with its lessons of humility and forgiveness, and the parable of the unmerciful servant; the lessons on voluntary continence (<401910>Matthew 19:10,12); the promise to the twelve (ver. 28); the parables of the laborers in the vineyard (<402001>Matthew 20:1-16), the two sons (<402128>Matthew 21:28-32), the transference of the kingdom to the Gentiles (ver. 43); the parable of the marriage of the king's son (<402201>Matthew 22:1-14); nearly the whole of the denunciations against the Scribes and Pharisees in ch. 23; the parables of the last things in ch. 25. In the history of the passion the peculiarities are numerous and uniform in character, tending to show how, in the midst of his betrayal, sufferings, and death, our Lord's Messiahship was attested. It is in Matthew alone that we read of the covenant with Judas for "thirty pieces of silver" (<401615>Matthew 26:15); his inquiry "Is it I?" (<401625>Matthew 26:25), as well as the restoration of the money in his despair, and its ultimate destination in unconscious fulfillment of prophecy (<402703>Matthew 27:3-10); the cup "for the remission of sins" (<401628>Matthew 26:28); the mention of the "twelve legions of angels" (ver. 52-54); Pilate's wife's dream (<402719>Matthew 27:19), his washing his hands (ver. 24), and the imprecation "His blood be on us," etc. (verse 25); the opening of the graves (ver. 52, 53), and the watch placed at the sepulcher (ver. 62-66). In the account of the resurrection we find only in Matthew the great earthquake (<402802>Matthew 28:2), the descent of the angel, his glorious appearance striking terror into the guards (ver. 2-4),

their flight, and the falsehood spread by them at the instigation of the priests (ver. 11-15); our Lord's appearance to the women (ver. 9, 10); the adoration and doubt of the apostles (ver. 17); and, finally, the parting commission and promise of his ever-abiding presence (ver. 18-20).

This review of the Gospel will show us that of the matter peculiar to Matthew, the larger part consists of parables and discourses, and that he adds comparatively little to the narrative. Of thirty-three recorded miracles eighteen are given by Matthew, but only two, the cure of the blind men (<4009>Matthew 9:27-30) and the tribute money (<4017>Matthew 17:24-27), are peculiar to him. Of twenty-nine parables Matthew records fifteen; ten, as noticed above, being peculiar to him. Reuss, dividing the matter contained in the synoptical Gospels into 100 sections, finds 73 of them in Matthew, 63 in Mark, in Luke, the richest of all, 82. Of these, 49 are common to all three; 9 common to Matthew and Mark; 8 to Matthew and Luke; 3 to Mark and Luke. Only 7 of these are peculiar to Matthew; 2 to Mark; while Luke contains no less than 22.

Matthew's narrative, as a rule, is the least graphic. The great features of the history which bring into prominence our Lord's character as teacher and prophet, the substance of type and prophecy, the Messianic king, are traced with broad outline, without minute or circumstantial details. We are conscious of a want of that picturesque power and vivid painting which delight us in the other Gospels, especially in that of Mark. This deficiency, however, is more than compensated for by the grand simplicity of the narrative, in which everything is secondary to the evangelist's great object. The facts which prove the Messianic dignity of his Lord are all in all with him, the circumstantials almost nothing, while he portrays the earthly form and theocratic glory of the new dispensation, and unfolds the glorious consummation of the "kingdom of heaven."

VII. *Arrangement and Contents.* — Matthew's order, we have already seen, is according to subject-matter rather than chronological sequence, which in the first half is completely disregarded. More attention is paid to order of time in the latter half, where the arrangement agrees with that of Mark. The main body of his Gospel divides itself into groups of discourses collected according to their leading tendency, and separated from each other by groups of anecdotes and miracles. We may distinguish *seven* such collections of discourses —

(1.) The Sermon on the Mount, a specimen of our Lord's ordinary didactic instruction (ch. 5-7); divided by a group of works of healing, comprising no less than ten out of eighteen recorded miracles, from

(2.) the commission of the twelve (ch. 10). The following chapters (11, 12) give the result of our Lord's own teaching, and, introducing a change of feeling towards him, prepare us for (3.) his first open denunciation of his enemies (<40125>Matthew 12:25-45), and pave the way for

(4.) the group of parables, including seven out of fifteen recorded by him (ch. 13). The next four chapters, containing the culminating point of our Lord's history in Peter's confession (16:13-20), and the transfiguration (ch. 17), with the first glimpses of the cross (16:21; 17:12), are bound together by historical sequence. In

(5.), comprising ch. 18, we have a complete treatise in itself, made up of fragments on humility and brotherly love. The counsels of perfection, in <40190>Matthew 19:1-20. 16, are followed by the disputes with the Scribes and Pharisees (<40123>Matthew 21:23-22. 46), which supply the ground for

(6.) the solemn denunciations of the hypocrisies and sophisms by which they nullified the spirit of the law (ch. 23), followed by

(7.) the prophecy of the last things (ch. 24, 25).

More particularly its principal divisions are —

1. The introduction to the ministry (ch. 1-4).

2. The laying down of the new law for the Church in the Sermon on the Mount (ch. 5-7).

3. Events in historical order, showing Jesus as the worker of miracles (ch. 8, 9).

4. The appointment of apostles to preach the kingdom (ch. 10).

5. The doubts and opposition excited by his activity in divers minds — in John's disciples, in sundry cities, in the Pharisees (ch. 11, 12).

6. A series of parables on the nature of the kingdom (ch. 13).

7. Similar to 5. The effects of his ministry on his countrymen, on Herod, the people of Gennesaret, Scribes and Pharisees, and on multitudes, whom he feeds (<40135>Matthew 13:53, 16:12).

8. Revelation to his disciples of his sufferings. His instructions to them thereupon (<40163>Matthew 16:13-18. 35).

9. Events of a journey to Jerusalem (ch. 19, 20).

10. Entrance into Jerusalem and resistance to him there, and denunciation of the Pharisees (ch. 21-23).

11. Last discourses; Jesus as lord and judge of Jerusalem, and also of the world (ch. 24, 25).

12. Passion and resurrection (ch. 26-28).

The view that Matthew's Gospel is arranged chronologically was revived by Eichhorn, who has been followed by Marsh, De Wette, and others. But it has been controverted by Hug, Olshausen, Greswell, Ellicott, and others, and is almost universally held to be untenable.

VIII. *Style and Diction.* — The language of Matthew is less characteristic than that of the other evangelists. Of the three synoptical Gospels it is the most decidedly Hebraistic, both in diction and construction, but less so than that of John. Credner and others have remarked the following

(1.) ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν, which occurs thirty-two times in Matthew and not once in the other evangelists, who use instead ἡ βασ. τ. θεοῦ, employed also by Matthew (6:33; 12:28; 21:31, 43).

(2.) ὁ πατὴρ ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς (ὁ οὐράνιος, four times), sixteen times, only twice in Mark, not at all in Luke.

(3.) Υἱὸς Δαβίδ, to designate Jesus as the Messiah, seven times, three times each in Mark and Luke.

(4.) ῾Η ἁγία πόλις, and ὁ ἅγιος τόπος, for Jerusalem, three times; not in the other evangelists

(5.) ἡ συντελεία τοῦ αἰῶνος, "the consummation of the age" "the end of the world," is found five times in Matthew, nowhere else in the New Test. except <580926>Hebrews 9:26, in the plural, αἰώνων.

(6.) ἵνα (ὅπως) πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθέν, eight times, nowhere else in the New Test. John uses ἵνα πληρ. ὁ λόγ**,** or ἡ γραφ*;* Mark once (<41449>Mark 14:49), ἵνα πληρ. αἱ γραφ.

(7.) τὸ ῥθὲν (always used by Matthew when quoting holy Scripture *himself* in other citations γέγραπται, with the other evangelists), twelve times; ὁ ῥηθείς, once (<40103>Matthew 3:3). He never uses the singular, γραφή. Mark once uses τὸ ῥηθέν (<41314>Mark 13:14).

(8.) ἐθνικός, twice; nowhere else in the New Test.

(9.) ὀμνύειν ἐν seven times; not elsewhere, save <660106>Revelation 10:6.

(10.) καὶ ἰδού, in narrative, twenty-three times; in Luke sixteen times; not in Mark. ἰδού, after a genitive absolute, nine times.

(11.) προσέρχεσθαι and πορεύεσθαι, continually used to give a pictorial coloring to the narrative (e.g. <40403>Matthew 4:3; 8:5, 19, 25; <40914>Matthew 9:14, 20, etc.; 2:8; <40913>Matthew 9:13; 11:4, etc.).

(12.) λέγων, absolutely, without the dative of the person (e.g. <40120>Matthew 1:20; 3:2, 13, 20; <40302>Matthew 3:2, 14,17; v. 2; 6:31, etc.).

(13.) Ιεροσόλυμα is the name of the holy city with Matthew always, except 23:37. It is the same in Mark, with one (doubtful) exception (<41101>Mark 11:1). Luke uses this form rarely; ῾ Ιερουσαλήμ frequently.

Other peculiarities, establishing the unity of authorship, may be noticed:

(1.) The use of τότε, as the ordinary particle of transition, ninety times; six times in Mark, and fourteen in Luke.

(2.) καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε, five times; Luke uses ὅτε δὲ ἐγένετο, or καὶ ὅτε ἐγενετο.

(3.) ἕως ου, seven times.

(4.) ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ, ἐν τῇ ρᾷ ἐκ..., and ἀπὸ τ. ρ. ἐκ., scarcely found in Mark or Luke.

(5.) ἀναχωρέω, "to retire," ten times.

(6.) καὶ ὅναρ, six times.

(7.) ποιεῖν ὡς, σπερ, Καθώς, ὡσαύτως*;* Luke, ποι. ὁμοίωκ.

(8.) τάφος, six times; only Romans 3:13 besides in the N.T.

(9.) σφόδρα, and other adverbs, after the verb, except οὕτω, always before it.

(10.) προσκυνεῖν, with the dative, ten times; twice in Mark, three times in John.

Other words which are found either only or more frequently in Matthew are, μαθητεύειν, σεληνιάζεσθαι, φρόνιμος, οἰκιακός, ὕστερον, ἐκεῖθεν, διστάζειν, καταποντίζεσθαι, μεταιρεῖν, συναιρεῖν λόγον, συμβούλιον λαμβάνειν, μαλακία-κος, etc. (see Credner, *Einzleit.* p. 63 sq.; Gersdorf, *Beitrdye z. Sprachchharact. d. N.T.).*

IX. *Citations from the Old Testament.* — Few facts are more significant of the original purpose of this Gospel, and the persons for whom it was designed, than the frequency of citations from and references to the O.-Test. Scriptures. While in Luke and Mark, the Gentile Gospels, we have only twenty-four and twenty-three respectively, Matthew supplies no less than fifty-four. The character of the quotations is no less noticeable than the number. In Matthew the Old Test. is cited verbally no less than forty-three times, many of the quotations being peculiar to this evangelist; in Luke we have not more than nineteen direct citations, and only eight quotations (in Mark only two), which are not found elsewhere. The two classes into which these citations are distinguished — those more or less directly from the Sept., and those which give an original rendering of the Hebrew text — have been alluded to above. The citations peculiar to Matthew are marked with an asterisk (*), and those which he quotes as having been fulfilled ill our Lord's life with (*a*).

Picture for Matthew

X. *Genuineness* — Notwithstanding the doubts that have been thrown upon it, the genuineness of Matthew is as satisfactorily established as that of any ancient book whatever. See Davidson's *Introd. to the N. Test.*, vol. 1. From the days of Justin we find perpetual quotations corresponding with the existing text of the Gospel, which prove that the book then in circulation, as of canonical authority, was the same as that we now have. Of the various recensions by which we are invited by Marsh, Hilgenfeld, Schleiermacher, Ewald, etc., to believe that the Gospel assumed its present form, there is absolutely no external evidence; while the internal, arising

from style and diction, are entirely in favor of the whole having substantially proceeded from one hand. Other supposed internal evidence varies so much, according to the subjective position of critics, and leads them by the same data to such opposite results, as to be little worth.

1. Some critics, admitting the apostolic antiquity of a part of the Gospel, apply to Matthew, as they do to Luke, the gratuitous supposition of a later editor or compiler, who, by augmenting and altering the earlier document, produced our present Gospel. Hilgenfeld (p. 106) endeavors to separate the older from the newer work, and includes much historical matter in the former; since Schleiermacher, several critics, misinterpreting the λόγια of Papias, consider the older document to have been a collection of "discourses" only. We are asked to believe that in the 2d century, for two or more of the Gospels, new works, differing from them both in matter and compass, were substituted for the old, and that about the end of the 2d century our present Gospels were adopted by authority to the exclusion of all others, and that henceforth the copies of the older works entirely disappeared, and have escaped the keenest research ever since. Eichhorn's notion is that "the Church" sanctioned the four canonical books, and by its authority gave them exclusive currency; but there existed at that time no means for convening a council, and if such a body could have met and decided, it would not have been able to force on the churches books discrepant from the older copies to which they had long been accustomed, without discussion, protest, and resistance (see Norton, *Genuineness*, chap. 1). That there was no such resistance or protest we have ample evidence. Irenaeus knows the four Gospels only *(Haer.* 3, chap. 1). Tatian, who died A.D. 170, composed a Gospel harmony, lost to us, under the name of Diatessaron (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* 4:29). Theophilus, bishop of Antioch, about 168, wrote a commentary on the Gospels (Jerome, *Ad Algasiam,* and *De Vir. ill.).* Clement of Alexandria (flourished about 189) knew the four Gospels, and distinguished between them and the uncanonical gospel according to the Egyptians. Tertullian (born about 160) knew the four Gospels, and was called on to vindicate the text of one of them against the corruptions of Marcion. *SEE LUKE*. Origen (born 185) calls the four Gospels the four elements of the Christian faith; and it appears that his copy of Matthew contained the genealogy *(Comm. in Joan.).* Passages from Matthew are quoted by Justin Martyr, by the author of the letter to Diognetus (see in Otto's *Justin Martyr,* vol. 2), by Hegesippus, Irenaeus, Tatian, Athenagoras, Theophilus, Clement,

Tertullian, and Origen. It is not merely from the matter, but the manner of the quotations, from the calm appeal as to a settled authority, from the absence of all hints of doubt, that we regard it as proved that the book we possess had not been the subject of any sudden change. Was there no heretic to throw back with double force against Tertullian the charge of alteration which he brings against Marcion? Was there no orthodox Church or member of a Church to complain that, instead of the Matthew and the Luke that had been taught to them and their fathers, other and different writings were now imposed on them? Neither the one nor the other appears.

The citations of Justin Martyr, very important for this subject, have been thought to indicate a source different from the Gospels which we now possess; and by the word *(*ἀπομνημονεύματα (memoirs), he has been supposed to indicate that lost work. We have not space here to show that the remains referred to are the Gospels which we possess, and not any one book; and that though Justin quotes the Gospels very loosely, so that his words often bear but a slight resemblance to the original, the same is true of his quotations from the Septuagint. He transposes words, brings separate passages together, attributes the words of one prophet to another, and even quotes the Pentateuch for facts not recorded in it. Many of the quotations from the Septuagint are indeed precise, but these are chiefly in the Dialogue with Trypho, where, reasoning with a Jew on the O.T., he does not trust his memory, but consults the text. This question is disposed of in Norton's *Genuineness,* vol. 1, and in Hug's *Einleitung.*

2. The genuineness of the first two chapters has been called in question, but on no sufficient grounds. See Meyer's note, *Comment.* 1:65, who adduces as arguments for their genuineness, that —

(1.) they are found in all MSS. and ancient versions, and are quoted by the fathers of the 2d and 3d centuries, Irenaeus. Clem. Alex., etc., and are referred to by Celsus (Orig. *C. Cels.* 1:38; 2:32).

(2.) The facts they record are perfectly in keeping with a Gospel written for Jewish Christians.

(3.) The opening of chap. 3, ἐν δὲ ταῖς ἡμ.ἐκ, refers back, by its construction, to the close of chap. 2; and <4013>Matthew 4:13 would be unintelligible without <4023>Matthew 2:23.

(4.) There is no difference between the diction and constructions and those in the other parts of the Gospel.

The opponents of these two chapters rest chiefly on their alleged absence from the Gospel of the Hebrews in use among the Ebionites (Epiphanius, *Haer.* 30:13). But Epiphanius describes that book as "incomplete, adulterated, and mutilated;" and as the Ebionites regarded Jesus simply as the human Messiah co-ordinate with Adam and Moses, the absence of the two chapters may readily be accounted for on doctrinal grounds. The same explanation may be given for the alleged absence from the Diatessaron of Tatian of these chapters, and the corresponding parts of Luke containing the genealogy, and all the other passages which show that the Lord was born of the seed of David "according to the flesh" (Theodoret, *Haer.* fab. 1:20). The case must be a weak one which requires us to appeal to acknowledged heretics for the correction of our canon. The supposed discrepancy between the opening chapters of Matthew and Luke, which has led even professor Norton to follow Strauss, Paulus, Schleiermacher, etc., in rejecting them, has been abundantly discussed in all recent commentaries, and by Wieseler *(Synopsis),* Neander *(Life of Christ),* Mill *(Pantheism),* Kern *(Ursprung d. Ev. Mat.),* etc., as well as in the various answers to Strauss. It is sufficient here to note the following points in reply:

(1.) Such questions are by no means confined to these chapters, but are found in places of which the apostolic origin is admitted.

(2.) The treatment of Luke's Gospel by Marcion suggests how the Jewish Christians dropped out of their version an account which they would not accept.

(3.) Prof. Norton stands alone, among those who object to the two chapters, in assigning the genealogy to the same author as the rest of the chapters (Hilgenfeld, p. 46, 47).

(4.) The difficulties in the harmony are all reconcilable, and the day has passed, it may be hoped, when a passage can be struck out, against all the MSS. and the testimony of early writers, for subjective impressions about its contents.

XI. *Commentaries.* — The following are the special exegetical helps on the whole of Matthew's Gospel, a few of the most important of which we

indicate by an asterisk prefixed: Origen, *Commentaria* (in *Opp.* 3:440 sq., 830 sq.); also *Scholia* (in Galland, *Bibl. Patr.* 14); Athanasius, *Fragmenta (in Opp.* 1, pt. 2; also 3:18); Hilarius Pictaviensis, *Commentarii* (in *Opp.* 1:669); Jerome, *Commentarii* (in *Opp. v.* 1); Faustus Rhegiensis, *Super ev. Matthew* (in Jerome, *Opp.* 11. 77, 204, 365); Chry*sostom, Homilies (in Opp. [Spuria,],* 6:731-980; also ed. Field, Cantab. 1839, 3 vols. 8vo; in English, in *Lib. of Fathers,* Oxf. 1843-51, vols. xi, xv, xxxiv); Cyril of Alexandria, T *Fayogenta* (in Mai, *Script. vet.* viii, pt. 2:142); Paschasits Ratbertus, *Commentaria (in Opp. i;* also in *Bibl. Max. Patr.* xiv); Chromatius Aquiliensis, *Tractatus* (in Galland, *Bibl. Patr.* 8:333); Bede, *Expositio* (in *Opp.* v. 1); Anselm, *Enarrationes* (in *Opp.* ed. Picard); Rupertus Tuitiensis, *Super Matthceum* (in *Opp.* 2:1); Aquinas, *Commentarii* (in *Opp.* iii); Druthmar, *Expositio (in Bibl. Max. Patr.* 15:86); Albertus Magnus, *Commentarii* (in *Opp.* ix); Melancthon, *Commentarii* (Argent. 1523, 8vo; also in *Opp.* iii); Munster, *Annotationes* (Basil. 1537, fol.; also in *Critici Sacri);* Luther, *Annotationes* [on ch.i-xviii] (Vitemb. 1538, 8vo; also in *Works,* both Lat. and Germ.); Sarcer, *Scholia* (Freft. 1538; Basil. 1540, 1541, 1544, 1560, 8vo); Bullinger, *Commentarius* (Tigur. 1542, fol.); *Titelmann,Commentarius* (Antw. 1545, 8vo; 1576; Par. 1546; Lugd. 1547,1556, 1568, fol.); Musculus, *Commentarius* [includ. Mark and Luke] (Basil. 1548,1556,1566,1578,1591, 1611, fol.); Bredembrach, *Commentaria* (Colon. 1550, fol.); Zwingle, *Annotationes* (in *Opp.* 4:1; in Germ. by Kiister, Halle, 1783, 8vo); Chytreus, *Commentarius* (Vitemb. 1555, 1566, 8vo); Ferus, *narrationes* (Mogunt. 1559, fol.; Antw. and Lugd. 1559; Par. and Ven. 1560; Complut. 1562; Par. 1564; Antw. 1570; Romans 1577; Lugd. 1604, 1610, 8vo); Hersel, *Commentarius* (Lovan. 1568, 1572, 8vo); Marloratus, *Exposition* (from the Lat. by Tymme, Lend. 1570, fol.); Junius, *Expositio (in Opp.* 2:1893); Brentz, *Commentarii* (in *Opp.* v); Aretius, *Commentarius* (Morg. 1580, 8vo); Tyndale, *Notes* [on i-xxi] (in *Expositions,* p. 227); Gualther, *Homilies* (Tigur. 1590-96, 2 vols. fol.); De Avendano, *Commentarius* (Madrid, 1592, 2 vols. fol.); Dannaus, *Commentarius* (Genev. 1593, 8vo); Kirsten, *Notae* (Vratisl. 1611, fol.); Pelargus, *Illustrationes* (Freft. 1612, 1617, 2 vols. 4to); Tostatus, *Commentarii* (in *Opp.);* Scultetus, *Exercitationaes* (Amst. 1624, 4to); Novarinus, *Noted* (Ven. 1629; Lugd. 1642, fol.); Gomar, *Explicatio* (Groning. 1631, 8vo); (Ecolampadius, *Enarrationes* (Basil. 1636, 8vo); Possinus and Corderius, *Symbolcea* (Tolos. 1646,2 vols. fol.); Episcopius, Note [on i-xxiv] (in *Opp.* II, 1:1); Dickson, *Exposition* (Lond. 1651,

12mo); De Aponte, *Commentarii* (Lugd. 1651, 2 vols. fol.); Bertram, *Enucleatio* (Arnst. 1651, 4to); MIatthias, *Analysis* (Ainst. 1652, fol.); Wandalin, *Paraphssis* (Slesw. 1654,4to); De Pise, *Commentaria* (Lugd. 1656, fol.); Pareus, *Comnmentarius (in Opp.* ii); Cocceits, *Noite* (in *Opp. 12*:3); Lightfoot, *Exercitations* (in *Works,* xi); Blackwood, *Exposition* [on i-x] (Lond. 1659, 4to); A. Lapide, *In Matth.* (Antw. 1660. fol.); Leighton, *Lecturles* [on i-ix] (in *Worcks,* 3:1); Winstrup, *Pandectae* (Lund. Scan. 1660, 1674; Hafn. 1699, 2 vols. fol.); Gerhard, *A dnofationes* (Jen. 1663, 1696, 4to); Spanheim, *Vindici* (i, ii, Heidelb. 1663; iii, L. B. 1685, 4to); Meisner, *Exercitationes* (Vitemb. 1664, 4to); Hartsoecker, *A antekenigen* (Amst. 1668, 4to); Saubert, *Variae Lectiones,* etc. (Helmst. 1672, 4to); De Veil, *Explicatio* [includ. Mark] (Lond. 1678, 8vo); Van Til, *Notes* (in Dutch,Amst. 1682; Dort, 1687, 1695; in German, Cassel, 1700; Frcft. 1705, 4to); Huysing, *Exposition* (in Dutch, Hague, 1684, 4to; in German, Cassel, 1710, fol.); Crell, *Commentarius* [on i-v] (in *Opp.* 1:1); Przipcovius, *Cogitationes* (Elesuth. 1692, fol.); Wegner, *Adnotata* (Regiom. 1699,17-05, 4to); Hidevger. *Labores* [incllud. some other books] (Tigur. 1700, 4to); *Olearius, Observationes* (Lips. 1713,3, 4to); Pfaff, *Note* (Tilbing. 1721, 4to); Klemm, *Exercitia* [on i-v] (Tiib. 1725, 4to); Vrimoet, *Observationes* [on i-v] (Fr. ad R. 1728, 8vo); D. Scott, *Notes* (Lond. 1741, 4to); Elsner, *Commentarimus* (Zwoll. 1767-9, 2 vols. 4to); Wakefield, *Notes* (Lond. 1782, 4to); Adam, *Exposition (in Works,* i); Goz, *Erklscruii* (Stuttg. 1785, 8vo); Wizenman, *Jesus nach Matth.* (Basle, 1789, 1864, 8vo); Beausobre, *Com7mentary* (from the French, Cambr. 1790, 8vo, and often since); Heddalus, *Anmnnerkungen* (Stuttg. 1792, 2 vols. 8vo); Griesbach, *Commentarius* (Jen. 1798, 8vo); Porteus, *Lectures* (Lond. 1802, and since. 2 vols. 8ev); Schulthess, *Homilien* (Winterth. 1805, 2 vols. 8vo); Menken, *Betrachtungen* (i, Frckft. 1809; ii, Bann. 1822, 8vo); Lodge, *Lectures* (Lond. 1818, 8vo); Meyer, *Beitrage* (Wien, 1818, 8vo); Gratz, *Conmentnar* (Tib. 1821-23, 2 vols. 8vo); Binterim, *Bemner- ungen* (i, Mainz, 1823, 8vo); *Fritzsche, *Commentar* (Lpz. 1826, 8vo); Harte, *Lectures* (Lond. 1831-34, 2 vols. 12mo); Cramer, *Jesus s. — ach Matthius* (Lpz. 1832, 8vo); Penrose, *Lectures* (Lond. 1832, 12mo); — Watson, *Exposition* [includ. Mark] (Lond. 1833 and since; N. Y. 1846 and since, 8vo); Scholten, *Ondersocking* (Leyden, 1836, 8vo); Cotter, *Paraphrase* [includ. Mark] (Lond. 1840, 12mo); Cheke, *Notes* (Lond. 1843, 8vo); Perceval, *Lectures* (Lond. 1845,4 vols. 12mo); Ford, *Illustration* (Lond. 1848, 8vo); Boothroyd, *Notes* (Edinb. 1851, 8vo); Overton, *Lectures* (Lond. 1851, 2 vols. 8vo); Cumming, *Readings* (Lond. 1853, 8vo);

Arnoldi, *Commentar* (Trier, 1856, 8vo); Goodwin, *Commentary* (Cambr. 1857, 8vo); *Morison, *Notes* (Bost. 1858, 1861; Edinb. 1870, 8vo); Shadwell, *Translation* (Lond. 1859, 12mo); *Conant, *Notes*, etc. (Amer. Bible Union, N. Y. 1860, 4to); Conder, *Commentary* (Lond. 1860, 8vo); Lutteroth, *Essai* [on i-xiii] (Par. 1860-67, 3 pts. 8vo); *Alexander, *Explanation* [on i-xvi] (N. Y. 1861, 12mo); *Luthardt, *De Compositione Matthew* (Lips. 1861, 8vo); Reville, *Etudes* (Par. 1862, 8vo); Gratry, *Commentaire* (Par. 1863, 8vo); *Nast, *Commentary* [includ. Mark] (Cincinnati. 1864, 8vo); Thomas, *Observations* (Lond. 1864, 8vo); Klofuter, *Commentarius* (Vien. 1866, 8vo); Hilgenfeld, *Untersuchung* (in his *Zeitschr.* 1866, 1867); Kelly, *Lectures* (Lond. 1870, 8vo); Adamson, *Exposition* (Lond. 1871,8vo). *SEE GOSPELS*.

Matthew Of Bassi.

SEE CAPUCHINS.

Matthew Of Blatares.

SEE BLATARES.

Matthew Of Cracow

(more accurately of Krokow, in Pomerania), a noted German prelate of the Church of Rome, and worthy to be counted foremost among the forerunners of the great Reformation, was a native of Pomerania, and flourished near the opening of the 15th century. But little is known of his personal history, except that he was made by the emperor Rupert a professor in the young University of Heidelberg; afterwards became chancellor to Rupert, and through the latter’s influence became bishop of Worms in 1405, and that he attended the Council of Pisa in 1409, and died in 1410. But of his labors we know enough to award him great praise as an ardent and faithful worker for reform among the clergy of his Church. Indeed, the corrupt condition of the Romish Church, and especially of the ecclesiastical body, seems to have early engaged his serious attention. In 1384 he delivered a discourse on the improvement of morals, both in priests and people, before an archiepiscopal synod in Prague; and, as he began then, so he continued through life to battle for reform and the eradication of corruption, and the abandonment of simony and other vile practices. Both with his tongue and by his pen he sought to advance the interests of the noble cause he had espoused, and, as his position secured

him great influence, his labors were certainly not in vain. For his day and generation he was no doubt another cardinal Julian (q.v.). He desired reform rather than a revolution, and therefore failed to accomplish his mission.

Matthew left behind him a number of MSS., some of which were afterwards printed. Among the most noted of his works is a treatise on the pollutions of the Romish court, which appears to have been written a little previous to the year 1409, about the period when the schism in the papacy seemed to open a door for conscientious minds to cherish doubts, at least privately, yet sufficiently to afford a leaven for the future, respecting the boasted infallibility of the popes, and the degree of implicit faith and obedience due to their appointments and decisions. It may be that the weakness occasioned by this papal schism furnished a reason why the author of so bold an attack on the prevailing corruptions did not encounter the hostility and persecution of the ecclesiastical powers. His favor with the emperor was an additional source of impunity, and probably also his early death after the publication of the work. We have no information of the effect immediately produced by the treatise, but it shows that the harvest of the 16th century was even then in its germ, and it seems like some of the seed towards the harvest, sown for a hundred years, to produce fruit in the times of Luther and Melancthon. See Ullmann, *Reformers before the Reformation,* vol. 1; Hodgson, *Reformers and Martyrs* (Phila. 1867, 12mo), p. 118 sq. (J. H. W.)

Matthew

(Matthaeus) OF PARIS, an English monastic, of great celebrity as a chronicler of England's early history, was born about the end of the 12th century. He took the religious habit in the Benedictine monastery of St. Albans in 1217. Almost the only incident of his life that has been recorded is a journey he made to Norway, by command of the pope, to introduce some reforms into the monastic establishments of that country, which mission he has the credit of having executed with great ability and success. He is said to have stood high in the favor of Henry III, and to have obtained various privileges for the University of Oxford through his influence with that king. His acquirements embraced all the learning and science of his age; besides theology and history; oratory, poetry, painting, architecture, and a practical knowledge of mechanics, are reckoned among his accomplishments by his biographers or panegyrists. His memory is

preserved mainly by his history of England, entitled *Historia Major*, really a continuation of a work begun at St. Albans by Roger of Wendover (who died in May, 1236), and which was subsequently entitled *Chronica Major*, or *Chronica Majora Sancti Albani*. Roger's name, however, was obscured by that of our subject, Matthew of Paris, who, though he adopted the plan of Roger's work, really furnished a most valuable chronicle, especially of mediaeval history. In the British Museum, and in the libraries of Corpus Christi and Benedict colleges, Cambridge, there are manuscripts of an epitome, by Matthew of Paris himself, of his history, generally referred to by the names of the *Historia Minot'*, or the *Chronica*, which, bishop Nicholson says, contains "several particulars of note omitted in the larger history." This smaller work was for a long time ascribed to a *Matthew of Westminster* (q.v.). Of late, however, the question of authorship has been fairly settled by Sir Frederick Madden, who edited and published these chronicles. He pronounced the Westminster Matthew "a phantom who never existed," and observes that even the late Mr. Buckle was so deceived by the general tone of confidence manifested in quoting this writer that he characterizes him as, after Froissart, the most celebrated historian of the 14th century. "The mystery of the 'phantom historian,'" says a writer in the *Westminster Review* (Oct., 1866, p. 238), "has been happily unveiled by Sit Frederick Madden, whose correct anticipation is unexpectedly confirmed by his discovery of the original copy of the work, now in the Chetham Library at Manchester. This manuscript establishes beyond all doubt that the largest portion of the *Flores Historiarum*, attributed to the pseudo Matthew of Westminster, was written at St. Albans, under the eye and by direction of Matthew of Paris, as an abridgment of his greater chronicle; and the text from the close of the year 1241 to about two thirds of 1249 is in his own handwriting. This manuscript, continued after his death by another hand on the same plan, down to the issue of the battle of Evesham in 1265, ceased after that date to be written at St. Albans, and passed eventually into the library of the Monastery of St. Peter, at Westminster. The author of the first continuation, after the manuscript had left St. Albans, was, Sir F. Madden thinks, John Bevere, otherwise named John of London. It was brought down by Bevere to the year 1306. A special class of manuscripts, including the Eton MS. of Matthew of Westminster, implicitly follows Bevere's chronicle; but in the original copy of the *Flores Historiarum*, after it came to Westminster, Bevere's text is generally abridged, although under some years there are additions. The entire work is carried on to the year 1305. 'It was,' says Sir Frederick, 'no doubt from

the fact that the latter portion of the *Flores Historiarum* was composed by a Westminster monk, that the entire work was afterwards attributed to a Matthew of Westminster, for the name of *Matthew* really belonged to Matthew *of Paris,* whilst the affix of Westminster was supplied by conjecture; and this pseudonyme having been recognized by Bale and Joscelin, and adopted by archbishop Parker, the error has been perpetuated to our own time.'" Besides this edition by Madden, entitled *Matthei Parisiensis, Monachi Sancti Albani, Historia Anglorum, sive ut vulgo dicitur, Historia Minor, item, ejusdem abbreviatio Chronicorum Angliae* (published by the authority of the lords commissioners of her majesty's treasury, London, Longmans, 1866 sq.), we have one by archbishop Parker (London, 1571, folio; reprinted at Liguri, Zurich, 1606; London, 1640 [or in some copies 1641], fol., by Dr. William Watts; Par. 1644, fol.; Lond. 1684, fol.). Watts's edition, which is sometimes divided into two volumes, contains, besides various readings and copious indexes, two other works of the author never before printed, namely, his *Duorum Offarum MerciorunRegum* (S. Albani Fundatorum) *Vitae,* and his *Viginti Trium Abbatum S. Albani Vitae,* together with what he calls his *Additamenta* to those treatises. "Matthew of Paris writes with considerable spirit and rhetorical display, and uses remarkable freedom of speech; and his work, which is continued to the death of Henry III (1272) by William Rishanger, another monk of the same abbey, has been the chief authority commonly relied upon for the history of that reign. Its spirit, however, is somewhat fiercely and narrowly English; and from the freedom with which he inveighs against what he regards as the usurpations of the papal see, Romanist writers have always expressed strong dissatisfaction especially with his accounts of ecclesiastical affairs. With Protestant critics, on the other hand, Matthew of Paris has been a favorite in proportion to the dislike he has incurred from their opponents. At one time it used to be affirmed by the Roman Catholics that the printed Matthew of Paris was in many things a mere modern fabrication of the Reformers; but Watts, by collating all the manuscript copies he could find, and noting the various readings, proved that there was no foundation for this charge" *(Engl. Cyclop.* s.v.). A translation of the *History* of Matthew of Paris, by Dr. Giles, forms a volume of Bohn's "Antiquarian Library," and the *Flowers of History* of Roger of Wendover forms two volumes of the same series. See Oudin, *Scriptores Eccles.* 3:204 sq.; also Herzog, *Real-Encyklopadie,* 9:176; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon,* 6:932: *North British Rev.* Oct. 1869, p. 119. *SEE ROGER OF WENDOVER.*

Matthew

OF WESTMINSTER, an early English chronicler, flourished in the reign of Edward II. Nothing whatever is known of his personal history except that he was a monk of the Benedictine Abbey of Westminster. He is supposed to have died about 1307 or 1377. His chronicle, written in Latin, is entitled *Flores Historiarum, per Matthceum Westmonasteriensemn collecti, praecipue se Rebus Brittannicis, ab Exordio Mundi, usque ad annum* 1307 (Lond. 1567; with additions, Frkf. 1601). Bohn has published an English version (Lond. 1853, 2 vols. 8vo). Another work formerly ascribed to him is now definitely settled to be the production of MATTHEW OF PARIS *SEE MATTHEW OF PARIS* (q.v.).

Matthew Of York (Tobias),

a noted English prelate, was born in Bristol in 1546. In childhood he manifested unusual talent, and was prepared for Oxford when only thirteen years of age. He took the bachelor's degree in 1563, and three years after the master's, and immediately entered into "holy orders" — a young man much respected for his great learning, eloquence, sweet conversation, friendly disposition, and the sharpness of his wit. In 1566 he was made university orator; in 1570, canon of Christ Church and deacon of Bath; in 1572, prebendary of Sarum and president of St. John's College, Oxford, and one of the queen's chaplains in ordinary. In 1583 he was installed dean of Durham, in 1595 he was created bishop of Durham, and in 1606 archbishop of York. He died at Cawood Castle March 29, 1628, The learning and piety of archbishop Matthew have been warmly eulogized by Camden. It is to be much lamented that his sermons, which are said to have been superior productions, were not preserved to us in print. The only publication of his is entitled *Concia Apologetica contra Capianum* (Oxf. 1581 and 1638, 8vo). In the cathedral church at York there is a MS. from his pen containing *Notes upon all the Ancient Fathers.* See Wood, *Athenoe Oxonienses;* Middleton, *Ev. Biogr.* 2:478 sq.; Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* s.v.

Matthews, Alford A.

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Mercer County, Pa., July 11, 1838; went to Wethersfield, Ill., in 1855, and was there converted and joined the Missionary Baptist Church. In the winter of 1862 - '63 he joined the Methodist Episcopal Church, after advising with his pastor and members of his own Church. Soon after he received license to

preach. In the spring of 1864, the health of the pastor of the Buda Circuit failing, the circuit was vacated, and Matthews was appointed his successor. At the close of the year he was admitted on trial into the Illinois Conference, and returned to the Buda charge. From the Conference of 1866 to that of 1868 he was in charge of the Tiskilwa Station. At the Conference of 1868 he was appointed to Chillicothe, and there he labored most acceptably to the people and most successfully for the cause to which he gave his life. He died quite suddenly at this place, Aug. 1, 1869. "From his boyhood days he was a diligent student; from his espousal of the cause of Christ, a devoted Christian; and from the time he received license to preach, a very zealous and successful minister of the Gospel. While at Buda, his first charge, he sought and found the blessing of perfect love, and lived in the enjoyment of the blessing until the day of his death." See *Conf: Minutes,* 1869, p. 241.

Matthews, Henry

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Prince George County, Md. Blessed with pious and good parents, he was early led to Christ, and connected himself with Asbury Church, in Howard County. In 1849 he moved to Baltimore, and joined the Sharp Street Church. In 1852 he was licensed to preach, and in 1857 was ordained a local deacon. In 1864 he joined the Washington Conference, just then organizing, and was appointed to Gunpowder Circuit, where he labored with great zeal for three years; was then appointed to West River Circuit, and in 1870 was stationed at Monocacy; but his health suddenly failed, and he was compelled to relinquish his arduous labors. He died Dec. 31, 1870. "Brother Matthews was a faithful, plodding, deeply conscientious minister. Wherever he went his solidity of character was acknowledged; and the firm faith which he himself reposed in the doctrines he preached, and his prayerful reliance on God, stamped on his efforts unvaried success." See *Conf. Minutes,* 1871, p. 28.

Matthews, John

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Beaver Co., Pa., Feb. 7, 1778. He enjoyed the advantages of a good parental training, graduated at Jefferson College, Canonsburg, Pa., in 1807, and studied theology under Rev. Dr. John McMillan. He was licensed in 1809, and in 1810 ordained pastor of Gravel Run and Waterford churches; in 1817 he became an itinerating

missionary, and took charge of the Church at Louisiana, Pike Co., Mo., where he continued itinerating, especially among the destitute of that vicinity, until 1825. when he settled at Apple Creek Church, in Cape Girardeau Co., Mo.; in 1827 he took charge of the Church at Kaskaskia, Ill., thence went to Missouri, where he labored till his health failed, and then removed to Georgetown, Ill., where he died, May 12,1861. Mr. Matthews was characterized by a cheerful and warm-hearted disposition. As a pastor he was faithful and zealous; as a friend, kind and affectionate. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist, Almanac*, 1862, p. 102.

Matthews, William

a Quaker preacher, was born in Stafford Co., Va., in 1732. His parents died when he was quite young. He entered the ministry at twenty-three years of age, and gave convincing evidence of a heavenly call. Matthews was a man of sound judgment and great Christian piety. He spent several years in ministerial work in England, Ireland, Scotland, and Wales. The exact date of his death is not known. See Janney, *Hist. of Friends,* 3:398.

Matthewís (St.) Day

a festal day observed in the Roman Catholic and the Anglican churches on Sept. 21, and in the Greek churches on Nov. 16, is mentioned in St. Jerome's *Comes,* and was first generally observed in the 11th century. — Walcott, *Sac. Archaeol.* s.v.

Matthia, Johann

a noted Swedish prelate, was born in Ostrogothia in 1592, and after enjoying the best educational advantages of his country, entered the ministry. After filling several important positions, he became court preacher and almoner to Gustavus Adolphus. He was next appointed preceptor to Christina, the daughter of that monarch, and was created bishop of Strengnis in 16i3. He died in 1670. Matthiti wrote several moral and theological works, the most important of which are, *Opuscula Theologica* (Strengnias, 1661, 8vo): — *Sacre Disquisitiones ad refutandos Epicureos, atheos et fanaticos* (Stockholm, 1669, 4to). See Hoefer, *souv. Biog. Genesis* vol. 33, s.v.

Matthi'as

(Ματθίας, a contraction of *Matithiah* or *Matthew*, a form frequently met with in Josephus [see below]), one of the constant attendants from the first upon our Lord's ministry, who was chosen by lot, in preference to Joseph Barsabas, into the number of the apostles, to supply the vacancy caused by the treachery and suicide of Judas (<40123>Acts 1:23-26). A.D. 29. We may accept as probable the opinion which is shared by Eusebius (*H. E.* lib. 1:12) and Epiphanius (1:20) that he was one of the seventy disciples. He is said to have preached the Gospel in Ethiopia (Niceph. 2:40; according to Sophronius, "in altera Ethiopia," i.e. Colchis; comp. Cellar. *Notit.* 2:309), or Cappadocia according to Cave, and to have at last suffered martyrdom (comp. *Menalog. Graec.* 3:198). According to another tradition, he preached in Judlea, and was stoned to death by the Jews (see Prionii *Vitae Apostol.* p. 178; *Acta Sanctomrum,* Feb. 24; comp. Augusti, *Denkwuidiqgk.* 3:241). There was early an apocryphal gospel bearing his name (Eusebius, *H. E.* 3:25, 3; Clemens Alex. *Strom.* 2:163; 7:318; Grabii *Spicileg. patr.* 2:1, p. 117; Fabric. *Cod. apocr. N.T.* 1:782 sq.).

"Different opinions have prevailed as to the manner of the election of Matthias. The most natural construction of the words of Scripture seems to be this: After the address of Peter, the whole assembled body of the brethren, amounting in number to about 120 (<40115>Acts 1:15), proceeded to nominate two, namely, Joseph, surnamed Barsabas, and Matthias, who answered the requirements of an apostle: the subsequent selection between the two was referred in prayer to him who, knowing the hearts of men, knew which of them was the fitter to be his witness and apostle. The brethren then, under the heavenly guidance which they had invoked, proceeded to give forth their lots, probably by each writing the name of one of the candidates on a tablet, and casting it into the urn. The urn was then shaken, and the name that first came out decided the election. Lightfoot *(Hor. Heb. Luc.* 1:9) describes another way of casting lots which was used in assigning to the priests their several parts in the service of the Temple. The apostles, it will be remembered, had not yet received the gift of the Holy Ghost, and this solemn mode of casting the lots, in accordance with a practice enjoined in the Levitical law (<031608>Leviticus 16:8), is to be regarded as a way of referring the decision to God (comp. <201633>Proverbs 16:33). Chrysostom remarks that it was never repeated after the descent of the Holy Spirit. The election of Matthias is discussed by bishop Beveridge *(Works,* vol. 1, serm. 2)." It would seem, however, that Paul was the divine

appointee to fill the vacancy in the college of the apostles. Monographs in Latin on his election have been written by Scharff (Viteb. 1652), Bittelmaier (ib. 1676), and Hammerschmid (Prag. 1760).

Matthi'as

is likewise the name of one person mentioned in the Apocrypha (Ματταθίας) and of several in Josephus (Ματθιας), especially as Jewish highpriests.

1. Given (1 Esdras 9:33) in place of the Heb. MATTATHIAH (Ezra 10:33).

2. A son of Ananus, made high-priest by Agrippa (soon after the appointment of Petronius as president of Syria), in place of Simon Cantheras, after that honor had been declined by Jonathan as a second term (Josephus, *Ant.* 19:6, 4).

3. Son of Theophilus of Jerusalem, made high-priest by Herod in place of Simon, son of Boethius (*Ant.* 17:4, 2); removed again by Herod to make room for Joaza *(ib.* 6, 4, where Josephus relates his temporary disqualification on the day of annual atonement), and again reinstated by Agrippa in place of Jesus, son of Gamaliel *(ib.* 20:9, 7).

Josephus likewise mentions Matthias, son of Boethius, as "one of the high-priests" betrayed by Simon during the last siege of Jerusalem *(War,* v. 3, 1), but it does not appear whether he was one of the above. *SEE HIGH-PRIEST.*

Matthias

a religious impostor whose real name was *Robert Matthew,* was born in Washington County, N. Y., about 1790. He kept a country-store, but failed in 1816, and went to New York City. In 1827 he removed to Albany, where he became much excited by the preaching of Messrs. Kirk and Finney; made himself active in the temperance cause; claimed to have received a revelation, and began street-preaching; failing to convert Albany, he prophesied its destruction, and fled secretly to New York City, where he was tried and acquitted on the charge of poisoning a wealthy disciple in wh.ose family he had lived. His impositions exposed, he soon disappeared from public view. See *Matthias and his Impostures,* by W. L. Stone (New York, 1835); Drake, *Dict. Amer. Biog. s.v.*

Matthias, Corvinus,

king of Hungary, second son of John Hunyady (q.v.), was born in 1443, and came to the throne in 1458. His accession was hailed with the utmost enthusiasm over the whole country. But the Hungarian crown at this time was no chaplet of roses; two sovereigns, alike formidable, the one, Mohammed II, from his military talents and immense resources, the other, Frederick III, from his intriguing policy, were busily conspiring against the boy-king. To meet these dangers Matthias rapidly carried out his measures of defense, and, scarcely prepared, fell on the Turks, who had ravaged the country as far as Temesvar, inflicted upon them a bloody defeat, pursued them as far as Bosnia, took the stronghold Jaieza, there liberated 10,000 Christian prisoners, and then returned to Weisenberg, to be crowned with the sacred crown of St. Stephen, in 1464. He next suppressed the disorders of Wallachia and Moldavia; but feeling that his plans were counteracted by the intrigues of the emperor Frederick III to gain possession of Hungary, Matthias besought the assistance of pope Pius II, but to no purpose. After a second successful campaign against the Turks, he turned his attention to the encouragement of arts and letters, and adorned his capital with the works of renowned sculptors, in addition to a library of 50,000 volumes. He sent a large staff of literary men to Italy for the purpose of obtaining copies of valuable MSS. (even now the *Collectio Corvina* is celebrated), and adorned his court by the presence of the most eminent men of Italy and Germany. He was himself an author of no mean ability, and possessed a delicate appreciation of the fine arts. At the same time the affairs of government were not neglected. The finances were brought into a flourishing condition, industry and commerce were promoted by wise legislation, and justice was strictly administered to peasant and noble alike. But the promptings of his ambition, and the pressure exercised by the Romish party, cast an indelible blot on Matthias's otherwise spotless escutcheon; he wantonly attacked Podiebrad, his father-in-law, the Hussite king of Bohemia, to wrest from Podiebrad the scepter which he was holding by the declared will of the people. In this action Matthias was influenced especially by pope Pius II and his successor, Paul II. *SEE HUSSITES*, vol. 4, especially p. 424, col. 2. After a bloody contest of seven years' duration between these kings, the greatest generals of the age, the Hungarian power prevailed, and Moravia, Silesia, and Lusatia were wrested from Bohemia. A third war with the Turks closed as successfully as the former two. The emperor also was humiliated by Matthias, and

expiated his guilt in poverty and disgrace. Matthias was suddenly cut down in the midst of his successes at Vienna, April 5,1490. See Butler, *Eccles. Hist.* 2:165; Gieseler, *Eccles. Hist.* 3:370 sq. *SEE LADISLAUS OF POLAND*; *SEE PIUS II*.

Matthias Of Kunwalde,

one of the first ministers of the Ancient Moravian Brethren (q.v.), flourished in the 16th century. He was appointed at the Synod of Lhota, in Bohemia, in 1467. On that, occasion nine men, of high repute for piety, were elected by ballot. Then twelve lots were prepared, nine being blank, and three inscribed with the Bohemian word *Jest* (He is). Thereupon a fervent prayer was offered up beseeching God to designate of these nine nominees, either one, or two, or three, as the ministers of the Church; but, if this should not be the time which he had ordained for such a consummation, to cause all the nine to receive blanks. In this event the Brethren would have deferred further action to some future period. Nine lots having been drawn singly from a vase and given to the nominees, it appeared that Matthias of Kunwalde, Thomas of Prelouc, and Elias of Chrenovic, had each received one marked *Jest.* The synod rose to its feet, sang a thanksgiving hymn, composed for the occasion, and accepted these three men as the future ministers of the Church. In the same year, after the episcopacy .had been secured, Matthias, although only twenty-five .years of age, was consecrated a bishop, and, upon the resignation of bishop Michael, became president of the Church Council. He administered its affairs, according to the extreme views of discipline entertained by Gregory (q.v.), until 1494, when he resigned his presidency and united with the liberal party. In 1500, while on his way to a synod in Moravia, he died at Leipnik, after having, in his last will and testament, which he addressed to the Brethren, exhorted them to avoid schisms, and to preserve the unity of the Spirit in the bonds of peace. He was buried at Prerau. (E. de S.)

Matthias I

emperor of Germany, son of Maximilian II and Mary, daughter of Charles V, deserves a place here because of his relation to one of the most eventful periods in the earliest stages of modern history. He was born in 1557. In 1578 he was invited by the Romanists of the Netherlands to assume the government of that country, but he held the position only a short time. He was appointed stadtholder of Austria in 1595, and in 1611 was invited by

the Bohemians to become their ruler. On the death of his brother Rudolf, emperor of Germany, in 1612, he succeeded to the throne, and was called upon to sit in judgment between Protestant and Romanist in the ensuing contest between these two factions of his empire. He pursued a vacillating policy, and, while striving to direct, made himself distrusted by both. He concluded a disadvantageous treaty with the Turks, then in possession of Hungary (1615), and soon after caused his cousin Ferdinand to be proclaimed king of Bohemia and Hungary. In the midst of the dissensions which preceded the Thirty Years' War he died, in 1619. — See Khevenhuller, *Annales Ferdinandei;* P. Santoric, *Vite di Ridolfo e Mattia Imperatori* (1664); Vehse, *Memoirs of the Court of Austria.* 1:240 sq.; Coxe, *House of Austria,* 2:95 sq.; Kohlrausch, *Hist. of Germany,* p. 311 sq. *SEE THIRTY YEARS WAR.*

Matthias, John B.

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Germantown, Pa., Jan. 1,1767; was converted while residing in New York, after his majority; was there licensed to preach in 1793; preached much and with excellent success as a local deacon until 1811, when he joined the itinerancy. Thereafter he labored very usefully until 1841, when loss of sight obliged him to superannuate. He died in great blessedness at Hempstead, L. I., May 27, 1848. He was educated a German Lutheran, and was by trade a ship-carpenter, but when he felt called to preach he prepared to the best of his ability, and for many years delivered regularly no less than three sermons a week, and many souls were converted under these labors. He was one of the most humble, pious, and loving of Christians, and the fruit of his unostentatious labors was abundant and blessed. — *Minutes of Conferences,* 4:224. (G. L. T.)

Matthias, John J.

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born at New York Jan. 17, 1796. His childhood and early youth were spent with his parents in Tarrytown. At a suitable age he went to Brooklyn to learn the art of printing, but, brought to a knowledge of converting grace, and persuaded in his own mind that he was called of God to preach the Gospel of Christ, he determined to prepare for the work. He entered the ministry when twenty-one years old, in the New York Conference at Goshen Circuit. In 1818 he was appointed to Pittsfield Circuit; in 1819 to Stow; in 1820 to

Leyden; in 1821 and 1822 to Cortlandt; in 1823 to Middlebury, Vt.; in 1824 to St.Albans; in 1825 to Pittsfield; in 1826 to Cortlandt. He was stationed in the city of New York in 1827 and 1828, and in the city of Albany in 1829 and 1830; was transferred to the Philadelphia Conference in 1831, and stationed in the city of Newark, N. J. In 1833, 1834, and 1835 he traveled the East Jersey District; in 1836 he was stationed at the Nazareth Church, in the city of Philadelphia. His health failing, he took a superannuated relation, and continued to hold it until 1841. While sustaining this relation to his Conference, the Pennsylvania and New York Colonization Societies appointed him governor of Bassa Cove, on the West Coast of Africa. He was in Africa about a year, but, subjected to severe suffering by the African fever, he returned to the States. In 1842 he was retransferred to the New York Conference, and stationed at Flushing, L. I.; in 1843 at Rockaway; in 1844 to 1847 was presiding elder of the Long Island District; in 1848 and 1849 was stationed in Williamsburgh; in 1850 and 1851 in the Twenty-seventh Street Church, New York; in 1852 was supernumerary at Hempstead, L. I.; but was given an effective relation in 1853, and stationed at Jamaica. In 1854 he was obliged again to superannuate, but his relation was changed to effective at the ensuing Conference. and in 1851 to 1857 served as chaplain to the Seamen's Friend Retreat on Staten Island. "He was held in high esteem by the managers and officers of that institution. At the bedside of the sick and in his chapel services he was felt to be well adapted to the duties of his office." The tax upon his sympathies and the labors of the position were more than his enfeebled health could sustain, and in 1858 he resigned the chaplaincy, and received a superannuated relation. He retired to a quiet and comfortable residence in Tarrytown, where he resided until the day of his decease, Sept. 25, 1861. "Few ministers have a longer or more worthy record than this. Some of these fields of labor were very arduous, others of them very responsible. In all of them he was faithful and useful. He was a high-minded, intelligent, and honorable man. His tastes were refined, his feelings delicate, his conversation chaste, and his manners dignified but affable. His

Christian reputation is without blemish. He possessed the disciplinary attributes of a minister — "gifts, grace, and usefulness." His preaching was practical and experimental. He sought assiduously and successfully to lead the members of his Church to a higher spiritual state, and a holy, active, religious life. As a pastor he had few superiors. Gentle, affectionate, and sympathetic in his manners, his pastoral visits were highly prized by the

people of his care. He fostered the Sabbath-school, and fed the lambs of the flock, a good minister of Jesus Christ" (bishop Janes, in the *N. Y. Christian Advocate,* Jan. 9, 1862). See also Smith, *Memorials of the N. Y. and N. Y. East Conferences,* p. 11.

Matthias's (ST.) Day,

a festival observed on the 24th of February in the Church of Rome, with a provision that in leap-year it should be observed on the 25th. In the Church of England it is usually observed on the 24th of February, even in leap-years. In the Greek Church St. Matthias's day is held on the 9th of August. The date of the introduction of this festival is involved in obscurity. Some suppose it was first established in the 11th century, others in the 8th. See Farrar, *Eccles. Dict.* s.v.; Eadie, *Eccles. Dict.* s.v.; Broughton, *Biblioth. Hist. Sac.* 2:76.

Matthieists.

SEE MUNSTER, ANABAPTISTS IN.

Matthieson.

SEE ANABAPTISTS.

Mattison, Hiram, D.D.,

a prominent divine of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born at Norway, Herkimer County, N.Y., Feb. 8,1811. Three years afterwards his parents, who were natives of New England, removed to Oswego County, and settled near the present city of Oswego. His mother, besides rearing her own twelve children, became the foster-mother of ten others who had not homes for themselves. The first years of his early manhood were devoted to teaching, but his conversion at the age of twenty-three turned his thoughts towards the ministry, which soon after became his lifework. He entered the Black River Conference in 1836, and filled successively several of the most important appointments in that body. In 1842 and 1843 he was stationed at Watertown; in 1844 and 1845 at Rome; in 1846 he became superannuated; the next year supernumerary; the next two years he was superannuated; in 1850 he was made secretary of the Conference, and his relation changed to effective. During this and the following year he served, by appointment of the bishop, as professor in Falley Seminary. In 1852 he was elected secretary of Conference for the third time, and his

relation was changed to superannuated. This same year, on account of ill-health and a tendency to pulmonary difficulties, he removed to New York City for the benefit of the sea air, and was pastor of John Street Church (left vacant by the death of Rev. W. K. Stopford), and afterwards of Trinity Methodist Episcopal Church in Thirty-fourth Street, which he organized, and under his administration the present church edifice was erected. His preaching was both popular and effective, being distinguished by great clearness of statement, force of argument, aptness of illustration, and earnestness of appeal. His sermon at the camp-meeting held near Morristown, N.J., in 1866, may be very justly pronounced one of the most eloquent and powerful discourses of modern times. Dr. Mattison labored with great zeal to secure action by the General Conference (of which he was a member in 1848, 1852, and 1856) against all slaveholding in the Church, but at length, despairing of success, he formally withdrew from the Methodist Episcopal Church, Nov. 1, 1861. He became the pastor of an Independent Methodist Church, for which a house of worship was built under his supervision in Forty-first Street. This church he continued to serve till 1865, when he returned to the Methodist Episcopal Church, and was appointed to the Trinity Methodist Church in Jersey City, having been admitted a member of the Newark (N. J.) Conference, in the fellowship of which he continued till death. The last year of his life was devoted to the service of the American and Foreign Christian Union as its secretary. The fertility of his pen was amazing. Believing strongly in the power of the press for good or evil, he made free and constant use of it to aid the one and oppose the other. His publications embraced a range from the little Sunday-school card to the stately volume, all intended to aid the public movement in favor of temperance, and in opposition to slavery and Romanism. There was too much in the life and character of Dr. Mattison to admit of a summing up in the space allotted to this brief sketch. We need only say that to know him, especially to know him well, was to admire, esteem, and love him as a man, a friend, a scholar, a minister, a hero, a Christian. Bishop Thomson, in his introduction to the writer's memoir of Dr. Mattison's life (see below), thus delineates him: "Before the world he stood as the able preacher, the gifted writer, the stern controversionalist, the unsparing antagonist; but he was not without the gentler and more attractive elements of character. He was an amiable, communicative, entertaining companion, a generous friend, and loving husband and father.

'From his rough heart a babe could press
Soft milk of human tpenderness.'

On all the storms of his life were rainbows, but only his intimate friends were in position to see them." His first book was *A Scriptural Defence of the Doctrine of the Trinity,* a small volume issued in 1843, and to which *multum in parvo was* peculiarly applicable. In the same year he began his publication of *Tracts for the Times,* which at length grew into a small but piquant monthly, called at first *The Conservative,* and afterwards the *Primitive Christian.* In 1846 he published a work on *Astronomy,* with large astronomical maps — a work of rare merit and popularity. Soon after he issued his *Elementary Astronomy,* and in 1850 edited a new and improved edition of *Burrett's Geography of the Heavens,* for which he is spoken of as "one of the most competent astronomers in the country." In 1853 he published his *High-School Astronomy,* and the same year was associated with Prof. J. B. Woodbury in bringing out a musicbook, *The Lute of Zion,* which, becoming widely popular, led in a short time to an enlarged edition under the title of *New Lute of Zion.* The next year his work on *Spirit Rappings* was issued, and had a large circulation. In 1856 his celebrated controversy with Dr. J. H. Perry, on the *Wesleyan Doctrine of Christian Perfection,* was published in successive pamphlets. Three years later he issued another tune-book, *Sacred Melodies,* "designed for use on all occasions of public worship;" and the same year also sent forth his *Impending Crisis,* a stout pamphlet of pungent facts and impassioned appeals on the slavery question. In 1864 his *Minister's Pocket Manual* was published, and within the next two years followed with the two most elaborate theological works of his life, *Immortality of the Soul,* and *Resurrection of the Body,* books of superior and permanent value. During 1866 he published *Select Lessons from the Holy Scriptures,* and his *Defence of American Methodism,* and in the next year a timely treatise on *Popular Amusements.* The year 1868, the last of his life, was perhaps the busiest, and the most prolific of results in the line of authorship. Besides editing and bringing through the press the work on *Perfect Love,* he wrote and published *Mary Ann Smith,* and a surprising number of other works on Romanism, from the tract of a few pages to the heavy pamphlet. He left an unfinished treatise on *Depravity in its Relation to Entire Sanctification,* and the outlines of several other theological works. His contributions to the periodical press were abundant and able. He was the author of several poems of decided merit, and among his issues from the press were various Church and Sunday-school requisites. He composed with remarkable ease and rapidity, and seldom rewrote a sentence or even a word. His busy life suddenly closed at his residence, Jersey City, N. J., in a signally triumphant

death, Nov. 24,1868. See *Minutes of Conferences*, 1869, p. 55 sq.; also *Work Here, Rest Hereafter, or the Life and Character of Rev. Hiram Mattison, D.D.*, by Rev. N. Vansant, with an *Introduction* by bishop Thomson (New York, 1870, 8vo). (N. V.)

Mattison, Seth

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Shaftesbury, Vt., Feb. 22, 1788; joined the Methodist Church in 1805; entered the Genesee Conference in 1810; and died Oct. 18, 1845, having preached with eminent usefulness and great holiness the Gospel of Christ for thirty-four years. — *Minutes of Conferences*, 3:643.

Mattison, Spencer

A.M., a Methodist Episcopal minister and educator, was born at Plainfield, N. Y., Aug. 2, 1808; was converted in 1825; graduated, with first honors, at Middlebury College, Vt., in 1835; joined Troy Conference the same year, but on his second charge his health failed, and he went to Georgia. On recovery he spent five years there as principal of Vineville Academy, and then rejoined the Troy Conference in 1842. In 1846 he was elected professor of ancient languages and literature in M'Kendree College, Illinois, where he spent six years, and then resigned and re-entered the regular work of the ministry, but at the close of a year he accepted the principalship of Rock River Seminary, Mount Morris, Ill. His health again failed, and he died Nov. 5, 1853. Professor Mattison was an excellent linguist and instructor, and greatly beloved by his pupils. He was a minister of fine talents and uniform piety, and a most accomplished Christian *gentleman*. — *Minutes of Conferences*, 5:455. (G. L. T.)

Mattithi'ah

(Heb. *Mattithyah'*, hy;t]Tæmi, *gift of Jehovah*, compare θεόδοτος, *Theodore;* also in the prolonged form *Mattithya'hu*, Why;t]Tæmi, <131518>1 Chronicles 15:18, 21; 25:3, 21; Sept. Ματταθίας, but in <151043>Ezra 10:43 Μαθθαθίας v. r. Ματθανίας; so also Ματταθίας , 1 Macc. 2:1; <420325>Luke 3:25, 26) the name of three or four men in the Old Test. and of one or two (Auth. Vers. "Mattathias") in the New. *SEE MATTATHAH*; *SEE MATTHEW*; *SEE MATTHIAS*, etc.; and especially *SEE MATTATHIAS*.

1. One of the sons of the Levite Jeduthun, appointed by David chief of the fourteenth section of the Temple musicians (<13253>1 Chronicles 25:3, 21). B.C. 1014. He is probably the same with one of the Levitical wardens who were assigned to the performance of the sacred anthems on the removal of the sacred ark to Jerusalem (<13518>1 Chronicles 15:18, 21; 16:5). B.C. cir. 1043.

2. An Israelite of the "sons" (residents) of Nebo, who divorced his Gentile wife after the Babylonian exile (<15043>Ezra 10:43). B.C. 459. He was possibly identical with No. 4.

3. The eldest son of Shallum, a Levite of the family of Korah, who had charge of the baked offerings of the Temple on the re-establishment after the exile (<13931>1 Chronicles 9:31). B.C. cir. 440.

4. One of those (apparently chief Israelites) who supported Ezra on the right hand while reading the law to the people after the captivity (<16804>Nehemiah 8:4). B.C. cir. 410.

5. A person named in <42526>Luke 3:26 as the son of Semei, among the maternal ancestors of Jesus; but as no such name appears in the parallel passages of the Old Test., and would here unduly protract the interval limited by other intimations of the generations, it is probably interpolated from No. 6. (See Strong's *Harm. and Expos. of the Gospels*, p. 16.)

6. The son of Amos and father of Joseph, among the maternal ancestry of Jesus after the close of the O.-Test. genealogy (<42525>Luke 3:25). B.C. post 406.

Mattock

Picture for Mattock

an old English name for an agricultural implement like a pickaxe with a wide point, for grubbing up and digging out roots and stones, is the rendering adopted in the Auth. Vers. for three Hebrew words. rD,q;mi (*mader'*, an instrument for *dressing* or pruning a vineyard; occurs only in <23725>Isaiah 7:25) denotes a *weeding-hook* or hoe; hv;r,q;mi(*machareshah'*, <09330>1 Samuel 13:20) and tv,r,j;mi(*machare'sheth*, "share," <09330>1 Samuel 13:20) are the names of two agricultural cutting instruments (for they needed sharpening by a smith), one of which is perhaps an ordinary hoe

and the other a *pick-axe* (from v r h; to *scrape;* but the plur. of one is t/v r ej } m'æ, *machareshoth'*, “mattocks,” [09321]1 Samuel 13:21). *SEE PLOUGH.* b r ,j , (*che'reb*, [14306]2 Chronicles 34:6; elsewhere usually a “sword”) signifies any sharp instrument, as a knife, dagger, chisel; and possibly a *spade* in the passage in question (marg. “maul”). The tool used in Arabia for loosening the ground, described by Niebuhr (*Descr. de l’Arabie*, p. 137), answers generally to our mattock or grubbing-axe (London, *Encyclop. of Gardening*, p. 617; Hasselquist, *Trav.* p. 100), i.e. a single-headed pickaxe, the *sarculus simplex,* as opposed to *bicornis,* of Palladius (*De Re Rust.* 1:43). The ancient Egyptian hoe was of wood, a and answered for hoe, spade, and mattock. The blade was inserted in or through the handle and the two were attached about the center by a twisted rope, See Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt.* 2:16, 18, abridgm.; comp, Her. 2:14. *SEE AGRICULTURE.*

Maturin, Charles Robert

an Irish divine, was born in 1782, and was educated at Trinity College, Dublin. Though popular as a pulpit orator, the income. from his living — the curacy of St. Peter’s, in the Irish metropolis — was inadequate to his support, and he turned aside to secular literary enterprises. He secured special distinction as a poet and dramatist. He died in 1825. Says a contemporary, “The genius of Maturin was great, but it was not always under the control of a pure taste.” He published a collection of his *Sermons,* besides many secular works, several of which were first brought out under the assumed name of Dennis Jasper Murphy.

Matutinal.

SEE MATINS.

Mauburne Or Momboir, Jean

an ascetic Belgian author, was born at Brussels about 1460. After having studied grammar and music at the cathedral school of Utrecht, he joined the regular canons of Mont-Saint-Agnss, a famous monastery near Zwoll, and was employed in different positions in the congregation of Windesham. The publication of his first work, *Rosetum Spirituale,* gave Mauburne great renown, and induced Nicholas de Hacqueville, first president of the Parliament of Paris, to invite him to France (1497), to reform the regular canons of the kingdom. Mauburne gladly heeded the call, and restored

order to the abbeys of Saint-Severin, of Cysoing, of Saint-Euvert d'Orleans, and of Saint-Martin de Nevers; but he attached himself more particularly to that of Livri, of which he was elected prior (Nov., 1500), then regular abbot by the resignation of Nicholas de Hacqueville in his favor (Jan., 1502). The zeal of Mauburne was not confined to his own order; he was interested in that of Benedict, and labored much for the reformation of the congregation of Chezal, which served as a model to the houses of Saint-Vanne and Saint-Maur. Taken ill in consequence of the fatigue caused by his religious labors, he was carried to Paris, and died there about the beginning of the year 1503. He included among his friends Saint Francois de Paule, Geoffroi de Boussard, chancellor of Notre-Dame of Paris; the bishop Louis Pinel, Pierre de Bruges, and probably Erasmus, who addressed several letters to him. His principal works are, *Rosetum exercituum spiritualium et sacrarum meditationum* (Bale. 1491, et al.). "This book," says Gence, "is the first where some passages of the *Imitation* have been introduced and given under the name of Kempis:" — *Venatorium investigatorium sanctorum canonici ordinis,* a historical manuscript which appears to be an abridgment of that of Buschius, and in which Mauburne again attributes to Kempis the book *Qui sequitus me* of the *Imitation.* We find in the ancient *Gallia Christiana* (t. vii, col. 281-282) two letters addressed to this priest by Erasmus, and written at Paris. See Swurt, *Athenae Belgicae,* p. 447; Mastelyn, *Necrol. Viridis Vallis,* p. 121; Sander, *Biblioth. Belgica; Gallia Christiana,* 7:836-839; Moreri, *Grand Dict. Hist.* s.v.; Paquot, *Memoires,* vol. 3: — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale,* s.v.

Mauduit, Michel

a learned French theologian, was born at Vire, Normandy, in 1644. While still young he entered the brotherhood of the Oratorians, where for a long time he studied the classics; then he devoted himself to preaching, and instructing the country people. The study of the Bible occupied the remainder of his life. He possessed a great variety of knowledge, understood Greek well, also Hebrew and Latin, and obtained many prizes in the academical competitions of Rouen and Caen. He died at Paris January 19, 1709. Of Mauduit's works we have *Traite de religion contre les Athees, les Deistes et les nouveaux Pyrrhoniens* (Par. 1677, 12mo); the 2d edition (1698) has been greatly *enlarged*: — *Melanges de diverses poesies; divises en IV livres* (Lyons; the edition of 1723, 12mo, is preferable on account of the additions to it). We find in this a well-written

preface on the good use of poetry: — *Dissertation sur le sujet de la goutte, avec le moyen de l'en garantir* (Paris, 1687, 1689, 12mo): — *Analyse des Epitres de Saint Paul et des Epitres canoniques, avec des dissertationes sur les endroits dificiles* (Paris, 1691, 2 vols. 12mo; reprinted in 1702): — *Analyse de l'Evangile selon l'ordre historique de la concorde* (Paris, 1694, 3 vols. 12mo, et al.). This work, to which the author devoted nearly all his life, has had many editions (later editions, Malines, 1821, 7 vols. 12mo; Paris, 1843-44, 4 vols. 8vo): — *Analyse des Actes des Apotres* (Paris, 1697, 2 vols. 12mo): — *Meditations pour une retraite ecclesiastique de dix jours* (Lyons, 1723, 12mo). Mausduit also left, in MS., *Analyse de l'Apocalypse* and *Traduction complete du Nouveau Testament.* See *Mercure de France,* May, 1709; Moreri, *Dict. Hist.* s.v. — Hoefer, *Nouvelle Biogr. Generale,* s.v.

Mauermann, Franz Laur

a German Roman Catholic prelate, was born at Neuzelle in 1780; entered the priesthood in 1797, and, after filling various positions, was in 1825 made chaplain to the royal house of Saxony, and in 1827 praeses of the Roman Catholic Consistory of the kingdom. In 1842 he was made bishop of Rome and confessor of the king of Saxony. Later he became apostolic vicar. He died in October, 1845. — *Regensburger Real-Encyklopädie,* s.v.

Maul Or Mall

Picture for Maul

is an old name for a hammer or *mallet,* and stands in the Auth. Vers. for the Heb. מפץ (*mephits',* only occurs in Proverbs 25:18; but kindred is מפצי, *mappets',* "battle-axe," Jeremiah 51:20; both from נפץ or פוץ; to *break* in pieces), a *war-club,* such as was anciently in common use, and even in the Middle Ages, the memory of which is still preserved in the modern *mace* as a sign of authority. "Probably such was that which is said to have suggested the name of Charles *Martel.* The mace is frequently mentioned in the accounts of the wars of the Europeans with Saracens, Turks, and other Orientals, and several kinds are still in use among the Bedouin Arabs of remoter parts (Burckhardt, *Notes on Bedouins,* 1:55). In their European wars the Turks were notorious for the use they made of the mace (Knollys, *Hist. of the Turks*)" (Smith). Various kinds of mace were used by the ancient Egyptians, either with or without a ball at the end to

give weight to the blow, and generally with a guard at the handle. The curved club or throw-stick, the Arabian *lissan* or "tongue," is a very general Oriental weapon. Among the Australians, this implement is yet a formidable one, called the *boomerang*. Unmistakable traces of its use occur on the Egyptian and Assyrian monuments (Wilkinson, *Anc. Eg.* 1:365; Bonomi, *Nineveh*, p. 134-6). *SEE ARMOR.*

Maulbronn

originally a Cistercian convent in the bishopric of Spiers, was founded by bishop Gunther of Spiers, on a tract of land given him by Walther von Lomersheim in 1148, previously infested with robbers. The convent soon became very rich, partly through donations, and partly by the zeal and activity of the monks. It was at first placed under the jurisdiction of the empire, by Frederick I and other emperors, but in the 14th century was placed under that of the Palatinate. In 1504 it was conquered by duke Ulrich of Wurtemberg, and when the Reformation commenced, it was appointed by him for the monks of his province who wished to remain Roman Catholics; duke Christopher, in 1557, took this also from them, appointed an evangelical abbot, and established a school in it. It is yet the seat of one of the four minor theological seminaries. The remaining portions of the building, i.e. the church, cloisters, entrance-hall, and refectory, are considered among the finest specimens of German Gothic architecture.

The place has become renowned in the annals of Protestantism by its connection with two important transactions, the *Colloquium Maulbrunnense*, in 1564, and the *Formula Maulbrunnensis*, in 1576.

(1.) The introduction of Calvinism into the Palatinate by duke Frederick III after 1560, and in particular the publication of the Heidelberg Catechism in 1563, provoked great opposition on the part of the Lutherans. The authorities, and especially duke Christopher of Wurtemberg, Wolfgang of Psalzneuburg, and margrave Charles of Baden, vainly endeavored to heal the dissension by means of a colloquy held between the theologians of the Palatinate and Wurtemberg at Maulbronn in 1564. The elector of the Palatinate was accompanied by his court preacher, M. Michael Diller, and the theologians Dr. Peter Boquin, Caspar Olevian, Zacharias Ursinus, and Peter Dathenius; also the church counselor Thomas Erastus, chancellor Dr. Eheim, and notary Wilhelm Xylander, professor of Greek at Heidelberg. The representatives of Wurtemberg were Valentin Vannius, abbot of

Maulbronn, Johannes Brenz, provost of Stuttgard, Jacob Andrea, provost and chancellor of the University of Tubingen, Dietrich Schnepf; professor at Tubingen, and the court preacher Balthasar Bidembach; also as notary, Lucas Osiander, then preacher at Stuttgard, and as civil counselors chancellor John Fessler and vice-chancellor Jerome Gerhard. The colloquy lasted from April 10th to April 15th. Chancellor Eheim, in his opening speech, invited the theologians, since the object of the conference was to heal their dissensions, to avoid all merely human views and arguments, and to confine themselves to the positive testimony of Scripture on the points of controversy. Yet, instead of treating of the doctrine of the Eucharist, which was their chief point of difference, the theologians at once launched into arguments concerning the ubiquity, or, as Andrea termed it, the *majestas nullo loco circumscripta*, of the body of Christ. Thus all possibility of harmony was at once destroyed. During eight sessions this same question was discussed without either party coming any nearer to the views of the other. The theologians of the Palatinate, and in particular Boquin, Olevian, and Ursin, partly denied the importance of the doctrine of the ubiquity of the body of Christ, and partly refuted their opponents by the Scriptures, the articles of faith, and by an *expose* of the errors into which these principles must lead. Those of Wirtemberg tried especially to defend the idea of the ubiquity of Christ's body from misapprehension and misrepresentation, and treated it as a necessary consequence of *unio personalis* and the *communicatio idiomatum;* they rejected the accusation of mixing up the two natures, and accused their opponents of making a mere man of Christ. As the others asked whether, in this view, the body of Christ was considered as omnipresent even in the womb, Andrea, who was spokesman of the Wurtemberg party, drew a distinction between the possession and the use of the attribute, and asserted that Christ could not have been omnipresent in the womb, but only became so actually after his ascension — a view which the Heidelberg theologians rejected as contrary to reason and unsupported by Scripture.

At the last two sittings, finally, the question of the Eucharist was discussed, as the princes wished that the two parties should seek to arrive at some understanding concerning this important point, leaving aside all Christological questions. Yet, after a very few speeches, the question of ubiquity was again started, this time by the Reformed theologians, and the discussion receded to its original ground. The colloquy now came to a close. The protocols were compared and signed, and the two parties

separated, each holding as firmly to its own views as previous to the meeting, and considering itself as having obtained the advantage. In spite of the promise of secrecy, the Heidelberg theologians boasted of having silenced their opponents, claiming even that duke Christopher himself was now more inclined to their doctrines. The Wurtemberg party would not brook this, and Brenz wrote an account of the colloquy, denying the statements of the Heidelbergians, which was at first circulated privately, and was finally printed in the same year under the title *Epitome colloquii Maulbrunnensis inter theologos Heidelbergenses et Wurtembergenses de Cana Domini et Majestate Christi,* and also a *Wahrhaftiger u. grundlicher Bericht v. d. Gesprach,* etc., *gestellt durch d. Wurtembergischen Theologen* (Frankfort, 1564, 4to); in these works he accused his adversaries of having had recourse to sophistry, and, when they found it impossible longer to defend their views, to have caused the colloquy to be brought to a close. Heidelberg answered by the *Epitome colloq. Maulbr. cum responsione Palatinorum ad epit. Wurtemb.* (Heidelberg, 1565, 4to), and published at the same time the protocol of the conference, which was followed up by the opposite party with a new edition of the protocols, "without changes or additions;" (Tubing. 1565, 4to). Both parties now accused each other of interpolating the protocols. The theologians of Wittenberg were also drawn into the quarrel, as duke Christopher submitted to them the protocols of Maulbronn and the *De Majestate Christi* of Andreat and Brenz, both of which they severely condemned. The dispute lasted for several years. It was finally set at rest by the wise and Christian efforts of elector Frederick at the Diet of Augsburg in 1566. See Osiander, *Histor. eccl.* cent. xvi, 100:59, p. 791; Struve, *Pfalz. K. Hist.* p. 149 sq.; Hospinian, *Hist. sacr.* t. ii.; Arnold, *Unpart. K. Hist.* cent. xvi, § 17, p. 14; Sattler, *Gesch. d. Herzogth. Wurtemberg,* 4:207 sq.; Planck, *Geschichte d. Prot. Lehrbegr.* vol. v, pt. ii, p. 487 sq.; Heppe, *Gesch. des deutsch. Protest.* 2:71 sq.; Klunzinger, *D. Religionsgesprach zu M.* (*Zeitschr. f. histor. Theolog.* 1849, 1:166 sq.); *Leben u. ausgewahlte Schrift. d. Vater,* etc., *d. reform. Kirche* (Elberfeld, 1857, p. 260).

(2.) Another conference, held twelve years later at Maulbronn, between theologians from Wurtemberg, Baden, and Henneberg, secured a better result. The theologians were L. Osiander, Balthasar, Bidembach, provost of Stuttgard, Abel Scherdinger, court preacher of Henneberg, Peter Strecker, pastor at Suhl, and some others. The object of the conference was to discuss a formula of union drawn up by Osiander and Bidembach.

The meeting took place Jan. 19, 1576, and the formula itself, which may be considered as a forerunner of the *Formula Concordiae,* received the name of *Formula Maulbrunnensis.* In the early part of February it was sent, together with an address by count George Ernest of Henneberg, to the lector August of Saxony, who received also about the same time the so-called Suabian and Saxon formula of duke Julius of Brunswick. The elector submitted them both to Andrea, who declared that, in his opinion, the formula of Maulbronn was the most serviceable for the purpose of uniting the different parties. Yet in the conference held at Torgau, May 28, Andrea consented to use nominally the other formula as a basis, but took good care to include all the principal points of the Maulbronn formula into the so-called Book of Torgau. See Hutter, *Concord. conc.* p. 305 sq.; Osiander, *Hist. Eccl.* cent. 16, lib. 4, pt. 3, p. 866; Planck, *Gesch. d. protest. Lehrbegr.* 6:428; Heppe, *Gesch. d. luth. Concordienformel,* 1858, p. 73 sq.

(3.) In September of the same year (1576), still another meeting was held at Maulbronn, in which Heerbrand, Schnepf, Magirus, Bidembach, L. Osiander, Dietz, Scherdinger, and Strecker took part. Its object was to discuss the Book of Torgau, and it ended in expressing its approbation of it as a whole. See Heppe, *Gesch. d. luth. Concordienformel,* p. 120 sq. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 9:178 sq. (J. N. P.)

Maulmont (Or Malmont), Jean De

a learned Frenchman, was born in Limousin, in the 16th century, of an ancient noble family, which possessed one of the baronies of Limousin, the chateau of Maumont. Of his personal history but little is known except that he was principal of the College of Saint-Michel, otherwise called Chanac, which had been founded in 1530 by the Pompadour house for the Limousin students. According to La Croix du Maine. “Maulmont was a very learned man, master of many languages, especially the Greek, a great theologian, and a prolific orator.” He was an intimate friend of Julius Scaliger. Many of his contemporaries have pretended that he was the true author of the translation of Plutarch which bears the name of Amyot; this assertion has been refuted by La Monnoye in a note on *L'Anti-Baillet* of Menage. We have of Maulmont’s works, *Les OEuvres de Saint Justin, philosophe et martyr* (Paris, 1538, fol.): — *Les Histoires et Chroniques du Monde, tirees tant du gros volume de Jean Zonare, auteur Byzantin, que de plusieurs autres scripteurs Hebreux et Grecs, avec annotations* (Paris, 1563, fol.):

—*Les graves et saintes remontrances de l'empereur Ferdinand au pope Pie IV sur le Concile de Trente* (Paris, 1563, 8vo): — *Remontrances Chretiennes en forme d'epitre a la reine d'Angleterre, trad. Du Latin de Hierosme Oserias, evesque Portugalois* (Paris, 1653, 8vo). The same author has written in Italian a life of Rene de Birague, chancellor of France, who died in 1583, and the *Gallia Chrtistiana* quotes it as a correct and usefulwork. See La Croix du Maine et DuVerdier, *Biblioth. Francoises;* Goujet, *Biblioth. Francoises,* vol. xii; *Gallia Christiana,* 6:571. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale,* vol. 34, s.v.

Maundy Thursday

also known under the term DIES COENAE DOMINICAE (q.v.), is the name given to the *Thursday before Easter.* The origin of this name is *Dies mandati* — mandate Thursday; either from the commandment which our Savior gave to his disciples to commemorate the sacrament of his supper, which he instituted on this day (hence also called *dies panis,* day of bread; and *dies lucis,* day of light); or because on this day our Savior washed his disciples' feet, and gave them commandment to follow his example. Others derive it from the Saxon *mand,* which means a basket, and subsequently any gift or offering contained in the basket. On this day penitents who had been put out of the Church on Ash-Wednesday were readmitted. There was also a general celebration of the Lord's Supper, with which the ceremony of washing the feet was connected. Candidates for baptism publicly recited the Creed. The origin of this practice is generally referred to the 7th century, but Riddle (*Christian Antiquities,* p. 669) contends that "it appears to have been of much earlier institution." *SEE PEDILAVIUM.*

Maunoir, Julien

a learned French ecclesiastic, was born Oct. 1, 1606, in the province of Saint-Georges de Reinthembault, diocese of Rennes. At the age of twenty he entered the Order of the Jesuits at Paris, and finished his studies at La Fleche. A professorship in the College of Quimper was offered him, but he preferred to preach, and accordingly entered the ministry. He studied the dialect of Brittany, began to travel over the country, and displayed so much zeal in his preaching that his health became impaired, and he was obliged to resume the career of teaching, which he followed at Tours. After having been ordained at Nevers, he consecrated the remainder of his life, according to a vow that he had made, to the evangelization of Brittany. For

forty-two consecutive years Maunoir labored for the accomplishment of his project. Unmoved by the injury and violence with which his devotion was often repaid, accepting or imposing on himself the rudest privations, traveling on foot, with a wallet on his shoulders, and carrying only the clothing and nourishment absolutely indispensable, he visited successively and repeatedly nearly all the parishes in the dioceses of Cornovaille and Leon, the islands of Ouessant, of Molene, of Sizein, etc., without mentioning a great number of localities in the other dioceses of Brittany, and everywhere his preaching was attended with success. He died Jan. 28, 1683, at Plevin, near Guincamp. In accordance with his expressed desire, he was buried like a pauper, but later a statue was erected to him in the church of Plevin. With the triple object in view of understanding thoroughly a language so indispensable to himself, of purifying it from the mixed dialect used by the preachers of the times, and of generalizing the learning of the language, Maunoir aided in the promotion of the colleges of Quimper and of Morlaix, where the language of Brittany was generally used. The same motives actuated him in the composition of the following works, which have been adopted by all the ecclesiastics of the country: *Canticon spirituel hac instructionon profetabl evit quisqui an hent da vont d'ar barados* (Quimper): — *Vita S. Corentini, Aremorici; Cosopeti* (Quimper, 1685, 12mo, et al.); far from being written in Latin, as father Southwell and Le Long have supposed, this life is composed of 766 Breton verses: — *Le Temple consacre a la passion de Jesus-Christ,* in Breton, prose and verse (Quimper. 1679,1686, 8vo): — *Le sacre College de Jesus divisi en cinq classes, ou l'on enseigne en langue Armorique les legons Chretiennes, avec les trois clefs pour y entrer.* These and other works of this character are curious in a philological point of view as monuments of the changes in the Breton language. A very competent judge, M. de la Villemarque, has given the following opinion: “Born in the French part of Brittany, father Maunoir was shocked by the rudeness of certain sounds in the Breton language. In order to soften them, he suppressed or modified certain signs necessary for preserving the primitive signification of the words, and for showing their etymology, derivation, and affinities. The expressions thus disfigured, of which he makes use in his works, prevailed in the 18th century, and he left an orthography without fixed principles or method, an orthography *ad libitum,* which has very properly been abandoned, since Le Pelletier has substituted the ancient Breton orthography in his *Dictionnaire.* See Boschet, *Le Parfait Missionnaire, ou la vie du P. Julien Maunoir* (Paris, 1697, 12mo); Lobineau, *Vie des Saints,*

etc., *de Bretagne,* v. 23-137; G. Leroux, *Recueil des vertus et des miracles du P. Julien Maunoir* (Quimper, 1716, 12mo); LaVillemarque, *Essai sue l'Histoire de la Langue Bretonne,* at the head of his edition of the *Dict. Francais-Breton de Le Gonidec* (St. Brieuc, 1847, 4to). — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale,* vol. 34, s.v.

Maupas Du Tour, Henri Caughon De,

a French prelate, was born in 1600 at the chateau of Cosson, near Rheims. Descended from an ancient family of Champagne, he had for his godfather king Henry IV, and was scarcely sixteen years of age when he was elected abbot of Saint-Denis of Rheims, with a regular benefice. In 1636 he founded there the society of Saint Genevieve. He next became chief vicar of the diocese of Rheims, then first chaplain to the queen, Anne of Austria, and in 1641 was finally elected bishop of Puy, whence he was transferred in 1661 to the see of Evreux. In the following year, being called to Rome to solicit the beatification of Francois de Sales, he was chosen assistant prelate to the pontifical throne. January 14,1667, he founded a seminary at Evreux, resigned his bishopric in 1680, and died at Evreux August 12 of the same year. Of his works we have *Vie de Mme. de Chantal* (Paris, 1644, 4to): — *Vie de saint Francois de Sales* (Paris, 1657, 4to): — *Oraison funebre de saint Vincent de Paul* (Paris, 1661, 4to): — *Statuts synodaux* (Evreux. 1664,1665, 8vo). See *Gallia Christiana,* vols. 2 and 11; Le Brasseur, *Hist. du Diocese d'Evreux. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale,* vol. 34, s.v.

Maupin, Milton

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born in Campbell County, Tennessee, Dec. 24,1829. He was educated at Emory and Henry College, Virginia; was licensed to preach about the year 1849; and was engaged for two or three years teaching school and preaching in the local relation. He went to California in 1852, and in 1853 joined the Pacific Conference, California. In 1856 he returned to Tennessee, in 1859 joined the Holston Conference, and was appointed to Grayson Circuit, in Western Virginia; in 1860 to Newport Circuit; in 1861 to Maynardsville Circuit. In 1862 he was appointed by the Conference a missionary chaplain to a regiment in the Confederate States army; but, as the regiment was disbanded before the close of the year, he returned home, and was without regular work until 1866, when he was appointed to Knox and

Maynardsville Circuit. In 1867 he was transferred to Trinity Conference, Texas, and appointed in 1869 to Gainesville Circuit; in 1871 to Decatur Mission, where he finished his life and ministry, April 1,1871. He was faithful to his calling while his strength lasted. “He left the aroma of a good name, and the assurance that he went *to his rest." — Minutes of the M. E. Church South,* 1871.

Maur (St.), Congregation Of

The Benedictines afford the only example of a monastic order which, after declining from an originally high position, and after remaining, so to speak, dead for two centuries, revived and took again a leading place in the Church by its activity and learning.

As early as the latter part of the Middle Ages the Order of Benedictines had lost much of their influence. The convents had become too wealthy, and the monks, instead of devoting themselves to study and religious exercises, were entirely given up to idleness and worldly enjoyments. This state of things continued through the 16th century. In the early part of the 17th a reform took place in the Convent of St. Vannes, near Verdun, under the influence of Didier de la Cour, and it was soon imitated by the formerly renowned convents of Moyenmoutier and Senones. Clement VIII confirmed the organization of this *Congregation de S. Vannes,* which produced some distinguished men, among them Dom Calmet and Dom Cellier. In 1614 the assembly of the French clergy expressed the wish that all the Benedictine convents throughout the country should connect themselves with St. Vannes; the general chapter of the congregation, however, was afraid of the consequences which might result from such extended power. In 1618, however, Dom Benard, one of the monks of St. Vannes who had been employed in reforming other convents, obtained from Louis XIII authority to establish a congregation, which when organized took the name of St. Maur, for fear of awakening jealousy if it took that of any particular convent. This congregation was confirmed by Gregory XV in 1621, and by Urban VIII in 1627. The first convent subjected by Benard to the new regulations was that of the Blancs-Manteaux at Paris. Soon a number of others joined it. In 1652 they counted forty convents; in the beginning of the 18th century their number reached 180, divided into six provinces. The most important of all these establishments was the convent of St. Germain des Pres, near Paris. It was the residence of the general of the order, was endowed with episcopal

authority, and possessed a library particularly rich in ancient MSS. Its statutes, drawn up to accord with the spirit of the times, the strict morality, intellectual pursuits, and great learning of its members, gained universal respect for the congregation. Amid the looseness of morals which then prevailed among the French clergy, the Congregation of St. Maur belongs to the few exceptions which reflect honor on the Church of Rome. According to the confession of a Romanist writer, they are perhaps the only order in the history of convents of which this can be said. It is also to be remembered that, conscious of serving higher and universal interests, they remained entire strangers to all persecutions both of the Jesuits and the Gallican clergy.

To secure a high degree of scholarship among the Congregation, the first general, Dom Tariffe, carefully prepared a scheme of studies; and as early as the 17th and 18th centuries the congregation counted a large number of distinguished men. Their labors were promptly directed to the gathering of materials for the history of the convents belonging to the congregation, and to that of the saints. These researches soon led them into paleological and diplomatic works. The finished education given to the novices required a large number of new books or improved reprints of old ones, which were prepared by order of the superiors by members of the congregation. Thus arose a large number of very important and valuable works. They treat of a great variety of subjects, but especially of the history of France and of the Church. The most distinguished among the monks were entrusted with the editorship, and the others were employed in gathering the materials, or making up some particular part of it: if one of them died before his task was complete, another took his place, and continued it in the same spirit and with the same learning. No other order ever made the same use of its riches: they bought the rarest MSS. and books, made journeys to visit foreign libraries and to establish relations with foreign savans. Their publications also possessed an outward finish previously unknown in typography. Their religious independence is shown in the fact that they remained in friendly relation with the recluses of Port Royal (q.v.), and suffered persecution for their refusal to endorse the bull *Unigenitus* (q.v.), and they were often and severely attacked by the Jesuits. The order continued in existence until the French Revolution.

The historical works of the Congregation of St. Maur are numerous, and embrace an extensive field. Dom Mabillon may be considered as the founder of diplomacy, of which he established the basis in his *De re*

diplomatica (1681, 6 vols. fol.); this was followed by a supplement in 1704, in consequence of the attacks of the Jesuit Germon. As these works related almost exclusively to France, a general work on the same subject was published by Dom Toustain and Dom Tassin, under the title *Nouveau traite de diplomatique* (1750-65, 6 vols. 4to), which is still the most perfect of the kind. To these must be added Montfaucon's *Paleographia Graeca* (1708, fol.), which, however, has been surpassed by subsequent publications. Chronology may almost be said to have been created by them. The *Art de verifier les dates,* commenced by Dantine and finished by Clemencet (1750, 2 vols. 4to), is well known to every student of history. A second edition was published by Clement (1770, fol.), and then a third (1783-92, 3 vols. fol.), each time with numerous additions. The fourth, much enlarged edition, due also to Clement, appeared first in 1818 (37 vols. 8vo), and was often reprinted; there are also an edition in folio and one in quarto. This work has justly been called the most important monument of French learning in the 18th century. Montfaucon's *Antiquite expliquee en figures* (1719, 10 vols. fol.) has now become somewhat antiquated in consequence of the new sources discovered since. In the domain of philology, the congregation took an active part in a yet unsurpassed work, the *Glossarium mediae et infimae Latcainitatis* of Dufresne Ducange (1678), which, if it did not originate with them, was at least increased one half by Dom Dantine and Don Charpentier (1733-36, 6 vols. fol., with a supplement by Charpentier, 1767, 4 vols. fol.), and acquired its full importance by their labors. This work is not only important for its philological value, but also for the information it contains on the literature, laws, and civil and ecclesiastical customs of the Middle Ages. Charpentier is also the author of the *Alphabetum tyronianum* (1747, fol.). They published the sources of the history of France. Such as had been furnished by Pithon and Duchesne were insufficient, and Colbert and Louvois vainly sought to have the work continued; but D'Aguessau finally succeeded in inducing the Benedictines to apply themselves to the task. It finally came into the hands of Dom Bouquet, who completed the first eight volumes of the *Scriptores rerum Gallicarum et Franicarum;* Dom J. B. Haudiguier and C. Haudiguier accomplished the 9th, 10th, and 11th; Dom Clement the 12th and 13th, and Dom Brial, the last of the Benedictines of St. Maur, the 14th and 15th (17381818, fol.). The work has since been continued by the *Academie des Inscriptions,* which published the 21st volume in 1855. To this class of works belongs the edition of the writings of Gregoire de Tours, published by Dom Ruinart (1699, fol.). They never

gave a complete history of France, but only the beginning of it, and the history of particular parts. Dom Martin wrote *La Religion des Gaulois* (1727, 2 vols. 4to), and Dom de Brezillac *Histoire des Gaules et des Conquetes des Gaulois* (1752, 2 vols. 4to), both of little importance now. Their histories of particular provinces are more valuable. The most important are *Histoire generale du Languedoc,* by Vaissette and De Vic (1730-45) 5 vols. fol.); *Histoire de Bretagne,* by Veisserie (who subsequently became a Protestant) and Lobineau (1707, 2 vols. fol.). This was afterwards entirely remodeled, although not completed, by Maurice de Beaubois (1742, 3 vols. fol., and 2 vols. 4to); *Histoire de Bourgogne,* by Plancher (1739 sq., 3 vols. fol.); *Histoire de la Ville de Paris,* by Felibien and Lobineau (1725, 5 vols.). Finally, the *Histoire litteraire de la France* (1733-63, 12 vols. 4to), inaugurated by Dom Rivet and others, and continued by the order till 1814, when it was taken up by the *Academie des Inscriptions;* the 20th volume was published in 1842. It is a very valuable collection of documents, not only for the history of French literature, but also for that of the Middle Ages generally. The researches in the libraries of the convents, also the journeys, principally in Italy, Germany, and the Netherlands, gave occasion to publish extensive catalogues and descriptions of them. Among these we notice the *Spicilegium veterum aliquot scriptorum* of D'Achery (1553-1677, 13 vols. 4to; new edit. by De la Barre, 1723, 3 vols. fol.); *Vetera Analecta,* by Mabillon (1675-85, 4 vols. 4to); *Collectio nova veterum scriptorum,* by Martene (1700, 4to); *Thesaurus novus Anecdotorum,* by Martene and Durand (1717, 5 vols. fol.); *Voyage litteraire de deux religieux Benedictins,* by the same (1724, 4to); *Diarium Italicum* (1702, 4to), and *Bibliotheca bibliothecarum manuscriptorum nova* (1739, 2 vols. fol.), both by Montfaucon. In Church history, their most important works are their revision of the *Gallia Christiana* of the brothers De Sainte-Marthe (1656, 4 vols. fol.). The new work was commenced by another member of that distinguished family, Dom Denis de Sainte-Marthe. It was intended as an introduction to a contemplated *Orbis Christianus,* for which a large amount of documents were collected, yet this work was never completed. The first volume of the *Gallia Christiana* appeared in 1715. Sainte-Marthe died on the completion of the third volume, in 1725. The order continued the work until the thirteenth volume, which appeared in 1785. It was then interrupted, until of late years Haureau, the author of the *Histoire de la Philosophie scholastique* (1850, 2 vols.), took it up again, and in 1856 he published his continuation. The *Gallia Christiana* was used as a model for other similar

works, such as the *Italia sacra,* the *Espana sagrada,* the *Illyria sacra,* etc. It also gave rise to numerous histories of special convents by others of the congregation; the greater part of them, however, remain unpublished. The only two which appeared are the *Histoire de l'Abbaye de St. Denis* of Felibien (1706, fol.), and the *Histoire de l'Abbaye de S. Germain des Pres* of Bouillart (1724, fol.). The collection of the French councils, commenced by Dom de Coniac, and afterwards continued by Dom Labat, was to be appended to the *Gallia Christiana.* The first volume appeared in 1789, at the moment of the outbreak of the French Revolution, and the congregation was dispersed before the second was complete. The history of martyrs was treated by Dom Ruinart in his *Acta primorum martyrum* (1689, 4to). Of greater interest are the works on the old liturgies and convent customs, some of which are among the earliest works of the congregation. Menard published the *Sacramentarium* of Gregory the Great (1642, 4to), Mabillon the *Liturgia Gallicana* (1645, 4to), Martene his *Libri V de antiquis monachorum ritibus* (1690, 2 vols. 4to), and his *De antiquis ecclesiae ritibus* (1700, 4 vols. 4to; 2d edit. 1736, 4 vols. fol.); finally, among the most renowned works in that line, we must mention the *Acta Sanctorum Ordinis S. Benedicti,* commenced by D'Achery, and continued by Mabillon and Ruinart (1668, etc., 9 vols. fol.: the tenth remained unpublished); the *Annales Ordinis S. Benedicti,* the celebrated work of Mabillon, completed by Massuet (1703, etc., 6 vols. fol.). The same congregation wrote also a history of their own order, which formed 3 vols. fol. in MS., but the superiors refused permission for publication. Dom Tassin published, however, an abstract from it, down to 1766. Dom Clemencet wrote a history of Port Royal, of which the first part alone appeared (1755, 10 vols. 12mo); the second part remained in MS., as being too favorable to the Jansenists.

The greatest claim of the Benedictines of St. Maur to the gratitude of theologians lies in their editions of the works of the fathers. They had at first contemplated only publishing the complete works of authors of their own order; but the favor with which their productions were received, as also the requirements of their schools, induced them to publish first the works of the Latin fathers, and afterwards of the Greek also. For this purpose they compared the various texts of the different works existing in France, Italy, England, Holland, Germany, etc. The result was a set of works which for correctness of the text remains unsurpassed, especially for the works of the most. important among the fathers. Among these works

we must not forget their valuable Latin translations of the Greek fathers, and their *Indices,* so important for all historical students. The first Latin father whose works they published is *St. Augustine.* His views afforded them powerful weapons in the Jansenistic controversy. The edition was commenced by Dom Delfau, and continued by Blampin and Constant (1679-1700, 11 vols. folio); Garet published *Cassiodor* (1679, 2 vols. fol.): Du Frische and Le Nourri, *Ambrosius* (1686-90, 2 vols. fol.); Constant, *Hilarius of Poitiers* (1693, fol.); Martianay, *Jerome* (1693-1706, 5 vols. fol.). The works of *Cyprian,* commenced by Baluze, who was not of St. Maur, were completed by Dom Maran (1726, fol.). In 1645 the Benedictines published the *Epistle of Barnabas* (4to). But it is only towards the close of the 17th century that they seriously applied themselves to this branch of ancient ecclesiastical literature. Montfaucon published the works of *Athanasius,* (1698, 3 vols. folio); this was followed by his *Collectio nova patrum* (1706, 2 vols. fol.), containing additions to *Athanasius;* the works of *Eusebius of Caesarea,* and the *Topography of Cosmas.* Massuet published *Irenaeus* (1710, fol.); Montfaucon, *Chrysostom* (1718-38,13 vols. fol.); Toutee, *Cyril of Jerusalem* (1720, fol.); Garnier, *Basil the Great* (1721-30, 3 vols. folio); Charles de la Rue and his nephew Vincent de la Rue, *Origen* (1733-59, 4 vols. folio); Maran, *Justin* and the other apologetists (1742, fol.). Maran commenced an edition of the works of *Gregory of Nazianzum,* which was continued by Clemencet, but the breaking out of the French Revolution prevented the publication of any but the first volume (1788, folio).

Among the works of writers of their order and others of the Middle Ages which they published, we notice the rule of St. Benedict of Aniane, *Concordia regularum,* published by Menard (1628, 4to); *Lanfranc,* by D'Achery (1648, fol.), and *Guibert of Nogent,* by the same (1651, fol.); *St. Bernard,* by Mabillon (1667, fol.; 2d ed. 1690, 2 vols. fol.; 3d ed. 1719, 2 vols. fol.); *Anselm of Canterbury,* by Gerberon (1675, fol., 2d ed. 1721) ; *Gregory the Great,* by Denis de Sainte-Marthe (1705, 4 vols. folio); *Hildebert de Mans,* by Beaugendre (1708, folio). Dom Constant compiled a collection of the letters and decrees of the popes, only the first volume of which appeared (1721, folio). To aid in the use of the *Biblioth. patrum maxima* of Lyon, Le Nourri wrote his *Apparatus* (1703, fol.), which, however, does not extend further than the 4th century; it consists of biographical, historical, and literary notices of the writers whose works are contained in the *Bibliotheca.* Finally, among their most valuable

publications are those relating to the ancient translations of the Bible. Such are the *Hexapla* of Origen, by Montfaucon (1713, 2 vols. fol.); the *Bibloth. divina* of Jerome, by Martianay (1693, vol. i of the works of Jerome), and the *Latinae versiones antiquae*, by Sahatier, Baillard, and Vincent de la Rue (1743-49, 3 vols. fol.).

Their zeal and their liberal views could not fail to involve them in numerous and bitter controversies; yet even then they generally preserved a tone of great moderation, whilst their greater learning often gave them the advantage over their adversaries. Perhaps the weakest contest they ever engaged in was their defense of the claims of their fellow Benedictine abbot Gersen as the author of the *Imitatio Christi*, against the attacks of the Augustinian canon regulars, *SEE KEMPIS*. They ably defended themselves against the insinuations of De Rance, founder of *La Trappe*, who accused them of worldliness on account of their studies. Mabillon was thus provoked to publish his renowned *Traite des etudes Monastiques* (1691, 4to, and 1692, 2 vols. 12mo; it was translated into Latin and Italian). They also got into difficulties with the Jesuits, who accused them of Jansenism on account of their edition of St. Augustine, and otherwise attacked them in the *Journal* of Trevoux. During this controversy they published very important essays against the bull *Unigenitus.* Gerberon published the *Histoire generale du Jansenisme* (1700, 3 vols. 12mo), and Le Cerf the *Histoire de let Constitution Unigenitus en ce qui regarde la Congregation de St. Maur.* The French Revolution, in forbidding the existence of convents, dispersed also the Benedictines. Several of the works they had then on hand remained uncompleted. The *Academie des Inscriptions* undertook to finish such as related to the history of France. The last of the Benedictines of St. Maur, Dom Brial, died a member of the French Academy in 1833. In later times an attempt was made to revive the order. La Mennais (q.v.) with some of his friends bought the abbey of Solesmes, formerly occupied by the Benedictines of St. Maur. The pope made it the regular abbey of the restored Order of Benedictines Sept. 1, 1837, and Geranger (afterwards called Gueranger), a German professor, formerly a Protestant, was made superior-general of the order. Yet so far, the attempts of the new monks to rival the fame of their predecessors have proved unsuccessful; the ultramontanism which pervades the French clergy is not favorable to profound studies. Its first work gave evidence of the spirit which now animates the institution: *Origines catholiques, origines de l'Eglise Romaine* (Paris, 1836, 4to; vol. 1 only has appeared). By his

Institutions liturgiques (Paris, 1846) Gueranger helped to introduce the use of the Roman liturgy in the French dioceses, in spite of the remonstrances of the Gallican clergy. The most eminent of the new Benedictines is Pitra, yet even his works will prove of more value to the papacy than to science. In an article published in the *Correspondant* of 1852 he attacked the *Regesta pontificum* of Jaffe, and asserted that the making of the pseudo-decretals (q.v.) affords proof that the primacy of the See of Rome was then already recognized by all. Pitra has published a *Histoire de St. Leger et de l'Eglise de France au 7me siecle* (Paris, 1846): — *Etudes sur la Collection des Actes des Saints par les Bollandistes* (Paris, 1850), a valuable work. Since 1852 he has been working at a *Spicilegium Solesmense*, of which three volumes have been published (Paris, royal 8vo). They do not continue the important works commenced by the old order, leaving even the series of the fathers unfinished. See Petz, *Biblioth. Benedicto-mauriana* (Vienna, 1716, 8vo); Le Cerf, *Bibliotheque historique*, etc., *des Auteurs de la Cong. de St. Maur* (Hague, 1726, 12mo); Tassin, *Histoire liter. de la Congr. de St. Maur* (Paris, 1726, 4to); Herbst, *Die Verdienste d. Mauriner um d. Wissenschaften* (*Tubinger theol. Quartalschrift*, 1833, part i, ii, iii; 1834, pt. i). — Herzog, *Real-Encyklopadie*, 9:190 sq.

Maurand (Or Mauran), Pierre

the first leader of the Albigenses in Southern France, was born at Toulouse, of a noted family, in the early part of the 12th century. From his youth he gave himself entirely to spreading the doctrines of the Albigenses (q.v.) throughout Languedoc. Rich and learned, preaching incessantly, traveling barefooted, sleeping on the ground, living in the midst of danger, he strongly impressed the southern mind, always easily excited, and in a short time made a great number of converts, whom he assembled in two of his mansions, one in the city, the other in the country. Maurand said boldly "that the clergy performed their ecclesiastical duties without learning, without morals, and without capacity; that usury was common, and that in many churches all was venal, the sacraments and the benefices; that the clerks, the priests, the canons, and even the bishops, associated publicly with abandoned women; that if the same vices were remarked in the lords and laity, it was owing to the general ignorance, an excuse which the clergy could not plead." As for his belief, he admitted two grand directing principles, independent and uncreated; good and evil; light and darkness. He did not consider almsgiving a means of salvation; and life should not be

an incessant commerce. He did not admit that a priest could, by a few words, transform the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, and persisted in seeing in the mass and sacrifice only a commemoration, a symbol. He rejected all the ceremonial service of the Church as an abuse which should be destroyed. He led, moreover, a most regular and sober life, prayed on his knees seven times a day and seven times each night. He did not acknowledge the remission of sins on the earth, not being able to believe that a mere mortal, a priest "all covered with the leprosy of vice," could absolve that of which he was himself knowingly guilty each day. As for the members of the clergy, he called them net pastors, but ravishing wolves, etc. The court of Rome was not slow in being roused, and the number of heretics multiplied so prodigiously that an appeal was made to the secular arm. After having condemned the sectarians in several synods, the archbishops of Narbonne and Lyons made some arrests, and burned alive those who would not recant. After the action of the Council of Albi in 1176, pope Alexander III himself inaugurated a crusade against the heretics, who were particularly strong in the dominion of Raymond V of Toulouse. The legate and the bishops entered Toulouse in the midst of the insulting clamors of the people. One of the prelates however preached, and attempted to refute the doctrines of the Albigenses; the latter, apparently convinced not so much by his reasoning as by fear of the count of Toulouse, did not dare to be seen or to speak in public. The legate, not contented with this success, caused the Roman Catholics to promise with an oath to denounce and deliver up all the heretics they knew. Pierre Maurand was one of the first reached by this measure. They induced him by caresses and promises to appear before the legate. In the examination to which he was obliged to submit, he declared that the bread was not the body of Christ. The inquisitors asked nothing more; they delivered him to the count of Toulouse, who immediately imprisoned him, ordering that his goods should be forthwith confiscated and his mansions demolished, whilst other punishment was yet to follow. Pierre Maurand, seeing himself on the verge of an ignominious death, promised to abjure his faith. They then brought him out of prison, and on the public square, before the assembled people, he kneeled to the legate and his colleagues; begged their pardon, and promised to submit to their orders. The next day the bishop of Toulouse and the abbot of Saint-Sernin took Maurand from his prison, naked and barefooted, and led him through the city, flogging him from time to time. Arriving at the cathedral, he paid a heavy fine, renewed the abjuration of his faith, and heard the sentence which condemned him to

start within forty days for Jerusalem, and remain there three years in the service of the poor; his goods were confiscated, half to the profit of Raymond V, half to the profit of the clergy. He was also obliged to pay a fine of five hundred pounds' weight of silver to the count of Toulouse, to make numerous gifts to religious establishments, to the poor, etc. However, when Maurand returned from Palestine, he recovered the greater part of his estates. See Dom Vaissette, *Histoire de Languedoc,* t. 3, chap. 19; *Dict. des Heresies,* article Albigeois, in the *Encyclopedie theologique* of the abbe Migne; Benoit, *Hist. des Albigeois,* t. 1; Langlois, *Histoire des Croisades contre les Albigeois;* Basnage de Beauval, *Hist. de l'Eglise,* t. 2, chap. 29. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Generale,* vol. 34, s.v.

Maurice, St.

SEE MAURITIUS.

Maurice

(duke and afterwards elector) OF SAXONY, one of the most prominent characters in the history of the Reformation in the Church of Germany, a celebrated general and champion of the Protestant cause, was the eldest son of duke Henry of the Albertine line and nephew of duke George the Bearded, the most bitter opponent of the Reformation. Maurice was born at Freiburg March 21, 1521; he espoused in 1541 Agnes, daughter of the landgrave Philip of Hesse; and later in the same year succeeded his father in the duchy of Saxony and its dependencies. He was hardly well established in his dominions when a dispute arose between him and his cousin, the elector of Saxony, John Frederick, regarding their respective rights over the bishopric of Meissen, which was the common property of the Ernestine and Albertine lines; but by the influence of Luther and of the landgrave Philip a temporary reconciliation was effected. In the war with the Turks he distinguished himself as a soldier, and became the favorite of Charles V. Whether, however, Maurice was at this time the sincere friend of the emperor is a question that has never yet been determined. This much is certain that Maurice was selfish by nature, and sought rather the furtherance of his own interests than the welfare of his associates and those who befriended him. A professed Protestant, he took part in the deliberations at Smalcald (q.v.; *SEE HOLY LEAGUE*), but refused to become a member of the league for fear of displeasing the emperor,

with whom he coquetted at that time to secure the protectorate of the bishoprics of Magdeburg and Halberstadt. No sooner had the emperor bestowed upon him this much-coveted favor, and honored him with the title of elector (June 19, 1546), than Maurice deserted the Protestant camp, and played the part of a most devoted adherent of the emperor's cause. In consequence of this unexpected hostility to the Protestants the imperial army gained a decisive victory at Muhlberg in April, 1547, well-nigh proving the death-stroke of the Protestant cause. By this defeat of the Protestants, and the imprisonment of his rival, John Frederick, Maurice, according to a previous understanding with the emperor, became himself the ruler of all Saxony. Thus gratified in all the ambitious desires in which he could expect aid from Charles V, Maurice became quite uneasy in his present relation, and hesitated not to embrace the very first opportunity to seek anew the favor of the leaders he had so basely deserted. It is true as late as 1547 Maurice was still found on the side of the imperialists, for he this year supported the *Interim* (q.v.) of Augsburg; but gradually he lessened the hold of the Romanists upon him, and by 1551 we find him a party to a secret treaty of the Protestants with Henry II of France, at the very time that he was professing to besiege the rebellious city of Magdeburg. As treacherously and unhesitatingly as he had abandoned the cause of the Reformers he now forsook the imperial side. Poor Charles was at Innsbruck, employing himself in building up vast schemes of ambition, little dreaming of the mine which the man whom he most of all confided in was preparing to spring under his feet. When suddenly the word came to him that he must release prince Philip of Hesse, whom he had imprisoned for his opposition to the imperial cause, even before he had time to decide the case, news came to him that Maurice of Saxony was marching against him. Without money, without troops, without allies, Charles was compelled to yield to the demands of the man whom he had himself made powerful. On April 18, by the mediation of Ferdinand, king of the Romans, a treaty was concluded at Linz granting the demands of the Protestants; but as it was not to take effect till May 26, Maurice employed himself in attacking (May 18) the camp of Reitti, in which soldiers were assembling for the emperor, defeated and wholly dispersed the imperialists, and advanced on Innsbruck with the view of taking Charles captive. Had it not been that a mutiny stopped his progress, the emperor would have been rudely handled, as Maurice knew his antagonist, and feared the consequences of his treachery. But

Maurice also was feared. His advance on Innsbruck so alarmed the members of the Council of Trent, then in session there, that they fled from the town, and the sittings were thenceforth suspended for some years. Finally came the day of convocation of the electors and princes of the empire at Passau; Maurice directing the cause of the Protestants, and Ferdinand attending to the imperial interests. To the Protestants this meeting must ever be memorable. It was here that a treaty of peace was established which secured to Protestants free exercise of worship; and it was by the Passau treaty that the Romanists of Germany agreed that the imperial chamber, from which Lutherans were not to be excluded, should render justice irrespective of religion; and that the Aulic Council should be composed exclusively of German ministers. These conditions, which in political matters secured "Germany for the Germans," and in religious affairs permanently established the principles of toleration, were embodied in the agreement called the *Peace of Passau* (Aug. 22, 1552). Charles, though he professed reconciliation, never lost an opportunity to wreak his vengeance on the elector. The latter, with his usual subtlety and address, patched up a reconciliation with the emperor, and engaged in the campaign of 1553 against the Turks, who were gradually gaining ground in Hungary. Returning soon, he found that one of his former allies, Albert, margrave of Kulmbach, had refused to accede to the treaty of Passau, and continued the war on his own account, making raids on the ecclesiastical princes of the Rhine and Franconia. Maurice also speedily discovered that behind the margrave stood the emperor, who had secured the services of the margrave because he had found in him a general and an army capable of wreaking his vengeance on the perfidious Saxon prince. But Maurice was equal to the occasion. Putting himself at the head of 20,000 men, he marched to protect his bishopric of Magdeburg against the ecclesiastical spoliator, and, falling in with him at Sievershausen, completely defeated him (July 9, 1553), but fell himself in the conflict, mortally wounded, and died July 11, 1553. "So thoughtful and reticent, so enterprising and energetic, so correct in judgment and unfailing in action, and at the same time wholly devoid of moral sentiment, he is one of the most prominent instances of power without principle which the world's history has ever presented." Kohlrausch has perhaps furnished the most moderate comment on the perjured life of Maurice of Saxony. "The final efforts he so patriotically made for the promotion and establishment of general tranquillity, and

his love for peace and order, which he sealed with his own blood, have in a great degree served to throw the mantle of oblivion over his earlier proceedings, and conciliated the critical voice of public opinion" (*Hist. Germany,* p. 296). Robertson appears to be equally anxious to laud the last act of Maurice, and to let it stand forth only as the lifework of this faithless prince. He excuses him on the ground that "his long and intimate union with the emperor had afforded him many opportunities of observing narrowly the dangerous tendency of that monarch's (Charles) schemes. He saw the yoke that was preparing for his country, and was convinced that but a few steps more remained to be taken in order to render Charles as absolute a monarch in Germany as he had become in Spain. At the same time he perceived that Charles was bent on exacting a rigid conformity to the doctrines and rites of the Romish Church, instead of allowing liberty of conscience, the promise of which had allured several Protestant princes to assist him in the war against the confederates of Smalcald. As he himself, notwithstanding all the compliances which he had made from motives of interest, or an excess of confidence in the emperor, was sincerely attached to the Lutheran tenets, he determined not to be a tame spectator of the overthrow of a system which he believed to be founded in truth" (p. 386). Though we would gladly like to concede this point, truth compels us to dissent, from the opinion of the noted historian. We doubt very much whether Maurice of Saxony, in any period of his life, believed either Romanism or Protestantism "to be founded in truth;" we doubt even that he ever believed himself "to be founded in truth." Let us say, rather, that he was possessed of an ambition which knew no bounds, and that, seeking honor for himself, he reaped all the glory of having concerted and completed that unexpected revolution which closed with the treaty of Passau — "that overturned the vast fabric in erecting which Charles had employed so many years, and had exerted the utmost efforts of his power and policy; that annulled all his regulations with regard to religion; defeated all his hopes of rendering the imperial authority absolute and hereditary in his family; and established the Protestant Church, which had hitherto subsisted precariously in Germany, through connivance or by expedients, upon a firm and secure basis" (p. 415; comp. p. 424, 425). It is indeed a singular circumstance that the Reformation should be indebted for its security and full establishment in Germany to the same hand which had brought it to the brink of destruction, and that both events should have been accompanied by the

same acts of dissimulation. See J. Camerarius, *Vita Mauritii Electoris Saxoniae* (1569); Georg Arnold, *Vita Mauritii* (1719); F. A. von Langenn, *Moritz Herzog und Churfurst von Sachsen* (1841, 2 vols.); Schlenkert, *Moritz Churfurst von Sachsen* (1798-1800, 4 vols.); R. von Weber, *Moritz, Graf von Sachsen,* etc. (Lps. 1863); Taillandier, *Maurice du Saxe* (Paris, 1865); Coxe, *House of Austria,* 1:450 sq.; Vehse, *Memoirs Court of Austria,* 1:254; Kohlrausch, *Hist. of Germany,* ch. 4; Robertson, *Charles V,* book 10. *SEE CHARLES V*; *SEE INTERIM*; *SEE REFORMATION*.

Maurice, Antoine

(1), a French Protestant theologian and Orientalist, was born at Eyguieres, in Provence, Sept. 27, 1679. He belonged to a Provencal family which had embraced the Reformed religion in the 16th century, and furnished many pastors to the churches of the south. When the revocation of the Edict of Nantes forced his father to retire to Geneva, he was not permitted to follow him, and remained for some time in the hands of priests, who hoped to educate him to the service of the Church of Rome. Two officers, friends of his family, coming to his aid, he succeeded finally in escaping the vigilance of his guardians and arrived at Vienna; being denounced during a halt, he fled alone, and arrived on foot at Bourg in Bresse (1686). Although it was in the middle of winter, he resumed his route with a faithful servant, and, after having wandered in the mountains of Jura, he succeeded in reaching Basle, from whence he was conducted to Geneva in a pitiable condition. He was then only nine years old. Consecrated to the ministry, he entered it in 1697, at Geneva, where, in 1704, he assumed pastoral duty. Gifted with a happy memory and great talent for the study of languages, he learned the greater part of the Oriental idioms, and perfected himself by speaking them fluently with a rabbi and priest from the Levant whom he had invited to his house. He was also fond of the sciences, and abandoned the system of Des Cartes for that of Newton, of whom he became a zealous partisan. In 1710 he was elected professor of belles-lettres and of history in the Academy of Geneva, later he taught the Oriental languages, and after 1724 theology. He was twice called to the rectorship. In 1713 he was made a member of the Royal Society of the Sciences of Berlin, on the proposition of Leibnitz. Maurice died in Geneva Aug. 20, 1756. Of his works we have an edition of the *Rationarium Temporum* du P. Petan, with notes (Geneva, 1721, 3 vols. 8vo): — twelve *Sermons* (ibid. 1722, 8vo): — twenty different dissertations, among others,

De Conscientia (1725-1734, 4to): — *De Resurrectione Jesu Christi* (1734-1763): — *Jus examinis* (1740, fol): — *De Suicidio* (1756, 8vo). His scientific and philological works have not been published. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.*

Maurice, Antoine

(2), a Swiss theologian, was born at Geneva April 11, 1716. He showed at an early age a decided taste for the physical sciences; at the age of sixteen he maintained before the celebrated professors Caames and Calendrini some theses, *De Actione Solis et Lunae in aerem et aquam* (Geneva, 1732, 4to), which were then considered very remarkable. He became pastor in 1748, and in 1750 succeeded his father in the theological chair. He died in Geneva July 23, 1795. He has left some dissertations on philosophical and theological points: *De Musica in Sacris* (Geneva, 1771, 4to): — *De Fide veterum Judaeorum circa futurum post hanc vitam statum* (ibid. 1780, 8vo): — *De Tolerantia apud Ethnicos* (ibid. 1790, 4to); — and in MS. a *Histoire ecclesiastique.* See Senebier, *Hist. litter. de Geneve;* Mensel, *Gelehrten-Lexikon,* s.v. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale,* s.v.

Maurice, Frederick Denison

a very celebrated English divine of our day, the successor of Dr. Arnold as leader of the “Broad Church” party of the Anglican clergy, was born in 1805, the son of a Unitarian minister of high reputation for intelligence and philanthropic zeal. Young Maurice at an early age entered at Trinity College, Cambridge, where he formed an intimate friendship with the late Scotch divine John Sterling (q.v.), a friendship which lasted through the whole of Sterling’s life, and which was made closer in the end by the marriage of the friends to two sisters. From Trinity College both Maurice and Sterling removed to the smaller corporation of Trinity Hall; and here thus early the former began to exert that singular influence, partly intellectual and partly moral, upon all who came near him, which accompanied him throughout his whole career. His examinations at college were passed with such great distinction that he was recommended for a fellowship notwithstanding his nonconformity, and when he refused, upon the ground that he could not conscientiously subscribe to the Thirty-nine Articles, he was given a year or two that he might overcome his scruples, take his degree, and enjoy a fellowship. This also he declined, on the

ground that, by holding out to himself such a prospect, he would be subjecting his intellectual independence to the risk of a temptation, and bribing his conscience. Accordingly, quitting Cambridge without a degree, he removed to London, where for some time he devoted himself to literature. With his friend Sterling he became connected with the "Athenaeum," then just starting, and opened a literary career that lasted for a period of forty-four years, within which "the ink of his pen was seldom dry." Experiencing a change in his religious sentiment, he finally decided to enter the ministry of the Established Church, but, lest his motives should be misinterpreted, he went to Oxford instead of Cambridge, and there about 1828 received ordination. From that very moment his activity in the Church began, and as he commenced so he continued through life. Earnestly devoted to the interests of the Christian religion, he sought to present the truths of the Gospel in a manner that might bring within the pale of the Church the educated and the liberal. He held that the Church ought to grapple intellectually, in its theological aims and expositions, with the most advanced forms of skeptical thought, in such a manner as to evince a liberal sympathy with much that is non-theological in its apparent aspect, in order the more surely to exhibit the supremacy of religion over all, and that the Church, as an institution, ought so to grapple with contemporary forms of social evil as to exhibit Christianity as the true source of every effective social amelioration. In carrying out these ideas he necessarily came into conflict with the views of others, both in and out of the Church; his orthodoxy on various doctrinal points was questioned, and he was severely attacked by those who believed him guilty of injuring the best interests of the Church.

Mr. Maurice was holding a position as preacher, but it is especially as a writer that he exerted his influence and secured a reputation, and, as a proper estimate of this man is impossible without a glance at his works, we proceed to a hasty consideration of his written productions in the field of theology and philosophy. Omitting numerous separate sermons and occasional tracts, we note his *Doctrine of Sacrifice deduced from the Scriptures*: — *Lectures on the Ecclesiastical History of the First and Second Centuries*: — *Theological Essays*: — *Patriarchs and Lawgivers of the Old Testament Prophets and Kings of the Old Testament*: —*The Unity of the New Testament*: — *Christmas Day and other Sermons*: — *On the Religions of the World*: — *On the Prayerbook*: —*The Church a Family*: — *On the Lord's Prayer*: — *On the Sabbath;* and *Law on the Fable of the*

Bees. To the "Encyclopaedia Britannica" he contributed *History of Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy,* in ancient and in mediaeval times, which was afterwards collected into book form and republished (2 vols. 8vo). He also published a reply to Mansel's *Bampton Lectures* in 1859. Particularly noteworthy among all these productions are his *Theological Essays* (Lond. 1853, 8vo; N. Y. 1854). A Unitarian by birth and education, Mr. Maurice had imbibed much of the humanitarian principles. In these essays he proposed for himself the task of influencing the general religious thought of England, determined, as a faithful ambassador of his Savior, to meet the actual wants of the disturbed and reluctantly skeptical age in which he lived. Unfortunately, however, Mr. Maurice had failed to make due allowance for the moderate degree of toleration that was in vogue twenty years ago when he came forward to act as a religious and theological reformer, and for the ignorance that prevailed among his fellow-men concerning the man who sought to do this work. Now that careful inquiry and investigation have clearly revealed his character, even the most orthodox of all orthodox Christians need not hesitate to speak in terms of highest commendation of the labors and services of Frederick Denison Maurice. But not so in the days of his travail. It was the specialty of his position," says a writer in the *British Quart. Rev.* (Jan. 1873, p. 30), "that he stood midway, as it were, between the professors of the Christian faith, as commonly received, and the modern skeptical and rationalizing spirit which attracted his sympathies, in so far as it was a spirit of free and earnest inquiry, aiming sincerely at the attainment of the truth. Thus he came to be considered by many as affording a sort of half-way house of shelter to those who did not or could not accept the ordinary orthodoxy, and who were yet too much in earnest about life and destiny to be satisfied with the cheerless negations of atheism or the cold comforts of a provisional skepticism. It was natural that he should meet the fate of those who strive to reconcile contraries. Disowned by orthodoxy — which is no matter for wonder — he was rejected and often also despised by skepticism. By the one party he was charged with unsettling the faith of ingenuous youth, while the others accused him of paltering with words in a double sense, and seeking to reconcile things really irreconcilable." The Lessing of the English Church, he held many views akin with the great German writer. Seeking, like the latter, to spread truth by giving it a fair test, Mr. Maurice often went beyond reasonable limits, and unknowingly endangered the interests of the cause he so unhesitatingly served; his language respecting both the *atonement* and the question of *eternal*

punishment was made the text of many attacks, the most noted of which was that by Dr. Candlish of the Scottish Church, in a sermon entitled *Examination of Mr. Maurice's "Theological Essays."*

Starting from the divine center as the root and source of all, religion is to Mr. Maurice a mode of life conditioned and determined on all sides by dependence upon God — the human personality upon the divine Person. "As a life it is a series of experiences through and in which man is acted upon by God, so as to be filled full out of the Infinite fullness. But how shall there be a communion between God and man? In order to the revealing of God, there must be a revealer. This revealer must be able to manifest forth what is *in* God, who is the Father universal, and to do this by such means that man may thereby know him as his Father. A mediator between God and man is essential to the satisfying and fulfilling of human wants. Only one who was himself God could adequately unfold the Eternal. And he must do this by manifestation of the divine in and through the human, otherwise man could not apprehend the revelation; the light would continue shining in darkness without being comprehended of the latter.... The Father has shown us what he is by an actual man like ourselves, who told us that he came forth from the Father, and that he knew him.... He could reveal God to men because, having been ever with the Father, he had also been near to all men from their beginning, as the Light lightening every man coming into the world. He was the Root, and because he was the Root, he was also the Head of humanity. He could redeem humanity, and he alone could, because it was his own because he was in some way already one with it; because in its deepest roots the human personality was bound to him. He did not, therefore, first become a Redeemer when he came to our earth in human form. He could redeem in time, because he had been the Deliverer before his incarnation — because it was his nature to be so." So far so well. There is, however, one great aspect of the work and mission of Christ which Mr. Maurice ignored, that brought the charge of heterodoxy to his door. The necessity of vindicating the authority of a broken law, the obligation from which even God himself could not escape of only pardoning when justice had been satisfied, and which, therefore, magnified and made honorable the law that man had disowned and the authority he had despised, are altogether tossed aside by Mr. Maurice. According to him, it is the sin, and not alone, if at all, the penalty of the sin of the world that Christ takes away. The penalty is and must always be borne by those against whom it is directed, and cannot be endured by any

at second hand. Need we wonder that this view of the atonement exposed Mr. Maurice to much obloquy? “He transforms the atonement,” says the writer already quoted, “into a mere means of reconciling man to God by a process of education. The subjective influence of the sacrifice of Christ — its effects, that is, upon the souls of men, ethically and spiritually — was alone emphasized by him. And whatever benefits may have been wrought by bringing this aspect of the atonement into prominence, obviously it is not the whole scriptural doctrine of sacrifice, as unfolded in the work in which he seeks to deduce that from the Scriptures.” Fundamentally defective in this one great doctrine of Christianity, there are yet others in which his influence was mainly pernicious. “Grateful to him as we are for the power with which he vindicated that great truth on which Christianity rests — the incarnation of our Lord — is it not evident that he was apt to resolve this, and with it the whole work of Christ, into the fulfillment of a merely naturalistic order?... He clung to the indefinite, afraid of losing hold of the reality by putting thoughts in the place of things — opinions, theories, and speculations about the real, for true contact with and genuine apprehension (or laying hold and grasping) of it. He would not let go his hold upon reality, which somehow was brought near by being revealed to man; but he was satisfied with the *somehow."* And yet, while there are some points like those mentioned on which we must differ from the teachings of Mr. Maurice, we must concede that, in face of a rationalism which menaces the foundations of Christianity, Mr. Maurice might well be counted, even by the most orthodox, “a champion of revelation.” We do not so much refer to his influence upon those who, accepting his theological teaching in its entirety, may be called his disciples, as to the far more diffused influence exercised by him upon the general religious thought of England. The very corner stone of this influence lies in his vivid and unfailing apprehension of the revelation of God in Christ as a present reality, exactly fitted to accomplish all that the world needs.

Mr. Maurice held for many years the professorship of divinity in King’s College. The peculiar views advocated in his *Theological Essays* deprived him of this position, and he was thereafter confined to the office of chaplain to Lincoln’s Inn. In 1860 the queen, in addition, appointed him incumbent of the district church of Vere Street, Marylebone, and in 1866 he was honored with a call to the chair of moral philosophy at Cambridge. He died at his residence in London, April 1, 1872, the object of universal admiration. “By not a few he was ‘worshipped on this side idolatry,’ while

by a large number of outsiders he was regarded with affectionate veneration. These feelings culminated at his death in a display of feeling such as it is given to few to call forth. The unanimity of the testimony borne to his character and work by the many journals, secular and religious, that chronicled his decease, was an index of the general sentiment. It was felt everywhere that England had lost a veritable hero in the battle for truth, and the Church a bright ornament and exemplar of the practical graces of the Christian life."

It must not be believed that Mr. Maurice's labors were confined to the theological or philosophical arena. It has been truly said by the *Athenaeum* that he "lived during his allotted term the lives of many men." He was the originator, or one of the originators, of the Christian socialistic movement, the design of which was to break down tie system of competitive labor, and elevate the working classes by teaching them to associate together in little companies, undertaking work in common, and sharing the proceeds. With a view to preparing working-men for such a task, he founded a working-men's college in London, to which in his last years he devoted much of his time and attention. He also took great interest in the cause of female education. Indeed, there are few social questions of any importance to which his sympathies did not extend. See *Fraser's Magazine,* 1854 (April); *Scribner's Monthly,* 1872 (Sept.); *British Quart. Rev.* 1873 (Jan.), art. 2; *English Cyclop.* s.v.; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors,* s.v.; *New Amer. Cyclop s. sv.*

Maurice, Henry

D.D., an English divine, flourished near the middle of the 17th century as chaplain to the archbishop of Canterbury. He published *A Vindication of the Primitive Church and Diocesan Episcopacy,* in answer to Baxter's *Church History of Bishops* (Lond. 1682, 8vo): — *Sermons* (1682, 4to; 1744, 4to): — *A Defence of Diocesan Episcopacy,* in answer to David Clarkson's *Primitive Episcopacy* (Lond. 1700): — *Doubts concerning Roman Infallibility.* See Gibson's *Preservative,* 4:271; Allibone, *Dict. Brit. and Amer. Authors,* vol. 2, s.v.; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliogr.* vol. 2, s.v.

Maurice, Thomas

an English divine and scholar, noted particularly for his studies of the antiquities of India, was born about 1755 at Hertford, where his father was then head-master of the Christ's Hospital school. After his father's death

the family was impoverished by al unfortunate marriage of the widow, and his education proceeded irregularly till Dr. Parr, on opening his school at Stanmore, was prevailed on to receive him as a pupil, and treated him with great generosity and kindness. Destined for the Church, he entered at nineteen St. John's College, Oxford, whence he removed next year to University College. After taking his degree of B.A., he was ordained by bishop Lowth, and held for some time the curacy of the large parish of Woodford, in Essex, which in 1785 he resigned for a chapel at Epping, in order to obtain greater leisure for study. His turn for historical studies had been fostered at University College by his distinguished tutor Lord Stowell, and he now began to concentrate his attention on the history of India, for treating upon which he made proposals in 1790 in a published letter addressed to the East India directors. The irreligious spirit of the French Revolution, alarming Mr. Maurice's mind, induced him to remodel his first work after it was nearly completed, and to devote a considerable proportion of it to dissertations on the Hindu mythology. In 1791 he came before the public with two volumes of his *Indian Antiquities*: the rest were brought out at intervals, the completion of the work being mainly owing to the liberality of the earl of Harborough; and the seventh and last volume appeared in 1797. This work remains to our day a trustworthy book of reference. Meantime he had undertaken a *History of Hindostan,* the three volumes of which, in quarto, were published in 1795, 1798, 1799, and a second edition appeared in 1821. In 1798 earl Spencer presented him to the vicarage of Wormleighton, in Warwickshire; next year he was appointed assistant librarian in the British Museum; in 1800 bishop Tomline obtained for him the pension that had been held by the poet Cowper; and in 1804 he received from the lord chancellor the vicarage of Cudham, in Kent. His *Modern History of Hindostan,* in two volumes, appeared in 1802 and 1804. Several other volumes on Eastern history and theology, and attempts in verse, succeeded this work; and one of his last undertakings was his *Memoirs, comprehending the History of the Progress of Indian Literature, and Anecdotes of Literary Characters in Britain, during a Period of Thirty Years.* Of this work the three volumes appeared in 1819, 1820, and 1822. He died March 30, 1824. See *English Cyclop.* s.v.; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors,* s.v.; Gorton, *Biog. Dict.* s.v.

Mauritius And The Thebaic Legion.

The legend concerning St. Mauritius and his fellow-soldiers originated with Eucherius, bishop of Lyons († about 450), and was first published in A.D. 1662, by the Jesuit Francis Chiffletus, from an old martyrology in the Abbey of St. Claude, in the Jura. A recension of this legend was admitted by Surius into his *Lives of Saints* in 1569, which is drawn from martyrologies of a later date, and was composed by a monk connected with the cloister of St. Maurice, who bore the same name as the bishop, but flourished nearly a century later. Much has been written for and against the authenticity of the legend, but the results of modern criticism seem to indicate that a basis of truth underlies the story. The evidence in its favor reaches to the 4th century, while the adverse proof rests chiefly on the improbability of the events narrated. It relates that during the wars of the emperor Maximian with the Gauls, a legion, known as the Thebaic, was ordered from the East to reinforce his army. It was composed entirely of Christians, and was led by Mauritius. While the emperor rested at Octodurum (now Martigny, at the foot of Mount St. Bernard), the bulk of this legion was stationed at St. Maurice, in the present canton of Wallis, excepting two cohorts, which were sent to Treves. The army was at this time employed in persecuting Christians, in which service the Thebaic legion was ordered to cooperate. They refused to obey, and the emperor, in a rage, commanded the decimation of the legion. As they remained firm, even after a second decimation, Maximian ordered the massacre of the entire body. Eucherius states that at this period a legion numbered 6600 men, and clearly asserts that the greater portion of this legion perished at St. Maurice, while the martyrology of St. Mauritius adds that officers were sent to Treves to execute a similar punishment on the two cohorts stationed there. A similar legend occurs in Simeon Metaphrastes, according to which a St. Mauritius with seventy of his soldiers was executed by order of Maximian; but this was probably a Greek adaptation of the Latin story. Grave doubts are cast upon the legend by the great number of fugitives from this massacre which constantly meet us, and by the improbability of the sacrifice of so large a body of troops in time of war. See De Lisle, *Defense de la Verite du Martyre de la Legion Thebeenne* (1737); the *Acta SS.* Surius, and the *Martyrol. Usuardi,* edit. J. B. du Sollier, S.J., Sept. 22, and October 4, 10, 15; also Tillemont, *Memoires,* tom. 4; Stolberg, 9:302 sq.; Rettberg, *Kirchengesch. Deutschlands,* 1, § 16. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 9:197 sq.; Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon,* 6:414 sq.

Maurus

a pupil of Benedict of Nursia, is chiefly known by the account given of him by the monks of the Congregation of St. Maur (q.v.). His history is mainly legendary. He is said to have been the first to introduce the Benedictine rule into France; to have founded its first convent in France at Glanfeuil, in the province of Anjou, and to have died in 584, after having performed a great number of miracles. Such at least are the main points to be gathered from his biography, much mixed up indeed in regard to dates, which appeared in the 9th century. Gregory of Tours makes no mention of him whatever. This, however, appears certain, that France was the field of his labors, for his name was known there before his biography appeared. Yet all the *Maurimonasteria* do not lead us back to him; thus, for instance, that at the foot of the Vosges is named after an abbot of the 8th century. Mabillon and Ruinart vainly tried to prove the correctness of the old biography (*Acta Sanctorum ord. S. Bened. sec.* 1:274 sq.; *Annales ord S. Bened. saec.* 1:107 sq., 629 sq.), whilst not only Protestant but also Roman Catholic writers have found ample reason to doubt its genuineness. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 9:201. (J. N. P.)

Maurus, Rabanus,

SEE RABANUS.

Maury, John Siffrein

a French prelate, and noted also as a pulpit orator, was born June 26, 1746, at Vaureas, in the Venaissin, of poor but respectable parents. He displayed at a very early age great eagerness for learning, and being destined by his parents for the ecclesiastical profession, he was placed at the Seminary of St. Garde, at Avignon, to pursue his theological studies. About 1766 he proceeded to Paris, in the expectation of earning a subsistence by the cultivation of his talents. Though he was without friends in that city, his first publication attracted considerable notice. Encouraged by this early success he took orders, and devoted himself to the study of pulpit eloquence. In 1772 an *Eloge* on Fenelon, which he published, was favorably received by the French Academy, and caused him to be appointed vicar-general of the bishop of Lombez. He however soon returned to Paris, where he became very popular as a preacher. A panegyric of St. Louis, which he delivered before the French Academy, and one of St. Augustine before an assembly of the clergy, met with so much

success that king Louis XVI appointed him preacher to the court, and presented him with the living of the abbey Frenade, in the diocese of Saintes. In 1785 he delivered his panegyric on *St. Vincent de Paul*, which is esteemed a masterpiece; shortly after he had the honor to be chosen a member of the Academy in the place of the lyric poet Lefranc de Pompignan, and the following year the valuable benefice of the priory of Lioris was conferred upon him. At the assembly of the States-General in 1789 he was named deputy of the clergy for the bailiwick of Peronne, and soon took a prominent part in the debates. From the first he enlisted himself on the aristocratic side, where his energetic eloquence and peculiar talent at reply rendered him a formidable antagonist to Mirabeau. His impressive and impassioned oratory, though it expressed opinions hostile to the great majority of the assembly, was often listened to with admiration and greeted with applause. His great moral courage and firm adherence to the principles which he had adopted, and which, in spite of the most violent opposition and in the face of the greatest danger, he earnestly advocated, secured for him the respect and esteem of the more enlightened portion of his enemies. November 27, 1790, a decree was passed in the National Assembly, by which every ecclesiastic in the kingdom was required to take an oath to maintain with all his power the new constitution; and, in case of any priest's refusal, it was declared that he should be held to have renounced his benefices. To this constitution the pope had refused his sanction, on account of its hostility to the interests of the Church, and the oath was indignantly refused by the great majority of the clergy. When the day arrived for the taking it by the bishops and clergy of the Assembly, an infuriated mob surrounded the hall, threatening death to all who should refuse. On this occasion also Maury displayed his usual intrepidity, and boldly advocated the independence of his order. "Strike, but hear me," was his exclamation, when the last efforts of his impassioned eloquence in that Assembly were interrupted by the incessant cries of his political antagonists. At the close of the stormy session of the National Assembly, Maury, who could lend no further aid to the prostrate cause of royalty and religion, quitted his native country, and, at the invitation of Pius VI, took up his residence at Rome. He was there received with the highest distinction, and the loss of his benefices in France was more than compensated by his speedy elevation to the highest positions in the gift of the Roman Church. In 1792 he was named archbishop of Nicaea "in partibus infidelium," and afterwards appointed apostolical nuncio to the diet held at Frankfort for the election of the emperor Francis II. This

mission accomplished, in 1794 he was elevated to the dignity of a cardinal, and was instituted to the united sees of Monte-Fiascone and Corneto. On the invasion of Italy by the French in 1798, though every effort was made to seize cardinal Maury, he escaped under disguise to Venice, where he assisted at the conclave assembled for the election of Pius VII. In 1799 he returned to Rome upon the conquest of Italy by Suwarrow, and was accredited as ambassador to his exiled king, Louis XVIII, at that time a resident of Mittan. This office he resigned on the reconciliation of the Church of Rome with the government of France under Napoleon (in 1804); thereafter he embraced the cause of the first consul, and was permitted to return to France. This position, which was deemed not to be in unison with the tenor of his former conduct, subjected him in after times to the reproaches and persecutions of the party whom he had served with so much personal hazard. Napoleon gladly received the approaches of so distinguished a member of the Church whose establishment he was restoring in France; an interview took place between them at Genoa, and in May, 1806, Maury reappeared at Paris. The flattering reception he there met with was calculated to attach him to the interests of this chief, who admitted him to his intimacy, and availed himself of his counsels in ecclesiastical matters. He received the pension assigned to the dignity of a French cardinal, and was appointed first almoner of Jerome Bonaparte. In 1807 he was elected a member of the Institute in the place of Target, one of the advocates of the unfortunate Louis XVI. His acceptance in 1810 of the archbishopric of Paris subjected him to the displeasure of Pius VII, between whom and Napoleon there had arisen much disagreement. Cardinal Maury was a warm and sincere admirer of the emperor, and he not only espoused his cause in the disputes with the head of the Church, but took every occasion, which the frequent victories of this chief afforded him, of testifying his gratitude by expressions of admiration in his mandates to the clergy of his diocese. These mandates, written in a style of the most florid eloquence, do not remind us of the impressive and energetic orator of the National Assembly: they were severely criticized by the adherents of the ancient *regime,* and by the witty frequenters of the Parisian saloons, who styled them “archiepiscopal despatches,” in allusion to their military tone, and their imitation of the style and manner of Napoleon’s bulletins. After the capitulation of Paris on the 30th of March, 1814, Maury was deprived by the Bourbons of the administration of his diocese; and, in their resentment for his adherence to Napoleon’s fortunes, they forgot his former daring and powerful support of their tottering throne. He then

returned to Rome, where he was imprisoned during one year by the orders of the pope; he was afterwards allowed to live in retirement on a pension which was given to him in compensation for his resignation of the see of Monte Fiascone. In this retirement, deeply affected by the ingratitude of his former party, and that of the pontiff, to whose elevation he had been instrumental, he died on the 11th of May, 1817. “Notwithstanding his extraordinary eloquence,” says the duchess of Abrantes, who knew him intimately, “the abbe Maury had been before the Revolution, what he was in proscription, what he continued under the empire, a man of talent rather than a man of sense, and a curate of the time of the League, rather than an abbe of the reign of Louis XIV.” She adds that his figure was in the highest degree disagreeable, but the description she gives of it appears rather a caricature than a portrait. His principal work, *Essais sur l'Eloquence de la Chaire* (3 vols. 8vo), published after his death by his nephew, Louis Siffrein Maury, still maintains its well-merited popularity. His mind was formed to appreciate the eloquence of Massillon, Bossuet, and Bourdaloue, and his criticisms on the other French divines are in general as correct as they are temperate. In his review, however, of English pulpit oratory, he manifests a want of acquaintance with the writings of its most celebrated preachers, such as Jeremy Taylor, Sherlock, and Barrow. He selected Blair as the best model of English eloquence, and the comparison which he draws between him and Massillon is necessarily most unfavorable to Blair. His own panegyric of St. Augustine is esteemed one of the finest pieces of French pulpit eloquence. He is also supposed, conjointly with the abbe de Boismont, to be the author of a work entitled *Lettres sur l'Etat actuel de la Religion et du Clerge en France.* See *Vie du Cardinal Maury* (1827), by Poujoulat; *Le Cardinal Maury, sa Vie et ses OEuvres* (1855); Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale,* s.v.; *Monthly Review,* vol. 69 (1812), Appendix; *English Cyclop* s.v.

Mauz’zim

µyZæ[m;Sept. Μαωζείμ v. r. Μαωζεί, Vulg. *Maozim*). The marginal note to the A. V. of <271138>Daniel 11:38, “the God of *forces,"* gives, as the equivalent of the last word, *“Mauzzim,* or gods protectors, or munitions.” The Geneva version renders the Hebrew as a proper name both in <271138>Daniel 11:38 and 39, where the word occurs again (marg. of A. V. “munitions”). In the Greek version of Theodotion, given above, it is treated as a proper name, as well as in the Vulgate. The Sept., as at present

printed, is evidently corrupt in this passage, but ἰσχυρά (<27:1137>Daniel 11:37) appears to represent the word in question. In Jerome's time the reading was different, and he gives "Deum fortissimum" for the Latin translation of it, and "Deum fortitudinum" for that of Aquila. He ridicules the interpretation of Porphyry, who, ignorant of Hebrew, understood by "the god of *Mauzzim"* the statue of Jupiter set up in Modin, the city of Mattathias and his sons, by the generals of Antiochs, who compelled the Jews to sacrifice to it, "the god of Modin." Theodoret retains the reading of Theodotion (Μαζωείμ being evidently for Μαωζείμ), and explains it of Antichrist, "a god strong and powerful." The Peshito-Syriac has "the strong god," and Junius and Tremellius render it "Deum summi roboris," considering the Hebrew plural as intensive, and interpreting it of the God of Israel. There can be little doubt that "Mauzzim" is to be taken in its literal sense of "fortresses," just as in <27:1119>Daniel 11:19, 39, "the god of fortresses" being then the deity who presided over strongholds. But beyond this it is scarcely possible to connect an appellation so general with any special object of idolatrous worship. Grotius conjectured that Mauzzim was a modification of the name Ἄζιζος, the war-god of the Phoenicians, mentioned in Julian's hymn to the sun (Beyer, *Addit. ad* Seldenii *"De Dea Syria,"* p. 275). Calvin suggested that it denoted "money," the strongest of all powers. By others it has been supposed to be Mars, the tutelary deity of Antiochus Epiphanes, who is the subject of allusion. The only authority for this supposition exists in two coins struck at Laodicea, which are believed to have on the obverse the head of Antiochus with a radiated crown, and on the reverse the figure of Mars with a spear. But it is asserted, on the contrary, that all known coins of Antiochus Epiphanes bear his name, and that it is mere conjecture which attributes these to him; and, further, that there is no ancient authority to show that a temple to Mars was built by Antiochus at Laodicea. The opinion of Gesenius is more probable, that "the god of fortresses" was Jupiter Capitolinus, for whom Antiochus built a temple at Antioch (Livy, 41:20). By others it is referred to Jupiter Olympius, to whom Antiochus dedicated the Temple at Jerusalem (2 Macc. 6:2). *SEE JUPITER.* Furst (*Handw.* s.v.), comparing <23304>Isaiah 33:4, where the reference is to Tyre, "the fortress of the sea," makes µyZafem; equivalent to µYhiz/[m; or even proposes to read for the former µy;z[m; the god of the "stronghold of the sea," i.e. Melkart, the Tyrian Hercules. A suggestion made by Mr. Layard (*Nineveh,* 2:456, note) is worthy of being recorded, as being at least as well founded as any already mentioned. After describing Hera, the Assyrian Venus, as "standing erect on a lion, and crowned with a

tower or mural coronet, which, we learn from Lucian, was peculiar to the Shemitic figure of the goddess," he adds in a note, "May she be connected with the 'El Maozem,' the deity presiding over bulwarks and fortresses, the 'god of forces,' of Daniel 11:38?" Pfeiffer (*Dub. Vex.* cent. 4, loc. 72) will only see in it "the idol of the *mass!"*

Maw

(hbqe *kebah', hollow,* only occurs in Deuteronomy 18:3), the rough *ventricle* or *echinus* of ruminating animals, which is the second of their four stomachs (Aristotle, *Hist. anim.* 2:17). So the Vulg., Onkelos, Saadias, and Kimahi interpret; but Josephus (*Ant.* 4:4), Philo (2:235, ed. Mang.), after the Sept. (ἔννυστρον, i.e. ἤννυστρον), understand the fourth stomach, or *omaum,* esteemed a great delicacy (like *tripe*) among the ancients (comp. Bochart, *Hieroz.* 1:571 ed. Lips.).

Mawmoisine Or Malvoisine, William De,

a Scotch Roman Catholic prelate, supposed to be a native of France, flourished in Scotland about the opening of the 13th century. He was made bishop of St. Andrew's in 1202; established many monasteries in that country, and was active in promoting a crusade to the Holy Land.

Mawson, Matthias, D.D.,

an English divine of the 18th century, became master of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, in 1732; subsequently rector of Hadstock, Essex; bishop of Llandaff in 1738; was translated to Chichester in 1740, and in 1754 to Ely. He died about 1771. Bishop Mawson published only occasional *Sermons* (Lond. 1732, '33, '40, '41, '43, '46, '50). See Allibone, *Dict. Brit. and Amer. Authors,* vol. 2, s.v.

Maxcy, Jonathan, D.D.,

a Baptist minister and noted American educator, was born in Attleborough, Mass., Sept. 2,1768; graduated at Brown University in 1787, and immediately became a tutor in that institution. Deciding for the ministry, he was licensed to preach April 1, 1790, and was on Sept. 8, 1791, ordained pastor of the First Baptist Church of Providence, R. I. He was on the same day also elected both a trustee and professor of divinity in the college, and in July, 1792, became president. His pastoral relations he severed September 8, 1792. In 1802 he accepted the presidency of Union College;

and in 1804, the newly-established South Carolina College having chosen him for its first president, he heeded the call, in the hope that a Southern climate would improve his health, which had become much impaired. Over this institution he continued to preside, with almost unprecedented popularity, until his death, June 4, 1820. Dr. Maxcy was one of the most accomplished pulpit orators and. scholars this country has produced. He was well versed in philology, criticism, metaphysics, logic, politics, morals, and philosophy. His character was very amiable and his piety sincere. His death was that of the believer in Jesus, and his memory is widely revered. He published a large number of sermons, addresses, orations, etc., which after his death were gathered in a volume, entitled *The Literary Remains of the Rev. Jonathan Maxcy, D.D., with a Memoir of his Life,* by Romeo Elton, D.D. The most valued of his publications were his sermons on the existence of God, frequently republished. See Sprague, *Annals,* 6:297; *Christian Review,* vol. 9; Allibone, *Dict. Brit. and Amer. Authors,* s.v.; Drake, *Dict. Amer. Biog. s.v.*

Maxentius.

SEE CONSTANTINE.

Maxfield, Thomas

a noted early Methodist lay-preacher, flourished in the latter part of the 18th century. He was one of Wesley's converts at Bristol, and was appointed to pray and expound the Scriptures, but not to preach, at the Foundery, in London, during Mr. Wesley's absence. Maxfield, however, being a young man of "much fervency of spirit, and mighty in the Scriptures," greatly edified the people, who, assembling in vast crowds, and listening with earnest attention, insensibly led him to deviate from this restriction and begin to preach. Wesley was informed of this irregularity, and hastened to London in alarm to check him, his prejudices for "Church order" being still strong. The mother of Wesley counseled him to hear Maxfield preach before reproving him, adding, "But take care what you do respecting that young man; he is as surely called of God to preach as you are." Wesley heard him and, his prejudices yielding to the power of truth, he objected no longer. Thus Maxfield became the first of the innumerable itinerant lay-preachers, who have spread the Gospel throughout the world more successfully than any other class of the Christian community. Wesley promoted his welfare in every way, introduced him in London to a social

position superior to his birth, by which he was enabled to make an advantageous marriage, and obtained ordination for him in Ireland from the bishop of Londonderry, who favored Wesley in that country. Maxfield was present at the first Methodist Conference, which was held at the Founders, London, June 25, 1774. Maxfield also attended the third Conference assembled at Bristol, May, 1746. He shared the persecution to which the followers of Wesley were subjected; was at one time seized and imprisoned for the king's service, thrown into a dungeon, and offered to the commander of a ship of war. In 1763, during a revival in London, great excitement was produced by an honest madman, Bell, formerly a life-guardsman, who had become a local preacher, and supposed that he had performed a miraculous cure. Possessing more enthusiasm than judgment, he became fanatical in public meetings, and greatly excited his hearers. He unfortunately obtained much influence over Maxfield — the latter was not naturally an enthusiast — and made him a companion in his fanaticism. Both the Wesleys conversed with Maxfield on the subject, telling him what they disliked in his conduct. In some matters he had been unjustly blamed, in others he promised to change; the evil, however, was not remedied, but seemed rather to increase. Then Mr. Wesley wrote a long letter to Maxfield, plainly telling him of the errors of his preaching and conduct, and of its tendency towards a separation from the Wesleyans. The doctrines advocated by Maxfield and Bell were erroneous, inasmuch as they taught that a person saved from sin need not examine himself, need not pray in private, need *only* believe; that *believing* makes man perfect, and that the pure in heart cannot fall from grace. They said no one thus saved could be taught by anyone who was not. They were thus led to consider themselves the only persons really capable of interpreting the Gospel and qualified to teach it, and soon regarded themselves as inspired, mistaking the workings of their own imaginations for the voice of the Spirit, and neglecting knowledge, reason, and wisdom generally. Maxfield finally decided to separate from Mr. Wesley, and accordingly gave up his work at the Foundery, and took with him one hundred and seventy persons who had embraced the Wesleyan cause. He now opened an independent chapel, and preached for twenty years. Towards the close of Maxfield's life, Wesley, in his travels through England, found him sinking under paralysis and the weight of years, prayed with him, invoking God's blessing on his last days, and subsequently preached in his chapel. See Stevens, *Hist. of Methodism* (Index in vol. 3); Smith, *Hist. of Wesley and his Time;* Tyerman, *Life of Wesley* (see Index in vol. 3).

Maximian.

SEE DIOCLETIAN.

Maximianists

a considerable party among the Donatists who separated from the main body of that sect, and arrogated to themselves the exclusive possession of those qualities of perfection and infallibility to which the whole sect had made pretensions when they separated from the Catholic Church. *SEE DONATISTS.*

Maximilian I

one of the most distinguished of the German emperors, the son and successor of Frederick III, the forerunner of Charles V, was born at Neustadt, near Vienna, March 22,1459. In his nineteenth year he married Maria, the only child and heiress of Charles the Bold, duke of Burgundy, who died in 1482. Maximilian had hoped to enjoy the estates of his father-in-law, but Louis XI of France attempted to seize some of these possessions, and thus involved our German prince in a contest which, when it promised to end favorably for Maximilian, was suddenly turned in favor of Louis XI by the dexterous intrigues of the latter among the Netherlanders. It was not until 1493 that peace was finally established at Senlis. This very year his father the emperor died, and Maximilian succeeded to the government of the vast possessions of the Teutonic realm, so soon to become the theater of one of the greatest revolutions the world has ever been called upon to witness — the Reformation of the 16th century — an event that was ushered in just as Maximilian himself was fast fading as the shades of evening. In 1494 the newly-crowned emperor married Bianca Sforza, daughter of the duke of Milan, which alliance gave rise to a succession of wars in Italy. Shortly after he joined the League of Cambray, formed between pope Julius II, Ferdinand of Spain, and Louis XII of France, against the Venetians; but that republic having soon after become reconciled to the pope, Maximilian joined the so-called Holy League between England, Spain, Venice, and the pope, in opposition to the French, who were signally defeated by the forces of Henry VIII and the emperor in the “battle of the spurs,” near Guinegate (1513). The ascension of Francis I to the throne of France somewhat modified matters in favor of the French. The new king of the Franks captured Milan, and compelled Maximilian to give up Verona to the Venetians for 200,000 ducats. By the

treaty of Basle (1499) he had been obliged to acknowledge the independence of Switzerland. Though thus unsuccessful in his wars, he had the fortune to see the hereditary dominions of his house increased during his reign by several peaceful additions; and the marriage of his son Philip with the infanta Juana, and of his daughter Margaret with the infant Juan of Spain, led to the subsequent union of Spain with Austria, while the marriage of two of his grandchildren with the son and daughter of Ladislaus, king of Hungary and Bohemia, brought both these kingdoms to the Austrian monarchy. The closing activity of his reign was displayed against the rising heresy. Luther had just come forward and attacked Tetzel (1517), and, as Leo X was inclined to make light of the opposition of the little Augustine friar, Maximilian addressed the Roman pontiff, and persuaded him to heed this difficulty as "a question which was dividing Germany." But in the very year in which the discussion at Leipzic came off Maximilian died (1519), and left it for his successor Charles V to further the cause of Protestantism by a blind obedience to the dictates of an incompetent Roman pontiff. Maximilian I was a liberal patron of literature, and learned men were greatly encouraged by him. Indeed he was himself an author, producing several works in prose and verse. See Hegewisch, *Gesch. d. Regierung Maximilians I* (1782; new ed. Leipz. 1818); Haltaus, *Gesch. d. Kaisers Maximilian* (1850); Klupfel, *Kaiser Maximilian I* (Berl. 1864); Lichnowsky, *Gesch. d. Hauses Habsburg;* Vehse, *Memoirs of Austria,* 1:2-33; Coxe, *Hist. of the House of Austria,* 1:278 sq.; Kohlrausch, *Hist. of Germany,* p. 234 sq.

Maximilian II

emperor of Austria, son of emperor Ferdinand I, and of Anna of Hungary, was born at Vienna Aug. 1, 1527. He was educated in Spain by Charles V; took part in the war of Smalcald (1544-48) against the French; became viceroy of Spain in 1549; on his return to Germany, about 1551, he made the treaty of Passau, and in 1552 became governor of Hungary. In September, 1562, he was crowned king of Bohemia; elected king of Rome at Frankfort in November of the same year; king of Hungary at Presburg in 1563; and finally succeeded his father as emperor of Germany in July, 1564. He made war against the Turks, in Hungary, until 1567, but afterwards reigned in peace. During his youth his preceptor, Wolfgang Stiefel, had made him acquainted with the Protestant tenets, and he showed himself favorable to the Reformation, living on very friendly terms with the Protestant princes (Fisher, *Hist. of the Reformation* [N.Y. 1873, 8vo], p.

423). Yet he did not allow their doctrines free scope throughout his empire, as the majority in the states was opposed to it, and the Protestants themselves, divided into Lutherans and Calvinists, were engaged in strife with each other. From the manner in which he sought the friendship and alliance of Romish princes, it must appear that Maximilian II never allowed his private convictions to rule him as a monarch, but that all was made subservient to the interests of the empire. Some will even have it. as Vehse (see below), that he was at one time a convert to the Protestant religion (comp. Baker, *Eccles. Hist.* 2:211). He, however, granted the Protestants in 1568 liberty to worship God according to their conscience throughout Austria, and commissioned D. Chytraeus to draw up a Protestant liturgy for Austria. Although he was opposed to the Jesuits, and subjected them to many restrictions, he yet, by his toleration, permitted them access and great influence in his own family. He died Oct. 12, 1576. See J. F. Miller, *Epistolae Ferdinandi I et M. II* (Pesth, 1808); Koch, *Quellen z. Gesch. M. II* (Leipz. 1857-61); Ranke, *Historischpolitischer Zeitschr.* (1832, p. 278 sq.); and the same reprinted in *Deutsche Gesch.* (1868), vol. 6; Bernard Raupach, *Evang. Oesterreich.* vol. 1 and 2; Lebret, *Magazin z. Gebrauch d. Staaten und Kirchengesch.* (Ulm, 1785), vol. 9; Maurenbrecher, in Sybel's *Histor. Zeitscshrift*, 1862, p. 351 sq.; E. Reimann, in the same journal, 1866, p. 1 sq.; Coxe, *Hist. of the House of Austria*, 2:4 sq.; Vehse, *Memoirs of the House of Austria*, 1:217 sq.; Pierer, *Universal-Lexikon*, 11:29; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 9:204.

Maximin I

Picture for Maximin

JULIUS VERUS, Roman emperor, was a native of Thrace, and a shepherd in his youth. His fine figure, great height, and strength attracted the notice of the emperor Severus, who enrolled him in his guards. Maximin advanced rapidly, but did not serve under either Miacrinus or Hieliogabalus. During the reign of Alexander Severus he came to Rome, was made senator and chief of a newly-formed legion, took an active part in the wars against the Persians and Allemans, and soon gained great influence over the soldiers. When Alexander Severus was killed at Mayence, March 19, 235, the troops appointed Maximin his successor, and the senate, frightened, confirmed the election. He remained, however, with the army, and made several expeditions into Germany. His disposition was naturally cruel, and he gave full scope to

it when on the throne. Two conspiracies against him which were discovered led to fearful massacres; in the first, it is said, over four thousand persons were executed. He also opposed Christianity, and particularly persecuted the bishops who had been most favored by Alexander. About the same time some earthquakes occurred in the empire, particularly in Cappadocia, and the people became enraged against the Christians, whom they accused of being the cause of all the evils which befell them, and the emperor allowed free scope to all barbarities the people chose to inflict on them. The persecution, indeed, broke out only in some parts of the empire, so that Christians could flee before it; but as the Christians had of late become used to toleration, this sudden visitation of persecution fell severely upon their heads, and caused much suffering (comp. Eusebius, *Eccles. Hist.* 6:28; Firmilian, in Cypr. *Ep.* 75; Origen, *Comment. in* <4024>*Matthew* 24:9). Finally his soldiers, tired of his tyranny and cruelty, murdered him, together with his son, at Aquileia, March, 238. Maximin was only regretted by the inhabitants of Thrace and Pannonia, who were proud of having an emperor of their own; the other parts of the empire rejoiced over his death. The legendary poesy of the 10th century assigns to the reign of Maximin the fabulous martyrdom of St. Ursula, a British princess, and her company of eleven thousand (according to others, ten thousand) virgins, who, on their return from a pilgrimage to Rome, were murdered by heathens in the neighborhood of Cologne. “This incredible number has probably arisen from the misinterpretation of an inscription, like Ursula et Undecimilla’ (which occurs in an old missal of the Sorbonne), or ‘Ursula et XI M. V., i.e. Martyres Virgines, which, by substituting *millia* for *martyres*, was increased from eleven martyrs to eleven thousand virgins. Some historians place the fact, which seems to from the basis of this legend, in connection with the retreat of the Huns after the battle of Chalons, 451” (Schaff). See Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* 9:207; Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology*, 2:983; Schaff, *Church Hist.* 1:170; Gieseler, *Ecclesiastical History*, 1:115.

Maximin II

Picture for Maximin 2

DAZA, Roman emperor, was originally an Illyrian peasant, who served in the Roman armies, and was raised by Galerius, who was his relative,

to the rank of military tribune, and lastly, A.D. 303, at the time of the abdication of Diocletian and Maximian, to the dignity of Caesar, receiving for his share the government of Syria and Egypt. After the death of Galerius, in 311. Maximin and Licinius divided his dominions between them, and Maximin obtained the whole of the Asiatic provinces. Both he and Licinius behaved ungratefully towards the family of Galerius, their common benefactor. Valeria, the daughter of Diocletian and widow of Galerius, having escaped from Licinius into the dominions of Maximin, the latter offered to marry her, and on her refusal banished her with her mother into the deserts of Syria. He gained unenviable notoriety by his severity towards his Christian subjects, and made war against the Armenians. A new war having broken out between Licinius and Maximin, the latter advanced as far as Adrianople, but was defeated, fled into Asia, and died of poison at Tarsus in 313. — *English Cyclop.* s.v.

Maximus, Alexandrinus,

called also the *Cynic Philosopher,* was born in the fourth century, in Alexandria, of Christian parents of rank. He united the faith of an orthodox believer with the appearance and conduct of a cynic philosopher, and was greatly respected by the leading theologians of the orthodox party. Athanasius, in a letter written about A.D. 371 (*Epist. ad Maxim. Philosoph.* in *Opp.* 1:917, etc., ed. Benedict.), compliments him on a work written in defense of the orthodox faith. Tillemont and the Benedictine editor of the works of Gregory Nazianzen (*Monitum ad Orat. xxv*), misled by the virulent invectives of that father, attempt to distinguish between this Maximus and the one to whom Athanasius wrote, for the reason that Athanasius could ever have approved of so worthless a character. They also distinguish him from the Maximus to whom Basil the Great addressed a letter (*Ep.* 41, Paris, 1839) in terms of great respect, discussing some points of doctrine, and soliciting a visit from him; but they are not successful in either case. The Maximus Scholasticus. however, to whom Basil also wrote (*Ep.* 42), was a different person. In A.D. 374, during the reign of the emperor Valens, in the persecution carried on by Lucius, Arian patriarch of Alexandria, Maximus was barbarously scourged and banished to the Oasis, on account of his zeal for orthodoxy, and the alacrity with which he aided those enduring the same persecutions (Gregory Nazianzen, *Orat.* 25, 100:13, 14). He was released at the end of four years, probably on the death of Valens; and it was soon after this event that he presented to

the emperor Gratian at Milan his work *De Fide,* written against the Arians (compare Jerome, *De Viris Illustr.* 100:127). He wrote also against other heretics, but whether in the same work or in another is not certainly known; and he disputed ably against the heathens. He appears to have returned from Milan and visited Constantinople, where Gregory Nazianzen had just been made patriarch, A.D. 379. Gregory received him with the greatest honor, and pronounced an oration (*Orat. 25*) in his praise, where his warm panegyrics cause the commendations of Athanasius and Basil to seem exceedingly tame. He welcomed him at his table, treated him with much confidence and regard, but was subsequently grievously disappointed in him. Whether in the succeeding events Maximus was himself ambitious or merely the tool of others, does not appear. Profiting by the sickness of Gregory, and supported by some Egyptian ecclesiastics, sent by Peter, patriarch of Alexandria, under whose guidance they professed to act, Maximus was ordained, during the night, patriarch of Constantinople, in the place of Gregory, whose election had not been perfectly canonical. This bold proceeding greatly excited the indignation of the people, with whom Gregory was popular. The emperor Theodosius, to whom the usurper applied, showing him no favor, the latter withdrew to Alexandria, from whence he was speedily expelled by his patron Peter (see Gregory Nazianzen, *Carmen de Vita sua,* vss. 750-1029). The resignation of Gregory did not benefit Maximus. His election was declared null and void by the second general council, and the presbyters whom he had ordained were declared not to be presbyters (*Concil. Constantinop.* can. 3, sec. Dionys. Exiguum; *Capital* 6, sec. Isidor. Mercat; apud *Concil.* vol. 1, col. 809, 810, ed. Hardouin). He attempted again to assert his claims to the patriarchate; but, though the Italian bishops seemed inclined for a time to second his efforts, he met with no permanent success. The invectives of Gregory Nazianzen against Maximus (*Carmina,* sec. *De Vita sua,* l. c.; *In Invidos,* vs. 16, etc.; *In Maximum*) were written after their struggle for the patriarchate, and contrast strongly with his former praises in his twenty-fifth Oration, to which some of Gregory's admirers, to conceal the inconsistency, prefixed the name of Heron or Hero (*In Laudem Heronis;* Jerome, *De Viris Illustr. l. c.*), which it still bears. The work of Maximus, *De Fide,* which is well spoken of by Jerome, is lost. (See Athenas, Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, Jerome, *l. c.;* Sozomen, *H. E.* 7:9, cum not. Vales; Tillemont, *Memoires,* 9:443, etc.; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* ad ann. 380, 1:276, ed. Oxford, 1740-42; Fabricius, *Bibl. Graeca,* 3:520). — Smith, *Dict. Gr. and Rom. Biog.* vol. 2, s.v.

Maximus, Confessor

a leading champion of orthodoxy in the Monothelite controversy (q.v.), was born at Constantinople in 580. At an early age he became private secretary to the emperor Heraclius, but, deciding for the ecclesiastic state, he resigned this position, and in 630 entered the monastery of Chrysopolis (Scutari), near Constantinople, and in a short time became its abbot. The dangers which threatened the state at the time induced the emperor to attempt a reconciliation between the parties engaged in the Monophysite controversy (q.v.), by means of a compromise, which declared that Christ had accomplished the work of redemption by *one* manifestation of his will as the God-man, (μιᾷ θεανδρικῇ ἐνεργείᾳ). The patriarchs Sergius, of Constantinople, and Cyrus, of Alexandria, as heads of the contending parties, agreed in 633 to unite on this formula, and many of the Monophysite faction returned to the Church; but several of the orthodox opposed the compromise strongly, as practically endorsing Monophysite views. With a view to put an end to these troubles, the emperor in 639 published an edict, known as the *Ecthesis* (q.v.), which prohibited all controversies on the question whether in Christ were one or two operations, but which itself plainly inculcated the doctrine of one will. Maximus, who had in the mean time removed to Africa, now entered the lists in defense of the orthodox view, and unequivocally resisted all attempts to undermine the faith of the Church. His course was favored by Gregorius (or Georgius), the prefect of North Africa, who sought an opportunity to renounce his allegiance to the Byzantine court; and under his protection Maximus exerted himself to the utmost to combat the many heresies which were then rife, manifesting a special zeal against the Monophysite Severians in Egypt and Crete, and against the Monothelites. His discussion with Pyrrhus, the patriarch of Constantinople, who had fled to Gregorius on being charged with complicity in the murder of the emperor Constantine, was held in July, A.D. 645, and resulted in the signal triumph of Maximus. The records of this disputation belong to the most interesting writings of the Monothelite controversy. In the following year the bishops of Africa and the neighboring isles, influenced by Maximus, held a number of synods which condemned Monothelitism, and called on Theodore, bishop of Rome, to support their views with his authority. Maximus now went to Rome, accompanied by Pyrrhus, who formally recanted his late opinions, and was recognized by the pope as the rightful patriarch of Constantinople; and thus a coalition in the interests of

orthodoxy was formed which promised a complete triumph. But Maximus was the only disinterested party to the agreement. Gregorius fell in a battle with the Saracens in A.D. 647; Pyrrhus hastened to take back his recantation, and to make his peace with the emperor; and the pope, disappointed in the hope of seeing his supremacy recognized in the East as well as in the West, anathematized him. Maximus was again compelled to confine his labors to controversial writings. He was now recognized at the imperial court as the soul of the opposition; and when he resisted the edict of Constans II, promulgated in A.D. 648, and known as the *Typus* (q.v.), Gregorius, an envoy of the Byzantine court, did not disdain to seek him in his cell, and attempt to shake his firmness. The monk, however, refused to make any concessions, since he regarded that edict as degrading Christ to the level of a being without will or energy, and denied the right of the emperor to interfere in dogmatic questions. On the accession of Martin I, Maximus, more than any others, induced that pope to convene the first synod of the Lateran (in 649); and there can be no doubt that he originated the resolutions there adopted, which condemned Monothelitism and the imperial edict. Thereafter Maximus entered a cloister, and we lose trace of the detailed record of his life. We meet him again when apprehended, under orders from Constantinople, perhaps at the same time as pope Martin I, and brought to trial in 665. The proceedings (of which the records are quite full) show that the aim of the emperor was simply to secure his approval of the τύπος, as a measure in the interests of peace; but the monk remained firm, and declared with tears that the only means of securing peace was the recall of that instrument. Hence the treatment he received became harsher; and when, after his third trial, he still persisted in maintaining his views, a synod convened by the patriarchs of Constantinople and of Antioch advised the emperor to banish him, and he was taken to the castle of Bizya, in Thrace, later to the monastery of St. Theodore, near Rhegium, and finally to Perberis. His exile was protracted more than a year, during which period frequent attempts were made by bishop Theodosius of Caesarea, and by special agents of the emperor to induce him to recant, but always without success. He was finally condemned to be scourged, and to lose his tongue and his right hand, that he might no longer be able either to speak or write, a and afterwards to be incarcerated in the castle of Shemari, in the country of the Lacians, where he died, Aug. 13, 662. His influence, however, continued to be felt. A few years later the emperor Constans II fell a victim to the hatred he had aroused chiefly by his persecution of this faithful champion of the Church,

and in A.D. 680 the Church gave her sanction to the doctrines so heroically defended by this monk in the first Trullan council (q.v.).

As a writer Maximus is distinguished by a rare combination of dialectic power with mystical profundity. His mind was receptive rather than creative, and in his works Platonic and Aristotelian thought, Chalcedonian orthodoxy, the theology of the Greek fathers, and the ideas of a Christian mysticism, which includes both the subjective ascetism of the Egyptian monks and the hierarchical tendencies of the Areopagite system, all meet and coalesce. The mysticism of the Pseudo-Dionysius exerted the greatest influence over him, and from it he derived his principal thoughts; and it is chiefly because of his authority that the wide-spread influence of this system upon the theology of the Middle Ages was possible. The influence exerted on Scotus Erigena by the writings of Maximus was especially important. Baur asserts that Erigena merely developed the ideas of Maximus, and commented on them; and other writers have shown in detail that the essential features of the system of Erigena are drawn from Maximus, and immediately through him from the Areopagite. This monk thus becomes important as a connecting link between the ideas of the East and West, between the early fathers and the Middle Ages, and as a forerunner of scholasticism; and in his genius, character, piety, learning, literary and ecclesiastical influence, as well as in his eventful life, he appears one of the most remarkable Christian thinkers and martyrs. His works have been largely transcribed and read, but there is no complete edition. Combefis has published a collection in two volumes, folio (Paris, 1675). Catalogues have recorded the titles of fifty-three, his letters being mentioned as one work. Of these, forty-eight have been printed. They may be classed as exegetical, which treat the Scriptures in allegorical style; commentaries on the Church fathers; dogmatico-polemical; moral and ascetic; epistolary; and miscellaneous. He is commemorated in the Latin Church Aug. 13; by the Greek Church Jan. 21. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 20:114 sq.; Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 12:783 sq.; Kurtz, *Church Hist.* 1:205 sq.; Hardwick, *Hist. of the Middle Ages,* p. 72 sq.; Gieseler, *Eccles. Hist.* 1:366 sq.; Milman, *Hist. of Lat. Christianity,* 2:274 sq.; Neander, *Hist. of Christian Dogmas,* 2:423 sq.; Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog. and Mythol.* s.v.

Maximus, The Greek

a celebrated personage in Russian Church history, was born at Arta, in Albania, towards the end of the 15th century. After studying at Paris, Florence, and other cities then distinguished as seats of learning, he took the monastic vows at the cloister of Mount Athos. The grand-duke Vassili Ivanovitch, having requested the patriarch of Constantinople to send two persons to arrange and describe a vast number of Greek manuscripts and books that had recently been discovered in some part of the palace, Maximus was selected, and accordingly set out for Moscow. He was directed by Vassili to examine the books, and to select such as were most deserving of publication; but as he was then wholly ignorant of the Slavonic tongue, he had first to prepare a Latin version, which was afterwards rendered by others into Slavonian. It was thus that the translations of a Psalter with a commentary, and Chrysostom's *Homilies on St. John,* were produced. Desirous of returning to his convent, it was only at the instances of the Czar, who wished him to revise the earlier translated books of the Greek Church, that he decided to remain, and he then undertook this task, for which he was now qualified by a successful mastery of the Slavonian. The diligence with which he executed it, resulting in many corrections, tended however only to raise up numerous enemies against him, among the rest Daniel the metropolitan. But what more immediately tended to his disgrace was the firmness with which he opposed Vassili's divorce from his first wife, Salome (on account of barrenness), and his marriage with the princess Helena Glinski (comp. Duncan, *Hist. of Russia,* p. 350). Maximus was condemned by a synod, excommunicated as a heretic, and imprisoned in the Otrotch monastery at Tver in 1525. In this confinement he was for some time treated with-great rigor, though the bishop of Tver interceded for him. At length removed to the Monastery of St. Sergius, he died there in 1556. A great number of works by him are extant, chiefly in manuscript, on a variety of subjects — dogmatical, polemical, philosophical, etc., from which considerable information has been derived with regard to the opinions and prejudices of the clergy and people in that age; nor was he at all timid in reproving the abuses and vices of the times. This alone would account for the persecution which he drew down upon himself; but after his death even those who had been among the more violent against him admitted his innocence, nor was it long before his memory came to be regarded as that of a holy man and a martyr. — *English Cyclop.* s.v.; Rose, *New Gen. Biog. Dict.* s.v.

Maximus Of Jerusalem

(*Hierosolymitanus*), a Greek ecclesiastical writer, flourished in the latter part of the 2d century. Jerome (*De Viris Illustr.* 100:47) speaks of Maximus as writing on the questions of the origin of evil and the creation of matter, and as having lived under the emperors Commodus (A.D. 180-193) and Severus (A.D. 193-211), but he does not designate what office he held in the Church, or whether he held any; nor does he connect him with any locality. Honorius of Autun (*De Scriptor. Eccles.* 1:47), extracting from Jerome, mentions the name of Maximinus; and Rufinus, translating from Eusebius, who has a brief passage relating to the same writer (*H. E.* 5:27), gives the name in the same form; but it is probably incorrect. A Maximus, bishop of Jerusalem, lived in the reign of Antoninus Pius or Marcus Aurelius, or the early part of that of Commodus, somewhere between A.D. 156 and A.D. 185; another Maximus occupied the same see from A.D. 185, and the successive episcopates of himself and seven successors occupy about eighty years, the duration of each episcopate not being known. The date of this latter Maximus of Jerusalem accords sufficiently with the notice in Jerome respecting the writer; but it is remarkable that though both Eusebius and Jerome mention the bishop (Eusebius, *Chronic.* and Jerome, *Euseb. Chronic. Interpretatio*), they do not either of them identify the writer with him; and it is remarkable that in the list given by Eusebius of the bishops of Jerusalem, in his *Histor. Eccles.* (5:27), the names of the second Maximus and his successor Antoninus do not appear. It is uncertain, therefore, whether the writer and the bishop are the same, though it is extremely probable they were. The title of the work of Maximus noticed by Jerome and Eusebius (for the two questions of the origin of evil and the creation of matter appear to have been comprehended in one treatise) was *De Materia.* Eusebius has given a long extract from it (*Praep. Evang.* 7:21, 22). A portion of the same extract is inserted, without acknowledgment, in the *Dialogus Adamantii de recta in Deum Fide,* or *Contra Marcionitas,* sect. 4, commonly attributed to Origen, but in reality written long after his time. It is also quoted in the *Philocalia,* 100:24, compiled by Gregory Nazianzen and Basil the Great almost entirely from the works of Origen. In the inscription to the chapter they are said to be from the *Praeparatio Evangelica* of Eusebius; and their being contained also in the supposed work of Origen, *De Recta Fide,* is affirmed in a probably interpolated sentence of the concluding paragraph of the chapter (Delarue, *Opera Origenis,* 1:800 sq.). This passage, apparently the

only part of Maximus's work which has come down to us, is given in the *Bibliotheca Patrum* of Galland (2:146), who identifies the author with the bishop, and gives his reasons for so doing in the *Prolegomena* to the volume, 100:6 ; see also Cave, *Hist. Litt.* ad ann. 196, 1:95; Tillemont, *Memoires,* 2:706, note 13 on Origen.

There was a third bishop of Jerusalem of this name, besides the two previously mentioned, who lived in the reign of Constantine the Great and his sons. He suffered in one of the later persecutions of the heathen emperors, apparently under Maximnian Galerius (Philostorgius, *H. E.* 3:12). His sufferings in the cause of Christianity, and the great excellence of his character, so endeared him to the people of Jerusalem, among whom he officiated as priest, that when he was appointed by Macarius, bishop of that city, to the vacant bishopric of Diospolis, the multitude would not permit his departure, and Macarius was forced to nominate another in his place. According to some accounts, Macarius repented almost immediately of the nomination of Maximus to Diospolis, and readily acquiesced in his remaining in Jerusalem, taking him for his assistant in the duties of the episcopal office (Sozomen, *Hist. Eccles.* 2:20). Upon the death of Macarius (some time between A.D. 331 and 335), Maximus succeeded him, and was present at the Council of Tyre, A.D. 335, when Athanasius was condemned. Sozomen records (*Hist. Eccles.* 2:25) that at this council Paphnutius, a bishop of the Thebais or Upper Egypt, and himself a confessor, took Maximus by the hand, and told him to leave the place; "for," said he, "it does not become us, who have lost our eyes and been hamstrung for the sake of religion, to join the council of the wicked." This appeal was in vain, and Maximus was induced, but unfairly, to subscribe to the decree condemning Athanasius. But he soon regretted this step, and, at a synod of sixteen bishops of Palestine, joyfully admitted Athanasius to communion when returning from the Council of Sardica, through Asia, to Alexandria. Sozomen relates (*Hist. Eccles.* 4:20) that Maximus was deposed by the influence of Acacius of Caesarea and Patrophilus (A.D. 349 or 350), and Cyril (St. Cyrillus of Jerusalem) appointed in his place; but if there is any truth in this statement, the death of Maximus must have very shortly followed his deposition (Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.* 2:8; Sozomen, *l. c.,* and 3:6; Theodoret, *l. c.;* Philostorgius, *l. c.;* Le Quien; *Oriens Christianus,* vol. 3, col. 156). — Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog.* vol. 2, s.v.

Maximus Philosophus.

Different parties of that name are known in ancient history.

1. A heathen eclectic-Platonic philosopher and conjuror, who was teacher to the emperor Julian, and had great influence over him.

2. Also a heathen, of Madaura, in Africa, is known to us by an interesting letter to Augustine. In consequence of his consciousness of the downfall of heathenism, he seeks to uphold a philosophical but impotent monotheism, which, in the worship of several deities, sees only the adoration of a higher or supreme deity who imparts to them their power; but he reproaches the. Christians with wishing to have that God all to themselves, and visiting the graves of the dead (martyrs). Regardless of the new life which Christianity awakened, or of the divine energy testified by its exclusiveness, he finally exclaims, wearily, “Trahit sua quemque voluntas.” The answer of Augustine is somewhat haughty and ironical (August. *Opp.* 2:25 sq., ed. Venet.).

3. Eusebius mentions a Christian philosopher of that name in the 2d century, giving an interesting fragment of a work of his on the question, then much discussed, of the origin of evil (*Praep. Evang.* 7:21 fin., 22; *Hist. Eccles.* 5:27). He has been by some considered as the author of the *Dialogus c. Marcion.,* formerly and erroneously attributed to Origen; but Gieseler (*Stud. u. Krit.* 1830-32, p. 380) successfully opposed this view.

4. Another Maximus, who represented himself both as a philosopher (cynic) and a Christian, and gave much trouble to Gregory of Nazianzum, at Constantinople. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 9:208.

Maximus, Bishop Of Turin,

was born towards the close of the 4th century, and early in the 5th was elevated to the episcopate. But little is known of his life. His signature is affixed to a document expressing the approval by the bishops of Northern Italy of pope Leo’s letter to Flavian on Eutychianism (Leo, *Opp.* ed. Quesnel, p. 291). Among the signatures to the acts of a synod held at Rome in A.D. 465, his name appears immediately below that of pope Hilarius, the successor of Leo, a circumstance that marks him as the oldest bishop of the assembly. His writings, chiefly homilies, are rich in descriptions of the life of the Christians, at a time when paganism, although tottering to its fall, was still powerful among the rural population, and

when the empire was trembling before the power of the invading hordes of barbarians. During the irruption of Attila he displayed a lofty faith in God, and succeeded in arousing his people from their despair, which had determined them to forsake their homes and seek safety in flight. The people of Turin obeyed his counsel, and their city was spared. But when the Huns departed from Italy, and the citizens purchased a share of their spoil, including slaves, he did not hesitate to condemn their conduct, and even compared them to wolves following in the track of lions, in order to gorge themselves on their abandoned prey. His homilies often censure the still prevailing idolatry, particularly the cultus Dianae arvorum numinis, the practice of the priests in inflicting wounds on themselves to do honor to their goddess, etc., and also defended the orthodox doctrines of the Church against Eutychians, Nestorians, Pelagians, and Manichaeans. The best edition of his works is that published at Rome in 1784, found in Migne, vol. 57. See also Schonemann, *Bibl. Hist. Lit.* (Leips. 1794), 2:607 sq.; *Acta Sanct.* June 25; *Biographie, Universelle*, vol. 27, s.v.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 9:208 sq.; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 12:782 sq.

Maximus Of Tyre,

a Neo-Platonic philosopher, surnamed after the place of his abode, flourished in the 2d century as teacher of philosophy and rhetoric, first in Greece and afterwards in Rome, whither he made two journeys, one under the reign of Antoninus, another under that of Commodus. He may be ranked with Phaedrus, Quintus Curtius, and others, of whom their contemporaries have scarcely made mention, and therefore of whom very little is known. We have extant of his works forty-one Διαλέξεις, or dissertations, upon various arguments, a MS. copy of which was first brought out of Greece into Italy by Janus Lascaris, and presented to Lawrence de Medicis. From this copy a Latin translation was made, and published by Cosmus Paccius, archbishop of Florence, in 1519; then in Greek by Henry Stephens in 1557; then in Greek and Latin by Daniel Heinsius in 1607; by J. Davis in 1703; by Reiske in 1774, and since, in 4to. These dissertations are entertaining, curious, and instructive, and have gained the author high encomiums among the learned. The following examples will give some idea of the subject of Maximus's dissertations: "On Plato's Opinion respecting the Deity;" "Whether we ought to return Injuries done to us;" "Whether an Active or a Contemplative Life is to be preferred;" "Whether Soldiers or Husbandmen are more useful in a State;" "On the Daemonium of Socrates;" "Whether Prayers should be addressed

to the Deity," etc. The dissertations have been translated into French by Morel (Paris, 1607), by Forney (1764), and by Dounais (1802); into Italian by Petro de Bardi (Venice, 1642); and into German by C. T. Damm (Berlin, 1764). There is, we believe, no English translation of this author. Isaac Casaubon, in the epistle dedicatory of his *Commentaries upon Persius*, calls him "mellitissimus Platonicorum;" and Peter Petit represents him as "auctorem imprimis elegantem in philosophia ac disertum" (*Misc. Observat.* lib. 1, 100:20). He has spoken a good deal of himself in his thirty-seventh dissertation, and seemingly in a style of panegyric, for which his editor Davis has accused him of indecency and vanity; but Fabricius (*Bib. Graec.* lib. 4, 100:23) has defended him very well upon this head by observing that Davis did not sufficiently attend to Maximus's purpose in speaking thus of himself; "which was," he says, "not at all with a view of praising himself, but to encourage and promote the practice of those lessons in philosophy which they heard from him with so much applause." Some have confounded Maximus of Tyre with Maximus Ephesius, the preceptor of Julian the Apostate. See *Genesis Biog. Dict.* s.v.; Smith, *Dict. Greek and Roman Biog. and Mythol.* s.v.; *English Cyclopaedia*, s.v.

Maxwell, Lady Darcy

an eminently pious Methodist, who by birth and rank belonged to the nobility of Scotland, is noted for her great works of philanthropy. She was the youngest daughter of Thomas Brisbane, County of Ayr, and was born about the year 1742. In her own home she received the rudiments of an education, but subsequently completed it in the city of Edinburgh. At the age of sixteen she resided for a time in London with her uncle and aunt, lord and lady Lothian, to enjoy the advantages of being presented at court. In 1759, soon after her return from London, she married Sir Walter Maxwell. This union seemed to open before her a bewildering vista of future joys and happiness; but only for two short years did she realize her bright anticipations; at the end of that period her husband and child were taken from her, and she was left a widow at nineteen. When tidings of her little one's death, within six weeks after that of her husband, were conveyed to her, without any outburst of grief, or even a murmur, she exclaimed, "I see God requires my whole heart, and he shall have it!" "God brought me to himself by affliction," she frequently said. It was while overwhelmed by these heavy trials that she became acquainted with the Methodists. The early ministry of John Wesley and George Whitefield was generally respected in Scotland. Many of the higher classes approved their

labors; ministers of the Establishment, members of the university, and persons of rank and title mingled in their audiences. It is supposed that some of the pious nobility, admirers of Wesley and Whitefield, first induced lady Maxwell to hear them. However that may be, it is certain that on June 16, 1764, Mr. Wesley preached to a large congregation in Edinburgh, and from that time corresponded with her ladyship, his influence aiding greatly in regulating her views, and guiding her determinations through life. From the time of her husband's death she had resided in Edinburgh or the vicinity. Her benevolence here was unusually great. Seeking to relieve misery in every form, there was scarcely a public or private charity for the repose of age or the guidance of youth, the relief of the poor, the care of the sick, or the spread of the Gospel, to which she did not contribute. In 1770 she established a school in Edinburgh for the purpose of affording education and Christian instruction to poor children — this school was always the object of her pious solicitude; its entire management and superintenennce remained with herself, and, as the benefits flowing from it became manifest, pecuniary aid was furnished by others. At the time of her death eight hundred children had profited by this praiseworthy charity, and it is still in active operation. The employment of her time each day was exceedingly exemplary; she usually rose at four o'clock, and attended the Wesleyan chapel at five, morning preaching being then customary; after breakfast she discharged the duties of the head of a family in her own house; from eleven to twelve she spent the time in interceding with God for her friends, the Church, and the world; the remaining hours of the day she devoted to reading, writing, exercise, and acts of benevolence. Her evenings, when alone, were occupied with reading, chiefly divinity; and, after an early supper, and committing her family to the care of the great Father who watches over all, and spending some time in praising God for his mercies, she retired to rest. In this manner, for nearly fifty years, she walked with her God. Her outward religious life had its varieties, but they were the varieties of advance; her inner religious life also had its changes, but they were those of the beautiful morning, which shines brighter and brighter unto the perfect day. In person, lady Maxwell was above the medium height, exceedingly straight and well proportioned; her features quite feminine, but strongly intelligent; her eye quick and penetrating, yet sweet and tender. She died July 2, 1810, passing away as peacefully and joyfully as she had lived: the society to which she belonged losing its oldest member, the world one of its best inhabitants, and the Church universal one

of its brightest ornaments. See Lancaster, *Life of Lady Maxwell* (N. Y. 1840, 12mo); Coles, *Heroines of Methodism*, p. 76.

Maxwell, Robert

one of the Scottish lords of the regency during the absence of James V in France, deserves a place here for his action in the first Parliament of Mary queen of Scots (1543), where he introduced a bill to allow the reading of the Scriptures in the vulgar tongue, which was passed in spite of the opposition of the lord chancellor, the bishops, and priests. He died in 1546.

Maxwell, Samuel

an American divine and educator, was born in Berkshire County, Mass., about 1805; was educated at Amherst College (class of 1829); subsequently became principal of the preparatory department of Marietta College, Ohio, and later a professor in the collegiate department of the same institution, and remained there until his death, which occurred January 24, 1867. He was also in the employ of the American Missionary Association in his last years.

Maxwell, William

LL. D. an American educator, celebrated also in the department of jurisprudence, was born at Norfolk, Va., Feb. 27, 1784; was educated at Yale College, 1802; practiced in his native city, and attained great eminence; assumed the editor's chair in the literary department of the *N. Y. Journal of Commerce* in 1827; resumed the practice of jurisprudence, however, in the following year; was a member of the Virginia House of Delegates in 1830, and of the State Senate from 1831 to 1837, during which time he was made secretary of the Historical Society of Virginia. He next accepted the presidency of the Hampden Sidney College in 1838, which he retained until 1844, and then edited the Virginia *Historical Register* from 1848 to 1853 (6 vols. in 3, 12mo). He died January 9, 1857, at Richmond, Va. He wrote *Memoir of the Rev. John H. Rice, D.D.* (Phila. 1835, 12mo). See Drake, *Dict. Amer. Biog.* s.v.

May, E. H.

a Dutch Reformed minister, was born at Lynn, Norfolk, England, Jan. 28, 1795. He received a good preparatory education, and studied for the ministry at Hoxton College, near London; was ordained in 1815 over the

Independent Church at Bury, Lancashire, and subsequently preached in Rochford, in the south of England, and Croydon, Surrey. In 1834 he came to America, and in 1835 became a member of the Classis of Washington, and pastor of the Reformed Dutch Church in Northumberland; in 1836, pastor of the Church in Schuylerville; in 1839, of the Twenty-first Street Church, New York; in 1848 accepted the appointment of secretary to the Pennsylvania Colonization Society; and in 1849 became secretary of the Pennsylvania Seamen's Friend Society, in which connection he served until near his death, August, 1858. Mr. May was an instructive and evangelical preacher, a man of refined taste and correct judgment, and a frank, open-hearted Christian. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac,* 1860, p. 203.

May, James

D.D., an Episcopal divine and theological educator, was born in Chester County, Pa., Oct. 1, 1805. He entered Jefferson College, Pa., in 1822; graduated with distinction; commenced the study of law, but finally entered the theological seminary at Alexandria, Va. He was ordained by bishop White in 1827, and first settled in Wilkesbarre, Pa., where he remained two years. In 1836 he became rector of St. Paul's parish, Philadelphia. While there he was engaged with Dr. Clark, then rector of St. Andrew's Church, Dr. Tyng, then rector of the Church of the Epiphany, and with Dr. Suddards, then and still rector of Grace Church, in the editorial management of the *Episcopal Recorder.* His health failing at this time, he was led to seek restoration in foreign travel. Two years were thus spent abroad. After his return, he accepted the position of professor of pastoral theology and ecclesiastical history in the Alexandria Seminary, his alma mater. The outbreak of the rebellion in 1861 closing the operations of that school, he removed to Philadelphia, and became professor of ecclesiastical history and systematic theology in the divinity school just organized. He remained there until his death. Dec. 18, 1863. But few men have so thoroughly won the affections of those with whom they were associated. Apparently not an impulsive man, he was by no means a person of cold and unimpulsive temper, but full of deep feeling. He has influenced the training of hundreds now in the ministry, who will greatly miss his counsels, and the encouragement his sympathy and personal attainments gave them. He was remarkable for the unvarying symmetry and depth of his Christian character, and seemed like one *inspired* by Gospel principles, rather than controlled by them, so perfectly natural and habitual was his manifestation of them. See *Am. Ch. Rev.* 1864, p. 150.

May, Samuel Joseph

an eminent Unitarian minister and philanthropist, was born in Boston, Mass., in 1797. He graduated at Harvard College in 1817; and, after preaching several years as a Unitarian minister at Brooklyn, Conn., became general agent of the Massachusetts Anti-slavery Society. Afterwards he assumed a pastorate at South Scituate, Mass.; from 1842 to 1845 was principal of the Lexington Normal school; and finally, in 1845, settled in the Unitarian ministry at Syracuse, New York. There the remainder of his life was passed, and he was identified with every movement for the moral, intellectual, and social improvement of the people, and came to be regarded as the leading spirit in every measure of benevolence. In all matters of education he was very active, and to him, as much as to any man in Syracuse, it is due that its public schools are so successful and maintain so high a character. He resigned the pastorate July 1, 1871. Mr. May devoted his energies especially to the antislavery cause for many years. He was one of the first members of the New England Society in 1832, and a member of the Philadelphia Convention of 1833 which formed the Anti-slavery Society. He was author of *Recollections of Amer. Anti-slavery* (1869). See Drake, *Dict. Amer. Biog.* s.v.; *New Amer. Cyclop.* 1871, p. 495.

Maya

(Sanscrit, *Illusion*) is a term applied by the Hindus, in a philosophical or mystical sense, to that power which caused or created the visible phenomena of the universe. The Hindu, like Berkeley and other European philosophers, assumes that external objects have no absolute existence, but that they are mere impressions on the mind. Maya, in Hindu theology, is, according to some, that mighty goddess the wife or consort of Brahma. See Moor, *Hindu Mythology,* s.v.; Wilson, *Sanscrit Dictionary,* s.v.; Thomas, *Dict. Biog. and Mythol.* s.v.

Mayence

a German town, beautifully situated on a sloping hill on the left bank of the River Rhine, is noted in ecclesiastical annals as the seat of an archiepiscopal see, and as the seat of several important Church councils. *SEE MAYENCE, COUNCILS OF*.

Mayence as an Archbishopric and Bishopric. — We have no trustworthy information as to the early history of this archbishopric. Attempts have been made to prove that the Christian Church was established there by St. Crescens, based on the passage in 2 Timothy 4:10, "Crescens (is departed) to Galatia;" and Jerome and other writers also favor the opinion of Gaul having been Christianized by Crescens. Ado, however, in his *Martyrologium*, written about 860, is the first to refer to the action of Crescens at Vienna. Still we find no documents referring to it until the 10th century, which may, however, be accounted for by the fact that the city was three times destroyed by fire up to that period. According to the ecclesiastical tradition, Crescens, a pupil of the apostle Paul, came to preach there as early as the year 82, became the first bishop of Mayence, and died a martyr in 103. The list of bishops up to the 6th century is all of later origin; according to it, Crescens was succeeded by Aureus, who was murdered by the Vandals when they took the city in 451. Sidonius, about 546, began the restoration of the town and of the church; Sigbert then became bishop about 589, and is said to have received from king Childebert the onyx bearing a likeness of that prince and of his wife, which is still retained among the jewels of Mayence. In 612 Leonisius (Leutgasius) caused war between Theoderick and Theodebert. We then find in the list Ruthelmus (Rudelin), Landwald, Lupoald (Leowald), Rigbert (Richbert, † 712), Gerold, who died at the hands of the Saxons in 743. He was succeeded by his son Gerwilio or Gewilieb, who in 744 marched with Carloman against the Saxons, and defeated them on the shores of the Weser. In 745 he was deposed, Bonifacius appointed in his place, and the bishopric transformed into an archbishopric, with the sanction of pope Zachary, in 748. In 753 or 754 Bonifacius resigned in favor of his pupil Lullus, who, however, did not receive the pallium before 780; he labored diligently for the interest of the archbishopric, founded several churches and convents, and greatly increased the revenues of the Church by the adoption of the tithing system in 779. He died Oct. 16, 786. His successor was Riculf, who founded the school of the Church of St. Alban at Mayence, and died Aug. 9, 813, the very year in which Constantine called a council at Mayence (see below). Haistulf, † Jan. 28, 827, introduced canonical life in the archbishopric; yet the succeeding archbishops, down to Marculf, were not elected according to canonical rules, but by the king, with the consent of the clergy and people. This was the case with Otgar, 826-47; Rabanus Maurus, 847-56 (who called a council, by order of Louis of Germany, in the year of his accession to the

archiepiscopal chair); Charles, son of king Pepin I of Aquitania, and nephew of Louis the German, 856-63, who was also archchancellor of the empire, a dignity which was retained by his successors; Liutbert, who marched against the Bohemians in 872, and against the Sorbians in 874; defeated the Normans, who had ascended the Rhine, in 883, and died Feb. 17, 889. Sunzo (Sunderhold) fell fighting against the Normans in 891. Hatto I played an important part in the history of Germany during the reign of Louis the Infant and Conrad I, and died Jan. 18, 913. His successor, Heriger, died in 927. Hildebert, who successfully disputed against Cologne and Treves the right to crown the king, and crowned Otto I at Aix-la-Chapelle in 936, died in 937. Friedrich was exiled to Hamburg or Fulda by the emperor Otto I, as a rebel; was recalled in 954, but repeatedly accused of treason, and escaped punishment only by his sudden decease in 954. He was succeeded by Wilhelm, a natural son of Otto, who died in 968. Of Hatto II (968-70), the tradition says that he was devoured by mice. Ruprecht died in 974. Willigis received the pallium from pope Benedict VII, together with the privilege of presiding at all the German councils and of crowning the king. To remind him always of his low origin (his father was said to have been a wagoner), he caused a wheel to be erected on the walls of his palace, and this is said to be the origin of the wheel on the arms of the archbishops of Mayence. In 978 he laid the foundations of the new cathedral (which, however, was burned down on the day of its consecration in 1009), and died in 1011. Next follow Archimbald (Erkenbold), 1011-21; Aribon, 1021-31; Bardo of Oppershofen, 1031-51, who finished the new cathedral, and consecrated it Nov. 10, 1037. He received on this occasion the pallium from pope John XIX, and the right to act as papal legate whenever no other person appeared invested with that authority in his diocese. The succeeding incumbent was Leopold (Luitpold), count of Bogen, 1051-59. Sigfrid I, count of Eppstein, joined a crusade in 1065; in 1069 he tried, but in vain, to procure a divorce between Henry IV and Bertha, and proclaimed — yet without effect — in 1075 the edict of celibacy of Gregory VII. After 1077 he took the part of the anti-kings, and crowned Rudolf of Suabia and Hermann of Luxemburg. He died in 1084. Wezilo (1084-88) was complained of at the Council of Halberstadt, and put under ban for maintaining that those of the secular clergy who lost their estates were no longer subject to ecclesiastical jurisdiction; he subsequently receded from this position. Under Ruthard (1088-99), in 1097, a persecution broke out against the Jews in Mayence, and the archbishop, fearing the anger of the emperor for having taken an

active part in it, fled to Thuringia, whence he returned only after a lapse of eight years. Adelbert I, count of Saarbruck (1109-37), was elected by Henry V, yet sided against him in 1112 on the question of investiture; he was imprisoned for his opposition, and only released in 1115, when the people of Mayence rose in arms to secure his liberation. Adelbert showed his gratitude by granting the citizens of Mayence the charter (releasing them from the jurisdiction of the church-wardens and from their taxes), which was inscribed on the door of the cathedral in 1135. In 1120 he fled again before the emperor, after whose death, in 1125, he assembled a diet for the election of a king. This is the first instance of the appearance in the history of Germany of the electors, among whom the archbishop of Mayence held the first place. Adelbert II, brother of the preceding, held the office 1138-41. Marcult; 1141-42, was the first archbishop elected according to canonical rules, with the concurrence of the people. Henry I, 1142-53, was appointed by Conrad III tutor to his son, before his departure for the crusade. He was hated by the clergy for his severity, and they accused him before the pope of squandering the funds of the Church and of immorality. He was deposed in 1153. Under Arnold I, of Seelenhowen (1153-60), the partisans of his predecessors, among them Hermann, count of the Palatinate, invaded the diocese and laid the land waste. Arnold retaliated, and peace was only restored at the emperor's return from Italy in 1155. Arnold having promised the emperor to accompany him in his next journey to Rome, and to employ his influence to settle the difficulty then existing between him and the pope, he sought to levy a tax on the diocese to defray his expenses; but the citizens resisted, and, the emperor refusing to take the part of the citizens, they murdered the archbishop in 1160. The emperor now appointed Conrad I, in spite of the opposition of the chapter; the new archbishop, however, on being requested to recognize the anti-pope, Pascal, fled to Alexander at Rome, and was made archbishop of Salzburg. His place was filled in 1165 by Christian I, count of Buch, chancellor of the emperor Frederic I. He proved true to that prince, and took his part in Italy against the pope; but was arrested there in 1180 by the count of Monte Ferrara, remained a prisoner until 1181, and died in the neighborhood of Rome in 1183. The title of archchancellor of the empire, which the archbishops of Mayence had often received since the 10th century, became permanent now. After the decease of Christian, Conrad I became again archbishop of Mayence. The late prelate had already set up a claim on the estates of the extinct house of Franconia in Thuringia and Hesse; Conrad brought it forward again in

1184, but was opposed by the landgrave Lewis III, and a lengthy strife ensued. In 1197 Conrad took part in a crusade, and died in 1200. Sigfrid II, the elder, count of Eppstein (1200-30), obtained in 1208 the direction of the bishopric of Worms, and in 1228 the right to crown the kings of Bohemia (which was exercised by his followers until 1343). Sigfrid III, of Eppstein, nephew of the preceding (1230-49), finding the finances in very bad condition, levied, with the assent of the chapter, on all benefices a tax amounting to one twentieth of their income. On the other hand, it was enacted that the archbishop could in future contract no liabilities without the consent of the chapter, and that every future archbishop should be strictly held to submit to that rule. In 1232 Sigfrid obtained from the king the abbey of Lorch, and restored the cathedral, which was consecrated in 1239. He favored the deposition of emperor Frederick II, and supported Henry Raspe, and afterwards William of Holland (this is commemorated by three statues to be seen in the cathedral of Mayence, the center one representing the archbishop, the one on his right Henry Raspe, and the other William of Holland). After the death of Henry Raspe, Sigfrid attempted to annex his possessions to Thuringia, but was opposed by landgrave Henry and Sophia of Brabant, and the dispute lasted seven years. Sigfrid died in 1249, and was succeeded by Christian II, of Bolanden, who resigned in 1251. Gerhard I (1251-59), was imprisoned in 1256 by duke Albrecht of Brunswick, and liberated in 1257 by king Richard of England, whom he afterwards supported as a candidate to the imperial crown. Under him the cathedral canons of Mayence ceased to lead the communistic life. Werner of Eppstein, nephew of Sigfrid III (1259-84), canceled part of the debts of the archbishopric, and concluded a treaty with the duchess Sophia of Brabant in 1263, by which he obtained Grunberg and Frankenburg; in 1271 he bought Wildenberg, Amorbach, Schneeberg, and Wilbach from Ulrich of Duren, and in 1278 the castle of Bockelnheim from count Henry of Sponhein; he took an active part in the election of Rudolph of Hapsburg as emperor of Germany. After a vacancy of two years, Henry II was appointed archbishop in 1286; he was disliked by the clergy for his strictness, and died in 1288. Gerhard II, of Eppstein (1289-1305), labored to have his cousin Adolph of Nassau elected emperor, but afterwards aided in his deposition and in the election of Albrecht of Austria: he used his influence with both emperors for the aggrandizement of his archbishopric. He was also somewhat distinguished as a legislator; his decrees form the *Concordata Gerhardi.* An electoral edict of king Albrecht having assigned him the second rank among the electors, he protested, and obtained an

imperial decree, under date of Sept. 23, 1298, placing him and his successors in the first rank; the same decree confirmed them also in the title of archchancellor of Germany. Peter Aichspalter (1306-20) improved greatly the finances of the diocese by his economy, and was a strict promoter of ecclesiastical discipline. Matthias, count of Bucheck and landgrave of Burgundy (1321-28), first sided with emperor Louis of Bavaria, but afterwards with the pope, and enlarged the estates of the archbishopric. After his death, which occurred in 1328, pope John XXII appointed Henry III, count of Burneburg, but the chapter elected archbishop Balduin of Treves; the latter governed the diocese during the difficulty, and added to it a part of the village of Herzberg, half of Mark Duderstadt, Schurburg, Botzwangen, Esenheim, and Odenheim. On Nov. 12, 1336, Balduin voluntarily surrendered his claim, and Henry was now accepted by the chapter, after promising to take sides with Louis of Bavaria, and to surrender the strong places of the diocese into the hands of the chapter. In 1329 he engaged not to tax the inhabitants of Mayence, or those of the suburbs, without their consent; in 1330 he released them from the ecclesiastical punishments they had incurred for injuring the clergy, and in 1331 absolved them from their promise to repay the Jews sums advanced by them to the city. He obtained jurisdiction over Eichsfeld, Duderstadt, and Giboldhausen; on the other hand, Olmutz and Prague were detached from Mayence, and, in consequence, the archbishops of Mayence lost the right to crown the kings of Hungary. He finally got into difficulties by his fidelity to emperor Lewis, and was deposed by pope Clement VI in 1346, yet continued to exercise his functions until his death in 1353. Gerlach, who had been appointed by the pope in 1346, was now recognized by all as archbishop. The difficulties between him and his predecessor had greatly injured the diocese: the funds had become low, debts had been contracted, the clergy had become much relaxed, and the respect of the people had diminished in consequence; Gerlach, however, added to the diocese the castles of Itter and Allenfelt, Ballenburg; the village of Budensheim, and the half of Geismar. At this time the Golden Bull, in which the high position of the archbishop of Mayence as dean of the electoral college was officially recognized, was given to the public. Gerlach died Feb. 12, 1371. His successor, John I, duke of Luxemburg, died in 1373. Louis, son of margrave Frederick the Earnest, was now appointed by both the pope and the emperor, while the chapter elected Adolph I, of Nassau, bishop of Spires, who took up his residence at Erfurt; the difficulty lasted until 1380; Adolph remained archbishop of Mayence,

while Louis was made archbishop of Magdeburg, and retained the regalia until his death. Adolph was long at war with landgrave Hermann of Hesse about some possessions in that province; he founded the University of Erfurt, and died in 1390. His successor, Conrad II, of Weinsberg, persecuted the Waldenses, of whom there were a number in his diocese, and entered into a league with the Palatinate, Bavaria, and Spires against the Flagellants. He died Oct. 19,1396. John II, count of Nassau, brother of Adolph I (1396-1419), took part in the deposition of emperor Wenzel, and, in consequence of being suspected of having had a share in the murder of the emperor elect, duke Frederick of Brunswick, as he sheltered the murderer, he became involved in a war with Brunswick and Hesse, which lasted until 1401: he added to his diocese Wetterau and Ardeck, besides several villages. Conrad III, count of Stein, was in 1422 appointed vicar of the empire by emperor Sigismund; but, being opposed by Louis of Heidelberg, he resigned that office in 1423: he added to the diocese the city of Steinheim, and enacted strict regulations for the conduct of the clergy. Under him the citizens of Mayence continued to complain of the exemption from taxes enjoyed by the clergy, and he did not succeed in settling the question. He died in 1434. His successor, Dietrich I, of Erbach, was more fortunate, and put an end to the troubles in 1435, with the aid of two commissioners of the Council of Basle. His whole time was taken up in quarrels with the pope and emperor; the Pragmatic Sanction of Mayence, of which he was the author, and in which he recognized the Council of Basle, the suppression of the annates, and the general restoration of canonical election, was rejected, while the Concordat of Aschaffenburg, which held the contrary views, was afterwards adopted. Dietrich died May 6, 1459, and was succeeded by Diether (Dietrich II), count of Isenburg-Budingen; the latter, however, found a rival in count Adolph of Nassau, whom Frederick, elector of the Palatinate, supported by force of arms; Diether was besieged in Heidelberg July 4, 1461, and obliged to flee. In 1462 he was deposed by pope Pius II, for refusing to collect the annates (which the pope had arbitrarily raised from 10,000 to 21,000 florins). Adolph II, count of Nassau, was now made archbishop, and a war commenced between Diether, supported by Bavaria and the Palatinate, and Adolph, upheld by Bavaria and Wurtemberg; a treaty was finally concluded, Oct. 25, 1463, Diether renouncing his claims. The city of Mayence, which was stormed by Adolph in 1462, lost all privileges. After the death of Adolph, Sept. 6, 1475, Diether was again appointed archbishop; but now commenced a strife about the city of Mayence: the

cathedral chapter claimed it for its own, while the citizens demanded their liberty, and rebelled against the chapter; they were finally defeated, and the city remained subject to the archbishop, who made it his residence; he built the palace of Martinsburg, and founded the University of Mayence, which was opened in 1477; he also restored to the diocese the estates of Algesheim and Olm, and died May 7,1482. Albert I, duke of Saxony, was son of the elector Ernst (1482-84). His successor, Berthold, count of Henneberg, accompanied emperor Maximilian as archchancellor to court; he took an active part in restoring peace throughout the country, and in the institution of the imperial chamber of justice; he also introduced great improvements in the ecclesiastical and conventual discipline, and laid the grievances of the Germans with regard to ecclesiastical affairs before the court of Rome. He died Dec. 21, 1504. Jacob of Liebenstein (1504-8) added Kostheim and part of Konigsberg to the diocese. Uriel of Genimengen (1508-14) ordered the examination of the clergy, and strictly opposed concubinage among them. Albrecht of Brandenburg, archbishop of Magdeburg, was made archbishop of Mayence in 1514, he loved grandeur, wasted the funds of the diocese, and abused the sale of indulgences; he took part in the league against the Protestant princes; being attacked by the landgrave of Hesse, he purchased peace at the expense of 40,000 thalers. In 1529 he originated the Edict of Worms against the Protestants; vet he afterwards sought to restore peace among the different religious parties, and was one of the principal promoters of the peace of Nuremberg. He died Sept. 24, 1545, highly respected both by the Roman Catholics and the Lutherans, and even by Luther, with whom he had some correspondence. Sebastian of Heusenstam (1545-55) labored to improve the administration of the diocese, and also to restore the influence of Romanism; he subscribed to the Interim of 1548. During his reign Albrecht Alcibiades of Brandenburg invaded the diocese, and took Mayence; he made the citizens swear allegiance to the king of France, demanded a contribution of 600,000 florins from the archbishop and chapter, and, as they were unable to pay that amount by the time stipulated, he burnt down the archiepiscopal palace and several churches; the archbishop himself fled to Eltfeld, where he died in 1555. His successor, Daniel of Homburg, endeavored to restore the archbishopric to its former splendor; he introduced the Jesuits into Mayence and in Eichsfelde, and surrendered education into their hands; he took part also in the attempts of reconciliation between the Protestants and Romanists, added to his diocese the county of Lahr (Rieneck), the county of Konigstein, and the villages of

Rennshausen and Zornheim. He died March 22,1582. He was succeeded by Wolfgang of Dalberg (1582 to April 5,1601). John Adam, of Bicken (1601 to Jan. 10, 1604), and John Suicard, of Kronenberg, strictly enforced all the old ecclesiastical rules, and persecuted the Protestants. Under Suicard the diocese began to feel the effects of the Thirty Years' War, which was then raging; it suffered especially from the inroads of Mansfeld and Christian of Brunswick, against whom he called for the assistance of the Spaniards. He died July 6, 1629. Anselm Casimir, of Wambold, was obliged to flee from Mayence when that city was taken by Gustavus Adolphus, Dec. 23,1631; he retired to Cologne, and the diocese was, until the Treaty of Prague, in 1635, occupied by Swedish and French troops, who greatly impoverished the country — not more, however, than the imperial forces. In 1635 the archbishop returned to Mayence; but the diocese becoming again the theater of war in 1643, he fled again before the French armies, and in 1647 made a treaty with Turenne. Mayence remained in the possession of the French, and the archbishop went to reside at Frankfort, where he died, Oct. 9, 1647. His successor, John Philip, of Schonborn, prince bishop of Wurzburg, resigned soon after his election, for the Swedes, after the expiration of the peace of Westphalia, exerted themselves for the secularization of the diocese, and the archbishopric was only maintained through the intervention of Saxony; it lost, however, by exemption, the districts of Verden and Halberstadt. On the occasion of the coronation of Ferdinand IV at Regensburg, John Philip came in conflict with the archbishop of Cologne over their respective prerogatives. He was also in difficulty with the inhabitants of Mayence, and finally took the city by force in 1664. Philip also quarreled with Saxony about the town of Erfurt, which was finally added to his diocese in 1665. He then devoted all his attention to internal improvements; he gave regulations to the court of Mayence in 1659; in 1661 he established a theological seminary; and in 1663 was also made bishop of Worms. He died Feb. 12, 1673. His successor was Lothar Frederick, of Metternich-Burchied, coadjutor of John Philip since 1670; in 1674 he got into war with the elector of the Palatinate, about the district of Bockelnheim, but died June 3, 1675. Domian Hartard, of Leyen, died Dec. 6, 1678. Charles Henry, duke of Metternich-Winneburg, was elected in 1679, and died on Sept. 27 of the same year. Anselm Franz, of Ingelheim, surrendered Mayence to the French in 1688, and took up his residence at Erfurt; but the marshal of Uxelles having given up Mayence to the duke of Lorraine, Sept. 8,1689, the archbishop returned to it. In 1691 he joined a league against France. By

a treaty concluded Aug. 24, 1692 with Brunswick, he gave up the district of Eichsfeld, with the exception of Duderstadt, Gieboldshausen, and Landau. He died in 1695. Lothar Franz, of Schonborn, nephew of John Philip, took the part of Austria against Spain in the War of Succession. In 1704 the district of Kronenberg was joined to the diocese by succession. In 1714 the strife between the archbishop and the Palatinate was brought to a close by the former giving up his claim to Bockelnheim, and receiving in exchange New Bamberg. He died Jan. 30,1729. Francis Louis, count of Neuburg, bishop of Breslau and Worms, and also archbishop of Treves, died April 19, 1732. Under Philip Charles, of Eltz-Kempenich, Alzenau, together with five villages, was added to the diocese. He died March 21, 1743. John Frederick Charles, count of Ostein, remained neutral in the Austrian War of Succession, and his diocese suffered severely from the French in consequence; in 1745 the grand duke of Tuscany succeeded in driving the French armies out of the country, but during the Seven Years' War the bishopric suffered again on account of its adherence to the queen of Hungary. The archbishop died June 4, 1763: he had added the bishopric of Fulda to Mayence. Emmerich Joseph, baron of Breidbach-Buresheim, was made also bishop of Worms in 1768; in 1769 he joined the two other ecclesiastical electors in trying to emancipate the German episcopacy from the dominion of Rome; by a decree of Dec. 23, 1766, he abolished a number of festivals, and by another of July 30, 1771, he enacted several reforms in the convents; he encouraged industry and agriculture, founded charitable institutions, and established the administration of the diocese on a regular basis; on Jan. 30, 1773, he entered into an agreement with Saxony concerning Trefurt and Mulhouse, by which he surrendered the jurisdiction of Protestant districts to Saxony. He died July 11, 1774. Frederick Charles Joseph, of Eichthal, who became also bishop of Worms, followed in the footsteps of his predecessor, introducing many reforms in the Church; he endowed the University of Mayence with the convents of Karthaus, Altenmunster, and Reichenklaren in 1781, to which, in 1784, he added seventeen prebends, and also directed that theological studies should no longer be pursued in convents, but only in the University of Mayence. The archbishops had heretofore been partisans of Austria, but he sided with Prussia when Frederick the Great opposed the plans of aggrandizement of the former power towards Bavaria; he opposed, also, the encroachments of the papal nuncios. When the French Revolution broke out, Mayence was betrayed into Custine's hands, Oct. 21, 1792; the archbishop fled to Heiligenstadt, then took up his residence at Erfurt, and died at

Aschaffenburg July 25,1802. He was the last archbishop of Mayence. The archbishopric was secularized Feb. 26, 1803. By treaty France received the portion of the diocese on the left shore of the Rhine, and the remainder was divided between Prussia, Hesse, etc., with the exception of the principalities of Aschaffenburg, Regensburg, the county of Wetzlar, and some other small portions which were given to the coadjutor of the late archbishop, Charles Theodore of Dalberg, as archchancellor, metropolitan, and primate of Germany. The see was transferred to the cathedral of Regensburg, and received jurisdiction over the whole of the former ecclesiastical provinces of Mayence, Treves, and Cologne, lying on the right shore of the Rhine, with the exception of the part belonging to Prussia, and also over the whole province of Salzburg, in Bavaria. The archbishopric of Mayence became a simple bishopric, subject to the archbishop of Mechlin, and including only the territory of the old archbishopric on the left shore of the Rhine. The first bishop was Joseph Louis Colmar, appointed Oct. 3, 1802, who governed his diocese exclusively under French inspiration. Mayence was taken by the allies May 17, 1814; Colmar died Dec. 15 of the same year. A vicar-general was then appointed. In 1829 the bishopric of Mayence was, by a papal decree, detached from Mechlin and subjected to Freiburg. Joseph Vitus Burg was appointed bishop Jan. 12,1830; he divided the diocese into deaneries, and died May 23, 1833. His successor, the former vicar-general, John Jacob Humann, died Aug. 19, 1834. Peter Leopold Kaiser issued complete diocesan statutes in 1837, and died Dec. 30, 1848. Leopold Schmid, professor of theology and philosophy at the University of Giessen, was appointed bishop of Mayence by pope Pius IX, Feb. 22, 1849, but he was not confirmed (see L. Schmid, *Ueb. d. jungste Mainzer Bischofswahl,* Giessen, 1850); and William Emanuel von Ketteler was made bishop in his place, March 29, 1850. Since Ketteler's accession, the bishopric of Mayence is noted as the gathering-place of all Jesuit ultramontanists. How this Roman see in Germany will continue its opposition to all order of state rule, now that the Jesuits have been expelled from Germany (1873), remains to be seen. See Theoderich Gresemund, *Catalogus episcoporum et archiepiscoporum Mogunt.* (Schunk's *Beitragen,* vol. 2); J. Latomus, *Gesch. d. Bischofe v. M.* (in Mencke, *Scriptores rerum Germ. vol.* 3); Servarius, *Res Moguntiacae* (in Joannis, *Res Mogunt.* Frankf. 1722, vol. 1); Severus, *Memoria pontificum Mogunt.* (Mayence, 1765); Wurdtwein, *Diaecesis Moguntina in archidiaconatus districta* (Manh. 1769-77, 3 vols.); Schepfer, *Codex eccles. Mogunt. nov.* (Aschaf. 1803); *D.*

Untergang d. Kurfurst. M. (Frankf. 1839); Werner, *Der Dom z. M.* (Mayence, 1827, 3 vols.); Pierer, *Universal-Lexikon,* 10:741 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 8:697 sq.

Mayence, Councils At

Of the numerous councils of the Church of Rome convened here, special notice is due to those of 813, 847-8, 1225, and 1549.

(1.) The first of these, convened June 9, 813, by order of Charlemagne, was composed of thirty bishops and twenty-five abbots; Hildebald, archbishop of Cologne and arch-chaplain, presided. The object of this council was to restore the discipline of the Church. To this end the Gospels, the canons of the Church, and certain of the works of the fathers were read, among others the pastoral of St. Gregory; the abbots and monks also read the letter of St. Benedict. Fifty-six canons were published. 1, 2, and 3 treat of faith, hope, and charity. 4. Orders the administration of holy baptism after the Roman use, and restricts it to Easter and Pentecost, except in cases of necessity. 6. Orders bishops to take care of disinherited orphans. 9. Orders canons to eat in common, and to sleep in the same dormitory. 11. Relates to the life of the monks. 13. To that of nuns. 22. Is directed against vagabond clerks. 23. Gives entire liberty to clerks and monks who have been forced to receive the tonsure. 28. Orders all priests at all times to wear the stole, to mark their sacerdotal character. 32. Defines the difference between the *exomologesis* and *litania;* the former it states to be solely for confession of sin, the latter to implore help and mercy. 33. Orders the observance of the great Litany by all Christians, barefooted, with ashes. 35. Confirms the 19th canon of Gangra on fasting. 36 and 37. Relate to holidays and Sundays. 43. Forbids mass to be said by a priest alone; for how can he say *Dominus vobiscum,* and other like things, when no one is present but himself? 47. Orders godparents to instruct their godchildren. 52. Forbids all interments within the Church except in the case of bishops, abbots, priests, or lay persons distinguished for holiness of life. 54. Forbids marriage within the fourth degree. 55. Forbids parents to stand as sponsors for their own children, and forbids marriages between sponsors and their godchildren, and the parents of their godchildren. 56. Declares that he who has married two sisters, and the woman who has married two brothers, or a father and son, shall be separated, and never be permitted to marry again (*Conc.* 7:1239).

(2.) The next council convened there about Oct. 1 847, by order of Louis of Germany, under Rabanus, archbishop of Mayence, assisted by twelve bishops, his suffragans, and several abbots, monks, priests, and others of the clergy, including the chorepiscopi. Thirty-one canons were published. The most important are: 2. Warning bishops to be assiduous in preaching the Word of God. 7. Leaving the disposition of Church property to the bishops, and asserting their power over the laity. 11. Forbidding to endow new oratories with the tithes or other property belonging to churches anciently founded, without the bishop's consent. 13. Relating to the life to be observed by clerks and monks; forbids joking, gaming, unsuitable ornaments, delicate living, excess in eating or drinking, unjust weights or measures, unlawful trades, etc. 14. Ordering all monks holding livings to attend the synods and give an account of themselves. 15. Forbidding the clergy to wear long hair, under pain of anathema. 30. Forbidding marriage within the fourth degree (*Conc.* 8:39).

(3.) The next important council was held at Mayence in 1225, by cardinal Conrad, legate of Honorius III. It is by some called "a synod of Germany." Fourteen canons were published, which relate to the incontinence of the clergy, and simony. The sixth declares that excommunicated priests who dare to perform any clerical function while under excommunication shall be deposed both from their office and benefices, without hope of being ever restored; shall be treated as infamous, deprived of the power of leaving their property by will, and never again permitted to hold any kind of ecclesiastical benefice (*Conc.* 11:294).

(4.) Another very large body assembled in council at Mayence in 1549, called together by Sebastian Heusenstein, archbishop of Mayence, with the deputies of the bishops of his province and the principal of his clergy. Forty-seven canons were published concerning the faith, and fifty-seven canons of discipline. Among the first we find an exposition of the mystery of the sacred Trinity, according to the faith of the Church; it is further stated that man was created with righteousness and endued with grace, but that he was possessed of free-will; afterwards the fall of man and his justification are spoken of, and it is declared that this justification proceeds from the grace of God; that it is given before any merit; that this justification is given when man receives the Holy Spirit, with faith, hope, and charity, which gifts it declares to be inherent in him, and not merely imputed, so that man is not only accounted righteous, but is so in reality, yet not through his own merits, but by God's grace and righteousness

communicated to him; that the charity which justifies must be accompanied by good works, of which *grace* is the source and principle (canons 7 and 8). The council moreover, in the canons of faith, set forth the doctrine of the sacraments, and decided, against the heretics, that they are not bare ceremonies, but effectual signs of grace, which they are, by divine operation, the means of conveying to those who receive them worthily.

With regard to ceremonies, it is decreed that such ought to be retained as incite the people to meditate upon God; among these are reckoned the sacraments, churches, altars, images, holy vestments, banners, etc. As to images, the council decrees that the people should be taught that they are not set up to be worshipped, and that none ought to be set up in churches which are likely to inspire worldly and carnal thoughts rather than piety. Curates are also enjoined to remove the image of any saint to which the people flocked, as if attributing some sort of divinity to the image itself, or as supposing that God or the saints would perform what they prayed for by means of that particular image, and not otherwise. Afterwards the following matters are treated of: devout pilgrimages, worship of saints, prayer for the dead, and the law of fasting.

Among the fifty-six canons of discipline and morality, we find it ruled (by canon 61) that when the lesser festivals fall on a Sunday, they shall be kept on some day following or preceding; that apostate monks, upon their return to their duty, shall be kindly treated; that nuns shall not leave their convent without the bishop's permission; that preaching shall not be allowed, nor the holy sacraments administered, in chapels attached to private houses; that care shall be taken that all school-masters be sound Catholics, etc. Finally, it is declared that the council received the acts of the holy oecumenical councils, and yielded entire submission to the catholic, apostolic, Roman Church in all things (*Conc.* 14:667; Landon, *Manual of Councils,* s.v.).

Mayer, Jacob

an American minister of the German Reformed Church, was born in Lykens Valley, Dauphin Co., Pa., in 1793; was brought up in the Reformed Church, and early instructed in its doctrines. Preparatory to entering the ministry, he was for four years under the special tuition of Rev. Dr. Samuel Heiffenstein, of Philadelphia; was licensed to preach in September, 1822, at the synod held in Harrisburg, Pa.; was soon afterwards ordained, and took charge of the churches in Woodstock, Va., and vicinity. After three years

of labor he removed to the neighborhood of Shrewsbury, York Co., Pa., and there took charge of quite a number of congregations. In this field he labored eight years; then removed to Mercersburg, Franklin Co., Pa., and became pastor of the Church at that place, in connection with those at Greencastle and London in the same county. In 1836 he was appointed special agent of the theological seminary at Mercersburg; the next eight years of his active life were devoted to the work of procuring funds for the use of that institution and of Marshall Coliege, in Mercersburg, in the founding and establishing of both of which he was deeply interested. While engaged in this work his health failed, and he was obliged to relinquish the pastoral work, and attend to some secular pursuit in order to provide for himself and family a proper temporal support. He lived in this way, during different periods, at Chambersburg, Philadelphia, Columbia, and mainly at Lock Haven; in the last-named place he died, Oct. 29, 1872. “He suffered severely, especially during the last four years of his life, from lingering consumption, in the midst of which he manifested much Christian patience, especially during the closing portion of his earthly career.” See *Reformed Church Messenger,* Nov. 6,1872.

Mayer, Johann

a German theologian, was born Aug. 2,1697, at Nuremberg; studied at the high-schools of his native place until 1717, when he went to the University of Altdorf to study theology. In 1720 he removed to the University of Halle, and there enjoyed the instruction of the celebrated German savants Wolf and Michaelis. He continued his studies until 1725, when he finally secured the position of catechist, first at an orphan asylum and later at a prison. In 1727 he was made vicar, and in 1728 morning preacher at St. Waldburg. The year following he became pastor at Schwinunbach and Wengen; in 1732 dean of Spitalch, Nuremberg; in 1738 was transferred to the Church of St. Laurence; in 1749 became senior of the chapter. He died Sept. 3, 1760. Mayer’s productions are mostly of an ascetic character; at the time of their publication they secured him much popularity, especially his *Epistolische Betrachtungen des Todes* (Nuremb. 1741, 4to). He also published a number of his sermons. For further details of his works, see Doring, *Gelehrte Theologie Deutschlands,* vol. 2, s.v.

Mayer, Johann C.

a Presbyterian minister, a German by birth. was born in Korb, Wurtemburg, May 4, 1835. He was educated at Basle, Switzerland, and attended the seminary at St. Christiana. He left his native land and settled in Texas, where he was licensed by the Lutheran Synod of Texas. On coming to New Orleans he organized a German Presbyterian Church, but died before he had been ordained pastor over it, Aug. 24, 1858. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac,* 1860, p. 76.

Mayer, Johann Friedrich

a German Lutheran minister, was born at Leipsic in 1650. He studied in the university of his native city, and became successively superintendent of Leissnig in 1673, of Grimma in 1679, professor of theology at Wittemberg in 1684, pastor of St. Joseph of Hamburg in 1686, professor of the gymnasium of that city in 1687, professor at the University of Kiel in 1688, professor and archchancellor at the University of Greifswald, and general superintendent of Pomerania and Rugen, in 1701. He died at Stettin in 1712. Mayer had taken a leading part in all the controversies of the time. Among his voluminous works we notice *Bibliotheca Biblica,* which treats of the most celebrated Jewish, Romish, Lutheran, and Calvinistic expositions of Scripture (best edition, Nostock, 1713): — *Best Method of Studying Holy Scripture*: — *History of Martin Luther's German Version of the Bible*: — *An Account of the Moderns who have written against the Holy Scriptures*: — *An Exposition of the first two Psalms*: — *Tractatus de Osculo Redum Pontificis Romani*: — *De Fide Baronii et Bellarmini ipsis Pontificiis ambigua.* See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 9:209; Pierer, *Universal-Lexikon,* 11:35; Hook, *Biog. Dict.* 7:262. (J. N. P.)

Mayer, John

D.D., an English divine, flourished in the early part of the 17th century. But few memorials have been discovered to furnish any satisfactory account of his personal history. It appears from his prefaces that he labored under infirm health, which unfitted him for public services as a clergyman for many years. In 1634 he became minister of Reydon, in Suffolk. He published *Theological Treatises and Commentaries on the English Catechism* (Lond. 1621, 4to): — *A Commentary on the Old and New Testaments* (rare; 6 vols. fol., and 1 vol. 4to, 1631, ‘47, ‘52, ‘53). See

Allibone, *Dict. Brit. and Amer. Authors,* vol. 2, s.v.; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* vol. 2, s.v.

Mayer, Lewis

D.D., a noted American divine of that branch of the Christian Church denominated the *German Reformed,* was born at Lancaster, Pa., March 26, 1783. After having received a liberal education in his native place, he removed to Frederick, Md., where he devoted his attention for some time to a secular calling. He was fond of reading and study. Having become conscious of a call to the holy ministry, he pursued his theological studies with great zeal and success, under the direction of the Rev. Mr. Wagner, of Frederick, Md. He was licensed and ordained in 1807, and became pastor of a charge in Shepherdstown, Va., where he labored till 1821. In that year he was called as pastor to York, Pa. In 1825 he resigned his charge, having been called by the Synod of the German Reformed Church to assume the presidency of the theological seminary then established at Carlisle, Pa., and afterwards located at York, Pa. In this position he labored with great zeal till 1835. His health giving way he retired to private life, and lived in York, Pa. He devoted his remaining strength to the preparation of a *History of the German Reformed Church,* only the first volume of which, however, has been published. This volume is chiefly occupied with an account of the Reformation in Switzerland. His labors were brought down to 1770. Dr. Mayer published also a *Treatise on the Sin against the Holy Ghost,* and *Lectures on Scripture Subjects.* While professor of theology he also edited for some years the Magazine and the Messenger of the German Reformed Church. He died Aug. 25, 1849. See biographical sketch by the Rev. E. Heiner, prefaced to Dr. Mayer's *History* (Phila. 1850, 8vo, pp. 477).

Mayer, Philip Frederick

D.D., a distinguished American Lutheran minister, was born April 1, 1781, in the city of New York, where he continued to reside till he reached his majority. His earlier years were spent at the German school attached to the Lutheran Church. His preparation for college was made under the direction of Mr. Campbell. He graduated with the first honors of his class at Columbia College, New York, in 1799, then under the administration of Dr. W. S. Johnson. He spent three years in the prosecution of his theological studies, under the instruction of the Rev. Dr. Kunze, one of the most learned men of his day. He was licensed to preach the Gospel in

1802, and soon after took charge of the Lutheran Church at Lunenburg (now Athens), N. Y. In 1806 he resigned this position, and accepted a call as pastor of St. John's (Lutheran) Church, Philadelphia. This was the first exclusively English Lutheran congregation formed in this country. To the discharge of his arduous duties Dr. Mayer devoted himself with conscientious fidelity and untiring zeal. He was unwearied in his efforts to promote the good of his own flock, as well as faithful and constant in his aims to advance the welfare of the whole community. He never withheld his influence from any object which met his deliberate and cordial approval. In 1808 he was associated with bishop White, Dr. Green, Dr. Rush, and others in the formation of the Pennsylvania Bible Society, the first institution of the kind organized in the United States, of which he continued to be an active and efficient manager, and was at the time of his death the presiding officer. He was also the senior member of the board of trustees of the University of Pennsylvania. He was the president of the board of managers of the Deaf and Dumb Asylum and of the Philadelphia Dispensary, and was actively connected with other eleemosynary institutions. Liberal and enlarged in his views, he was at some time identified, either as a patron or director, with every philanthropic enterprise of a catholic spirit in his adopted city. He retained his pastoral connection with the Church till his death, which occurred April 16,1858. Dr. Mayer was no ordinary man, or he could never have so successfully sustained himself for so long a period among the same people, and enjoyed in so eminent a degree the regard and confidence of the whole community. He was a man of clear intellect and quick perceptions, united with great delicacy of taste and keen discernment. He was a ripe scholar, thoroughly acquainted with the whole range of English literature, and in the department of Biblical Criticism having few superiors. He received his D.D. from Columbia College, New York, and the University of Pennsylvania. (M. L. S.)

Mayhew, Experience

a noted American divine, for years actively engaged in missionary labors among the Indians, was born Jan. 27, 1673. His father, grandfather, and great-grandfather were all most successfully engaged as missionaries to the Indians before him. In March, 1694, about five years after the death of his father, he began to preach to the Indians, taking the oversight of five or six of their assemblies. The Indian language had been familiar to him from infancy, and he was employed by the commissioners of the Society for

Propagating the Gospel in New England to make a new version of the *Psalms* and *John,* which work he executed with great accuracy in 1709. He died Nov. 29. 1758, aged eighty-five. He published a sermon entitled *All Mankind by Nature equally under Sin* (1724): — *Indian Converts* (1727), in which he gives an account of the lives of thirty Indian ministers, and about eighty Indian men, women, and youth, worthy of remembrance on account of their piety: — *Letter on the Lord's Supper* (1741): — *Grace Defended* (1744), in which he contends that the offer of salvation made to sinners in the Gospel contains in it a conditional promise of the grace given in regeneration. In this he says he differs from most Calvinists; yet he supports the doctrines of original sin, of eternal decrees, and of the sovereignty of God in the salvation of man. His son Zechariah succeeded him in the missionary field, making five generations thus engaged. The age attained by the Mayhews is remarkable: the first, Thomas, died aged ninety; Experience, eighty-four; John, grandson of the first John, eighty-nine; his brother Jeremiah, eighty-five; Dr. Matthew, eighty-five; Zechariah, seventy-nine. — *Indian Conv.,* Appendix, p. 306, 307; Chauncy's *Remarks on Landaff's Sermon,* p. 23; *Cyclop. Rel. Knowledge,* s.v.

Mayhew, Jonathan

D.D., a celebrated American divine, was born at Martha's Vinevard Oct. 8, 1720. He was a descendant of Thomas Mayhew, the first English settler of that island. In early childhood Jonathan gave indications of great vigor of mind and a strong will. He was fitted for college by his father, who was a very intelligent man. During his college course at Harvard he was distinguished not only as a fine classical scholar, but also for his skill in dialectics and his attainments in ethical science. He graduated with great honor in 1744. Three years later he received a call from West Church, in Boston, and continued in this station for the remainder of his life. On the day first appointed for his ordination only two clergymen of those invited were in attendance, owing, no doubt, to his extreme rationalism; and even these two refused to act, and a council, consisting of fourteen ministers, had to be convoked, June 17, after which the new candidate was duly installed in office. Mr. Mayhew's liberal opinions were so unpopular in Boston that he was for some time excluded from membership of the Boston Association of Congregational Ministers. In 1750 the degree of doctor of divinity was conferred upon him by the University of Aberdeen. His publications excited great attention not only in this country, but also in

England. In 1755 he published a volume of sermons on the *Doctrine of Grace.* At the close of one of these sermons there is a note on the doctrine of the Trinity, which was offensive alike to those who did and did not endorse his general views. Subsequently the doctor himself appears to have regretted having written it, and he unsuccessfully endeavored to prevent its being published in the London edition. Dr. Mayhew was at this time scribe of the Massachusetts Convention of Congregational Ministers. In 1763 the Rev. East Arthorp published a pamphlet entitled *Considerations on the Institution and Conduct of the Society for Propagating the Gospel,* occasioning a violent controversy, in which Dr. Mayhew bore a prominent part. Dr. Mayhew was extensively known throughout Great Britain, and numbered among his correspondents such men as Lardner, Benson, Kippis, Blackburn, and Hollis. He died July 9, 1766. Dr. Mayhew possessed a mind of great acuteness and energy, and in his principles was a determined republican. He had no little influence in producing the American Revolution. Among his best-known publications are the following: *Seven Sermons* (1749, 8vo): — *A Discourse concerning Unlimited Submission and Non-resistance to the Higher Powers* (1750, 8vo). See Mr. Bancroft's notice of this sermon, and his eloquent tribute to Mayhew, in his *Hist. of the United States,* 4:60-62: — *Thanksgiving Sermon for the Repeal of the Stamp Act* (1766): — *Sermons to Young Men* (1767, 2 vols. 12mo). See *Memoir of the Life and Writings of the Rev. Jonathan Mayhew,* by Alden Bradford (1838); Riche, *Bibl. Amer. Nova,* 1:140, 145, 153; Allibone, *Dict. Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.*; Sprague, *Annals Amer. Pulpit,* 7:22 sq.

Mayhew, Thomas

a Trinitarian Congregational minister, son of Thomas Mayhew, the governor of Martha's Vineyard, was born in Southampton, England, about 1621; emigrated with his father to New England in 1631; resided for a few years in Watertown, Mass.; and in 1642 assisted his father in establishing a settlement at Edgartown, Martha's Vineyard. Being deeply affected by the intellectual and moral degradation of the Indians, and possessing good natural talents, and a considerable knowledge of the Latin, Greek, and Hebrew languages, he determined to devote himself to preaching to the natives of the island. He soon acquired their language, commenced his pulpit ministrations in 1646, and labored among them so faithfully that in 1650 he had 100 converts, and in 1662, 282, among whom were eight pawams or priests. In 1657 he sailed for England to obtain aid from the

Society for the Propagation of the Gospel; but the ship in which he had taken passage was lost at sea, and never heard of. Cotton Mather says that "he was so affectionately esteemed by the Indians that many years afterwards he was seldom named without tears." He wrote, in connection with John Eliot, *Tears of Repentance, or a Narrative of the Progress of the Gospel among the Indians in New England. — Sprague, Annals American. Pulpit,* 1:131; Drake, *Dict. American Biography*, s.v.

Maymbourg

SEE MAIMBURG.

Mayne, James S.

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Ravallagh, near Coleraine, Antrim County, Ireland, in 1825. He received a careful academic education in his native country, and in 1853 came to America; graduated at Princeton College with honor in 1857; studied divinity at the theological seminary at Princeton, N. J.; was licensed in 1859, and in 1860 commenced his labors at May's Landing, Atlantic City, and Absecon, N. J., where he died. Aug. 30, 1860. Mr. Mayne was a man noted for his consistent and devoted piety. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac,* 1862, p. 103.

Mayne, Jasper

an English divine and poet, was born in Devonshire in 1604. At the age of nineteen he entered Christ-church College, Oxford, and in 1631 secured the degree of M.A. He took holy orders, became a popular preacher, was presented by his college to two neighboring livings, and continued at the same time his residence in the university. He was made D.D. in 1646. At the time of Cromwell's usurpation, being firmly devoted to the cause of Charles I, he was deprived of his student's place, and soon lost both of his vicarages. His spirit, however, remained unbroken, and in 1652 we hear of his holding a public disputation with a noted Anabaptist preacher. Subsequently he resided, until the Restoration, as chaplain in the family of the earl of Devonshire; in 1660 he was restored again to his living, was made chaplain in ordinary to the king, a canon of Christ Church, and archdeacon of Chichester. He died in Oxford in 1672. Dr. Mayne published in 1662 a translation of a part of Lucian's Dialogues, also several sermons and scattered poems.

Maynooth College.

In consequence of the English Reformation, the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland lost all its rights and possessions. At the Synod of Dublin, in 1560, seventeen bishops out of nineteen endorsed the Act of Uniformity, and, upon the principle that “ubi episcopus ibi ecclesia,” the English Reformed Church was declared the only legal Church in Ireland. The Roman Catholics were therefore compelled to worship in private, and to get their priests educated abroad. With the assistance of foreign princes they established, during the years 1582-1688, a number of seminaries in Spain, Italy, and the Netherlands (namely, at Salamanca, Alcala, Lisbon, Evora, Dacay, Antwerp, Tournay, Lille, Rome, Prague, Caupranica, Toulouse, Bordeaux, Poitiers, Nantes, Bouley, and Paris). As most of the students were poor and dependent on the aristocracy of Ireland, a great attachment grew up between them and the class by whom they were patronized. But in consequence of the French Revolution intercourse between Ireland and the Continent became more difficult. The Irish colleges of France and Brabant were closed, and the necessity became apparent of establishing a seminary at home. The most opposite political parties agreed in supporting this measure: the aristocracy from fear that the young priests might imbibe democratic ideas abroad, and the democrats from the hope of gaining over to their views the priests, who had heretofore always sided with their patrons. The middle classes especially thought to find in home-bred priests useful auxiliaries to their emancipation. When therefore the Roman Catholic prelates submitted to the lord lieutenant of Ireland their plan of establishing a college, he immediately gave his approval; the Irish Parliament, composed of Protestants, sanctioned it, voted an appropriation of £8000, and readily obtained the approbation of the Parliament of England in 1795. A board of trustees was organized, consisting of four Protestants, the Irish lord chancellor, three chief justices, six Roman Catholic laymen, and ten bishops. Dr. Hussey, who had been eminently active in organizing the whole affair, was elected president of the college. The whole care and management of the college was vested in this board of managers. The four Protestant members were changed every five years (being replaced by election of the other members), and, together with three Roman Catholics, fulfilled the duties of inspectors, yet without the power of interfering with either the doctrines or the discipline of the college. The most liberal among the Roman Catholics wished the college to be established at Dublin, the seat of the University, and where members of the

different denominations were already studying harmoniously together. But the Roman Catholic bishops opposed this, as they desired their priests to be educated under stricter discipline. The board of managers therefore chose the village of Maynooth, eleven miles from Dublin, and commenced building a seminary for fifty students on, a piece of land purchased from the duke of Leinster. When the Irish Parliament was incorporated with the English, in 1801, an appropriation was made for the College of Maynooth amounting to some £8000 a year for the next twenty years. In 1808 some £13,000 more was voted for the purpose of enlarging the seminary, as it was inadequate to educating the number of priests required. Indeed in that year there were 478 obliged to study abroad, chiefly in France, while there were only 200 to 250 attending at Maynooth. The seminary continued a long time without attracting much attention; even the report of the board of trustees, presented in 1826 to Parliament, did not throw much light on the real character of the institution; in fact, the true state of things was rather covered up than revealed in that document. But when O'Connell's agitation broke out, it became apparent that its principal champions were priests educated in Maynooth College. It was also found that the alumni of Maynooth took an active part in the Roman Catholic emancipation in 1829 by unfairly influencing the elections. The seminary, instituted for the purpose of suppressing democratic ideas, seems thus to have become a center of political as well as religious agitation. But the interior workings of the institution remained hidden from the public gaze until a zealous Protestant minister, M'Ghee, procured the theological text-book of Peter Dens, used at Maynooth, which was published to the extent of three thousand copies in 1804; another edition of the same number appeared in 1832. This work, which breathes to the utmost the Roman Catholic spirit of aggression and persecution, and upholds the most offensive doctrines of that Church, was considered there as the highest authority, and gives a striking contradiction to the statement so often made by interested parties that the Roman Catholicism of the 19th century is animated by an entirely different spirit from that of former times. These revelations provoked much opposition to Romanism, and a growing desire to abrogate the privileges of the Romanists. June 28,1835, a great meeting was held at Exeter Hall, which was followed by others in various cities of England and Scotland. It was proved that the Romish Church still displayed the same zeal for the destruction of heretics, still claimed to relieve from oaths, retained auricular confession, with all its attendant evils, and all from unequivocal passages in the aforesaid textbook. Numberless pamphlets were published

on this occasion; Protestant associations were formed in Ireland to defend evangelical freedom, and chief among these were found the Orangemen. The old hatred between the Roman Catholics and the Protestants was thus revived, and trouble with Ireland seemed imminent. On the side of the Romish Church the "liberator of Ireland" gained crowds to his party by his eloquence and his fiery denunciations of the English; his attitude became so threatening that the government was obliged to prosecute him for high-treason. This repressed the rebellion in its very infancy, but at the same time embittered the feelings of the Roman Catholic population. Previous experience for seven centuries had shown that persecution could indeed weaken, and almost destroy, but never conquer Ireland; and this was still more the case with regard to their Church, which the Roman Catholic Irish clung to the more as it was weaker and more oppressed. There remained nothing but to try whether kindness would succeed where harshness had failed. The occasion was favorable, the insurrection was suppressed, and, if the victors met the vanquished as friends, much might be gained. This Irish question proved almost insolvable to the English government. Cabinet after cabinet were wrecked upon it, without arriving at any result. And this is not to be wondered at, for the civil as well as religious relations in Ireland had for a long time been in so abnormal a state that all attempts at reform seemed either inefficient or dangerous. Every effort to improve the condition of the peasantry was met by the opposition of the landed aristocracy, while every assistance rendered to the weak and oppressed, but *de facto* national Church of Ireland, exasperated the Protestant element of the population. The passage of any bill concerning Ireland was a most complicated piece of politics. But, said an Irish paper, "Protestantism is not as powerful as landed property, and religion must give way before ground-rents." Without attributing such views — as was often done — to the British government, for attempts at conciliation were made from religious motives, it would appear that Sir Robert Peel inclined to this theory when, in 1845, he presented the Maynooth Bill to Parliament. Indeed for the last fifty years Parliament had been voting an annual appropriation of over £8000 for the education of Roman Catholic priests, the preceding year the Charitable Bequest Bill had been passed almost unanimously, and the Roman Catholic prelates had assured Peel that the passage of his new bill would be thankfully received by the Roman Catholics as a pledge of reconciliation. But hardly had the bill been presented to the House of Commons when a storm of opposition arose. The Protestants of the various denominations united to denounce it, and to petition against a bill

which would modify the Protestant character of the administration. A large meeting, chiefly of Dissenters, was held at Exeter Hall, March 18, 1845, and a Central Anti-Maynooth Committee organized to oppose the bill, and to overwhelm the Parliament with petitions. On April 3 Peel presented the bill to the House of Commons. He attempted to prove that there were but three ways of acting: to maintain things as they were, to suppress the usual appropriation, or to increase it. The first he declared impracticable, as so insufficient a sum for the purpose could not gain much gratitude for the donors; the second, he said, was still less advisable, as the withdrawal of assistance to which they had been accustomed for fifty years would not fail to exasperate the Irish; but the third he looked upon as a certain remedy. He therefore proposed to raise the yearly appropriation for Maynooth to £26,000, making it a part of the regular budget, and thus transforming the grant into a dotation; he moreover proposed to incorporate the board of trustees, and to vote a special grant of £30,000 for building purposes. Besides, the existing *ex officio* inspectors were to be replaced by five inspectors appointed by the crown, who, however, would leave the control of the doctrines and discipline to the three Roman Catholic inspectors. The opposition was headed by Sir R. Inglis. He attacked the bill on religious ground, as opposed to Protestant principles. He did not mean to withdraw the usual appropriation, but wanted Roman Catholics, like Dissenters, to educate their ministers at their own expense. All those opposed to the Established Church sided with him. The bill received 216 votes against 114 at the first reading. This, however, was but the prelude. At the second reading the struggle commenced in earnest, and lasted through six sittings. They first argued about the new principle, which converted a yearly grant into a dotation, for *this gave to the previously ignored Roman Catholic Church a legal existence and official recognition.* The friends of the bill sought to defend this principle in various ways. Some claimed that it was the *duty* of the Parliament to care for Maynooth, either because, by uniting with itself the Irish Parliament, it had assumed its charges, or as a sort of restitution for the former possessions of which the Church of Rome had been deprived. Yet the assumption of the liabilities of the Irish Parliament did not guarantee the continuance of the grant longer than twenty years more, and, on the other hand, calling £26,000 a restitution, when the yearly income from the confiscated Church property amounted to over £600,000, sounded like bitter mockery. Others preferred to take the broader ground of moral obligation, claiming that it was necessary to aid oppressed and impoverished Ireland. Others again, leaving the past to consider only the

future, argued from the political point of view. They hoped that this conciliatory measure, and the better education of the priests, would open a new aera to Ireland. None of these views satisfied Gladstone, who, after criticizing them all, finally arrived at the negative principle that the support granted to Maynooth should only be withdrawn at the last extremity, as it would have the worst consequences on the relation existing between England and Ireland. Some even sought to treat it as a mere educational question. Still the majority could not blind themselves to the fact that it really involved the weighty and difficult question of the relation between the English government and the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland. The opponents of the bill had an easier task. They could readily attack it from an abstract religious stand-point. They divided themselves, however, into two great sections, according to the ground they took. The Churchmen and some of the Dissenters did not oppose the continuation of the former support, but its increase; the Dissenters, as a body, opposed this, like all other government support towards churches. Both parties clamored loudly against the abuses of the Church of Rome, its political as well as religious tendencies, and particularly the Jesuitical spirit inculcated at Maynooth. Yet Parliament perceived that something must be done to allay the hostile feelings in Ireland, and the bill passed the second reading with 323 votes against 176. After another protracted and severe struggle, it received at the third reading 317 votes against 189. The discussion of the bill in the House of Lords was a repetition of that in the House of Commons. The most eminent jurists decided in favor of the bill. Brougham established a precedent in bringing forward a previous act in which the principle of dotation was clearly expressed. On the bench of bishops, six voted in favor of the bill; among them the archbishop of Armagh and the bishops of Norwich and St. David. The bill finally went through with 181 votes against 50, and received the royal sanction on June 30, 1845. While the bill was under discussion in Parliament, the opposition outside was very active. A large meeting was held on April 13 at Covent Garden, in which both Churchmen and Dissenters took part. Other meetings were also held in the principal cities. The Dissenters were especially active. Churchmen and Dissenters asserted as the ground of their opposition: 1, that by increasing the grant to the seminary, the papacy would be legally recognized in Ireland; 2, that the practice of employing government funds for the support of religion is wrong in principle; 3, that there were special objections to the bill under consideration, namely, the Jesuitical tendencies of Maynooth, the danger of the influence over the masses of a more thoroughly-educated

clergy, the evil of binding the clergy to the support of the government, leading them to oppose the progressive social tendencies of the people; and, finally, the spirit of aggression inherent to the papacy. Some of the Dissenters, however, found this platform too indefinite; they wanted the bill rejected wholly on and-State-Church principles, and on May 2 formed a special committee at Salter's Hall, distinct from the original Central Anti-Maynooth Committee. On May 20 they held a meeting at Crosby Hall, in which 300 ministers and 400 laymen (principally Baptists, Presbyterians, Independents, and Calvinistic and Arminian Methodists of the new Connection) took part. They urged the Roman Catholics to decline the assistance of the Government to their Church for their own sake and that of their religion. Sir Culling Eardley, president of the Central Committee, spoke in a quite different tone in a letter to O'Connell. He accused the Roman Catholic leader of inconsistency if he accepted the new grant, and threatened to use every means in his power to gain his end. An Anti-Maynooth Committee was also organized at Dublin, and in a meeting held on June 5 an address to the House of Lords was drawn up, which received 3627 signatures, and also a petition to the queen. On the whole there were some 10.000 petitions drawn up against the bill, which received about 1,130,000 signatures. The government, however, remained unmoved, and the excitement gradually subsided. It was thought that now the Roman Catholic party would rest satisfied, and be truly reconciled; yet at one of the very first synods held by them the royal colleges were excommunicated and the national school condemned. The Roman Catholic prelates in Ireland — Cullen, Slatery, and M'Hale — had already attracted considerable attention by their Ultramontane views, but at this last outrage the old opposition spirit kindled again into a flame. Spooner provoked a visitation of Maynooth College by a bill he proposed May 11, 1852. Yet more moderate advice prevailed: it was claimed that the papal aggression in no wise affected Ireland, but rather England, and that the most Ultramontane among the Irish prelates, Cullen, was educated at Rome, not at Maynooth. Spooner finally withdrew his motion. Yet every year, for some time after, the proposition of stopping the appropriation was renewed; and was not dropped until quiet had been fully restored in Ireland, and general harmony re-established.

The agitation of the Irish population in late years, provoked, no doubt, in a great measure in Ireland, as in Poland, by the immaculate emissaries of the pontiff of Rome, has led the government of England to consider the

propriety of granting the three millions of Irish Romanists such liberty in worship and education as should make them as fit subjects as the other twenty millions of the northern isles who enjoy the protection of the British crown, and worthy associates of their English-speaking neighbors. In 1868 Mr. Gladstone, whose very earliest work had been "marked by a plain inclination to elevate the Church above the State," and who, in the very maiden-days of his political career, had "exhibited an unfailing tenderness for the whims, the complaints, and the growing claims of his friends the papal prelates," was called to the premiership of Great Britain, to establish, if possible, perfect accord between the English and Irish people. Almost the sole aim of the policy which the new premier inaugurated was the conciliation of the Romanists of Ireland. For this one purpose he has labored uninterruptedly. No sooner had he succeeded Mr. Disraeli than he urged the disestablishment of the Church of England principles as the ecclesiastical principles of Ireland. His success in this attempt is now a matter of history. *SEE IRELAND.* Flattered by the easy victory gained in his first effort, Mr. Gladstone followed it by a proposal for the establishment of compulsory education and denominational schools. Herein, also, he succeeded, but only measurably. Encouraged by these repeated successes, he has lately come forward with a scheme which only a few days ago (February, 1873) threatened his ruin, and even now holds him in suspense. His new scheme now on foot is a proposition to dismantle Trinity College, long the eyesore of Romanists, and to found an immense educational establishment, called the Irish University, in which Catholics shall study only their own history and philosophy, Protestants a different series, and which shall be endowed with a vast revenue from the spoliation of Trinity and the wrecks of the Established Church. Both Dissenters and Conformists are alarmed at the step Mr. Gladstone stems determined upon. Even Romanists disfavor the proposal, for of the three or four millions of Catholic Irish it is probable that not one third of suitable age can read and write. The greatest opposition, however, has come from Rome, and suddenly the premier of Great Britain finds himself confronted by those whom he had always had reason to look upon as his chief supporters. Well has it lately been said that "the policy of Rome knows neither friendship nor gratitude; to serve 'the Church' it strikes indiscriminately at its friends or foes; and the British statesman has shown himself no match for the Italian priests, who have preyed upon his eminent renown, and would now, perhaps, exult over his fall. They throw him aside as the instrument they can no longer use, and demand that Ireland shall be ruled and educated by

Catholics alone. With mediaeval mummeries they have dedicated the island to 'the sacred heart of Jesus,' and plainly intend nothing less than the total subjugation of its Protestant population to a priestly despotism." The endowment of Maynooth, and later the establishment of the queen's colleges, and even the open doors of Trinity, cannot and will not pacify Rome. She seeks control of Ireland both in Church and State; and so long as the papacy shall remain tainted by a zest for temporal power, both England and Prussia will find defilement and abasement, aye, not unfrequently rebellion in the ranks of those of her subjects who claim fidelity to the hierarchy. The last days certainly are teaching even the most liberal-minded politicians that the Church of Rome is built upon a foundation which is political as well as ecclesiastical, and that the severe measures, as inaugurated by Bismark, will alone save the Protestant world from ruin and decay.

Mayo, Daniel

a Presbyterian divine of some note, was born in London or vicinity in 1672. He was educated first at home, then went abroad and studied for some time in Holland under Witsius. On his return to England he preached successively at Tothill Fields, Westminster, at Kingston-upon-Thames, and at Hackney, and finally settled permanently at Silver Street, London, where he died in 1733. Mr. Mayo was a man of considerable talents, great zeal and activity, combined with prudence. Besides publishing many sermons, he wrote, in continuation of Henry's *Exposition,* a *Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians.* See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors,* s.v.; Brown, *Cyclop. of Religious Knowledge,* s.v.

Mayotta

one of the Comoro Isles (in the Indian Ocean), since 1843 under the control of the French, is situated in latitude 12° 34'-13° 4' S., and longitude 440 59' 15"-45° 23' E., covering some twenty-one miles from north to south, with an average breadth of six or seven miles; if, however, the dangerous coral reefs which surround the island be included, the whole occupies a space of thirty miles north and south, and twenty-four miles east and west, and contains a population of about 8000, mostly Romanists. The surface of this isle is very uneven, and is studded with volcanic-looking peaks, some of which exceed 2000 feet in height. Its shores are in some places lined with mangrove swamps, which are uncovered at low water,

and are productive of malaria and fever; it is in most parts capable of cultivation, prominently that of sugar, the only article exported. The French themselves live mainly on the island of Gaondzi, inside the chain of reefs on the east side of Mayotta. A governor and colonial officer are residents, and some 100 French soldiers, besides some natives, were stationed there. The Roman Catholic Church alone has a hold here.

Mayow, Robert Wynell

an English divine, was born at Saltash, in the latter half of the 17th century (1777); was educated at Exeter College, Oxford; and, after serving several curacies in succession, removed to Ardwick, near Manchester, but there he died, only three months after removal, in 1817. Mr. Mayow is highly spoken of as a pulpit orator. A noted English writer has compared him with Sterne for his great humor and strong feeling, which the two possessed in common. He published *Plain Preaching, or Sermons for the Poor and for People of all Ranks* (Lond. 1816, 12mo):— *Sermons and Miscellaneous Pieces,* to which is prefixed a *Memoir of his Life* (1822, 12mo). — Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth.* s.v.

Mayr, Beda

a Benedictine monk, was born at Duitingen, in Bavaria, in 1742. He entered the cloister at Donauworth in his twentieth year. Finely cultured, and classed with the best talent of his day, he sought relief from the dullness of convent life by teaching mathematics, poetry, rhetoric, philosophy, canon law, and theology. He was charged with being liberal to excess, and was both feared and distrusted by the clergy of the Roman Catholic Church. His principal work, *Defence of the Natural, Christian, and Catholic Religion, according to the Necessities of our Time*, was published at Augsburg in 1787, and is still mentioned. He died April 28, 1794. A list of his works is given by Doring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands,* vol. ii, s.v.; see also Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon,* 6:953. (G. M.)

Mayr, Colestin

a German theologian, was born April 21, 1679, at Donauworth. In 1698 he entered the Benedictine Order at Augsburg; later he became a student at the University of Salzburg, where in 1711 he was appointed professor of philosophy. In 1713 he obtained the professorship of polemical theology,

and the inspection of the Salzburg schools. About this time he was made doctor of divinity. In 1714 he was appointed ecclesiastical counselor of the duke of Salzburg, and at the same time became professor of scholastic theology. In 1716 he was appointed vice-rector of the university, in 1719 pro-chancellor, and in 1728 chief rector. In 1731 he retired from academic life, and thereafter held an official relation to the cloister Linzheim, in Neuburg, where he died, March 19, 1753. Mayr enjoyed great prominence as a writer of theology, but his productions have never been collected in book form. They consist mainly of dissertations and contributions to different journals. For a list of his writings, see Doring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands,* vol. ii, s.v.

Maysart

SEE MEYSART.

Mazarin, Jules

(properly *Guilio Mazzarino*), cardinal, the celebrated prime-minister of king Louis XIV of France, the successor of cardinal Richelieu, and inaugurator of a reign noted for attainments in arms, language. fine arts, literature, industry, and a superior degree of splendor, was born of a noble Sicilian family July 14,1602, most probably at Piscina, near the lake of Celano, in Abruzzo Citra, though in the letters of naturalization granted him in France in 1639 it is stated that he was born at Rome. It is certain, however, that he received his education at the Eternal City, and hence, no doubt, the mistake as to his native place. In 1619 Mazarin went to Spain to pursue the study of jurisprudence, probably intending to enter the legal profession, but, returning to Rome in 1622, a little later he entered the military service, and was given a captain’s commission in 1625. Soon after this he entered the service of the Church, and was employed as companion of the papal legate to France, and in this mission displayed great political talents. In the difficulties arising out of the contested succession to the duchy of Mantua, in which France supported the pretensions of the count De Nevers, while the emperor of Germany, the king of Spain, and the duke of Savoy supported those of the duke of Guastalla. Mazarin was sent by pope Urban to Turin as the assistant of cardinal Sacchetti. The latter at once perceived his talent, gave him his entire confidence, and in fact devolved upon him the entire management of the negotiation. It was not immediately successful, for in 1629 Louis XIII in person invaded Savoy,

took Suza, and forced the duke of Savoy to abandon his alliance with Spain. Finally Sacchetti returned to Rome, leaving Mazarin, with the title of “internuncio,” to continue the negotiations. Cardinal Barberini, the pope’s nephew, returned in Sacchetti’s stead, and Barberini found Mazarin as indispensable as had his predecessor. Mazarin labored unceasingly to restore peace. He visited the contending powers; in 1630 he saw Louis XIII and cardinal Richelieu, who both formed a high opinion of him, and in 1631 he finally succeeded in effecting the treaty of Cherasco, by which peace was restored. Mazarin at this time displayed considerable trickery in favor of France. and by this unfair partiality acquired the hatred of the courts of Spain and Germany, but the thanks of Louis and Richelieu, who recommended “the able negotiator” to the favor of the pope. Shortly after he was to receive at the hands of the French cardinal and prime-minister the reward due for his great services to Louis XIII. In 1634 he was named vice-legate to Avignon, but was sent to Paris as nuncio to intercede with Louis XIII in favor of the duke of Lorraine, whose duchy the king of the French had taken possession of. Mazarin, now unequivocally drawn towards Richelieu, of course failed to accomplish the task assigned him by the holy father. Mazarin returned to Rome in 1636 as the avowed supporter of French interests, and, on the death of Richelieu’s celebrated confidant, father Joseph, pope Urban was solicited by Louis XIII and his minister to bestow upon Mazarin the cardinal’s hat promised for father Joseph, but, as Urban refused, Mazarin in 1639 quitted Italy for France, and there entered the service of the king as a naturalized Frenchman. In 1640 he was nominated ambassador to Savov, where, after a short war, he was enabled to restore peace, and in 1641 he was at length raised to the rank of cardinal, through the persistent efforts of his friend the cardinal and prime-minister of France. Mazarin, in France, was a faithful and useful assistant to Richelieu, especially during the famous conspiracy headed by Henri de Cinq-Mars, which ended by his execution in September, 1642. This was Richelieu’s last triumph. In the following December he died, recommending on his death-bed that Louis should receive Mazarin as his own successor, and Louis, sufficiently predisposed in Mazarin’s favor, gladly acceded to the last wish of his faithful friend and counselor. In 1643 Louis XIII himself died, and Alazarin’s position became one of great difficulty amid the intrigues, jealousies, and strifes of the courtiers surrounding Louis XIV in his minority. By the will of the late king he had been declared the sole adviser of the queen-regent, Anne of Austria, but the latter assumed a decidedly hostile attitude towards the cardinal, and it

was some time before he succeeded in acquiring the principal power in the government, as well as the confidence of the queen-regent. He used his power at first with moderation, and courted popularity by gracious and affable manners. He prosecuted the war against Spain which began under his predecessor, and in which Conde and Turenne maintained the honor of the French arms. A dispute which arose between the court and the Parliament of Paris, regarding the registration of edicts of taxation, was fomented by cardinal De Reiz into the revolt of the Parisians called “the Day of the Barricades” (Aug. 27, 1648), and was followed by the civil war of the Fronde. The court was forced to retire to St. Germain, and Mazarin was outlawed by Parliament; but, by the truce of Ruel, he still remained minister. The feeling against him, however, became still more inflamed when, at his instigation, the queen-regent caused the princes of Conde and Conti and the duke of Longueville to be arrested in January, 1650. Mazarin went in person at the head of the court troops to the insurgent provinces, and, after the victory at Rethel, showed so much insolence that the nobles and the people of the capital made common cause against him. He found it necessary to secure his safety by flight to the Netherlands. The press teemed with violent publications against Mazarin, known as *Mazarinades* (collected by Morean in the *Bibliographie des Mazarinades* [Paris, 1850-51, 3 vols. 8vo]; a selection of them was also published by Moreau under the title *Choix des Mazarinades* [ibid. 1854, 2 ols. 8vo]). After the rebellion of the prince of Conde he ventured to return to France; but Paris makings his removal a condition of its submission, he retired again from the court, and it was not till Feb. 3, 1653 that he made a triumphant entry into the capital, where he was received with significant silence. Yet after a time the skill, patience, and perseverance of Mazarin triumphed, and he regained his former popularity and acquired his former power. See here article Lorus XIV, p. 526, col. 1. After governing France with great ability, and just as Louis XIV was arriving at an age when he felt the capacity and desire to sway the scepter himself; Mazarin died, March 9, 1661. In 1690 some letters, written by Mazarin during the negotiation of the peace of the Pyrenees, were published; additional letters were published in 1693, and in 1745 others were added, and the whole arranged under the title of *Lettres du Cardinal Mazarin, ou l'on voit le secret de negotiation de la Pai dedes Pyrenees.* “They were written for the information and instruction of the young king, and form useful examples of clearness and precision in diplomatic writings.” His person was remarkably handsome, and his manners fascinating, and from an opponent he turned Anne of Austria, the

queen-regent during Louis XIV's minority, into his friend, if not secretly affianced companion, as has been asserted with much appearance of truth. "Mazarin," says Mignet (*Memoires relatifs la succession d'Espagne*), "had a far-seeing and inventive mind, a character rather supple than feeble. His device was 'Le Temps et moi."' Under his administration the influence of France among the nations was increased, and in the internal government of the country those principles of despotism were established on which Louis XIV afterwards acted. The administration of justice, however, became very corrupt, and the commerce and finances of the country sank into deep depression. It is admitted that as a financial administrator he was far inferior to Richelieu. Mazarin was very niggardly and very avaricious, and had acquired in various ways, fair and foul, an immense fortune, amounting to 12,000,000 lives, which he offered to the king shortly before he died; afraid, it is thought, that it might be rudely seized from his heirs. Louis declined the restitution, which was perhaps what the wily minister expected. In his will Mazarin made many and large bequests to students and literary enterprises; indeed, he had always proved himself the friend and patron of learning. The College Mazarin was founded at his wish, to receive students from the provinces acquired by the "peace of the Pyrenees," and to this same institution he presented his library, of immense value and size. See the *Memoir's* of Mazarin's contemporaries, Retz, Madame Motteville, La Rochefoucault, Turenne, Grammont, etc.; *Mmle. de Longueville*, etc., by Victor Cousin; Aubery, *Histoire du Cardinal Maszarin* (1751); Capefigue, *Richelieu, Milazarin, la Froide et la sregne lde Louis XIV* (Paris, 1835,8 vols. 8vo); Saint-Aulaire, *Histoire de la Fronde;* Bazin, *Histoire de France sous le Ministere du Cardinal Mazarin* (Paris, 1842, 2 vols. 8vo); Voltaire, *Siecle de Louis XIV;* Gualdo-Priorato. *Vita del Cardinal Mazarin* (1662); John Calvert, *Life of Cardinal Mazarin* (1670); Sismondi, *Histoire des Fmrsangais;* Grammont, *Memoires;* V. Cousin, *La Jeunesse de Mazarin;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Bio. Generale;* Chambers, *Cyclop.* s.v.; *English Cyclop s.v.; Fraser's Magazine*, November, 1831, and February, 1832.

Mazdak (Or Mazdek)

a Persian religious enthusiast, flourished towards the close of the 5th century (he is believed to have been born about A.D. 470). He professed to be a prophet, and, securing many followers, declared for a community of property. Gaining in strength among the people, he found favor finally also in the eyes of his ruler, king Kobhad, and the system of communism was

adopted, effecting great changes in the social order. The revolution, however, lasted only a short time, and gradually the old order of things was restored.

Mazel, Abraham,

a leader of the French Camisards, was born at Saint-Jean-du-Gard some time about the middle of the 17th century. After the insurrection of the Cevennes in 1702 he was imprisoned, but, escaping from his captors, he determined to bring the people to a more determined stand, and while engaged in this work was killed in a skirmish near Uzes in 1710. See Court, *Histoire des Camisards*. *SEE CAMISARDS*.

Maziti'as

(Μαζιτίας v. r. Ζειτίας), given by erroneous Graecism (1 Esdras 9:35) in place of the Hebrew MATTATHIAH (<151043>Ezra 10:43).

Mazolini, Silvestio

an Italian theologian, is usually known by the surname *Prierias* (after the name of his birthplace, Prierio). *SEE PRIERIAS*.

Ma'zor

(Heb. *Matsor',* r/xm;), a name occurring only in the original, and which the traslators of the A. V. ("besieged places," <121924>2 Kings 19:24; <233725>Isaiah 37:25; "fortified cities," <330712>Micah 7:12; "defense," <231906>Isaiah 19:6) have confounded with a word of the same form signifying a *fortress* (as in <193122>Psalm 31:22; <350201>Habakkuk 2:1, etc.). Gesenius, however (*Thesaur. Heb.* p. 815), regards it as a title of *Egypt*, and apparently Lower Egypt, as, in three out of the four passages where it occurs, it is in the phrase r/xm;yrea}y], the *streams* or canals *of Egypt, i*.e. the branches of the Nile (<231906>Isaiah 19:6; 37:25; <121924>2 Kings 19:24); and that it comes from the Egpytian word *meduro, a kingdom;* perhaps the sing. of the dual form *Mizriailum,* µyaæix]miq. d. *double Egypt* (comp. Josephus, Ant. 1:6, 2). Others (see Bochart, *Phaleag*, 4:24), as probably the Hebrews themselves, considered Egypt to be so called as being strongly fortified (see Died. Sic. 1:31). *SEE EGYPT*; *SEE FORTRESS*.

Maz’zaroth

(Heb. *Mazzaroth',* tworZ;mi a word found only in the plural, and occurring but once, <183832>Job 38:32, probably by an interchange of liquids foi twolZ;mi “planets,” <122305>2 Kings 23:5), an astronomical term, probably meaning the twelve *signs* of the Zodiac (see Hirzel, Delitzsch, and Conant, severally, ad loc.). *SEE ASTRONOMY*. “The Peshito-Syriac renders it by *ioallto,* the Wain, or Great Bear; and J. D. Michaelis (*Suppls. d Lex. Heb.* No. 1391) is followed by Ewald in applying it to the stars of the northern crown (Ewald adds the southern), deriving the word from ‘ rz,n,e *ne-zer,* a crown. Furst (*Handw.* s.v.) understands by Mazzaroth the planet Jupiter, the same as the star of <300526>Amos 5:26. But the interpretation given in the margin of our version is supported by the authority of Gesenius (*Thes.* p. 869). On referring to <122305>2 Kings 23:5, we find the word twolZ;mi, *mazzacloth* (A.V. the planets), differing only from *mazzaroth* in having the liquid *l* for *r,* and rendered in the margin ‘the twelve signs,’ as in the Vulgate. The Sept. there also has μαζουρώθ, which points to the same reading in both passages, and is by Suidas explained as the ‘Zodiac,’ but by Procopius of Gaza as probably ‘Lucifer, the morning star,’ following the Vulgate of <183832>Job 38:32. In later Jewish writings *mazzaloth* are the signs of the Zodiac, and the singular, *mazzal,* is used to denote the single signs as well as the planets, and also the influence which they were believed to exercise upon human destiny (Selden, *De Dis Syr.* Synt. 1:c. 1). In consequence of this, Jarchi, and the Hebrew commentators generally, identify *mazzaroth* and *mazzaloth,* though their interpretations vary. Aben Ezra understands ‘stars’ generally; but R. Levi ben-Gershon, ‘a northern constellation.’ Gesenius himself is in favor of regarding *mazzaroth as* the older form, signifying strictly ‘premonitions,’ and in the concrete sense, ‘stars that give warnings or presages,’ from the usage of the root rz'n; *nazar,* in Arabic. He deciphered, as he believed, the same words on some Cilician coins in the inscription l [ˆz ˆ rzm, which he renders as a prayer, ‘may thy pure star (shine) over (us)’ (*Mon. Phoen.* p. 279, tab. 36).”

Mazzocchi (Or Mazzoccolo), Alessio Simmmacho

an Italian antiquary and Orientalist, was born at Santa Maria di Capua in 1684, and afterwards flourished as professor of Greek and Hebrew at Naples. He died in 1771. Mazzocchi was celebrated for his learning far beyond the borders of his native land. His many treatises (written in Latin

and Italian) were elaborate and scholarly dissertations upon various subjects. The Paris Academy of Inscriptions recognized his services to the world by making him a member of its body. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale,* s.v.

Mazzola, Girolamo Bedolo

an Italian painter, pronounced the most distinguished pupil of Parmigiano, was born near Parma in 1503, and died about 1580. He excelled as colorist and in perspective. Among his most valuable productions are those falling within the domain of sacred art. The most worthy of notice are his *Madonna with St. Catharine* and *Miracle of the Multiplication of the Loaves.* See Vasari, *Lives of the Painters;* Hoefer. *Nouv. Biog. Generale,* s.v.

Mazzola (or Mazzuola), Girolamo Francesco Malia

an eminent Italian painter, surnamed Il Parmigiano, *the Parmesan,* was born at Parma in 1503. He visited Rome in 1523, and was employed by Clement VII to execute a number of works in that city. His style, formed on that of Correggio and Kaphael, is characterized by exceeding grace and delicacy of form and softness of coloring. It was said by Mazzola's admirers that "the spirit of Raphael had passed into him." Mazzola was the first Italian artist who engraved with aqua fortis. He died in 1540. Among his masterpieces are the *Madonna a della Rosa,* in the gallery of Dresden; an *Annunciation,* in the principal church of Viadana; the *Madonna with St. Margaret, St. Jerome,* etc., in the Museum at Bologna; the *Madonna dello Lunyo Collo,* at Florence; and the *Vision of St. Jerome,* in the National Gallery, London. See Vasari, *Lives of the Painters;* Affo, *Vita di F. Mazzola* (1784); Mrs. Jameson, *Memoirs of Early Italian Painters;* Bellini, *Cenni intorno alla Vita ed alle Opere di I. Mazzola* (1844); Mortara, *Memoria della Vita di F. Mazzuola* (1846).Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale,* vol. 34, s.v.

Mcadam, Thomas

a ruling elder in the Presbyterian Church, was born April 10, 1777, near Ballymena, Ireland. Being an ardent friend of liberty, the oppressive measures of the British government led him to take an active part in the efforts made to obtain freedom in Ireland; in consequence of which he incurred the suspicion of the officers of the law, and being in danger of

losing his life by a summary trial, in 1797 he left his native land for America. He was subsequently engaged in teaching in Philadelphia; was for a considerable time at the head of the mathematical and English school connected with the University of Pennsylvania; was ordained a ruling elder in 1801, and for many years treasurer of the Board of Missions of the General Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church. He died Nov. 16, 1844. Mr. McAdam was a man of noble and generous impulses, dignified in manners, intelligent, and truthful. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1860, p. 176.

Mcarthur, James P.,

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Jackson, N. Y., October 22, 1827; graduated at Union College, Schenectady, N.Y.; studied theology, first in the Associate Seminary, Canonsburg, Pa., and afterwards in the seminary at Xenia, Ohio; was licensed by the Presbytery of Miami, and connected with the Presbytery of Cambridge when he died, April 15, 1859. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1860, p. 159.

Mcauley, William

an Associate Reformed Presbyterian minister, was born in the north of Ireland about 1765. His early education was thorouogh, as he was intended for some literary profession, and when about fifteen years old he was entered as student at the University of Glasgow, where he gained high distinctions. Both students and professors regarded him as a youth of singular promise. Upon graduation he at once entered upon the study of theology, under the well-known and venerable John Brown of Haddington, the professor of theology to the Associate Burgher Synod of Scotland, and was one of the last class of students taught by that great and good man. William McAuley was licensed to preach in 1789 by the Associate Presbytery of Armagh, and was ordained by that body in 1790, as minister of the Associate congregation of Tulliallan, and there he labored acceptably until 1794, when he emigrated to the United States. Here he was received by the Presbytery of Washington (Synod of New York), and was installed in charge of the united congregations of Kortright, Harpersfield, and Stamford, Delaware County, N. Y. As the country developed, his churches grew in power, and divisions becoming necessary, he was finally confined in his labors to Kortright alone. He held his post for over half a century, and died in the harness March 24, 1851. Mr. McAuley deserves to be

remembered as one of the pioneers of American Protestantism. His task was one requiring energy and perseverance, and both these qualities he possessed in an eminent degree. Though frequently left to struggle against poverty and sickness in the care of a large family, he never faltered, and unhesitatingly pressed forward to advance the interests of his Master's cause. Says Dr. John Forsyth (in Sprague's *Annals of the American Pulpit*, 9:78): "That he was not an ordinary man, all, I think, will admit, who consider the single fact that his 'natural force' as a preacher was considered as 'unabated' by the grandchildren and great-grandchildren of those who seventy years ago or more settled in a wilderness, which, through their instrumentality, has been made to blossom as the rose... . In the central portions of Delaware County there are thousands who, though they never saw him, yet, from what their fathers have told them, will cherish with affectionate veneration the name of William McAuley."

McBride, Matthew

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Philadelphia April 27, 1830; graduated at the University of Pennsylvania in 1851, and studied in the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Presbyterian Church; was licensed in 1855 by the Philadelphia Presbytery, and became a pastor in Mount Vernon, Iowa, where he remained until 1861, when, compelled by impaired health to resign, he returned to Philadelphia. He next became editor and proprietor of *The Banner of the Covenant*, which he conducted with great acceptance to the Church until his death, May 13, 1863. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1864.

McBride, Robert

a Presbyterian minister, was born at Franklin Mills, Ohio, in May, 1825; graduated with honor at Oberlin College, Ohio; subsequently studied theology in the same institution; and in 1853 was licensed by the Western Reserve Conference, and ordained by Washtenow Presbytery; in 1855 accepted a call to the Church in Howell, Mich., where he labored until his death, Sept. 12, 1860. Mr. McBride was a man of much devotional piety, and labored zealously in building up the Church. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1862, p. 191.

Mcbryde, Thomas Livingston, D.D.

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Abbeville District, S. C.. Feb. 25, 1817; pursued his literary course in Franklin College, Athens, Ga., graduating in 1837; entered the theological seminary in Columbia, S. C.; and in 1839 was licensed to preach by Harmony Presbytery; was appointed missionary to China in 1839, and sailed for. Singapore in March, 1840; in 1843 returned to this country on account of failing health; and afterwards became pastor successively of Providence and Rocky River churches in Abbeville District, S. C., and Hopewell Church, Pendleton, S. C., in which latter place he labored till he died, April 15, 1863. He received the degree of D.D. from Erskine College, S. C. Dr. McBryde was an able minister, a sound divine, and a wise counselor. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1866, p. 355. (J. L. S.)

Mccaine, Alexander

an American divine of note, was born in Tipperary, Ireland, in the year 1768. He was educated in England, and was intended for the ministry of the Church of England; but, emigrating to the United States in 1791, he joined the Methodist Episcopal Church, and in 1797 entered the itinerant ministry, and filled several important pulpits until 1821, when he located. He now became one of the agitators of the movement which so lately has been successfully carried — lay representation. In relply to the adverse decision of the General Conference of 1824, he published the somewhat elaborate *History and Mystery of Methodist Episcopacy* (1829), a work displaring rare ability. When the Methodist Protestant Church was started, he became one of its zealous promoters, and was regarded as one of the most able andl influential ministers of that body. He died June 1, 1856. He was particularly ready with the pen, and distinguished for his rare talents in the pulpit.

McCall, John A.

a Presbyterian minister, was born in New Athens, Ohio, Feb. 23, 1834; graduated at Franklin College. New Athens, in 1859; studied theology in the seminary at Xenia, Ohio; was licensed by the Wheeling Presbytery in 1862, and in 1863 was ordained by the Xenia Presbytery, and had just accepted a call to Cedarville, Ohio, when he died. Aug. 25, 1863. Mr. McCall was a man of more than ordinary talents, and remarkable for his sober and studious habits. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1864, p. 351.

McCall, Joseph Pinckney

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born in Mississippi; professed religion while young; joined the Methodist Protestant Church, and was soon after licensed to preach. The war breaking out soon after, he went out as a volunteer in the Southern army. After the war he was received into the Methodist Episcopal Church South, and in due course was recommended to the Quarterly Conference and licensed to preach. In 1866 he was received into the Memphis Annual Conference, and was stationed at Wesley Circuit, with Rev. A. R. Wilson as preacher in charge. In 1867 and 1868 he served at Dresden Station. His last appointment was Hickman Station, in Kentucky, where he labored faithfully until his death, April 8, 1870. Mr. McCall was an able and faithful minister of the Gospel, and the Church greatly mourned her early loss. — *Minutes of the M. E. Church South*, 1870, s.v.

McCalla, Daniel

D.D., a Congregational minister, was born at Neshaminy, Pa., in 1748; graduated at Princeton College, N. J., in 1766; was licensed to preach July 20, 1772; taught an academy in Philadelphia; was ordained pastor of New Providence and Charleston, Pa., in 1774; acted as chaplain in the Revolutionary War; taught afterwards an academy in Hanover County, Va.; and was finally twenty-one years minister at Wappetaw, S. C. He died April 6, 1809. See Hollinghead, *Sermons and Essays of* 1). *MlcCalla* (1810, 2 vols.); also Drake, *Dict. of Amer. Biog. s.v.*

McCalla, William Latta

a Presbyterian minister, was born near Lexington, Ky., Nov. 25, 1788. He received his preparatory education under the supervision of his parents; graduated with honors at the Transylvania University, Lexington, Ky.; afterwards studied theology privately; was licensed in 1816, and afterwards, ordained pastor of the Presbyterian Church at Augusta, Ky.; in 1823 he went to Philadelphia, and was installed pastor of the Scotch Presbyterian Church, where he continued to labor until 1835, when impaired health prompted him to resign. Subsequently he took charge of the Fourth Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, and under his pulpit ministration the Church became large and influential. In 1839 he resigned this charge, and spent some time as an itinerant missionary in Texas; on his return to Philadelphia, he successively filled the Middletown and Ridley

charges, in the vicinity of Philadelphia, and Union Church, on Thirteenth Street. In 1853 he removed to St. Louis, Mo., and after preaching there some time became connected with the Female Seminary at St. Charles, Mo. In 1859 he assumed the pastorate of a Church in Louisiana, where he labored until his death, Oct. 12, 1859. Mr. McCalla possessed excellent pulpit talents; his expository style was rich and absorbing, his preaching close and pungent. He was the author of many published *Sermons* and *Essays;* also *Discussions with Alexander Campbell on Baptism; with Kneeland on Universalism; with Barker on Infidelity;* a small volume on the *Doctorate of Divinity;* and *Travels in Texas.* See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac,* 1861, p. 99.

Mccampbell, John, D.D.

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Rockbridge County, Va., April 9, 1781; graduated at Washington College, Lexington, Va.; subsequently studied theology with Isaac Anderson, D.D., at Maryville, Tenn.; was licensed in 1805, ordained by the Union Presbytery in 1807, and preached successively to the Strawberry Plains, Hopewell, and New Market churches, within the bounds of French Broad Presbytery. He died Sept. 28, 1859. Dr. McCampbell was a faithful minister, a good preacher, and an earnest pastor. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac,* 1861, p. 191.

Mccarroll, Thomas

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Newlin, Pa., August 12, 1800. In 1829 he entered the itinerant ministry in the Philadelphia Conference, and in 1835 the New Jersey Conference. He labored as an effective minister for thirty-one years. He was three times appointed presiding elder, and was a member of the General Conference of 1852. A thorough student, an eloquent preacher, a faithful pastor, a gentle ruler, he was greatly beloved and esteemed in all his appointments. He died in East Newark, N. J., May 9, 1860.

Mccarron, Michael, D.D.,

a Roman Catholic theologian of note, was born in the County of Monaghan, Ireland, in the year 1804. He received his early education in his native place, after the completion of which he entered Maynooth College to pursue his theological studies, and on graduation was ordained to the ministry. Soon after this he came to the United States. He was placed at St.

James's Church (now the cathedral), in Brooklyn. Subsequently he was transferred to St. James's Church, New York, but very soon afterwards was appointed pastor of St. Joseph's Church, Sixth Avenue, where he remained several years. About the year 1857 the late archbishop Hughes conferred on him the pastorate of the large congregation of St. Mary's Church, corner of Grand and Ridge Streets, New York, which he retained until his decease, Feb. 23, 1867. At the time when father McCarron arrived in this country archbishop Hughes had been actively engaged in the work of education, and had succeeded in exciting a deep interest among the Catholics on the subject. Father McCarron, then in the vigor and prime of life, entered upon this work with the greatest zeal, and the results of his efforts in that noble cause were soon apparent, and are felt at the present time. Father McCarron received evidences of the respect and esteem of his associates by his advancement to the archdeaconship of the archdiocese of New York. The date of this appointment is not known to us.

Mccartee, Robert. D.D.

an American Presbvterian minister, was born in New York City Sept. 30, 1791, and was educated at Columbia College. He chose the legal profession, and was engaged in his studies of jurisprudence when he was impressed with the duty of devoting himself to the sacred ministry. He therefore entered the Theological Seminary of the Associate Reformed Church at New York, and pursued a theological course of study, and was licensed to preach in 1816. He was immediately called to Philadelphia, where he remained several years; then returned to New York to take charge of the Orange Street Church, which had at that time but thirty members. While he was the pastor of this Church it was removed to Canal Street. When his connection ceased, in 1836, it numbered eight hundred members. In 1836 he accepted a call to the Church at Port Carbon, Pa., and remained there four years. In 1840 he became the pastor of the Presbyterian Church at Goshen, N. Y.; in 1849 of the Union Church at Newburg, and in 1856 of the Westminster Church in Twenty-second Street (with which the Twenty-fifth Street Church was united), New York City. This was his last pastoral charge. In 1862 his health, which for some time had been enfeebled, failing still more, he resigned his charge. He died at Yonkers, N.Y., March 12, 1865. "All who have known Dr. McCartee will remember him as one possessed of a genial nature, whose warm-hearted friendship was ever finding the most fitting expression in words and acts; as a simple-minded, fervent Christian, whose love for the Savior and his

blessed Gospel was never concealed; and as an able minister of the New Testament, whose fervid eloquence when proclaiming the glad tidings of salvation, and in urging them upon the acceptance of perishing men, was seldom equaled. We have often listened with wrapt attention to his solemn appeals, while the tears which were flowing down his cheeks, and his tender words, were answered by the tears of his hearers. But his voice is now silent; his work is done; he has entered into rest" (*The Observer*, N. Y. March, 1865). The degree of D.D. was bestowed on Mr. McCartee by Columbia College in 1831. See *New Amer. Cyclop.* 1865, p. 536; Wilson. *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1866, p. 132.

McCartney, John B.

a Presbyterian minister, was born near Apollo, Armstrong Co., Pa., June 22, 1835; graduated at Jefferson College, Canonsburg, Pa.; and in 1855, at the Western Theological Seminary, Alleghany, Pa.; was licensed in 1857, and in 1858 was ordained and installed pastor of the churches at Mount Washington and Temperanceville, in the vicinity of Pittsburg, Pa. In 1864 he accepted a call from the Twelfth Presbyterian Church, Baltimore, Md., and was installed its pastor May 2,1865, where he labored until he died, May 14, 1865. Mr. McCartney was a man of superior abilities, a close student, and an excellent scholar. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1866, p. 136.

McCartney, William D.

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Columbia Co., Pa., in 1806; graduated at Washington College, Washington, Pa., in 1832; studied theology at the Western Theological Seminary, Alleghany City, Pa.; was licensed in 1835, and installed pastor of West Liberty Church, Pa.; afterwards labored in the Ridge Church, Madison, and Holmesville churches, Ohio, within the bounds of Steubenville and New Lisbon Presbyteries, and died July 27,1863. Mr. McCartney was gifted with superior intellectual powers, logical and discriminating in his theological views, an excellent scholar, and a successful minister. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1864, p. 175.

Mccaul, Alexander

an eminent Anglican divine, was born about the opening of this century, and was educated at King's College, London, where he afterwards became professor of divinity. He was also prebend of St. Paul's, London, since

1845. He is noted, however, not so much on account of the high positions he filled as an ecclesiastic, as for his missionary labors among the Jews, a task for which his great erudition and uncommon familiarity with the Hebrew language and literature peculiarly fitted him. He died in 1863. Dr. McCaul left, besides *Sketches of Judaism and the Jews* (Lond. 1838, 8vo), *The Old Paths, or a Comparison of Mod. Judaisnm wiih the Rel. of Moses and the Prophets* (2d ed. 1868, 12mo); a lot of minor theological works, and a host of sermomns; for a list of which see Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* 2:1902.

Mccaulle, Thomas Harris, D.D.

a Presbyterian minister, was born about the middle of last century; graduated at Princeton College, N. J., in 1774; was ordained minister in the western counties of North Carolina; was several years president of a college at Waynesborough, S. C.; and died in Savannah, Ga., about 1800.

Mccay, David

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Lewiston, Pa., Feb. 17, 1816; was educated at Jefferson College (class of 1838) ; studied theology in the Princeton Theological Seminary; was licensed by Huntingdon Presbytery in 1841; and in 1842 was ordained, and installed pastor of the united churches of Bethesda, Concord, and Callensburg, Pa., where he continued to labor for more than twenty years. In 1861 he accepted the chaplaincy of the 103d Regiment of Pennsylvania Volunteers, in which position he labored until his death, June 4, 1862. Mr. McCay possessed an intellect of high order, clear, comprehensive, and eminently practical; his attainments in science and literature were varied and exact; his piety deep, constant, and heartfelt. See *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1863, p. 191.

Mccheyne, Robert Murray

a celebrated Scotch preacher and evangelist, was born in Edinburgh, Scotland, May 21, 1813. At five years of age he was quite proficient in English. When eight years old he entered the high-school, where for six years he maintained high rank in his classes. In November, 1827, he entered Edinburgh University, and during his college course gained prizes in various departments of study. He studied modern languages privately; was proficient in gymnastic exercises, and in music and drawing. This last acquisition was advantageous to him afterwards in sketching scenes in the

Holy Land. The death of his eldest brother, David, led to his conversion, or was the beginning of the great change in his life, and brought him to study for the ministry. In 1831 he entered upon his studies in theology and Church history in Divinity Hall, under Dr. Chalmers and Dr. Welsh. In 1835 he removed to the Presbytery of Annan, and was licensed to preach July 1. November 7 he began his labors at Larbert, a parish containing six thousand people, to whom he was a devoted pastor. He was also an intense student of the Bible, reading it in both the Hebrew and the Greek. In 1836 he was called to St. Peter's Church, Dundee, and was ordained there Nov. 24. This charge was large, and his labors were so constant that his health failed, and he was obliged to retire for a season of rest. During this vacation he went, with three other ministers, to Palestine, on a "mission of inquiry to the Jews." His health improved by his travels, and on his return he resumed his work at St. Peter's, where he remained until 1842, when his health again failed. He now undertook a preaching tour, with other ministers, through the north of England, preaching in the open air and in churches of different denominations. Returning from England, he was obliged by failing health to have an assistant in his labors at Dundee. In February, 1843, he went on his last tour as an evangelist; on his return from which he was attacked by a fever, and died March 25. 1843. His death was a loss not to his own congregation or denomination only, but to the whole Christian world. Mr. McCheyne was one of the most beautiful examples of the true Gospel minister. Whether among his own congregation, or in Palestine, or traveling as an evangelist, he was always preaching by his words and holy life. He was pre-eminent as a preacher, as a pastor, and as a Christian. and did a great work not merely by the great number of conversions which took place directly or indirectly through his instrumentality, but by the zealous spirit which he infused into every department of Christian work. He had also fine talents for literary and scholastic pursuits. He wrote a number of pieces showing a taste for poetry, one of which — *Greece, but living Greece no more* — was written at the age of fourteen. His letters from Palestine, his lectures, sermons, and letters, show an ability for composition rarely surpassed; but he consecrated all his talents and powers to the service of Christ, and lived only for the salvation of men. His name will long be fragrant in the Church as a model preacher of the Gospel. See *Life and Remains of Letters, Lectures, and Poems of the Rev. Robert Murray McCheyne*, by Rev. Andrew A. Bonar (New York, 1857). (H. A. B.)

Mcclanahan, Alexander W.,

a Presbyterian minister, was born near West Union, Adams County, Ohio, Nov. 28, 1821; graduated with honor at Miami University, Oxford, Ohio, in 1844; studied theology in the theological seminary at Oxford; was licensed in 1847 by the Chilicothe Presbytery; and in 1848 ordained. His first and only charge was at Decatur, Ohio. He died Oct. 29, 1862. Mr. MIcClanahan was noted for his kindness of heart and spirit of self-sacrifice; he had a massive intellect, capable of broad and comprehensive views, and, when aroused to high mental activity, he wrote and spoke with rare power. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanacs,* 1863, p. 359.

McClaskey, Joel

an eminent Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Derry County. Ireland, Jan. 2, 1756. His parents, who were members of the Established Church of England, in 1772 emigrated to New Jersey; here John was converted in 1782, and, feeling that he was called of God to preach the Gospel, took the necessary steps to enter the ministry, and in 1786 became a member of Conference as an itinerant; in 1792 was appointed presiding elder on Philadelphia District; in 1793-94, to Baltimore; in 1795, to Philadelphia: in 1796-98, presiding elder on New Jersey District; in 1799-1801, to New York City; in 1802, to Philadelphia; in 1812-13, presiding elder on Chesapeake District, and died at Chestertown, Md., Sept. 2, 1814. Mr. McClaskey was a man of deep and earnest piety; versed in the Scriptures; and thousands of souls were converted through his efforts during a long and useful ministry. *Conference Minutes,* 1:257; Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit,* 7:125.

Mcclelland, Alexander, D.D.

a noted (Dutch) Reformed minister and educator, was born at Schenectady, N. Y., in 1794; graduated at Union College in 1809; studied theology with Rev. John Anderson, D.D., in Western Pennsylvania, and afterwards with Rev. John M. Mason, D.D.; was licensed by the Associate Reformed Presbytery, New York, in 1815; and, when nineteen years only, was elected pastor of Rutgers Street Presbyterian Church, New York, as successor of Dr. Milledoler. Here he remained seven years, and established his great reputation as a pulpit orator among the foremost men of his day. In 1822 he became professor of rhetoric, logic, and metaphysics in Dickinson College, Pa.; removed in 1829 to New Brunswick, N. J., as

professor of languages in Rutgers College; and in 1832 was elected professor of Oriental literature and Biblical criticism in the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church. He continued, however, to give instruction in rhetoric and belles-lettres in the college for several years. He resigned his place in the theological seminary in 1857; and, after a tour in Europe, returned to New Brunswick, where he lived in retirement until his death, Dec. 19, 1864. This published works consist of a few occasional sermons and pamphlets, and a volume on the *Canon and Interpretation of Scripture* (New York, 1860, pp. 329, 12mo). Dr. McClelland was in almost every respect a man *sui generis.* He was original in thought, in style of expression, in oratory, and in the professor's chair. He was humorous and witty, keen and strong, robust in mind, thorough in scholarship, impatient of dullness and idleness, and exacting to the last degree as a teacher. Inspiring his pupils with his own enthusiasm, he taught them to study and to think accurately for themselves. He gave very short lessons in Hebrew and in Greek; but the grammar and dictionary were always in use, and he required critical accuracy in recitations. His written lectures on the Epistles to the Romans and Hebrews, and his oral criticisms on Isaiah and the Psalms; his condensed Hebrew Grammar, and his lectures on the Canon and interpretation of Scripture, were admirable specimens of his skill as an instructor. His rare pulpit eloquence was quite equaled at times by outbursts of his genius and power in the professorial chair. Naturally impulsive and irritable, he was often sarcastic and severe; and these tendencies were aggravated by protracted and distressing disease. Yet his best students overlooked all this in their admiration of his ability as a teacher. In the pulpit he was clear and forcible, brilliant and impassioned, versatile and learned, simple and profound, electric, and frequently eccentric. Among his published sermons are a few of his memorable discourses; but some that were perhaps even more characteristic of his remarkable oratory were left out of the collection. No printed page can reproduce the effects of his mellifluous voice, his significant gestures, and the earnestness of his impassioned power. His peculiarities of temperament and manner interfered considerably with his general usefulness, and his independence of thought sometimes led him into questionable statements of truth; and in 1834 he was arraigned before the General Synod for heresy, on the subject of spiritual renovation; but, having made satisfactory explanations, he retained his professorship and ecclesiastical status. His latter years were spent in retirement among his books, and in the quiet pursuit of favorite studies, until he was disabled by a long and incurable

disease; and then, with simple trust in Jesus, entered into rest. Quite detailed sketches of Dr. McClelland's life and works, from the pen of Dr. Chalmers, of New York City, were published in the *Christian Intelligencer* (New York, 1872, Oct., Nov.). (W. J. R. T.)

Mcclintock, John, D.D.

one of the projectors and editors of this *Cyclopaedia*, was born in the city of Philadelphia, Oct. 27, 1814. His parents were devoted members of the Methodist Episcopal Church in that city. In the year 1832 he entered the freshman class of the University of Pennsylvania, and by strenuous exertions completed the whole collegiae course in the space of three years. Before his graduation, in the year 1835, he had commenced preaching, in the New Jersey Annual Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church. In the year 1836 he accepted a call to the chair of mathematics in Dickinson College, which had been reopened in 1834 under Methodist auspices. In this institution he spent twelve most fruitful years. In the year 1840 he exchanged the mathematical chair for that of the Latin and Greek languages, succeeding his friend, the Rev. Robert Emory. As a teacher Dr. McClintock was most successful. Rapid and brilliant, and at the same time thorough and accurate, he was the beau ideal of a college instructor. In 1846 he commenced, in connection with the writer of this article, a series of Latin and Greek text-books, designed to apply to these languages the method of "imitation and repetition" which had been successfully introduced into the teaching of modern tongues. The series was well received, and its method has since been extensively followed. In the year 1848 Dr. McClintock was elected by the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church the editor of its *Quarterly Review.* In this office he spent eight years. His fine taste, his critical acumen, and his interest in all departments of human knowledge, were amply illustrated in his conduct of the *Review.* Under his care it rose rapidly to the highest rank among periodicals of its kind. In 1856 he was, in association with bishop Simpson, appointed a delegate from the Methodist Episcopal Church to the Wesleyan Methodist Conference of England. He was at various times elected president of several colleges, but he never assumed the active duties of such a position. In 1857 he became pastor of St. Paul's Methodist Church, in the city of New York. He adapted himself readily to the duties of the pastoral office. and speedily became known as one of the most eloquent preachers of the metropolis. A fine presence, a rich voice, and a graceful delivery gave effect to the utterances of a well-stored mind. His

charge of this Church expiring by limitation in 1860, he accepted the appointment of pastor of the American chapel in Paris, then and now under the care of the American and Foreign Christian Union. While holding this position the great American civil war broke out, and Dr. McClintock was not a man to be idle in the time of his country's peril. Appreciating the value to the national cause of the friendly opinion of Europe, he exerted himself to the utmost in diffusing a right knowledge of the merits of the controversy in which the American Union was involved. In these labors he availed himself of the aid of the count De Gasparin and the Rev. Mr. Austin of England. During the entire war his pen was never idle, and from the platform, whenever it was practicable, he made eloquent pleas for the national cause. During the period of his residence abroad, he was also corresponding editor of the *Methodist,* a paper established in 1860 in the city of New York. His letters kept the American public well advised of the fluctuations of European opinion in relation to the war. Upon his return home, in 1864, he was for a second time appointed to the pastorate of St. Paul's Church, but, finding his health unequal to the discharge of the duties of the office, he resigned it at the end of a year. In 1866 he was made chairman of the Central Centenary Committee of the Methodist Episcopal Church, to which was given the work of organizing the commemoration of the introduction, in 1766, of Methodism into the United States. Mr. Daniel Drew, of New York, having signified his intention of founding, in connection with this centenary commemoration, a Biblical and Theological School, Dr. McClintock was chosen its first president. The school was opened in the year 1867, at Madison, New Jersey, under the most flattering auspices, and has been from the beginning an entire success. Dr. McClintock's health had, prior to his election to the presidency of Drew, shown symptoms of decline. Since 1848 he had been frequently prostrated by attacks of illness. From 1867 to 1870 a great decay of vitality was perceptible, and on March 4 of the latter year the "wheels of life stood still at last."

To the preparation of this *Cyclopaedia,* Dr. McClintock had, in company with his co-editor, Dr. Strong, devoted many laborious years. To theology and its kindred studies his attention had through life been chiefly directed. He lived to see three volumes completed, and the fourth in a state of forwardness. In the year 1847 he translated, with Prof. C. E. Blumenthal, Neander's *Life of Christ,* published by Harper and Brothers. In 1851 he prepared an essay on the *Temporal Power of the Pope,* which was at that

time a political question of some importance in the United States. The *Theological Institutes,* by Watson, Dr. McClintock supplied with an analysis, which is considered a model work of its kind. He was also a frequent contributor to the *Methodlist Quarterly Review,* and an occasional one to several other periodicals. Since his death a volume of his sermons has been collected and published under the title *Livinq Words* (N.Y. 1871,12mo). Dr. McClintock's versatility of talent is apparent even from this slight sketch. He was truly a many-sided man. Yet his attainments were solid; an imperfect understanding of any subject he could not tolerate. In facility of acquiring knowledge he was very remarkable. He could track a subject, never losing the clew, through a labyrinth of books, until he came into full possession of it, both as a whole and in its details. The critical faculty was dominant in him. To systematize knowledge, to reduce it to form and completeness, was instinctive with him; yet he had at the same time the fervor which makes the orator. His eloquence was of the highest order; in power to sway an audience he had few if any superiors. He was probably the most complete scholar that his Church has produced in the United States. His style as a writer was remarkable for clearness, precision, directness, and condensation. His personal qualities endeared him to hosts of friends; his death, in the midst of his years, has been deplored as a great loss to the cause of religion and learning in our country. (G. R. C.)

Mcclung, John Alexander, D.D.,

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Washington, Ky., Sept. 25, 1804. His education was received at a private school at Brick Pond, Woodford County, Ky., his instructors being Messrs. Thompson and Daly, from the University of Dublin, Ireland. In 1823 he entered Princeton Thelogical Seminary, and in 1828 was licensed to preach. Subsequently, his mind becoming unsettled concerning the authenticity of some of the books of the Old Testament and one or two of the Epistles, he gave up preaching and entered upon the study of law. During this stage of his life he wrote *Sketches of Western Adventures,* and otherwise contributed to the press of the day. He was admitted to the bar in 1835, and became a regular practitioner until 1849, when, his religious principles being revived, he was again, in 1851, licensed and ordained, and was called to the First Presbyterian Church, Indianapolis, Ind.; during his pastorate there he was elected president of Hanover College, Ind. In 1857 he accepted a call to Maysville, Ky., wvhere he labored until the summer of 1859, when he was drowned. Dr. McClung was a man of brilliant intellect and rare eloquence;

he was a polished schlar, a generous friend, and an humble Christian. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. A*1*manac,* 1861, p. 100.

McClure, Alexander Wilson

D.D., an American divine, was born in Boston, Mass., May 8, 1808: was educated at Yale and Amherst colleges and Andover Theological Seminary (class of 1830); was settled at Mialden, Mass., 1830-41; then at St. Augustine, Fla., 1841-44; editor of the *Christian Observatory* from 1844 to 1847; and pastor again at Malden from 1848 to 1852. Leaving the Congregational body, he accepted a call to the First Reformed Church, Jersey City, N. J., and remained there three years (1852-55), when he became corresponding secretary of the Amrerican and Foreign Christian Union, 1855. His health having been impaired, he was sent in 1856 as chaplain of the union at Rome, Italy. In 1858, broken down by bronchial disease, he retired from public service, and lingered a great sufferer until his death, Sept. 20, 1865. The American Chapel in Paris was erected largely by funds which Dr. McClure secured with great zeal and labor. Dr. McClure's contributions to the periodical press were numerous and popular, including valuable articles for the *Observatory,* the New *Brunswick Review,* and the *Literary and Theological Review.* He also published *The Life-Boat, an Allegory*: — *Four Lectures on Ultra Uniresalsises,* "a theological classic, unanswered and unanswerable": — A *Series of Letters upon the Bible in the Public Schools,*written in controversy with a Romish priest in Jersey City: — *Lives of the Chief Fathers of New England* (2vols.): — and *The Traslators Revived, or Biographical Articles on the History of the Translators of the English Bible* (New York, 1853, 12mo). The title is somewhat unfortunate, but the work is invaluable, the materials being drawn from the best sources in Great Britain and America, and with the utmost care for many years, to secure accuracy and fullness. Dr. McClure was a truly learned scholar, a genuine wit, a keen dialectician, and a practical controversialist. Ardent and honest as the sunlight, abounding in good feeling, and simple in manners as a child, he was a man of positive convictions, fearless of consequences in the advocacy of truth and in assailing popular errors. Yet, with all his exuberant mirth and knowledge of the world, Dr. McClure was pre-eminently a devout and humble Christian minister. Chastened by many providential trials, his piety grew more serene, and beautiful, and deep with advancing infirmities and years. His prayers and preaching were solemn, tender, and scriptural. Eternal things were seen and felt by him as eternal

realities, and his hearers often were hushed and melted under his reverential appeals. His death was triumphant. See Corwin, *Manual; Recollections of Dr. N. Adams; Personal Memories.* (W. J. R. T.)

McClure, Arthur

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in East Tennessee, Feb. 16, 1801 was converted about 1819; entered the Tennessee Conference in 1822, and died Sept. 26, 1825. He was a young man of much promise, excellent in abilities and graces, and an eloquent and successful minister. — *Conference Minutes,* 1:550.

McClure, David

D.D., a Congregational minister, was born Nov. 18, 1748, in Newport, R. I.; graduated at Yale College in 1769; was ordained missionary to the Indians near Pittsburg, Pa., May 20, 1772. The mission was broken up by the troubles with England, and McClure became pastor in North Hampton, N. H., Nov. 13, 1776; at East Windsor, Conn., June 11, 1786, and died June 25, 1820. He was chosen trustee of Dartmouth College in 1778, and made D.D. by the same in 1800. Dr. McClure published *Sermons on the Moral Law* (1795, 8vo): — *Memoirs of the Rev. Eleazar Wheelock. D.D.,* in connection with the Rev. Dr. Parish (1810): — and a number of occasional sermons and addresses, and magazine contributions. See Sprague, *Annals,* 2:7.

Mccombs (Or Mccoombs), Lawrence

an early Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Kent Coulty, in the State of Delaware, on the 11th of March, 1769. Little is known of his early education, but it is to be presumed, from the easy circumstances of his father, who was a man of wealth, and the high character of the schools and academies of the district in which he lived, that he early attained to a good degree of intellectual culture. In 1792 he was admitted to the Philadelphia Conference on probation, and his first appointment was to the Newburg Circuit, in the State of New York; two years later he was appointed to Long Island; in 1795, to New London; in 1796, to Middletown; in 1797 and 1798, to Polland; in 1799, to New London; in 1800, to Philadelphia; in 1801, to Baltimore City; in 1802, to Baltimore City and Fell’s Point; in 1804, to the Baltimore Circuit. In 1806 he asked and obtained a location, and selected a residence on the eastern shore of Maryland, near the head of

the Chesapeake Bay. In this location he is said to have labored with unabated industry and devotion. In 1815 he re-entered the itinerancy, and took his place in the Philadelphia Conference; in that and in the following year he was appointed to Smyrna; in 1817, to Queen Anne's; and in 1818, to Kent. From 1819 to 1822 he was presiding elder of the Jersey District; in 1823 he was appointed to Essex and Staten Island; in 1824 and 1825, to St. John's Church, Philadelphia; and in 1826, to Wilmington. In 1827 and 1828 he was presiding elder of the East Jersey District; from 1829 to 1832, of the Chesapeake Bay; and in 1833, of the South Philadelphia District. In 1834 he was appointed to St. Paul's Church, Philadelphia; in this year, however, he was constrained, by his rapidly-failing health, to relinquish his active position and become a super-numerary. In 1835 he took his place among the retired and infirm, after having performed an unprecedented amount of labor, and left the impress of his energetic character wherever he went. He closed his useful and eventful life June 11, 1836. An intimate friend, also a minister, the Rev. J. Kennaday, has left this beautiful tribute to his memory: "In his religious character Mr. McCombs blended great zeal and fidelity with a very unusual kindliness of spirit. No hostility could intimidate him in the course of duty, nor could any provocation betray him into petulance or resentment. Meek in spirit, intrepid in purpose, gentle and social in manner, he was greatly respected in the pulpit, and ever welcome to the hospitalities of the numerous circles which he adorned as the man of God. He was strong in faith, much in prayer, and a great reader of the Bible. His intellectual character was developed more in the uniform strength of his faculties than in the marked prominence of any one or more of them. His perceptions were quick and clear, and his judgment sober and impartial. He had a fine imagination, which, being restrained and regulated by his admirable taste, gave beauty and warmth, as the artists say, to all his pictures. In unison with these traits, there were some physical qualities that contributed largely to his power and success. His personal appearance was very imposing. In stature he was full six feet in height, with a finely-developed form; though not corpulent, the breadth of his chest indicated the prodigious strength which enabled him to perform his almost gigantic labors. The general expression of his countenance betokened intelligence, gentleness, and energy, while his full, frank face was illumined by his ever-lindling eye. His voice was full, clear, and of great flexibility, sweeping from the lowest to the highest tone, and modulated in the most delicate manner, in beautiful harmony with his subject. In preaching in the field, which was his favorite arena, I used to think he was quite an approach to

Whitefield. Such was his known power at camp-meetings that the announcement that he was to be present on such an occasion would draw a multitude of people from great distances.... I have thought that in some respects there was a striking resemblance between him and the late distinguished Dr. John M. Mason, of New York, whom I often heard in my boyhood." See Sprague, *Annals Amer. Pulpit,* 7:210 sq.; *Conf. Min.* 2:492.

Mcconaughy, David, D.D., LL.D.,

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Menallen township, York County, Pa., Sept. 29, 1775, and graduated at Dickinson College, Carlisle, in 1795; studied theology for two years; was licensed in 1797, and preached frequently as a missionary in Philadelphia and New York; accepted a call from the United Christians of Upper Marsh Creek and Conewago in 1800, and remained pastor till 1832. During this connection he visited Baltimore, Philadelphia, and New York in behalf of the Gettysburg Church, and as a minister and a teacher rendered important services. At an early period he interested himself much in the cause of temperance by appointing meetings, preaching, and forming a society, of which he himself was president. He removed to Washington in 1832 to the presidency of the college, which he resigned in 1849. He died Jan. 29, 1852. Dr. McConaughy published *A Brief Summary and Outline of Moral Science* (1838): — *Discourses, chiefly Biographical, of Persons eminent in Sacred History* (1850, 8vo): — *Two Tracts on the Doctrine of the Trinity and on Infant Baptism Sermons and Addresses.* See Sprague, *Annals,* 4:199.

Mcconnell, William L.,

a Presbyterian minister, was born near Canonsburg, Pa., Sept. 19, 1829; graduated at Jefferson College, Canonsburg, Pa.; studied theology in the Associate Reformed Seminary, Alleghany, Pa.; and was licensed and ordained by Alleghany Reformed Presbytery in 1857. He accepted a call to Hanover Church, and subsequently to West Newton, Pa., where he labored until failing health compelled him to desist. He died July 18, 1866. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac,* 1867, p. 363.

Mccook, Robert J.

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born in Wilkinson County, Ga., Jan. 5, 1817; professed religion and joined the

Church when in his fourteenth year, and was impressed with a call to preach the Gospel. Resisting this impression, he lost his religious peace, and finally made shipwreck of his faith. At about twenty-two he again connected himself with the Church, but still shrunk from obeying his call to the ministry until 1853, when he was licensed to preach, and was admitted into the Florida Convention in 1854. From that time (except during the year 1866, when he was superannuated), he labored with devoted zeal and encouraging success, filling various important charges with great usefulness until his death at Key West, Nov. 22, 1870. “He was a godly man. ‘Holiness to the Lord’ was his theme in the pulpit, and was illustrated in his daily life. His end was peace, and his works do follow *him."* — *Conference Minutes M. E. Church South,* 1871, s.v.

McCoombs

SEE MCCOMBS.

Mccorkle, Samuel Eusebius, D.D.

a Presbyterian minister, was born near Harris Ferry, Lancaster County, Pa., Aug. 23, 1746, and graduated at New Jersey College in 1772; was licensed in 1774, and, after laboring for two years in Virginia, accepted a call from the congregation of Thyatira in 1777. About 1785 he opened a classical school named *Zion Parnassus.* which he continued ten or twelve years. He died Jan. 21, 1811. Dr. McCorkle published *Four Discourses on the great First Principles of Deism and Revelation contrasted* (1797): — *Three Discourses on the Terms of Christian Communion*: — *Occasional Sermons.* See Sprague, *Annals,* 3:346.

Mccoy, Isaac

a Baptist minister, was born in Fayette County, Pa., June 13, 1784; was licensed to preach in 1805, and began work as a missionary. Oct. 13, 1810, he was ordained pastor of the Church at Maria Creek, in Clark County, Ind.. where he remained some eight years, making occasional missionary tours in the surrounding country. In 1818 he was appointed a missionary to the Indians, and in May, 1820, removed to Fort Wayne, where he established a Church; in the fall of the same year he removed to Carey, on the St. Joseph River, and from thence, in 1829, to the Indian country, now Kansas. In 1842 he became the first corresponding secretary and general agent of the American Indian Mission Association, at Louisville, Ky. He

died June 21, 1846. He published a *History of Baptist Indian Missions,* embracing remarks on the former, present condition, and future prospects of the aboriginal tribes (1840, 8vo). See Sprague, *Annals,* 6:541.

McCracken, John Steele

a Presbyterian minister, was born near Cincinnati, Ohio, April 25,1804. His opportunities in early life for acquiring knowledge were poor. In 1833 he entered the preparatory department of Miami University, Oxford, Ohio, and graduated in 1838; studied theology under the care of the First Presbytery of Ohio of the Associate Reformed Church, and subsequently attended the theological seminary at Alleghany City, Pa., and the seminary at Oxford; was licensed in 1841, and then went out as a missionary among the newly-formed congregations in Illinois and Iowa; in 1843 he accepted a call from the Church at Kenton, Ohio, where he labored until his health gave way. He died April 1, 1863. Mr. McCracken was an able expounder and a sound theologian; his judgment was eminently just and critical; his disposition charitable and liberal. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac,* 1864, p. 352. (J. L. S.)

McCracken, Samuel W.

a Presbyterian minister, was born near Lexington, Ky., Jan. 12, 1800; was educated at Miami University (class of 1831); studied theology at Maryville, Tenn., and was elected professor of mathematics in the college at Maryville; was afterwards chosen professor of mathematics in Miami University; was licensed by Ohio First Presbytery in 1835, and in 1836 was ordained; in 1839 accepted a call to Hopewell Church, Ohio, and resigned his professorship in the university; here he continued to labor until his death, Sept. 10, 1859. Mr. McCracken maintained a high reputation for talent; prudent and far-sighted, his counsels were always worthy of consideration; opposed to all expedients, he made experience the basis of action. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Alm.* 1861, p. 209. (J. L. S.)

McCrary

W. H., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Tennessee Jan. 17,1831; was educated at Bethel College, Tenn.; was licensed in 1849, after teaching school for several years; was ordained in 1854. He died Sept. 14, 1858. Mr. McCrary was a good preacher, a successful teacher, and a fine theologian. See Wilson. *Presb. Hist. Almanac,* 1861, p. 236.

Mccready, Jonathan Sharp,

a Presbyterian minister, was born near New Galilee, Pa., April 15,1828; enjoyed in early life the advantage of religious instruction, discipline, and example; graduated at Franklin College in 1852; studied theology in the Associate Seminary at Canonsburg (class of 1855); was licensed by the Associate Presbytery of Ohio in October of the same year; in 1856 was ordained and installed pastor of the Associate congregation of Cadiz, and there continued to labor until 1862, when he volunteered in the service of the government. While in the army he continued to preach, and perform every other ministerial duty as occasion offered, until he was killed, Sept. 7, 1864. Mr. McCready was endowed with a clear and penetrating intellect; his education was comprehensive, his style logical and energetic, his manner positive and emphatic. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac,* 1866, p. 265.

Mccrie, Thomas, D.D.,

a noted Scotch divine, celebrated as a write on ecclesiastical history and polemics, was born at Dunse, in Berwickshire, in November, 1772. “Dr. McCrie’s parents,” says his biographer, “being connected with that branch of the secession usually termed Anti-Burghers, he was brought up under... the primitive strictness of that communion... and received that thoroughly religious education, of the importance of which he was ever afterwards so strenuous an advocate, and of the success of which he was himself a striking example.” After securing the rudiments of education at the parish school of his native place, he entered, in 1788, the University of Edinburgh, and in 1791 commenced his theological studies. In 1795 he was licensed to preach by the Associate Presbytery of Kelso, and he was immediately afterwards chosen pastor of a congregation of the same body in Edinburgh, where he served the following ten years, applying himself with great assiduity to the discharge of his professional duties, and occasionally publishing able pamphlets on some of the gravest and most difficult subjects of theological inquiry. The differences of opinion, and the appearance of *New-Lights* with peculiar doctrines quite unknown to the primitive belief of the “Secession Church,” caused McCrie in 1806, with five friends, among them the celebrated Bruce, to separate from the “General Associated Synod,” and to form “the Constitutional Associate Presbytery,” avowing “strict adherence to the principles of the original secession.” (Here compare *Hist. Sketch of the Origin of the Secession*

Church, by the Rev. A. Thomson, and the *History of the Rise of the Relief Church,* by the Rev. Gavin Struthers [Edinburgh, 1858, 12mo]). During the controversy which this change provoked he gave himself largely to the study of the Reformers, and came to admire so much his great countryman, John Knox, that he zealously applied himself to the composition of a *Life of John Knox* (Edinb. 1812, 8vo, and often), a masterly work, that combines the highest excellences of which biography is capable, and was by his contemporaries regarded as "a literary phenomenon." "It placed the character of the Scottish Reformer," says Jamieson (*Cyclop. Rel. Biog.* s.v.), "in an entirely new light, and showed him to be so widely different from the rude and illiterate demagogue he had been hitherto represented, that its appearance was hailed with patriotic pride and gratitude. It placed the name of McCrie at once in the foremost ranks of living historians. The highest literary honors were conferred on him" (compare Hetherington, *Hist. Ch. of Scotland,* 2:369). He received from the University of Edinburgh the honorary title of D.D., being the first Dissenter to whom that distinction was awarded; and his book, besides passing through several editions in Scotland, was translated into most of the languages of Europe. Encouraged by the success of his first literary effort, Dr. McCrie published, as the fruits of his researches regarding a later period of Scottish ecclesiastical history, the *Biography of Andrew Melville,* a celebrated champion of Presbyterianism in the reign of James VI of Scotland. This work, composed on the same principle of combining the memoirs of an individual with a narrative of public events (it illustrates the formation of the Kirk of Scotland, and the peculiarities of the Presbyterian establishment), evinces a vast amount of erudition and research. Critics of Anglican tendency have always been inclined to accuse McCrie of great partisan zeal and unfairness to his opponents: thus Mr. Hallam designated his writings as the products of "Presbyterian Hildebrandism." But these censures are unjust and unmerited. His impartiality and candor, and his unaffected desire to investigate the truth, to whatever conclusion it might lead, have been clearly conceded even by liberal opponents, and unmistakably impress themselves on every thoughtful reader. A writer, commenting on a later production from Dr. McCrie, in the *Westminster Review* (Jan. 1857), aptly says: "McCrie belongs to the higher class of writers to whose earnesestess, thoroughness, and genuine research we turn for relief from the superficial second-hand showiness of books written from a transient impulse, in order to supply only a transient need." After McCrie's formation of the "Constitutional Associate Presbytery," difficulty

arose among his people respecting their Church property. The result finally was the building of a new place of worship in West Nicholson Street, and there he ministered for nearly thirty years. In 1821 he made a tour to the Continent, mainly with a view to study the Continental Reformation, and, after continuing his investigations until 1827, published the *Hist. of the Ref. in Italy*, and in 1829 the *Hist. of the Ref. in Spain*, both of which had the honor of being prominently placed in the list of the Roman Index of forbidden books, and are spoken of as "the very best accounts we possess of the protest made against Romish corruption by the races of the South — a protest not less ardent, but unhappily less persistent than that of the phlegmatic North." At the time of his death, Aug. 5, 1835, the doctor was engaged on a "Life of Calvin," which unfortunately he left uncompleted. All his completed works were published under the title of *Works of the late Thomas McCrie, D.D.*, by his son Thomas, in 4 vols. 8vo (Edinb. 185557). They contain, besides the works already mentioned, *Discourses on the Unity of the Church* (1821): — *Memoirs of William Veitch and George Bryson* (1825): — *Lectures on the Book of Esther* (1838):— *Vindications of Christian Faith* and his *Sermons* (1836). See *Life and Times of Thomias McCrie, D.D.*, by his son Thomas (Edinb. 1840, 8vo); *Blackwood's Magazine*, 38:429; *Gentl. Magazine*, 1835, pt. ii, p. 434; *The Annual Biogr. and Obit.* (Lond. 1836, 8vo), 20:442; Allibone, *Dict. Brit. and Amer. Authors*, vol. ii, s.v.; Cunningham, *Hist. Studies*, 1:411. (J. H. W.)

Mccullough, Robert

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Ireland. He received a classical education in the College of Belfast, Ireland; subsequently emigrated to this country, and studied theology in Princeton Theological Seminary. In 1848 he was licensed, and ordained pastor of Mount Grove and Hopewell churches, Ohio, where he remained until 1856, when he went to California. On his return he became connected with the New Lisbon Presbytery, in which connection he remained until his death in 1859, See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1860, p. 76.

Mccurdy, John

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born in Elbert County, Ga., July 10, 1800; in 1825 he professed religion, and joined the Methodist Episcopal Church; in 1830 was licensed to preach, and in 1843 was admitted into the Tennessee Annual Conference. From that time till his

death he labored faithfully on various circuits and missions. Much of his time was devoted to missionary work among the colored people. In this field he was very successful. For the last several years of his life his health was feeble, and he was on the supernumerary and superannuated lists. He died in Williamson County, Tenn., Aug. 17, 1870. Mr. McCurdy “was a man of sound judgment, good common-sense, and deep and uniform piety. He lived above reproach, and died honored by all who knew *him."* — *Conference Minutes M. E. Ch. South,* 1870, s.v.

Mccutchen, James B.

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born near Murfreesboro, Tenn., Aug. 26, 1829; professed religion in his fourteenth year, and joined the Methodist Church; was licensed to preach, and joined the Memphis Annual Conference in 1852; was appointed to Camden Circuit in 1853; Mount Pinson in 1854; Tishomingo in 1855; Clinton Circuit in 1857; Paducah Circuit in 1858; Murray Circuit in 1860; and Tishomingo Circuit in 1861. During this year he was elected chaplain of the 7th Kentucky Regiment C. S. A. In this service he continued till the close of the war, when he resumed his place as, traveling preacher, and was appointed in 1866 to Cageville Circuit; in 1868 to Trenton Circuit, and again to Cageville Circuit in 1869. He died Aug. 28, 1870. “Brother McCutchen was a self-made man, having received but a limited education in his youth, but by industry and hard study he had acquired a very good English education, and no mean acquaintance with the Latin and Greek languages. His preaching was of a plain, practical character, exhibiting a large acquaintance with the sacred Scriptures, and with the standard literature of the Church. He was not of a polemical turn of mind, but when our doctrines were attacked, he always showed himself a fearless champion and a trustworthy debater. But few men in our ranks are better prepared to defend our doctrines than he was, and yet he cherished a noble catholicity of sentiment and feeling that did credit at once to his head and heart. He was not merely acceptable, but popular and useful, making many friends wherever he *went."* — *Conference Minutes of. E. Church South,* 1870, s.v.

Mcdearmon, James,

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Amelia County, Va., April 1, 1799; was educated in what were known as the *Old Fields Schools* of Virginia; was early made a ruling elder in the Church, and at once identified himself

with the cause of temperance. He was licensed by West Hanover Presbvtery in 1834, and in 1838 ordained and installed pastor over Hoe Creek and Morris churches, in Campbell County, Va. He died Sept. 15, 1867. Mr. McDearmon was a good and useful man, and an earnest apostle of temperance in his region. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac,* 1868, p. 347.

Mcdermott, Thomas

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Monmouth County, N. J., in 1791; was educated in the Lawrenceville High School, N. J.; studied divinity in the theological seminary at Princeton (class of 1832), and was licensed and ordained by New Brunswick Presbytery, as pastor of the Church at Stillwater, N. J.: in 1838, removed to Ohio as pastor of Hubbard and Unity churches; in 1844 accepted a call to Clarkson Church; and in 1846 resigned to become pastor of Chippewa Church, where he remained until compelled to resign because of failing health. He died June 6, 1861. Mr. McDermott was a devoted preacher; earnest in his work, and industrious in his efforts. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac,* 1862, p. 109.

McDonald, Andrew

a Scotch minister, was born at Leith in 1757; was educated at the University of Edinburgh; was ordained deacon in 1775; pastor of a congregation at Glasgow in 1777; subsequently removed to London, and devoted himself to the authorship of light literature, and died in the great English metropolis, “a victim to sickness, disappointment, and misfortune,” in 1790. A list of his works is given by Allibone, *Dict. Brit. and Amer. Authors,* 2:1166.

McDonald, Daniel

D.D., an Episcopal minister in America. was born near Bedford, Westchester County, N. Y., about 1787, and was educated at Middlebury College. Having taught for some time, he was ordained in 1810, and became rector of St. Peter’s, Auburn, N. Y. He subsequently took charge of the academy in Fairfield, Herkimer Co. where he superintended the preparation of candidates for holy orders. In 1821 he was made D.D. by Columbia College; removed to Geneva, and served for many years as missionary in the village of Waterloo. He became professor in the College of Geneva in 1825, and continued so until his death, March 25, 1830. His

works are *A Sermon in the Churchman's Magazine,* and *A Series of Articles in the Gospel Messenger, signed P.* See Sprague, *Annals,* v. 525.

McDonald, John

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Brooke County, Va., July 25, 1794; was educated in Ohio University, Athens, Ohio; was licensed and ordained by Athens Presbytery in 1827, and installed pastor of the Church in Burlington, Ohio; subsequently served as missionary in Kentucky; in 1832 labored in Manchester and Huntington churches, Ohio; and from 1836 in the Pleasant Prairie Church, Ill., until his death, Aug. 15, 1866. Mr. McDonald was possessed of rare mental strength and discriminating powers; extensive religious and literary acquirements; sterling piety, and unassuming humility. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac,* 1867, p. 184.

Mcdonogh, John,

an American philanthropist, a merchant of New Orleans, was born at Baltimore in 1778, and in 1800 removed to the Southern city, where, after having by hard labor and strict economy amassed an immense fortune, he delighted to serve the cause of humanity. He founded free schools and asylums for orphans, and also aided greatly the cause of the “American Colonization Society.” He established himself a colony in Africa, and sent thither many of his own negroes, after having previously provided them with a thorough education and a trade. He died Oct. 26. 1850. See Drake, *Dict. Amer. Biog.* s.v.

McDowell, Alexander

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Ireland, and came to this country in 1737; was licensed in 1739; and afterwards itinerated through portions of Maryland and Virginia, until, in 1741, he was ordained as an evangelist to Virginia, and subsequently to itinerate in New Castle Presbytery; in 1743 took charge of White Clay and Elk River churches; in 1752 was appointed principal of the Synod’s school, which he afterwards removed to Elktown, Md., and in 1767 to Newark, Del. He continued to labor as a teacher and preacher until his death, Jan. 12, 1782. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac,* 1863, p. 48. (J. L. S.)

McDowell, John

D.D., a Presbyterian minister (O. S.), was born in Bedminster, Somerset County, N. J., Sept. 10,1780; was educated at Princeton College, where he graduated A.B. in 1801; studied theology with Dr. Woodhull, of Freehold; and was licensed by the Presbytery of New Brunswick in 1804. In December of that year he was installed pastor of the Presbyterian Church of Elizabethtown, where he remained until 1833. During his ministry there 1144 persons were added to the Church. In May, 1833, he became pastor of the Central Church, Philadelphia, which, from small beginnings, grew to be a strong Church under his ministry. In 1846 he accepted a call to the new Spring-garden Street Church, where again his talent for organizing and establishing a society was very successfully employed. He remained in this parish till his death, February, 1863. He published a *System of Theology* (2 vols.): — *Bible Class Manual* (2 vols.): — *Bible Questions;* etc. For nearly fifty years he was a trustee of Princeton College, and was a director of the theological seminary from its foundation. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Alm.* 1864, p. 186.

McDowell, William Anderson

D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born May 15,1789, at Lamington, Somerset Co., N. J.; in 1809 graduated at Princeton, where he acted as tutor for several months; completed his theological studies in 1813; was licensed by the Presbytery of New Brunswick, and ordained and installed pastor at Bound Brook. In 1814 he became pastor of the Church of Morristown, N. J.; but after a residence of nine years his health obliged him to resign; in 1823 he was installed by the Charleston Union Presbytery, served for several years, and in 1832 became moderator of the General Assembly, and secretary of the “Board of Domestic Missions of the Presbyterian Church” (Phila.). He subsequently visited the South; and preached occasionally in New Jersey, where he died, Sept. 17, 1851. See Sprague, *Annals,* 4:495; Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac,* 1864.

Mcelhany, William G.

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Huntington, Pa.; graduated at Jefferson College, Pa., in 1847; studied theology in the Associate Reformed Seminary at Canonsburg, Pa.; and in 1850 was licensed by Chartier Presbytery; in 1855 was ordained and installed pastor of the Church in Hoboken, N. J., which relation existed until his death, May 28,

1860. Mr. McElhany was a sound evangelical preacher. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Alm.* 1861, p. 209.

McFarland, Asa

D.D., a Congregational minister, was born April 19,1769, at Worcester, Mass.; graduated at Dartmouth College in 1793; was ordained pastor in Concord, N. I., March 7, 1798, and died there Feb. 18, 1827. He was made trustee of Dartmouth College in 1809, and president of the New Hampshire Missionary Society in 1811. His publications were, *Oration before the Pi Beta Kappa Society in Dartmouth College* (1802): — *An Historical View of Heresies and Vindication of the Primitive Faith* (1808); and several occasional *Sermons.* See Sprague, *Annals,* 2:412.

McFarland, James

a Presbyterian divine, was born in March, 1800, at Dumbarton, within the present limits of the city of Glasgow, Scotland. He entered the grammar school in Glasgow when seven years old. He next passed to St. Andrew's College, and afterwards to the divinity school of the Established Church, and was licensed to preach the Gospel at the age of twenty-one. During his college course he served as private tutor to an only son of a branch of the great family of Argyle. At the age of twenty-six he became the assistant and successor of the Rev. Dr. Mushett. at Shettleston, a suburb of Glasgow. Soon after he was called to the largest and most numerous congregation in the whole of Scotland at Aberbrotheck, a seaport and manufacturing town between Montrose and Aberdeen, situated on the German Ocean. In the year 1835 Mr. McFarland came to New York, and a little later went to Delaware County, settled by Scotch people, many of whom were the associates and schoolmates of his boyhood. After a few years he removed to Ulster County, and in 1838 was called to be the pastor of the Reformed Dutch Church of Bloominegdale. During his ministry in that place a beautiful church was erected in the neighboring village of Rosendale, principally through his personal efforts. Unusual accessions were made to the membership, and he continued as pastor of the united congregations until the year 1844, when he was called to a large and flourishing congregation at Canajoharie. In 1848 he became the pastor of the Reformed Dutch Church of English Neighborhood, where he remained seven years. After a brief visit to Canada, he returned to Ulster County as pastor of the Reformed Dutch Church of Esopus and St. Remy Chapel. In

1861 he relinquished Esopus and St. Remy, and the next year became minister of a Presbyterian congregation in Galway, Fulton County. From this date until his death his ecclesiastical relations were with the Presbyterian body. In 1866 he left Galway, and became pastor of a congregation at Port Washington, a pleasant summer retreat on the Shrewsbury River, Monmouth County, N. J. He died March 23, 1870. Mr. McFarland was distinguished for his scholarship. He was an excellent linguist. “As a preacher, Mr. McFarland was careful in his preparations, which he delighted in making even to the last. There was the careful use of language, brevity in treatment, and such use and application of the truth as was suited to excite the spirit of devotion, to awaken love and reverence, and to administer satisfying consolation to the penitent and mourner. His positions in the ministry attest popular qualities, his labors evince practical tact, and his success in gathering men and women into the fold attest the blessing of the Good Shepherd upon his ministrations.”

McFarland, James Hunter

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Harrisburg, Pa., March 10, 1809; was converted in 1827, and soon after licensed to preach, and admitted to the Philadelphia Conference in 1830. His ministerial charges were Trenton Circuit, Essex, Bergen Neck Mission, Plainfield, Westchester, Bustleton, Dover, Elkton, Agency for Dickinson College, Newcastle, Columbia, Eighth Street, Philadelphia, presiding eldership of Reading District, Frankford, Bordentown, and Haverstraw, N. J. In 1852, while a member of the New Jersey Conference, his health failed, and he was transferred to the Philadelphia Conference as a supernumerary. In June, 1862, he was appointed chaplain of the United States Hospital in Philadelphia, and in this relation he prosecuted his ministry to the close of his life, March 23,1863. His last words were addressed to his wife: “Mother. I am dying! Lord Jesus, take me!” McFarland was for more than twenty years a corresponding member of the Academy of Natural Sciences in Philadelphia, and was also a member of the Entomological Society. “He was a very faithful and devoted minister of Christ, and did the work of an evangelist successfully. He was warm in his friendship, faithful to the demands of duty, and above everything that looked like a compromise of Christian principle.” — *Conference Minutes*, 1863, p. 47.

Mcfarlane, Jessie,

a female preacher of the Society of Friends, was born about the year 1842; commenced preaching at seventeen, at first to girls and women, but later also to men. After eight years of this service, she became the wife of Dr. Brodie, of Edinburgh, and spent the remainder of her life in more private activity for the cause of her Master. She died about 1869. Her preaching was impressive, her life one of uncommon purity and devotion, her death triumphant. She wrote a paper on the scriptural authority for the preaching of women, which is inserted in a memoir of her life, entitled *In Memoriam. Jessie McFarlane*, by J. G. (Lond. 1872,12mo). See *Friends' Review* (Phila.), Oct. 12.1872.

Mcferrin, James,

a distinguished minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Washington County, Va., March 25, 1784. His ancestors emigrated from Ireland to this country about the year 1740. His father was a Presbyterian, a farmer, a strict observer of the Lord’s day, and esteemed for his sobriety, good judgment, and intelligence. Mr. McFerrin’s educational advantages were very limited, the years of his minority being passed on his father’s farm, where, however, he acquired habits of industry, sobriety, and enterprise. On his twentieth birthday he was married to Jane Campbell Berry; shortly after which event he removed from Virginia to Rutherford County, Tenn. The country was new, the settlements exposed to depredations by the Indians; hardships and dangers were consequently inseparable from such a condition of things. Mr. McFerrin gave great attention to military tactics, in which he became thoroughly skilled, and, on the breaking out of the war with Great Britain in 1812, he was called into service, and, as captain of a company of volunteers, was engaged in a campaign against the Creek Indians under that renowned man, general Jackson. On account of his brave conduct at the battle in which the Indians were defeated, Mr. McFerrin was elected colonel. In his thirty-sixth year his whole course of life was changed, the result of which was that he thenceforth devoted himself to the work of the ministry. In 1823 he became a member of the Tennessee Annual Conference, and was appointed to the Jackson Circuit, in the northern part of Alabama. He had charge of this circuit two years. The two subsequent years (1826 and 1827) he traveled the Limestone Circuit, and at the close of this period removed to the vicinity of Courtland, Ala., where he purchased a farm, and remained

for several years. This was in the Franklin Circuit, which he traveled in the years 1828 and 1829. During this period he attended the General Conference held in Pittsburg in 1828. He was also a delegate to the General Conference of 1832, held in Philadelphia. At the close of his labors on the Franklin Circuit he was made presiding elder of the Richland District, which he traveled four years. In the year 1834, having determined to remove to Western Tennessee, he deemed it proper to locate for one year, till he should be settled in his new home. In 1835 he was re-admitted into Conference, and appointed to the Wesley Circuit, which he traveled two years. His next appointment was to Randolph and Harmony, for one year; and to the Wesley Circuit for one year (1839), which proved to be the last of his itinerant life. Among his papers is the following record, made in 1839: "Since I joined Conference, Nov. 25, 1823, I have preached 2088 times, baptized 573 adults and 813 infants, and have taken into society 3965 members." Mr. McFerrin died Sept. 4, 1840.

Mcgaughey, William G.,

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born in Davidson County, Tenn., Jan. 12, 1812; was converted in 1833; was licensed to exhort at Holly Springs, Miss., about 1843; and shortly after received license to preach, and accomplished much good for the Church in this capacity. He was also for several years agent for the American Bible Society. In 1847 he was ordained deacon by bishop Soule; elder by bishop Andrew in 1852; in 1855 was admitted into Louisiana Conference, and appointed to Swan Lake and Pecan Grove; to Lake Providence in 1.858 Carroll Circuit in 1859; Tensas and Elizabeth Chapel in 1861; Tensas Mission in 1863; Wesley, Tensas, and Jordan Chapel in 1864; Tensas District in 1865; Lake Providence District in 1867; Carroll Circuit in 1870; and in 1871 Lake Providence. He died Jan. 26, 1872. Mr. McGaughey was a devoted Christian and an able minister, much esteemed by all who knew him. — *Conference Minutes of the M. C. Church South,* 1872, s.v.

Mcgavin, William,

a celebrated Scotch layman and writer, was born in the parish of Auchinleck, Ayrshire, Aug. 12,1773. His parents were in very moderate circumstances, and young McGavin therefore enjoyed but slender educational advantages. While yet a boy he was apprenticed to a bookseller and printer, but soon made himself a host of friends by the great literary

talent he displayed in frequent contributions to the local newspapers. He was entrusted with the care of an elementary school, which he conducted with skill, though he hated the drudgery of teaching. He took an early opportunity to quit the rostrum, and to seek a livelihood in the counting-house. He became the agent of the British Linen Company's banking establishment in Glasgow. Although this business connection gave him great care and responsibility, McGavin's fondness of writing would not allow him to withdraw altogether from literary labors, and, by habits of unwearied industry, he was enabled to command leisure for the publication of many valuable religious tracts. An ardent opponent of Romanism, he attacked it in a series of papers entitled the "Protestant" (1818-21), which Dr. Robert Hall (Review of Birt's *Popery*) pronounced "the fullest delineation of the popish system, and the most powerful confutation of its principles, in a popular style." McGavin also edited John Howie's *Scotch Worthies,* and John Knox's *Hist. of the Reformation,* and frequently preached to the poor and the humble in the suburbs of Glasgow. He died in 1832. See Chambers's and Thomson's *Biog. Dict. of Eminent Scotsmen* (1865), vol. 3, s.v.; Jamieson, *Dict. of Reli. Biog.* s.v.; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors,* vol. ii, s.v.

Mcgee, William C.

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Paterson, N. J., Aug. 15, 1816, and was educated at New Jersey College, N. J. (class of 1836), and at the theological seminary, Princeton, N. J. In 1841 he was licensed and ordained pastor of Hardwick and Marksborough churches, where he remained until his death, May 25, 1867. Mr. McGee, as a preacher, was earnest, lucid, and practical; as a pastor, constant and zealous; as a citizen, intelligent and public-spirited. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac,* 1868, p. 127.

Mcgilvary, Archibald B.

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born in the Isle of Skye, coast of Scotland, towards the close of the last century. He came to this country in 1806, joined the South Carolina Conference in 1832, and died at Greenville, S. C., June 9, 1863. "Brother McGilvary was a modest, cheerful, and agreeable man, a faithful friend, and good citizen. As a minister of Christ, he was holy, laborious, and *useful." — Conference Minutes of the M. E. Church South,* 2:449.

Mcglashan, Alexander,

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Queenston, Canada, Feb. 23, 1812; pursued his preparatory studies in the academy in Geneva, N.Y.; graduated at Hobart College, Geneva, N.Y., and in 1840 at the theological seminary in Auburn, N.Y. He was licensed and ordained as all evangelist in 1843. and afterwards commissioned by the American Tract Society as a general agent to the Southern States. While in this employ he built a mariner's church in Mobile, Ala.; subsequently his services were transferred from the tract and colportage efforts to the cause of the Seaman's Friend Society. In 1859 he again removed to the North, and in 1863 commenced work for the cause of the sailor in New York City, where he established a new church, called the Church of the Sea and Land. In 1866 he removed to St. Catharine's, Canada, where he remained until his death, Sept. 9,1867. Mr. McGlashan was a man of extraordinary Christian zeal, peculiar talents, and marked success. See Wilson, *Presb. list. Almanac,* 1868, p. 128.

Mcgorrisk, Bernard,

a Roman Catholic priest, was born in Ireland in 1818; went to Paris to pursue an academical course, and there also studied theology; emigrated to this country early in 1842; was engaged for several months as professor of French at St. John's College (Fordham, N. Y.); afterwards went as missionary priest to the West, where he labored for nearly eighteen years, building fifteen or sixteen churches. About 1860 he removed to Brooklyn, where he built the present church of St. Vincent de Paul. He died Oct. 29, 1865. — New *Amer. Cyclop.* 1865, p. 654.

Mcgregor, David,

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Ireland in 1711, and from 1736 until his death (May 30,1777) was pastor of Londonderry Church, New Hampshire. He received the degree of A.M. from New Jersey College. He published *Sermons sand Theological Treatises* (1741-74). See Drake, *Dict. of Amer. Biog. s.v.*

Mchenry, Barnabas,

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in one of the eastern counties of Virginia Dec. 10,1767*;* was converted when only fifteen years of age, and shortly after joined the Church. Called to preach

the Gospel, he entered the itinerancy in May, 1787, and was appointed to Yadkin Circuit. Thereafter he successively served the cause of his Master in the following appointments: in 1788 at Cumberland Circuit: in 1789 at Danville; in 1790 at Madison; in 1791 at Cumberland; was placed in charge of the district in 1792, and in 1793 of an enlarged number of circuits; in 1.794 he was sent to Salt River Circuit; in 1795 was located on account of impaired health; in 1819 was readmitted, and appointed presiding elder of Salt River District, Tennessee Conference, but his health again failed him, and he was finally obliged to retire from active work, and take the place of a super-annuate. He died at Mount Pleasant, near Springfield, Ky. June 16, 1833. "Barnabas McHenry," is the testimony of one, "was a man of strong mind and able in argument. He stood upon the walls of our Zion and defended her bulwarks when she was assailed by an enemy." Bishop Bascom says, "Of the early years of his ministry but little is known, except vague yet cherished traditions of the beauty, unction, and eloquence of his preaching, together with the dangers and hardships to which he was exposed as a pioneer missionary in the wilderness of the West from 1788 to 1795.... Even a century in a single community produces few such men as Barnabas *McHenry* and Valentine Cook. They were men by themselves, and their memory would adorn the history of any Church or age." See Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit,* 7:143 sq.; Finley, *Sketches of the M. E. Church South; Minutes of Conferences,* 1834.

Mcilvaine (Or Macllvaine), Charles Petit, D.D.,

an eminent divine of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born in Burlington, New Jersey, June 18, 1799. His father, Joseph McIlvaine, was a leading lawyer and United States senator from New Jersey at the time of his death, in 1826. Charles graduated in 1816 at Princeton; was admitted to deacon's orders July 4, 1820, by bishop White, and, having labored in Christ Church, Georgetown, Md., he received two years later priest's orders from bishop Kemp, of Maryland. In 1825 he became professor of ethics and chaplain in the United States Military Academy at West Point. In 1827 he became rector of St. Ann's Church, Brooklyn, N.Y., where he remained until 1832, when he was consecrated bishop of Ohio. While rector at Brooklyn, he also held the professorship of evidences of revealed religion and sacred antiquities in the University of the City of New York. In the episcopacy, Dr. McIlvaine quickly made a name for himself as a man of learning, and of unusual kindliness of disposition, not only in his own Church, but among all Christians, both in this country and in Europe. For

the last ten years or more he was looked upon as the representative of the Low Churchmen of the Protestant Episcopal Church. In his death (which occurred at Florence, Italy, while on a journey for recreation, March 14, 1873), irenical theology has lost one of its ablest advocates, and the Evangelical Association one of its most active promoters. Bishop McIllvaine was a large contributor to theological literature. His *Lectures on the Evidences of Christianity* (9th ed. 1857, 12mo, reprinted in England and Scotland), delivered in New York University in 1831, were published by request of the Council, and have gone through many editions. During the early part of the controversy arising out of the Oxford tracts, appeared his *Oxford Divinity compared with that of the Romnish and Anglican Churches* (Phila. 1841, 8vo ; Lond. 1841, 8vo), which the *Edinburgh Review* recommended as one of the best "confutations of the Oxford school." In 1854 he published a volume of sermons entitled *The Truth and the Life.* He also compiled two volumes of *Select Family and Parish Sermons* (Columbus, Ohio, 1839, 2 vols. 8vo). His other works of a minor character are, *The Sinner's Justification before God* (*N.Y.* 18mo; Lond. 1851, sq.): — *The Holy Catholic Church* (Phila. 18mo; Lond. 1844, 16mo): — No *Priest, no Altar, no Sacrifice, but Christ* (N. Y. 12mo; Lond. 12mo): — *Valedictory Offering; Five Sermons* (1853, 12mo): — *A Word in Season to Candidates for Confirnation*: — *The Doctrines of the Prot. Epis. Church as to Confirmation*: — *Chief Danger of the Church*: — *The Truth and the Life; a Series of Twenty-two Discourses* (N. Y. 1865, 8vo; Lond. 1855, 8vo; this volume was published at the request of the Convention of the Diocese of Ohio, together with *A Memoir of the Rev. Chas. Simeon,* both published in New York); and contributed articles to the *N. Y.* (quarterly) *Review,* the *Episcopal* (monthly) *Observer,* the *London* (monthly) *Christian Observer,* the *Protestant Churchman* (New York), the *Episcopal Recorder* (Phila.), and the *Western Episcopalian* (Gambier, Ohio). In 1853 the degree of D.C.L. was conferred upon him by the University of Oxford, and in 1858 that of LL.D. by the University of Cambridge. He was distinguished for the soundness and clearness of his evangelical views, and for the expository character of his preaching. "That for which as a preacher he is most eminent is his power of illustrating Scripture by Scripture; and his mode of doing this shows at once the fullness and the accuracy of his knowledge of Scripture and the transparent simplicity of his conception... . in all his preaching he aims to lay broad and deep the foundations of the Christian character, in strong, clear views of man's sinfulness and need, and Christ's fullness and freeness as a Savior."

See Fish, *Pulpit Eloquence of the Nineteenth Century* (N.Y. 1857, 442, q.v.) for a notice of this excellent prelate, and a sermon of his on the resurrection of Christ. See, also, *Western Memorabilia; Knickerbocker,* 35:42; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibl.* 1:1911; Allibone, *Dict. Brit. and Amer. Authors,* vol. ii, s.v. (J. H. W.)

McIver, J. W.

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born Sept. 19, 1835; professed religion in 1858; joined the Memphis Conference in 1861, and filled the Chulahoma and Good Springs circuits. He joined the Confederate army in the late civil war. In 1865 and 1866 he was appointed to the Richland and Cassida circuits; and in 1867 to the Iuka Circuit. He died suddenly, of congestion, while on his way to an appointment, Jan. 17,1868. "Brother McIvor was a very promising young preacher, much beloved by all the people where he preached, and it is with feelings of deepest sadness that we record his early death." See *Conference Minutes of the M. E. Church South.* 3:246.

Mckay, William,

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Columbiana County, Ohio, July 7, 1825; pursued his academic course at Jefferson College, Canonsburg, Pa.; studied theology at the Western Theological Seminary, Alleghany City, Pa.; was licensed by the Presbytery of New Lisbon, and immediately took temporary charge of the Church at Yellow Creek; but, owing to ill health and other causes, had to give up his labors. He died Jan. 19, 1863. Mr. McKay possessed an extensive knowledge of the Scriptures, and was well versed in theology. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac,* 1864, p. 187.

McKean, James W.

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Lawrence County, Pa., April 30, 1833; was educated at Richmond College and Jefferson College, Canonsburg, Pa. (class of 1859), and at the Western Theological Seminary; in 1862 was licensed and ordained by the Ohio Presbytery, with a view to labor as a domestic missionary in the Lake Superior region; in 1863 was elected principal of the Synodical School at Hopkinton, Iowa, where he continued to labor until May, 1864, when he enlisted in the service of his country. He died while in camp, July 9, 1854. Mr. McKean was an accurate scholar, a

good teacher, and a model of Christian piety. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1866, p. 137.

McKean, Joseph

D.D., LL.D., a Congregational minister, was born April 19, 1776, in Ipswich, Mass.; graduated at Harvard College in 1794; entered the ministry, and was ordained pastor in Milton, Mass., Nov. 1, 1797; resigned Oct. 3, 1804; was elected professor of mathematics in Harvard College in 1806, but declined, and was chosen Boylston professor of rhetoric in 1809. He remained in this position until his health failed. He died at Havana March 17, 1818. He published a *Memoir of the Rev. John Eliot, S.T.D.*, in the *Hist. Coll.*, and several occasional sermons and addresses. See Sprague, *Annals*, 2:414.

Mckearn, Richard

a Baptist minister, was born in Rawdon, Ireland, Aug. 22, 1804, and emigrated with his parents, while yet a youth, to the British possessions this side the Atlantic, and finally settled at Rowdon, N. F. Richard was reared in the Episcopal Church, but in 1820 was converted under the preaching of elder James Munro, a Baptist evangelist, and in 1821 finally joined the Baptists; he began preaching in 1826, and March 10, 1828, became the pastor of a congregation at Rowdon In May, 1829, he was called upon to assume the pastors ate of a Baptist congregation at Windsor also, and he thereafter preached both at Rowdon and Windsor until about 1836, when ill health compelled him to withdraw from the ministry. Deprived of the advantages of academic training, he had prepared for college while in the ministry, and in 1839 matriculated at King’s College, and there graduated in due course of time, and took his degree of B.A. In 1842, his health still too feeble to reenter the ministry, he removed to Dartmouth, and established himself in business. He died Aug. 17,1860, acknowledged by all who knew him to have been “a conspicuous example of unbending Christian integrity, and earnest, steadfast devotion to the cause of Christ.” “As a preacher,” says one of his contemporaries and associates, “Mr. McKearn commanded the full attention of his auditory. His manner was earnest and energetic; his subjects practical, and treated with clearness and precision. Their application to the heart and conscience was with great power. His language was free and copious, his voice excellent, and capable of great modulation. As his subject required, he was

earnestly winning and persuasive, or denounced with fearful energy the courses of the ungodly." See *The Christian Messenger* (Halifax), Oct. 17, 1860.

Mckeen, Joseph, D.D.,

a Congregational minister, noted as an educator, was born Oct. 15, 1757, in Londonderry, N. H.; graduated at Dartmouth in 1774; served under general Sullivan in the Revolution; was licensed to preach, and ordained pastor in Beverly in May, 1785. In 1802 he was chosen first president of Bowdoin College, and was inaugurated Sept. 2. He died July 15, 1807. "Dr. McKeen possessed a strong and discriminating mind; his manners were conciliating though dignified, and his spirit mild though firm and decided. He was indefatigable in his exertions to promote the interests of science and religion. He was respectable for his learning and exemplary for his Christian virtues, being pious without ostentation, and adhering to evangelical truth without bigotry or superstition." He published his *Inaugural Address* and a few occasional *Sermons.* — Sprague, *Annals,* 2:216.

Mckendree, William,

a bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in King William County, Va., July 6,1757. He was the subject of frequent religious impressions in youth, but he failed to find peace. He was an adjutant and commissary in Washington's army for several years, and was present at the surrender of Cornwallis at Yorktown in 1781; in 1787 he was converted, during the great revival that occurred under the labors of the Rev. John Easter; and entered the itinerancy June 17, 1788. In 1796 he was made presiding elder; in 1801 was sent by the bishops to preside over Kentucky District, and to have general superintendence of the Western Conference, then embracing Ohio, Kentucky, Tennessee, Western Virginia, and part of Illinois; and in 1806 was presiding elder on Cumberland District, with the same supervision of the Conference. At the General Conference in Baltimore, May, 1810, McKendree was finally promoted to the highest office in the gift of the Church — the episcopacy. He died March 5, 1835, at his brother's, near Nashville, Tenn., having preached faithfully almost fifty years, been twelve years a presiding elder, and nearly twenty-seven years a bishop in the Church. Bishop McKendree was one of the most eminent of all the preachers and pastors of his age. From the time of his

first efforts he was marked as a man of the most vigorous genius, the most genuine modesty, and the most devoted piety. Although not classically educated, his broad and grasping mind went oil acquiring and growing until it had digested and could wield at will a vast and varied knowledge. His imagination was grand and fervid, but always healthy; and could give to his knowledge the freshness of romance, or to his judgment the spell of prophecy. His utterance was copious and forcible, and his voice rich, deep, and flexible. These elements of mind and means, employed by a strong and pathetic heart baptized with the Holy Ghost, made him not only the most truly eloquent bishop that his Church has ever possessed, but one of the best preachers of any Church or age. As a pastor, his administrative abilities were unrivalled. He found the economical methods of the Church crude and indefinite, and imparted to them a systematic vigor; and he was a distinguished promoter of her benevolent institutions. As a man and a Christian he was honored by every class of society. His labors were mighty in laying the deep foundations of evangelical religion in the Mississippi Valley, and his genius and devotion are still a power in the churches, and his memory is blessed. See *Minutes of Conferences,* 2:402; *Life,* by B. St. J. Fry, in the M. E. S. S. Library; and that by Bp. Paine, of the M. E. Church South (Nashville, 1869, 2 vols. 12mo); Summers, *Biog. Sketches,* p. 43; Wakely, *Heroes of Methodism,* p. 93; Bennett (W. B.), *Memorials of Methodism in Virginia* (Richm. 1871, 12mo), p. 260 sq.; McFerrin, *Hist. Meth. in Tennessee,* 1:366; Redford, *Hist. Meth. in Kentucky,* 2:28. (G. L. T.)

Mckennan, James Wilson, D.D.

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Washington, Pa., Sept. 2, 1804; graduated at Washington College, Pa., in 1822, and then studied and practiced law at Millersburg, Ohio; subsequently commenced the study of theology with Dr. John Anderson, of Upper Buffalo Church, Pa.; was licensed by Washington Presbytery in 1828, and in 1829 was ordained and installed pastor of the United churches of Lower Buffalo and West Liberty, Pa. In 1835 he accepted a call to Indianapolis, but owing to infirm health he had to resign. He was afterwards engaged in teaching in Wheeling, and at Moundsville, Va., and also as rector in the preparatory department, and adjunct professor of languages ins Washington College. He died July 19, 1861. Dr. McKennan’s character was truly remarkable in candor, benevolence, and meekness; in simplicity and directness of purpose; in

strength of faith and zeal. His sermons were characterized by plainness and directness of style. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac,* 1862, p. 109.

Mckinley, John,

a minister of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, was born in Philadelphia, Pa., July 18, 1815. He was educated at the University of Pennsylvania, which institution he entered when not quite fourteen years old, and there he graduated with the first honor of his class in 1833. From his very childhood the ministry had been looked to as the profession of his life, and he therefore, immediately upon the commotion of his college course, entered upon the study of theology at the theological seminary of his Church, then under the care of Dr. Samuel B. Wylie. In 1835 Mr. McKinley was licensed to preach by the Presbytery of Philadelphia. After filling various minor appointments, he was in 1838 called to the pastorate of the Reformed Presbyterian Church at Milton, Pa. Here he labored acceptably and successfully until 1841, when failing health compelled him to withdraw from active work. His precautions had been taken too late, for he failed rapidly, and died Oct. 5 of the same year. "All who knew him recognized in his death the extinction of one of the bright lights of the Church." His only publication is a series of articles on *the Slave Trade,* which appeared in a weekly periodical at Milton, Pa. "He was a man of cultivated intellect, of sound and discriminating judgment, of generous sympathies and noble impulses, and fervent piety." See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit,* 9:87 sq.

McKinney, Calvin

a Presbyterian minister, was born at Wallkill, Orange County, N. Y., Jan. 12, 1819. He received a good academic education, afterwards studied theology in the Associate Reformed Seminary at Newburg, N. Y., and was licensed and ordained in 1856. He labored successively. at Millport, Mecklenburg, and West Groton, N. Y. He died June 9, 1864. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac,* 1866, p. 220.

McKinney, David

D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Mifflin County, Pa., Oct. 22,1795. He was educated at Jefferson College (class of 1821); then studied theology at the school of divinity at Princeton, N. J.; was licensed to preach by the Presbytery of Philadelphia in April, 1824, and ordained

and installed at Erie, Pa., in May, 1825. In 1835 he removed to the bounds of the Presbytery of Huntingdon, and took charge of the churches at Sinking Creek and Spring; in 1841 he was transferred to Hollidaysburg, in the same presbytery. In 1852, having severed his pastoral relations, Dr. McKinney removed to Philadelphia, and there established the *Presbyteriann Banner*. In 1855 he removed the office of publication to Pittsburg, and there submerged in it the interests of the *Presbyterian Advocate.* He sold the paper in 1864, to become librarian and treasurer for the Board of Colportage of the Synods of Pittsburg and Alleghany, and this position he filled until the time of his decease. Dr. McKinney was a private partner, and at one time in connection with the editorial staff of the *Northwestern Presbyterian Banner*. He died May 28, 1873.

McKinney, Isaac Newton

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Erie, Pa., Oct. 20,1828; graduated at Jefferson College in 1848, and in 1849 engaged in teaching in Alabama; in 1852 he entered the theological seminary at Princeton, but because of failing health was obliged to relinquish his studies; in 1856 he accepted a license to preach, and in 1857 was ordained and installed pastor of Montour's Church, but soon after accepted an appointment as professor of Latin in his alma mater; in 1862 he was engaged in editing the *Presbyterian Banner,* and then in originating and conducting the *Family Treasure,* and died Nov. 20, 1864. Mr. McKinney was a scholar, well versed in language — embracing Latin, Greek, French, and German. As a preacher, he was ardent, direct, and lucid; as a teacher, he had rare capabilities. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac,* 1865, p. 103.

McKinney, James

a Reformed Presbyterian minister, was born in Cookstown, Tyrone County, Ireland, in 1759. After due preparation he entered Glasgow College, where he distinguished himself by close application to study and a display of unusual talents. His next step was to study medicine, but, called of God to preach the Gospel, he finally entered upon the study of theology, was licensed in due time, and constituted pastor of a congregation at Kirkhills, Antrim County, about 1780. In 1793 he emigrated to this country, and was immediately employed as missionary, Four years later he became the pastor of a Reformed Presbyterian Church at Galway and Duanesburg, N. Y., and there he remained until 1804, when he accepted a

call to a Church at Chester County, S. C. He went south in May, but lived only a few months; he died Sept. 10, 1804. Dr. McMasters thus comments upon McKinney (in Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 9:2): "Of the character of Mr. McKinney as a preacher, and of the power of his eloquence, the very large assemblies that everywhere attended his ministry, and the uniform testimony of all well-informed and serious men, of various denominations. leave no room for doubt... . One feature of his ministerial character may perhaps be inferred from the plan of a work which he proposed to publish, the introductory portion of which only he lived to complete. The proposal was a discussion of the Rights of God, the Rights of Christ as Mediator, the Rights of the Church, and the Rights of Humanity in general. Taking the part he published as a specimen of the whole, the reader will regret the failure of the purpose. The work would have been worthy of the man — not only sound in matter, but deep in thought and impressive in style." An Irish journal, commenting on the character of James McKinney, says of him: "The character of James McKinney never was exceeded in the boldness of its outline and in the distinctness and prominency of its features. His eloquence was in perfect character. His heart, possessed with the love of the truth as it is in Jesus, was ever set upon its recommendation and enforcement; and it was when descanting upon the grand Gospel theme of a crucified Savior or asserting the Church's rights, or when, with well-sustained pathos, he mourned the wrongs of Zion, that his mind assumed a gigantic attitude, and put forth its wonderful energies. His diction was clear, copious, strong, and full of pertinent and often brilliant figures. He has frequently, in his public discourses, caught a flame from the working of his judgment, imagination, and feelings; and then his conceptions, conveyed in simple, energetic language, or in bright imagery, and in bold and apt allusions, produced an astonishing effect. In America, whose republican institutions he had long loved, the land of enterprise and freedom, was the field which just suited the genius of McKinney; there his powers had full scope for development and exercise."

McKinney, John

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Bellefonte, Pa., Aug. 26, 1797; graduated at Jefferson College, Canonsburg, Pa., in 1817; studied theology in the seminary at Princeton, N. J., and was licensed by Philadelphia Presbytery in 1824; was ordained and installed pastor of the Church at Fredericksburg, Ohio, in 1829; subsequently became pastor of the Church

at Alexandria, Pa., and still later a supply at Oswego, Ill. He died in 1867. Mr. McKinney's life was one of real sacrifice and great usefulness; he was mild, affectionate, trustworthy, and eminently righteous. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac,* 1868. p. 131.

McKinnon, J.

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Esquessing, C. W. His early education was commenced in Oneida Institute, in N. Y., in 1837; in 1838 he placed himself under the tuition of Dr. Rae, in Hamilton, C. W. His collegiate studies were pursued in Queen's College, Kingston, C. W., and Knox College, Toronto. In 1844 he was licensed, and became pastor successively of the St. Thomas, Owen Sound, and Beckwith churches. He died Dec. 24, 1865. Mr. McKinnon was a man of sterling integrity and conscientious fidelity; he possessed a competent knowledge of the languages. but excelled in the logical and mathematical faculties. See Wilson, *Piesb. Hist. Almanac,* 1867, p. 478.

Mclachlan, James

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Glasgow, Scotland, in 1797; was educated in the Glasgow University, and studied divinity in the theological seminary of the Old Burgher section of the Secession Church; was licensed in 1827, and ordained as a missionary to Southern Africa, under the patronage of the London Missionary Society, but after two years' residence at the Cape of Good Hope he was compelled by ill-health to return. In 1830 he was made chaplain of the Seamen's Chapel in the city of Glasgow; but, becoming dissatisfied with his ecclesiastical connection, he joined the Reformed Presbyterian Church, and in 1834 was sent by the Scottish Synod of the Church to Canada West as their missionary. Subsequently he accepted a call from the congregation at Lisbon, N. Y., where he continued till his death, Nov. 19, 1864. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac,* 1866, p. 292.

Mclain, John

a Presbyterian minister, was born near Bloomingsburg, Ohio, April 2, 1824; was educated at the South Salem Academy, Ohio, and studied theology with Dr. Carothers and Rev. H. S. Fullerton, and for a short time at the Western Theological Seminary Alleghany City, Pa.; was licensed in 1852, and ordained in 1853, as pastor of Harmony Church. During the last

few years of his life he was connected with the Western Reserve Presbytery, and was a commissioner from that presbytery to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, which met at Columbus, Ohio, in 1862. He died June 24, 1862. Mr. McLain was a man of indomitable energy, great zeal, and geniality of spirit. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1863, p. 193.

Mclane, James Woods, D.D.

a Presbyterian divine, was born in Charlotte, N. C., May 22, 1801; received his preparatory training in Phillips' Academy, Andover, Mass.; graduated with high honor at Yale College in 1828, and in 1834 at Andover Theological Seminary; was licensed by the Andover Congregational Association in 1835; was shortly after ordained pastor of the Madison Street Presbyterian Church in New York, and labored there until 1856, when he became pastor of the Presbyterian Church at Williamsburg, L. I. There he labored with untiring zeal until 1863, when he resigned on account of failing health. During his ministry Dr. McLane contributed frequently to the religious press; was for many years director of the American Bible Society, and prepared for this society an improved standard edition of the Bible. He was also for many years recorder of the Union Theological Seminary, and secretary of the Church Erection Fund. He died at Brooklyn, N. Y., Feb. 26, 1864. Dr. McLane was a man of fine talents and scholarship; as a preacher, earnest and practical; as a writer, bold and uncompromising. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1865, p. 168; Appleton, *New Amer. Cyclop.* 1864, p. 595.

Mclaurin, James

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Perthshire, Scotland, in 1796; graduated at Edinburgh; studied theology in Glasgow; and in 1824 was licensed and ordained by a presbytery of the Church of Scotland. In 1840 he emigrated to the United States, became pastor successively of the Plainfield and Paw Paw churches, within the bounds of Kalamazoo Presbytery, Mich., and subsequently preached at Birmingham and Fentonville, Mich. He died May 11, 1860. Mr. McLaurin was an able and learned minister. See Wilson. *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1861, p. 161.

McLean, Alexander

a Presbyterian minister, was born in the Island of North Uist, Scotland, in March, 1827. His early advantages were poor-his boyhood being a constant battle for existence against the strong arm of Romanism. He graduated at the Edinburgh University, and afterwards studied theology; while thus engaged he was associated with the Rev. Mr. Hall in the Glasgow Home Mission work. In 1855 he came to Canada, and in 1856 was ordained pastor of the East Puslinch congregation, where he remained till his death, May 25, 1864. Mr. McLean was an effective minister, and an ardent laborer in the mission work. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac,* 1866, p. 372.

McLean, Charles G.

D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Armagh County, Ireland, March 17,1787; graduated at the University of Pennsylvania in 1808, and studied theology under the Rev. Dr. John M. Mason, of the Associate Reformed Church; was licensed in 1812, and ordained pastor of the Presbyterian Church near Gettysburg, Pa., during which pastorate he became an Independent. In 1844 he accepted a call from the Reformed Dutch Church at Fort Plains, N. Y., and in 1852 emigrated to the West, and, in connection with his son-in-law, established a female seminary at Indianapolis, Ind. He died July 4,1860. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac,* 1861, p. 101.

McLeod, Alexander

D.D., a minister of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, was born in the Island of Mull June 12, 1774. His father and grandfather were ministers of the Church of Scotland. In 1792 he came to America and entered Union College, where he graduated in 1798. In 1799 he was licensed by the Reformed Presbytery at Coldenham, and in 1801 was installed pastor of the First Reformed Presbyterian Church. His first publication was *Negro Slavery Unjustifiable* (N. Y. 1802). In 1803 appeared *Messiah governing the Nations;* in 1816, *Ecclesiatstical Catechism*: — *The Gospel Ministry*: — *Lectures on the Prophecies*: — *Sermons on the War*: — *Life and Power of True Godliness.* He was the chief organizer of the American Colonization Society in 1816, and wrote its constitution. During his pastoral career he received various calls to other churches, to colleges, and to editorships; but he declined them all, and remained in his charge until his

death, Feb. 17, 1833. See Wiley (Sam. B.), *Memoir of A. McLeod, D.D.* (N. Y. 1855, 8vo); Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1862, p. 261; Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 9:9 sq.

McLeod, Cornelius

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born about 1820; joined the Church when but a boy; entered the South Carolina Conference in 1837, and for nearly thirty years labored faithfully and zealously for the cause of the Redeemer. His last appointment was Richland Fork Mission. He died April 9, 1866. "McLeod was a successful laborer, and was much beloved by those for whom he labored. Remarkably amiable, he won without effort the affections of those with whom he was associated; and now, though he has passed away, he lives in the hearts of his *people." — Conference Minutes of the M. E. Church South*, 3:17.

McLeod, Norman

D.D., one of the most noted Scotch divines of our day, was born at Campbelltown, Argyleshire, June 3, 1812. He was early destined for the ministry by his father, who was at the time of Norman's birth parish minister of Campbelltown, and Norman was to make the fourth generation of the McLeods in the ministry of the Scotch Kirk. To fit him properly for the responsible position he was to occupy in the near future, his father accepted a parish near Glasgow, and Norman made his preparatory studies for college at Glasgow. His academic education he obtained at Edinburgh, and he then traveled for some time in Germany and the northern countries of Europe. On his return to Scotland he studied theology at Edinburgh, enjoying especially the counsel and instruction of the celebrated Dr. Chalmers. He was licensed to preach in 1838, and "with the Norse tongue in him, and a vigorous Celtic imagination," he soon found a parish ready to receive him, and was ordained pastor of London, in Ayrshire. Here he labored faithfully until 1843, the year so eventful to the Scotch Kirk. *SEE SCOTLAND*. Though Norman McLeod had been a pupil of Dr. Chalmers, and greatly esteemed the doctor, he refused to leave the establishment, and even opposed the Free Church movement. In consequence of this decision to remain a Churchman many offers of promotion came to his door, and he finally accepted the parish of Dalkeith, where he resided until 1851, when he was called to the Barony Church of Glasgow, whither he removed, and "substantially began the real work of his life," among a membership of

from eleven to twelve hundred adults, who by his guidance not only walked themselves in the path of righteousness, but were the means of promoting Christian holiness and ameliorating the condition of the poor and the forsaken. “Commonly,” says his biographer, Dr. Walter C. Smith (in *Good Words,* Aug. 1872, p. 513),”’ he preached thrice every Sabbath, besides conducting a large class of his own; and his preaching was no mere stringing together of theological commonplaces, but the expression of earnest thought about the highest things, full of practical help and counsel for living men... . Neither did he regard his congregation merely as a company of people to be preached to, but rather as a body of men whom he had to lead unto every good work.” Aside from his parish work, extended as it was far beyond the labor usually performed by three ministers, he edited for ten years the *Edinbusrgh Christian Magazine,* a periodical of the old religious type, which, while it existed, did much good to the people who read it, but proved a heavy loss both to publisher and editor. In spite of McLeod’s connection with this literary venture, Mr. Strahan, the noted British publisher, hesitated not to court the services of Dr. McLeod when in 1860 the publication of *Good Words* was projected. The manner in which the doctor replied to the invitation is well worthy of the Christian minister of Glasgow (comp. *Contemporary Review,* 1872, July, p. 29 sq.). The success of *Good Words* as a literary venture has been almost unprecedented in the annals of magazine literature. “Wherever the English language is read it has familiarized the people with the great leaders of theological thought; has brought into the cottage specimens of the pencil of the most eminent artists; has diffused sound information on secular truth; and has been the means of introducing to the poor, poets of eminence and writers of wholesome fiction. Its pages, too, were often graced with the kindly productions of the editor’s own pen. Many of his works, now published in book form, and of deservedly high popularity, first appeared in *Good Words."* A recognition of his able services came to Dr. McLeod in his later years from a quarter where, as a member of the Church outside the Anglican establishment, he could hardly have expected so much-we refer to his appointment, upon the death of Dr. Robert Lee, to the chaplaincy to the queen of England, a honor which never before fell to the lot of any Scotch minister except William Carstairs. In the midst of these varied labors, while still in fullest sympathy with the great life that stirred around him, and full of hope for its progress, and doing his full share of the task, death came upon him, June 16, 1872, causing a loss deeply felt not only by his own Church, but by all evangelical

denominations, by the rich and the poor, the high and the low; for it must be borne in mind that his genial, great, noble nature made its influence felt everywhere; and "he considered no work foreign to him if it could be called his Master's business." "Perhaps no other minister of the Church of Scotland was so generally beloved or exercised so potent an influence for good. His charity was remarkable. He extended the hearty hand of fellowship to men of all sects believing in Jesus Christ and him crucified. In the pulpit his utterances Mere peculiarly fresh and eloquent; and reproof and instruction, conveyed in a spirit of love, came home with striking effect to men's business and bosoms. He had a holy horror of shams in whatever guise they might be presented;" and we do not wonder that the man who is most competent to speak of him is constrained to say that Dr. Norman McLeod was "the most manly man" he ever knew; "the most genial, the most many-sided, and yet the least angular" (John Strahan, publisher of *Good Words,* in *Contemporary Review,* July, 1872, p. 291 sq.). "Norman McLeod," continues Mr. Strahan, "was no mere paper, and pulpit, and platform good man, putting all. his goodness into books, and sermons, and speeches. Where he was best known — known as standing the crucial test of the 'dreary intercourse of daily life' — there he was most respected and beloved. Glasgow had known him for many a year as a most unpretentious and yet most indefatigable worker for his brethren's weal in this life and beyond this life: and money-making Glasgow struck work in the middle of the week to show that it felt it had lost its best citizen." It should not be omitted here that Dr. McLeod strove hard to advance the cause of the Indian Mission scheme of the Church of Scotland by not only obtaining for it the contributions of the Church, but by inducing men of high Christian and educational attainments to undertake the work of preaching the Gospel to the people of India. He himself visited India only a short time before his death to inquire into the success of the Mission and to advance its interests more ably. His last speech before the last Assembly he attended was to revive the mission zeal of the Church. (J. H. W.)

McLeod, Xavier Donald

a Roman Catholic priest, was born in New York about 1821. and was the son of the celebrated Presbyterian divine, Dr. Alexander McLeod. He was educated at Columbia College; studied theology; took orders in the Episcopal Church in 1845; sailed for Europe in 1850, and while abroad embraced Roman Catholicism. After his return to this country he devoted himself to the publication of several works of a secular nature, besides a

Life of Mary Queen of Scots (1857). About 1860 he became professor of belles-lettres at Mount St. Mary's College, near Cincinnati; subsequently entered the priesthood, and died in August, 1865. — *New Amer. Cyclop.* 1865, p. 648.

Mcloughlin, F. T.

a Roman Catholic priest, was born in the parish of Aglia, Upper Canada, in 1836; was educated at the College of St. Michael, Toronto; studied for the priesthood in the Seminary of St. Mary's, Baltimore, Md.; was ordained priest in Brooklyn for that diocese; died in New York Aug. 3, 1863. "He won by his attention to the best interests of his people, the sincere admiration of all." — *New Amer. Cyclop.* 1865, p. 645.

Mclure, Daniel Milton

a Presbyterian minister, was born near Flat Rock, S. C., Dec. 1835; pursued his studies at Davidson College, N. C., and subsequently at Oglethorpe University, Ga. (class of 1858); studied divinity in the theological seminary at Columbia, S. C.; and in 1861 was licensed to preach, and supplied a Church in Alabama. In 1864 he was regularly ordained and installed pastor of Williamsburg Church, and died Oct. 25, 1865. Mr. McLure's mind was of more than ordinary strength; independence and clearness characterized his thoughts, deliberation and study formed his opinions. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac,* 1867, p. 44-7.

Mcmahon, William,

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born in Dumfries, Prince William County, Va., about 1785; was converted at a camp-meeting held near Oldtown, Md.; was appointed class-leader by Peter Cartwright, and afterwards licensed to exhort by the Rev. James Quinn, and soon after to preach, and was received into the traveling connection in 1811. His first appointment was Silver Creek, in the territory of Indiana; in 1812 he was sent to Kentucky, where he remained four years, and traveled the Lexington, Shelby, Jefferson, and Fleming circuits. Under this four years' ministry thousands were awakened and converted. In 1816 he was transferred to the Mississippi Conference to take charge of a district. He started on his journey with bishop Roberts, but was taken sick at Nashville, and there transferred by bishop McKendree to the Tennessee Conference,

and was appointed to Nashville Circuit. After that time he became one of the leading minds of the Tennessee and Memphis Conferences. His health having failed, he located, and removed from North Alabama to De Soto County, Miss., in December, 1835; was readmitted into the traveling connection at the second session of the Memphis Conference, held in the fall of 1841, and was appointed to Holly Springs District, where he remained four years. He continued in the regular work, preaching with a power and success such as but few men ever had, until his health gave way. For several years before his death he sustained either a supernumerary or a superannuated relation. He died about 1867 or 1868. “Few men, during the present century, have exerted a greater influence upon Methodism in the South. For fifty years he held up the cross and preached the doctrines of Christianity in Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, and Mississippi, leaving holy foot-prints, and winning votaries to Christ. He was in many respects a most remarkable man. No one ever had the reputation that he had in North Alabama and Mississippi.” — Conference *Minutes of the M. E. Church South*, 1870, s.v.; McFerrin, *Methodism in Tennessee*, 2:426; Redford, *Hist. Meth. in Kentucky*, 2:252.

McMaster, Erasmus D.

D.D., a noted Presbyterian divine, was born in Pennsylvansia. Feb. 4, 1806; gralduated at Union College, N.Y., in 1827; was licensed to preach in 1829; was ordained in 1831, and made pastor at Ballston, N. Y.; was president of the South Hanover College, Indiana, from 1838 to 1845, and of Miami University, Ohio, from 1845 to 1849: was professor of systematic theology in the New Alban Theological Seminary from 1849 to 1866; and was then appointed to the same chair in the theological seminary of the Northwest. He died at Chicago, Illinois, Dec. 10, 1866. Possessed of a vigorous and thoroughly cultured mind and a well-balanced judgment, McMaster succeeded in all he attempted. “His expositions of Scripture and his religious addresses and sermons were exceedingly rich and instructive, and held the attention of all his hearers; while his influence over his students was unbounded.” He published several sermons and addresses, and minor theological treatises. See Drake, *Dict. Amer. Biog.* v. s.; *New Amer. Cyclop.* 1866, p. 463.

McMaster, Gilbert

D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Ireland, Feb. 13, 1778; came to this country when yet a child, and was educated at Jefferson College, Pa., where he graduated in 1803; was ordained August 8, 1808, and was pastor of Duanesburg Church, N. Y., from 1808 to 1840, and of the Church at Princeton, Ind., from 1840 to 1846. He died at New Albany, Ind., March 15, 1854. His works are: *An Essay in Defence of some Fundamental Doctrines of Christianity*: — *An Analysis of the Shorter Catechism* (1815): — An *Apology for the Book of Psalms*: — *The Moral Character of Civil Government considered* (1832): — *Thoughts on Union in the Church* of *God* (1846). See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac,* 1863, p. 368; Sprague, *Annals Amer. Pulpit,* 9:46 sq.; Drake, *Dict. Amer. Biog.* s.v.

McMillan, Edward

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Cumberland County, N. C., Sept. 2, 1804; was educated under Rev. Samuel Donnell and Rev. J. R. Bain, Tenn.; was licensed by Shiloh Presbytery in 1827, and ordained in 1828; labored in 1829 in Moulton, Ala.; in 1835, in Bethany, Tenn.; in 1849, in Gallatin, Tenn.; in 1856, in Carlinville, Ill.; and in 1862 became chaplain in the army, in which service he died, Aug. 27, 1864. Mr. McMillan as a preacher was clear and analytical; as a Christian, confiding, prayerful; as a man, naturally kind, noble, and generous. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac,* 1866, p. 220.

McMillan, Gavin

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Antrim County, Ireland, Feb. 6, 1787, and was brought to Charleston, S.C., in August of the same year. He began his education under Rev. John Kell, and pursued his classical studies under the care successively of John Orr, Rev. Thomas Donnelly, Rev. E. Newton, and Mr. Campbell; in 1817 he graduated with honor at the South Carolina College, S.C.; afterwards studied divinity in the Reformed Presbyterian Seminary in Philadelphia, Pa.; was licensed by the Reformed Philadelphia Presbytery in 1821, and in 1823 was ordained and installed pastor of Beech Woods Church, at Morning Sun, Ohio, where he labored for fifty years. In 1839 and 1861 he was moderator of the Synod. He died Jan. 25, 1867. Mr. McMillan was eminent as a scholar and theologian; clear and instructive as a preacher; wise and trustful as a counselor. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac,* 1868, p. 390.

McMillan, Gavin Riley

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Fairfield District, S. C., Dec. 24, 1824; was educated in Miami University, Athens, Ohio; graduated at the theological seminary of the Reformed Presbyterian Church in Philadelphia, Pa.; was licensed in 1850, and in 1851 was ordained pastor of the Neshanock and Hermon churches, in Pennsylvania. In 1859 he accepted a call to the First Reformed Presbyterian Church in Brooklyn, but owing to failing health resigned in 1860. Subsequently he settled in the West, and became president of the Union Female Seminary at Xenia, Ohio. He died Jan. 9, 1865. Mr. McMillan was a man of good talents — the judgment predominating over the imaginative, the practical over the speculative; truthfulness, simplicity, and humility were the principal traits of his character. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1867. p. 395.

McMillan, Hugh

D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Chester District, S. C., February, 1794; pursued his collegiate studies at the University of Pennsylvania, and graduated with the highest honor; was soon after elected professor of languages in Columbia College; but, determining to consecrate himself to the ministry, he entered the theological seminary of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, Pa., and in 1820 was licensed to preach. In 1821 he was ordained and installed pastor of the Rock Creek Brick Church, Chester District, S. C. His reputation as a profound linguist being now well established, at the public solicitation he founded an academy at the Brick Church for the primary education of young men. In 1828 he accepted a call to become pastor of the united congregations of Xenia and Massie’s Creek, Ohio, where also, at the earnest request of his people, he established an academy in 1830. In 1850, his congregation, becoming too numerous, divided into two societies, and he removed to Cedarville, where he died, Oct. 9, 1860. Dr. McMillan was a man of deep-toned piety; zealous, faithful, and indefatigable as a minister; profound and learned as a scholar. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1861, p. 218. (J. L. S.)

McMillan, Robert

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Washington County, Pa., March 10, 1829; graduated at Jefferson College, Canonsburg, Pa., in 1850, then taught some months in Darlington, Pa., and afterwards took charge of the

academy in Cross-Creek village, where he labored for three years with great acceptance. Subsequently he studied theology at the Western Theological Seminary in Alleghany City; was licensed in 1856, and in 1857 ordained and installed pastor of the congregations of Warren and Pine Run, Pa., where he labored until his death, Aug. 1, 1864. Mr. McMillan possessed a clear mind, a warm heart, and a most unassuming spirit; his talents were of a high order, cultivated by thorough education; his sermons were of the richest ingredients and finest mould. See Wilson, *Priesb. Hist. Almanac,* 1865, p. 105.

Mcmullen, James Porter

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Abbeville District, S.C., July 21, 1811; graduated at Franklin College, Athens, Georgia: in 1838; studied theology privately, under the direction of his brother, Rev. Dr. McMullen, and in 1841 was licensed and ordained pastor of the united churches of Matthew Zion, Concord, and Carthage, Ala., and afterwards took charge of Pleasant Ridge and Bethsaida churches, in Greene and Pickens counties, Ala. In 1864 he was appointed by the Executive Committee of Domestic Missions of the General Assembly of the Church South to labor in the Army of Tennessee, in which service he was killed in battle, May 16, 1864. Mr. McMullen was a man of excellent mind and great force of character. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1868, p. 348.

Mcmurray, William, D.D.

a (Dutch) Reformed minister, was born in Salem, N. Y. in 1784; graduated at Union College in 1804; was tutor in same in 1806-7; was licensed to preach by the Associate Reformed Church in 1808; settled at Lansingburg, N.Y., in 1808-11; entered the Reformed Church as pastor at Rhinebeck Flats, N. Y., in 1812-20; then removed to Market Street Reformed Dutch Church, New York, and died in 1835. His character was distinguished for its beautiful balance and harmony of excellent and gentle qualities. His ministry was remarkable for its fervor, diligence. and uniform success. His Church in New York grew from very small and humble beginnings, and chiefly among a poor people in the then suburbs, to a membership of between five and six hundred communicants. Besides frequent contributions to the periodical press, Dr. McMurray published several valuable occasional discourses (1825,1833). — Sprague, *Annals,* vol. 9: Corwin, *Manual* (*Dutch*) *Reformed Church,* s.v. (W. J. R. T.)

Mcnair, John, D.D.

a Presbyterian divine, was born near Newton, Pa., May 28,1806. He was reared with an earnest regard to his spiritual welfare, and at an early age made a profession of religion. He was educated at Newton Academy, then at Jefferson College, Canonsburg, Pa., graduating in 1828; studied theology at Princeton Seminary, N. J.; was licensed in 1831, and ordained in 1833. He labored for several years as a missionary in Pennsylvania, Indiana, and New Jersey; but subsequently he was called to Lancaster, Pa., where he continued to labor for eleven years. During the rebellion he entered the army as chaplain, and when the war was over returned and took charge of the Church in Strasburg, Pa. He died Jan. 27, 1867. Dr. McNair was retiring in his manner and deportment, possessing, however, a firmness and integrity of purpose which made itself felt in his expressed opinions. His sermons evinced a high order of talent, being eloquent, yet plain and easily comprehended. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac,* 1868, p. 132.

McNeill, Angus Currie

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Robeson County, N. C., May 4,1812. He early exhibited an intense fondness for learning, and, though he had to struggle against adverse influences, managed to secure a good primary education; his final preparation for college was received in the Donaldson Academy in Fayetteville, N. C., where he discharged the twofold duties of teacher and pupil until 1835, when he entered the University of North Carolina, where he graduated with the first honor. He studied theology in the Union Seminary at Prince Edward, Va., was licensed in 1845, and ordained and installed pastor of Carthage, Union, and Cypress churches in North Carolina. In 1852 he accepted a call to the pastorate of Centre Ridge Church, Ala., which relation existed until his death, Oct. 14,1860. Mr. McNeill was an able minister, an eloquent orator, and a fine scholar. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac,* 1862, p. 110.

McNeill, James H.

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Fayetteville, N. C., May 23 1825; entered North Carolina University at Chapel Hill, N. C.; after one year went to Yale College, New Haven, and subsequently graduated at Delaware College, Newark, Del., in 1844; studied divinity in the Union Theological Seminary, New York, for two years, and afterwards graduated

at Princeton, N. J.; was licensed in 1848, and in 1849 ordained and installed pastor of the Church at Pittsborough, in Chatham County, N. C.; was made one of the corresponding secretaries of the American Bible Society at New York in 1853; in 1861 was elected associate editor of the *North Carolina Presbyterian,* which position he held until 1862, when he entered the Confederate army. He was killed in battle, March 31,1865. Mr. McNeill was a man of strong will, and great independence of thought and action; his distinct individuality was indicative of the highest executive ability; his earnestness and vigor made him effective in every sphere. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac,* 1866, p. 356.

Mcneish, David

a minister of the (Dutch) Reformed Church, was born in Scotland in 1820; came to this country while yet a youth; graduated at Rutgers College in 1841, and at the New Brunswick Theological Seminary in 1844. He consecrated himself to the work of domestic missions, for which he was peculiarly fitted by his constitutional vigor and enthusiasm, by his unusual gifts as a public speaker, and by the depth and activity of his piety. He combined the “ingenium perfervidum Scotorum” with a truly American practicality, and with a consuming zeal which dared all difficulties and endured all trials “for Jesus’s sake.” Few preachers could be more intensely earnest and solemn in dealing with the higher themes of the Gospel, and in appeals to the consciences and the hearts of his hearers. One of his sermons on the last judgment seemed to the writer of this notice as if it were almost inspired. Its realizing power was awful and sublime. But he was equally at home in appealing to the tenderest sensibilities of the soul. Like a master musician, he could sweep all the chords of his mighty harp at will. His devotion to his missionary work in Michigan and Indiana, where all of his ministry was spent, was self-consuming. He lived for the Church of God until his earthly career closed in 1854. His great thought and last uttered wish was in full accordance with his high theological belief and experience. “Oh, that I may be made perfectly holy!” He was settled successively at Centreville and Constantine, Mich. (1844-49); at South Bend, Ind. (1849-52); and again at Constantine (1852-54). But his influence was powerful in all the Reformed churches of the Western States, among which he was a pioneer and a master builder. (W. J. R. T.)

Mcnelly, George

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born Feb. 15, 1793, on Drake's Creek, Davidson (now Sumner) County, then territory south of Ohio, now State of Tennessee; was licensed to preach in August, 1814; entered the traveling connection in the autumn of the same year; was ordained deacon in 1816, and elder in 1818, by bishop McKendree. His ministerial life was spent in Tennessee, Ohio, and Kentucky. His educational opportunities were limited, but by hard study, pursued in the midst of the abundant labors of a Methodist itinerant, he obtained a good knowledge of Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, and also of the sciences. He stood quite high, not only as a preacher, but also as a theologian. See McFerrin, *Methodism in Tennessee*, 2:334.

Mcnulty, John

a Presbyterian minister, was born at Killala, Ireland, in June, 1829; was educated at Belfast, Ireland, and, after reaching the United States, in the Associate Reformed Seminary at Newburg, N. Y., Union Seminary, New York City, and the theological seminary at Princeton, N. J. In 1853 he was licensed, and in 1854 was ordained and installed pastor of the Church at Richland City, Wis.; in 1856 accepted a call from the Church of Caledonia in De Korra, Wis., where he labored zealously until he died, May 15, 1861. Mr. McNulty was a devoted and zealous worker in the cause of Christ. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1862, p. 111.

Mcpheeters, William. D.D.

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Augusta County, Va., Sept. 28, 1778; was educated at Liberty Hall, Lexington, and licensed in 1802. Soon after he preaclled in various parts of Kentucky, extended his labors to Ohio and took charge of the Church at Danville, Ky., and of a male school. In 1804 he visited the counties of Greenbriar and Monroe. Subsequently he served at New Lebanon and Windy Cove, and acted as a stated supply in 1805 at Bethel Church. He was ordained in 1806, and took charge of the academy and congregation in Raleigh, N. C., where he remained several years. In 1836 he was principal of a school in Fayetteville, and was afterwards agent of the Board of Domestic Missions of the General Assembly. He died Nov. 7, 1842. — Sprague, *Annals*, 4:304.

McPherson, John Erskine

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Iredell County, N. C., Aug. 17, 1806; was educated at the academy at Beattie's Ford, N. C.; spent one year in the Union Theological Seminary, Virginia, and finished his studies privately under the Rev. R. H. Morrison, of Davidson College, N. C.; was licensed in 1838, and for several months labored as a missionary in North Carolina. In 1842 he was ordained, but for ten years more continued to labor in the mission work; in 1852 he was called to Prospect Church, in Rowan County, N. C.; in 1855 removed to Cherokee County, and labored in that missionary region until 1859. He died April 9,1860. Mr. McPherson was characterized by a patient perseverance and devotion to duty. indicative of the highest, grade of spiritual life. See Wilson. *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1861, p. 102.

McPherson, Joseph A.

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South. was born in West Feliciana Parish, La.. Dec. 19. 1835; was educated at the Centenary College, Jackson, La. (class of 1853): spent several years in teaching; entered the Mississippi Conference in 1859, and was appointed to Bolivar Circuit; in 1860 he was transferred to Fort Adams Circuit, and died June 18,1861. He was a faithful and able minister of the Gospel, and the Church greatly lamented his early loss. — *Conference Minutes of the M. E. Ch. South*, 2:317.

Mcqueen, George, Jr.

a Presbyterian missionary, was born in Schenectady, N. Y., in 1826; graduated at Union College, N. Y., in 1849; studied divinity in the seminary at Princeton, N.J.; was licensed and ordained by the presbytery of Albany in 1852, and soon after sailed for Africa, as a member of the Corisco Mission. where he labored until he died, March 25, 1859. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1860, p. 76.

Mcreynolds, Robert Young

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born in Alien County, Kentucky, in 1818; was converted in his sixteenth year; was licensed to preach in his nineteenth year, and joined the Kentucky Conference in 1829. In 1840 he was transferred to the Rock River

Conference, and was stationed at Galena; in 1841 was transferred back to the Kentucky Conference, and continued in the regular work until 1845, when he located until 1867. He was next readmitted to the Louisville Conference, and appointed to Portland; in 1868 to Shepherdsville Circuit, and in 1869 to Litchfield Circuit. He died August 23, 1870. Mr. McReynolds was “a benevolent man, a cheerful, happy Christian, very zealous and useful in the *ministry." — Conference Minutes of the M. E. Church South,* 1870, s.v.

Mcswain, William Adney

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born in Montgomery (now Stanley) County, N. C., Nov. 5, 1814; was converted and joined the Church in 1831; was licensed to preach in 1836, and entered the South Carolina Conference in 1838. He served on the following circuits: Pleasant Grove in 1843; Rutherford in 1844-45; Union in 1846-47, and again in 1854; Neuberry in 1848. and again in 1855-56; Black Swamp in 1849-50. In 185152 he was pastor of Trinity Church, Charleston; in 1853 of Spartansburg station; in 1857 tract agent of his Conference; from 1859-62 presiding elder on the Cokesbury District; in 1863-64 pastor of Ninety-six, and in 1865 of Laurens Circuit. He died Jan. 7, 1866. Besides the trustworthiness indicated in his appointments, he served as a delegate to the last two sessions of the Southern General Conference, and was elected to that which was to meet in 1862. and was at the time of his death president of the Sunday-school Society of the South Carolina Conference. “Few men, with similar disadvantages, ever attained that measure of ability, degree of eminence, and width of popularity which constituted that honor which was so cheerfully and universally awarded by the Church and world to this self-made man. Possessed of great versatility of genius, gifted with rare social qualities and conversational powers, and blessed with a singular descriptive faculty, he was well qualified, from his vast fund of general information, to give life, interest, and information to the fireside or social circle. His appearance in the pulpit, his engaging address, flow of language, and tone of voice, and ease and naturalness of manner, his own interest in the subject, with the general persuasiveness of his style, gave to his sermons, which evinced much thought and research, an effectiveness which was only equaled by the great popularity of the preacher himself. He was a favorite divine with all sects of Christians and all classes of people.” See *Conference Minutes of the M. E. Church South,* 3:17.

Mcvean, Daniel Creighton

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Caledonia, Livingston County. N. Y., Oct. 10, 1818; graduated at Union College in 1844; pursued his theological studies in the Seminary of the Associate Reformed Synod of New York at Newburg, and in 1847 was licensed to preach. He traveled for two or three years as a probationer, and in 1850 was ordained and installed pastor of the Associate Reformed Church of Lyndon, where he labored for sixteen years. He died Sept. 7, 1868. Mr. McVean was a faithful pastor, a useful minister, and an eminently pious man. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac,* 1868, p. 274.

Mcvickar, John, D.D.

an eminent clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born at New York in 1787, and was educated at Columbia College (class of 1804), and at Cambridge University, England. He entered the ministry in 1811 as rector at Hyde Park, N. Y., and remained there until 1817, when he was appointed professor of moral philosophy, rhetoric, and belles-lettres in Columbia College. The duties of this position he discharged until 1857, when ill-health obliged him to retire from active duties. In recognition of his services he was created Emeritus professor. He also acted as chaplain on Governor's Island. He died at Bloomingdale, N. Y., Oct. 29, 1868. Dr. McVickar was the author of several valuable works; among them the following deserve our notice: *Early Years of Bishop Hobart* (1834): — *The Professional Years of Bishop Hobart* (1836): — *A Memoir of the Rev. Edmund D. Griffins,* appended to the "Remains of the Rev. E. D. Griffins" (1831. 2 vols. 8vo). See *Life of the Rev. John McVickar, D.D.*, by W. A. McVickar (N.Y. 1871); *New Amer. Cyclop,* 1868; Drake, *Dict. Amer. Biog.* s.v.; Allibone, *Dict. Brit, and Amer. Authors,* 2:1198.